

PROOFS OF A CONSPIRACY TO BUILD A TOTAL, MANAGED GLOBAL SOCIETY

- - - - - Part One - - - - -

INTRODUCTION

There appeared in the *Wall Street Journal* of September 1, 1972, a leading editorial which labeled as fantasy, hallucination and big lie, the charge that there is "a long-time conspiracy financed by the Rockefeller family and programmed through the Council on Foreign Relations, aimed at imposing a one-world Socialist government."

The spokesman for the Dow Jones interests also derided the idea of any conspiracy in such controversies as fluoridation, progressive education, mental health programs, sex education in the schools, etc. These were all ridiculed as "rightist" fantasies. But also scorned as untrue were such "leftist" charges of conspiracies in connection with the assassination of JFK, that "the military industrial complex sent Johnny marching off to war in Vietnam in pursuit of corporate profits," and that "the U.S. intervened in Vietnam in order to lay claim to that nation's off-shore oil reserves," etc.

Then, in closing his editorial, the writer perhaps unintentionally delineates the most important tool of the total conspiracy:-

"What is notable about these descents into surrealism is that radical rightist theorists are generally without political, economic or social influence. As a rule, they preach their gospel mainly to their own kind through fringe journals and vanity printing presses. But radical leftists are given nationwide TV forums from which to propound their theories, respected publishers vie to print their most fantastic charges, even the most wild of them remain respected members-in-good-standing in the academic community, and the national media, which properly execrate the rightists, generally treat them with respect and from time to time with deference. . . ."

If what the editor says is true—and it is—then is this not proof in itself that there is a conspiracy to silence the rightists and to publicize every word uttered by the leftists?

We cannot deny that what we write in this series of letters will be preached mainly to "our own kind" and we realize that few will be converted because of what we write. In far graver situations—because souls were involved in their cases—Noah faced the same handicap, as did Isaiah, and all the other prophets from Jeremiah to John the Baptist. Still, what they said had to be said, because it was their privilege and duty to bear witness to the truth, that succeeding generations might read what their own generations refused to hear. It is with this same regard for obligation that we write of a conspiracy which is denied and called fantasy by those who would conceal facts from the people.

DEFINITION:-

Merriam-Webster Dictionary, Second Edition, records the following meanings for the word "conspiracy": 1) a "combination of men for an evil purpose; an agreement between two or more persons to commit a crime in concert, as treason, a plot." 2) "Combination of men for a single end; a concurrence, or general tendency, as of circumstances, to one event; harmonious action; 3) "Law. An agreement, manifesting itself in words or deeds, by which two or more persons confederate to do an unlawful act, or to use unlawful means to do an act which is lawful; confederacy."

Using any one, or all three of the above definitions, it becomes immediately apparent that to deny that conspiracy exists is to, in the words of the editor of *Wall Street Journal*, engage in "fantasy, hallucination, myth and big lie."

The Council on Foreign Relations is, of course, a "combination of men for a single end," which makes of it a conspiracy. The real argument, then, has to do with the answer to the question: For what end are the members of the CFR conspiring?

It is our intention to prove, out of their own

mouths, that there is a conspiracy to build a new social, political and economic world order, and that the purpose of that conspiracy is to concentrate the wealth, the natural resources, the production, distribution, and sale of the world's goods, in the hands of a favored oligarchy of international financiers and industrialists.

We further intend to prove that there is an overall plan for the accomplishment of this purpose, a plan which is already being carried out, and a plan which calls for the building of a new social order on a global scale.

First, let us ask, *Why?* And a person well qualified to answer is Roy Ash, president of Litton Industries and chairman of the President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization.

On February 7, 1972, there was held a White House Conference on the Industrial World Ahead, which was called:

"A Look at Business in 1990."

As one of the participants in that conference, Roy Ash later appeared before the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce to tell West Coast businessmen what was decided at the White House Conference. The billing for this latter event is impressive, reading:

"The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Commerce and the White House Staff, is presenting The White House Conference, The World Ahead, A Look at Business in 1990. Thursday, May 18, 1972. Los Angeles Hilton. 3:00-6:30 p.m."

Following is a part of what Roy Ash told his Los Angeles audience.

It's a privilege to be with you this afternoon and, together, to peer into the future toward 1990. Some of you may have wondered why the White House conferees were advised to direct their prognostications to the year 1990, rather than to some other specific date in the decades ahead. Unfortunately, there is little I can provide in the way of edification; I rather wondered about it myself. Alright, I reasoned, George Orwell long ago appropriated 1984. Herman Kahn more recently laid claim to 2000. So there were not many good numbers left. Possibly 1990 was selected for the benefit of the panelists. They will all be retired and safe from harm if their predictions are wrong.

At the White House conference held earlier this year my fellow panelists and I discussed the subject of world business and the economy of

1990. Our particular panel, I should add, was comprised of Jean Frere, Managing Partner of Banque Lambert, Brussels, Belgium; Robert V. Roosa, partner of Brown Brothers Harriman & Co., United States; Roberto Campos, president of the International Bank, Sao Paulo, Brazil; and Peter G. Peterson, then Assistant to President Nixon for International Economic Affairs and Executive Director of the Council on International Economic Policy, and now the Secretary of Commerce.

While we did not always achieve unanimity, our conclusions on the general subject of the future of world business tended, for the most part, to be strikingly similar. In the time allotted me today, I will attempt to summarize those conclusions. However, in all fairness to Messrs. Frere, Roosa, Campos and Peterson—none of whom are here to cry foul if their panel chairman goes astray—I will hedge by saying that what follows represents essentially my own views, reinforced where appropriate with their comments.

The threshold question is, why is world business so important to us anyway? Why don't we just concentrate on improving the U.S. business and economy? Isn't that enough challenge?

The answer is that increasing economic and business interdependence among nations is the keynote of the next two decades of world business—decades that will see major steps toward a *single world economy* evolve out of today's increasingly interacting, but still separate, national economies. As city, state and regional economies in this country have become melded into a single and highly interacting national economy, so individual national economies will meld into a single world economic system. And as the economic development of the United States made obsolete self-contained U.S. state, or even regional, economies, so the natural development of the world between now and 1990 will make obsolete a free standing French economy, a Japanese one, and even a U.S. economy in isolation from others.

Such an evolution is natural and inexorable—and beneficial. For an intelligent civilization always has and always will seek more and more efficient, and thus productive, means of converting its limited resources, energy and manpower into useful products and services. More highly integrated economic structures—based on specialization of its many elements and on interdependency among the specialized parts—is the inevitable answer. A single world economy is that higher order integration for the decades ahead.

The obstacles and hazards in the way of realizing a beneficially functioning single world economy are many. More effective multilateral

governmental institutions must be developed and brought into operation. Some aspects of individual sovereignty will be given over to supranational authority. Even as critical, the relative roles of the world's governments, on the one hand, and of globe circling business enterprises on the other, need to be worked out. Some have likened the upcoming issues between sovereign nations and multinational business to the test of earlier times between church and state.

We need only look at the long road the European Common Market countries have taken, and are still on, as they step by step reconcile national interests with the mutual advantages of a more broadly based economy, and as they embrace the activities of multinational business, to visualize the even more complex issues as we move toward a *single world economy*. But the Common Market countries are all industrialized and all operate under the private enterprise system. In embracing *all* the countries of the world, special attention needs to be given to the less industrialized countries and how they relate to the already industrialized ones, and to *the place of the socialist countries in a developing world economy*.

Roberto Campos, of the panel, maintains that great strains will arise in embracing within a single world economy countries of widely disparate development levels. He sees a strong bipolarity of interests and objectives. One of the bilateral poles of the future, as he sees it, will be comprised of emerging post-industrial, mass consumption societies—the largely developed societies—by 1990 perhaps 30 per cent of the world's population when taken together. The industrial-transitional and pre-industrial societies, representing over 70 per cent of the world's population, would constitute the other pole. And, as he notes, these two groups will greatly differ in the nature of their priorities and in the range of options available, thus a continuing source of international tension. Campos foresees, in the post-industrial societies, a humanistic revolt against technology and the surfeit of materialism it has produced; and in the developing nations, a technological revolt against hedonistic humanism—because for them the most urgent concern is the eradication of poverty—through stepped up “materialism.”

As importantly, international agreements between the socialist and the private property economies add a different dimension to the problems for which solutions need be found over the years ahead. But as Jean Frere forecasts, the socialist countries will take major steps toward joining the world economy by 1990. He goes so far as to see

them becoming members of the International Monetary Fund, the sine qua non for effective participation in multilateral commerce. Then also, by 1990 an imaginative variety of contractual arrangements will have been devised and put into operation by which the socialist countries and the private capital countries will be doing considerable business together, neither being required to abandon its base ideology. (The economic theories of Adam Smith and Karl Marx are not without their common points.)

These special dimensions of the next economy—the economy of the world, as it first permeates the industrial countries and then reaches out to embrace both the pre-industrial and socialistic ones—present challenging tasks for the next two or more decades....

The industrial world ahead... will turn increasingly on the use of massive amounts of capital, the development and application of a cascading flow of new technologies, and highly professionalized management. Yet these relatively scarce resources are not equally available to all the world's countries. *Thus the role for the multinational company.*

For, the fundamental reasons the multinational corporations are here to stay and will conduct much of the world's business of the future are simple ones. These powerful factors of production—that is, capital, technology and management—will be fully mobile, neither contained nor containable within national borders. They can be employed wherever in the world they will be most productive. World-wide transportation systems—extensive, economic and rapid—will make the world smaller in 1990 than California was in 1920. New management techniques, aided by computer processed data and instant communications, will allow as effective direction and control of world-around business activities in 1990 as a fifty man factory was controlled by the on-the-floor visual supervision of 1920.

The multinational corporation will be the natural outgrowth of the driving force of industrial enterprise that continually seeks out ways of producing and distributing more goods at lower cost to the consumer. Having a world perspective and operating in conducive national environments, it will combine labor, materials, capital, technology and management in the most productive combinations and distribute the fruits of this combination to world markets.

Such maximum efficiency in the use of all the world's productive resources is essential for the demanding period ahead. The multinational corporation—*domestic in all countries, foreign in none*—will become the mechanism to realize the

potentials of world business for all the world's citizens.

Yet the very scale and dimension of the multinational corporation will require *new forms of relationships between business and national governments*. To reflect this need for reconciling the roles of sovereign nations and multinational corporations, Robert Roosa is convinced we are going to have to develop and apply clear "rules of the road." It cannot now be predicted whether they will come about from case by case development in the courts of international law or by treaty among major nations. In any event, effective international rules of the road are as essential for the world economy ahead as they are for Los Angeles traffic.

As a framework for their development and application will be the establishment of more effective supranational institutions to deal with intergovernmental matters, and matters between governments and world industry. A key intergovernmental institution that needs to work well in a world economy is the *International Monetary Fund*. Roosa predicts that the IMF will reach new capabilities and dimensions. It will become, in Bob's words, the most advanced embodiment of the aspirations that so many have for *a world society, a world economy*. The IMF, he forecasts for 1990, is going to be *the source of all of the primary reserves of all the banking systems of the world*.

Jean Frere observes that monetary stability is going to be as critical for the 1990 world economy as the finer standards for distance, weight and time that are now required by modern technology. To bring this about is no small task; inflation must be licked and gold restored its rule; he concludes.

It would be my own forecast that within two decades the institutional framework for a World Economic Community will be in place and operating just as today's European Economic Community structure provides the strong supranational framework for the European economy.

So, as we look ahead to the world economy of 1990 we already see some parts falling into their places. World business already is rapidly increasing. Multinational corporations are increasingly a fact of world business. Governments are beginning to perceive the meaning, problems and opportunities of a world economy. High on official agendas, world-around between now and then, will be programs to reconcile national interests, the forces of world business, and international objectives.

For, in the final analysis, we are commanded by the fact that the economies of the major countries

of the world will be interlocked. And since major economic matters in all countries are also important political matters in and between countries, the inevitable consequence of these propositions in that *the broader and total destinies—economic, political and social—of all the world's nations are closely interlocked*. We are clearly at that point where economic issues and their related effects can be considered only in terms of a *total world destiny*, not just separate *national destinies*, and certainly not just a separate *go-it-alone destiny for the United States*.

In the preceding, Roy Ash and his fellow White House panelists—multinational industrialists, international bankers, government appointees—tell American businessmen that a World Economic Community will be in operation by 1990, that "some aspects of national sovereignty will be given over to supranational authority," that the IMF will be "the source of all of the primary reserves of all of the banking systems of the world," and that the Socialist countries of the world will join in the creation of this New World Society, and finally, that this is "natural, inexorable, and beneficial."

In simpler words: We shall have World Government whether we like it or not. And the oligarchists who say this know whereof they speak; because they have their plan, it has been put into operation, and it is now working and being worked at every level of society: international, national, regional and at State, County, City and Community levels.

This revolutionary plan for the reshaping of the world is complex, difficult to understand because of its semantics. Even the name of the plan is disarming, seemingly innocent and innocuous. The plan is called the "Planning-Programming-Budgeting System" and few people other than its operators even know of the plan's existence.

We intend to do our utmost to relieve this dearth of knowledge in this series of letters.

(To Be Continued)

DON BELL REPORTS and CLOSER-UP are privately circulated newsletters which accent the Christian American point of view. Complete service: \$24 per year. 3 months trial: \$6. Extra copies: 10¢ each. Please address orders and make checks payable to:

DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

article by Mildred Spaeth appearing in the local paper (reprinted in the *Record*) reads: "His (Hoover's) life in West Branch was ended at 11 years. But when at 22, a graduate of the new Stanford University's first class, an engineer on his way to England to discuss his new job as *head of the Rothschild families' mining interests all over the world*, he came to spend a day here..." Italics were added for emphasis.)

Seymour Harris also speaks glowingly of the first use of what is now called the planning-programming-budgeting system, in his reference to the Soviet five-year plans. What this Fabian fabler does not say is that the five-year plans were *programmed* and *budgeted* by American financiers, industrialists and technicians. Professor Antony Sutton of Stanford University's Hoover Institution, notes in his highly authoritative *Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development*:

"...there is a report in the State Department files that names Kuhn, Loeb & Co. (long established, important financial house in New York) as the financier of the first Five Year Plan."

Professor Sutton proves most conclusively in his three volume history of Soviet technological development that the Soviet Union was *planned, programmed and budgeted* by the United States (for further information on this subject refer to *Don Bell Reports* of August 25, 1972, which deals with Aid and Trade with the Enemy.)

However, the Soviet Five-Year Plans were not to be used in the United States; rather, Fabianism was the system chosen for us. Let us recall what was said previously of how different styles of Socialism are carefully tailored to fit particular situations and particular cultures. So, while the Soviet Five-Year Plans were a type of our present Planning-Programming-Budgeting System (hereafter referred to as PPBS), the Soviet PPBS was a crude and coercion-based system ideally suited to the inhabitants of the USSR (and to Orientals), and would be not at all suitable for people of Nordic and Anglo-Saxon cultures.

So, this American-style PPBS was adapted from the English PEP (Political and Economic Planning). In a remarkable article by the late Florence Fowler Lyons which appeared in the Dec. 17, 1967 issue of *The Ledger* (Montrose, Calif.), the following explanation is given:

"If PPBS confuses you, just associate it with the source of its inspiration - the traditional communist-socialist 'Five Year Plans.' Hitch admitted in 1966 that PPBS grew from 'small beginnings... which date back to Blackett'."

Hitch is Charles J. Hitch, 13-year veteran of the think-tank called Rand, where the PPBS was perfected for American usage. Hitch presently is president of the University of California (there for reasons we'll explain later.) And Blackett is Professor Patrick M.S. Blackett, chief science advisor to British Fabian Socialists Hugh Gaitskill and Harold Wilson.

In an excellent background paper sent us by Marilyn Angle, of Santa Monica, California, where patriots are fighting the introduction of PPBS in their school system (more of this in a future letter in this series), we are given the following thumbnail history of the development of PPBS in the Executive Branch of the Federal Government:

- 1929: President Hoover set up *President's Research Committee on Social Trends*, which was liberally financed by a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation.
- 1949: President Truman named a U.S. *Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of Government*. This was the first Hoover Commission, and it recommended the establishment of *performance budgeting* (this is the B in the developing PPBS).
- 1955: Second Hoover Commission.
- 1956: President Eisenhower appointed the *Commission on National Goals*. The American Assembly of Columbia U. was given responsibility for preparing this "national goals" report, and a number of foundations provided financial support. Staff director of the Commission was William F. Bundy.
- 1961: President Kennedy, implementing two *RAND* suggestions, launched PPBS in the Department of Defense under Robert Strange McNamara. * (See footnote at bottom of next page).
- 1965: President Johnson Initiated PPBS throughout the Executive Branch.
- 1966: Congress passed *Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act*, which set the stage for bringing PPBS into the Model Cities Program.
- 1968: HEW under President Johnson prepared a draft *Social Report*. What had been primarily *economic* planning now would become *social* planning and programming.

PROOFS OF A CONSPIRACY TO BUILD A TOTAL MANAGED GLOBAL SOCIETY

- - - - - Part Two - - - - -

THE PLANNERS

In order to build the Planned Society, it is first necessary for the builders to enter into a Conspiracy and formulate *The Plan*, outlining the goals and objectives that are to be attained. Next, it is necessary to blueprint *The Program*, to diagram the steps that are to be taken in order to achieve the planned goals and objectives. Finally, it is essential that *The Budget* be prepared, so that the necessary wherewithal will be immediately available for the carrying out of *The Program* and the attainment of the goals and objectives of *The Plan*.

And that is a skeletal description of the *System* which is being used to bring about *The New World Order*, and which is called so unobtrusively and so innocuously, the *Planning - Programming - Budgeting System*.

Planning is, of course, the first essential step. And Planning also is the *essential ingredient* of any totalitarian system of government. Economic Planning is the very heart and soul of any and every form of Socialism, from the Rightist Fascism to the Leftist Communism.

But this kind of planning is alien to, and inimical to, the American form of representative republican government and free enterprise economy.

No one knows this better than the Socialist Planners. "Planning has no place under pure capitalism," wrote Seymour Harris, professor of economics at the Harvard Littauer School of Business Administration, founding member of the Fabian Socialist Americans for Democratic Action, Senior Consultant to the United States Treasury Department and the Council of Economic Advisers and ten other Federal agencies in the Kennedy Administration, author, lecturer, etc., etc. This adviser to Presidents who has expressed great admiration for the Soviet System and who looks upon himself as chief American prophet of the

great god of economics Maynard Keynes (a claim disputed with merit by John Kenneth Galbraith) is author of the prophecy that "a planned society may be just around the corner, and capitalism may be but a stage in the historical process from feudalism to socialism." His reasoning:

"Planning has no place under pure capitalism, for it does not allow much room for the capitalist trinity—sovereignty of the consumer, the tyranny of the price system, and the quest for profits. In a planned economy, the economic architects generally determine what use is to be made of limited resources and, therefore, to some extent impair the sovereignty of consumers. Their targets are set according to an objective determined by the state, e.g., producing for war or raising the mass standard of living, and thus do not allow price and income movements to regulate the productive process; and since these goals are selected by the general board of strategy, acting for the party, the government, or the people, the planned economy supplants the entrepreneur, who is the human magneto in the capitalist machine."

This is the typical argument for Fabian economic policies, which were adopted and adapted by the American Federal Government beginning in 1933. We have written much about Fabianism in previous letters, and it is not our purpose to debate the fallacies of the system at this time. However, a brief restatement of some of the highlights of this specialized brand of Socialism seems required:

The Fabian Society was organized in England in 1882 and has played the guiding role in the Socialization of England. In addition to its domestic activities, there was much overseas missionary work performed; the London School of Economics was established, according to one of its promoters, in order "to raise and train the bureaucracy of the future socialist state"—and many

Americans have been trained there, one of them having been the late John Kennedy. With Richard Nixon's admission that he is "a Keynesian," the claim of former Prime Minister Clement Atlee seems to have been fully justified: "It's alumni do the economic planning for the English-speaking world."

In 1931 there emerged in England from the inner circle of the Fabians what was known as *Political and Economic Planning (PEP)*. Shortly thereafter a number of the most prominent British Fabians came to the United States to assist their American colleagues in *Planning, Programming, and Budgeting* FDR's New Deal.

It is important to understand that Fabianism would never have been adaptable to Russia and Communism could never have been successfully imposed on the English. *The two different forms of Socialism were carefully tailored to their specific roles and for their respective situations.*

The Planners also understood that culturally and otherwise there is much in common between the people of England and the United States. They have substantially the same legal systems, speak the same language, observe Christian traditions, etc. If Fabianism was the proper approach for the successful socialization of England, it was reasonable to conclude that it might also be the most suitable brand to try out on the Americans.

So, as Syndicalism and the I.W.W. movement fizzled out like a wet fuse on a bomb; as the Bolshevik fad faded off the pages of current history, after World War II both the Trotskyist and Communist causes trickled down to form mere pools of subversion in metropolitan areas; but Fabian Socialism grew and it grew until, in 1972, its aims and objectives are to be found prominently displayed as planks in the platform of the National Democratic Party.

(A parenthetical comment: The Fabian approach in the United States followed much the same pattern as that which had proved successful in England. There the Fabians took over the Labour Party and made their revolutionary changes while that Party was in power. But the Labour Party could never make the programs work properly; so the Conservative Party would then be brought into power, to restore order and make the Labour Party programs work. In the same sense in the United States, the left-leaning National Democratic Party proposes and

takes a step toward total Socialism, then the National Republican Party disposes and makes the Democratic proposals work! Both are Socialist, but in order to display a seeming difference, the National Democrats lean leftward and copy the Welfare Statism of Sweden; while the National Republicans lean toward the right and, in keeping with their alleged accent on "big business," imitate the monopolistic Corporate State Fascism developed in Italy.)

"In 1913, the *planned* economy existed only in the minds or scribbles of leftward theorists. As recently as 1930, the average economist reacted violently to the suggestion that a *programmed* economy might embody some logic. But much has happened since 1930. The world has observed three five-year plans in the USSR effect an unparalleled expansion and industrialization, as well as a strengthening of the military machine." So wrote Seymour Harris in his book *Economic Planning* (Alfred A. Knopf, 1949). The words *planned* and *programmed* in the preceding quote were italicized by your author to point out a planned coincidence:

It is interesting that Harris chose the year 1913 as the date of conception of the theory of *economic planning*; for it was that year that the Federal Reserve System was born, the Income Tax began, and the first tax-exempt foundation received a federal charter.

We mention these happenings of 1913 because the system we are discussing in this letter bears the name and title of the *Planning - Programming - Budgeting System*, and here we see how the *budgeting* was *planned* even before the *programming* began.

Interesting, too, was the author's selection of the year 1930 in connection with violent objections on the part of economists to the *programmed economy*; for it was in that year that President Herbert Hoover began laying the groundwork for the coming *planned* depression which would permit the ushering in of the New Deal *Programming*. (If any of our readers are shocked by our reference to Mr. Hoover as the man who "made straight the way" for the coming of FDR and the New Deal, permit us one reference to the pages of the *Congressional Record* of August 20, 1962, page 16008. There is an entry by Rep-Schwengle of Iowa dealing with the establishment of a Hoover Memorial and Library at West Branch, Iowa (Hoover's birthplace) on August 10, 1962. One paragraph from an

- 1969: President Nixon's Administration committed itself to the issuing of Annual Social Reports. In July, 1969, Nixon established the *National Goals Research Staff* and directed that it report to him annually, starting July 4, 1970, with specific concentrated concern for the year 1976 (200th anniversary of the Nation.)
- 1970: Bureau of the Budget is reorganized into *Office of Management and Budget* to have complete control over the *performance budgeting* for all areas of government activity.
- 1972: President Nixon signed *Executive Order No. 11647*, which created Ten Federal Regional Councils.
- 1973: (Pending) Restructuring of the Federal Cabinet into five departments for domestic functions. Also revenue sharing to finance PPBS at local levels of government.

The foregoing information merely highlights the development and application of PPBS at the domestic level, within the United States. But perhaps even more important in the final analysis is the *international application* of PPBS. The World Bank, under McNamara, uses PPBS as an inflexible guideline in the granting of loans; it is a requirement for all U.S. loans or give-aways to foreign countries or developing regions; the Peace Corps is a PPBS adjunct; all Ford Foundation grants are subject to PPBS

* Robert McNamara was the first executive to try out the RAND-developed PPBS at the corporate level. He used PPBS to build the Edsel automobile. The Edsel became a joke in the motor car industry, but the system used to produce it was approved by Kennedy for Defense Department management. McNamara as Secretary of Defense brought in Charles Hitch of RAND (now of UC) and Alain C. Enthoven of RAND (now of Litton Industries), to take charge of the PPDS operation of the Defense Department. Coincidentally, McNamara used PPDS at Ford and lost money. Litton Industries under Roy Ash, president and Alain Enthoven, vice president, also installed PPBS to operate their multinational conglomerate - and Litton Industries reported a loss of \$14 million in the third quarter of its current fiscal year (reported May 25, 1972). It is this same Roy Ash whom we quoted so extensively in our first letter in this series. McNamara, who started it all, now has gone to the *International Bank for Reconstruction and Development*, where he is busily installing PPBS on an international scale.

control and management; etc.

PPBS also is a requirement of the United Nations since 1956 for all developing countries, via "regional workshops on budget classification and management" which were held in Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Far East.

UNESCO, between 1960 and 1963, "in cooperation with the developing nations," established a network of new training and research centers for Latin America (Santiago), Asia (New Delhi), the Arab States (Beirut), and for the new African Nations (Dakar). "To provide a nexus for these regional centres and for universities and other organizations that might be attracted to this field of training, UNESCO (with the co-operation of the World Bank, the Ford Foundation and the French Government) established in Paris in 1963 the *International Institute for Educational Planning* (IIEP.)"

PPBS is being used, therefore, at every level of government for the control and management of people of all classes: internationally, nationally, regionally, and at State, County, City and Community levels. PPBS was "perfected" by RAND Corp., a think-tank located at Santa Monica, Calif., to aid Government in pursuit of its "goals and objectives" *through the process of budgeting*. It is being applied to Defense, Law and Order; Health, Education and Welfare; Economic Development; the new public corporations such as the Post Office; Education; etc.

It works like this: Big Brother says, "I have made the *Plans*; you must set up your *Program* so it will help fulfill my goals and objectives; then I will set up a *Budget* for the operation of your *Program*; using the *Revenue Sharing Plan* to finance it. By means of the *Revenue Sharing Plan* I took all of your money, so you'd be forced to operate your *Program* under my *Budget* and in accordance with the goals and objectives of my *Plan*." That's PPBS in a nutshell.

(To Be Continued)

DON BELL REPORTS and CLOSER-UP are privately circulated Newsletters which accent the Christian American point of view. Complete service: \$24 per year. 3 months trial: \$6. Extra copies: 10¢ each. Please address orders and make checks payable to:
DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

PROOFS OF A CONSPIRACY TO BUILD A TOTAL MANAGED GLOBAL SOCIETY

- - - - - Part Three - - - - -

THE SEVEN-YEAR PLAN

In *Science* magazine, February 5, 1971, there appeared an article by Karl Deutsch, John Platt and Dieter Senghass of Harvard University, which states that four of the most important political achievements in this century are:

1. Soviet type of one-party state, developed by V. I. Lenin, 1917-21.
2. Large-scale nonviolent political action, M. K. Gandhi, 1918-34.
3. Peasant and guerrilla organization and government, Mao Tse-tung, 1929-49.
4. Cost benefit analysis (PPBS), Charles Hitch (1956-63).

These political achievements are described as *political administrative techniques*.

It was Charles Hitch who developed the Planning-Programming-Budgeting System at RAND Corporation, then joined Robert S. McNamara to install the system in the U.S. Department of Defense. Hitch later was transferred to the presidency of the University of California, to assist in installing PPBS in the California school system.

In regard to the four *political administrative techniques* listed above, it should be noted that each is a new development for the *control of people*.

The Soviet "one party state" is not a political development as we know such in the United States; for the Communist Party is not a *political* party in the true sense of the word; rather it is a *monopolistic minority group* which forces its will upon the majority of the citizens of the USSR. Under this political administrative system, a small self-proclaimed elite monopolizes all the power of the state so that it can create the environment which will allegedly perfect human nature and result ultimately in a perfect society. Monopoly control by a small elite: this was Lenin's contribution toward the building of the *New World Order*. And it was simply a system of *people control*.

Gandhi's contribution had to do with the control of people through peace; Mao Tse-tung's contribution was for the control of people through violence; and Hitch's PPBS is for the control of people through planning and programming through the coercive use of the budget - the power of money being used for the purpose of creating a *New Society* (which includes the programming for the creation of a *new man* who will fit into the preplanned pattern peacefully and contentedly.)

The use of the acronym PPBS, with its accent on "Budgeting," would seem to indicate that this was merely a new system of accounting, and nothing more. In fact, this was the assurance usually given all the dubious and the skeptical who opposed the installation of PPBS. However, as a mere accounting system, PPBS was a failure from the very beginning:

PPBS was given its trial runs, not within a government agency, but in certain private-sector corporations (forecasting the desire of the Elite Planners to convert this Nation into a Corporate-Fascist-State.) PPBS first tried out at the expense of the Ford Motor Co., in its Edsel Manufacturing Department, under the managership of Robert Strange McNamara, with farcical results. The PPB System also was tried out with the Penn-Central Railway, and that corporation was taken over by the Government. It was installed at multinational Rolls Royce, and that corporation went into the hands of receivers. Men who helped perfect PPBS at RAND joined the executive staff of the multinational conglomerate, Litton Industries in an attempt to make the system work at the corporate level in a competitive economy - and Litton lost \$14 million in its last reported fiscal quarter. Etc., etc.

In other words, PPBS was clumsy, costly, ineffective; yet it was considered to be so

successful *administratively* that it was adopted by the Executive Branch of our Federal Government, installed first in the Defense Department and later in all Departments. (If you agree that our conduct of the Vietnamese War has been a most miserable failure, remember that it was conducted under Charlie Hatch's Planning-Programming-Budgeting System!)

Even though PPBS has been an abysmal failure wherever tried at the corporate level, Rand Corporation executives and spokesmen are still working overtime trying to "sell" the system to every large corporation in the country. As an example, we have the photostat of an article written by L. A. Dougharty, of the Cost Analysis Department of Rand Corporation, titled: "Developing Corporate Strategy Through Planning, Programming, and Budgeting."

Because we are dealing with "proofs of a conspiracy," it is necessary to reproduce some of their words and their presentations. And because Mr. Dougharty gives the Rand Corporation description of how the United States Government uses PPBS, we reprint pertinent parts of the Dougharty article, together with a table showing how PPBS has been adapted as a "Seven-Year Plan" by the Federal Executive:

DEVELOPING CORPORATE STRATEGY THROUGH PLANNING, PROGRAMMING, AND BUDGETING

...the corporation needs a planning framework that aids in clarifying objectives, identifying the alternatives open to the firm, and measuring the effectiveness of those alternatives toward the attainment of the objectives of the corporation. To cope with this problem of integrating objectives with resources, ... the Government of the United States—the biggest conglomerate of them all—is employing what is termed "Planning, Programming, and Budgeting (PPB)."...

Table I presents a programme structure for the U.S. Government. It illustrates how the resources of the government (measured in dollars, are allocated to the various broad programme areas such as National Defense, Education, etc.

Under each broad programme area, the programmes of the government agencies that contribute toward the attainment of the broad area objective would be arrayed. Education programmes, for example, would be arrayed

under the Education category, rather than under the sponsoring agency. Selecting from among the competing programmes in each broad programming area involves the second aspect of PPB—the analytical part. Analysis is shorthand for a variety of quantitative techniques for exploring the cost and effectiveness of programme proposals over an extended time period (seven years—Ed.) The most prominent example of the use of PPB is in the United States Department of Defense, where the new planning structure clarified objectives in defense and pinpointed weaknesses in the then current strategy for defense....

In the case of the Department of Defense, the programme categories that reflect the military objectives of the United States are set by the Department and not by the services.... The transition of the PPB concept used in government planning to corporate planning is not difficult to make. The parallel between business and war is remarkably close, so it is not surprising that planning techniques of the two can be quite similar....

(End of quotation)

In connection with the above, the Rand Corporation, which designed the PPB System used by the Defense Department, affirms that the entire responsibility for the PPBS operation *must reside with one person at the top*. "No one at a lower level has the authority or the right or the ability to acquire the knowledge required to perform the necessary tasks..." says Rand. This will explain why General Lavelle—and perhaps other Generals—are in trouble over the "unauthorized" bombings in Viet Nam. The general officers at the lower level had not "the authority or the right or the ability" to make an on-the-spot decision, even though such a decision might save thousands of lives!

Randman Dougharty, in the above article, writes only of the use of PPBS in the Defense Department. However, Table I, which he uses to illustrate his article, does show its application, not to departments and agencies of the Executive, but to *programme areas*. Hence, we see appropriations budgeted, not to the State Department as one unit and the Treasury Department as another unit of the Executive Branch. Rather, they are combined in one "programme area" and the appropriation is voted by Congress for the area of "international affairs and fi-

TABLE 1. PROGRAMME STRUCTURE OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Programme area	Planned budget allocation						
	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
I. National defense	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx
II. International affairs and finance	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx
III. Space research and technology	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx
IV. Agriculture and agricultural products	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx
V. Natural resources	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx
VI. Commerce and transportation	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx
VII. Housing and community development	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx
VIII. Health, Labor and welfare	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx
IX. Education	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx
X. General support	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx
Total	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx

Source: "The Federal Program by Function," *The Budget of the United States Government, 1969*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1968.

nance." Commerce and Transportation are two separate and distinct Cabinet Departments; yet they are linked together in the budget. Likewise Health, Labor and Welfare; while Education is separated from H.E.W. and made a programme area all by itself alone, though each Department will spend a part of its funds on one or more areas of education! Thus, Congress loses the ability to know how much money is being used for what, and loses all control over Administration expenditures! Only the "one person at the top" knows how the taxpayers' money is being spent. And, as presently set up, that "person at the top" is the director of the Office of Management and Budget, whose name is Caspar W. Weinberger, whose assistant director of OMB is S.M. Cohn, and who, with Arthur Burns of the Federal Reserve, and Henry Kissinger of the White House, make up a Governing Troika of appointed—not elected—rulers of these United States. In effect, they are not representing the people or the States, even though they do receive their appointment from the President of the United States. Rather, they are the chosen agents of that Elite Minority Group which has determined to build a total, managed, global society.

To attain that goal, PPBS has been perfected and installed in the Federal Government. It is a totally interrelated *management system*, wherein the planning, programming, and budgeting components are interdependent and inseparable within the system, and whereby each subsystem, or separate function of government (education, health, welfare, labor, defense, etc.) is linked to-

gether into a total national system. The entire framework is then managed from "the executive head."

And this "executive head" manages the System from and through the Office of Management and Budget!

As a part of the documentary proof which has been collected and forwarded to us, to sustain such charges, we have a copy of an official Bulletin, a part of which we shall reprint:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Washington, D.C. 30503

Bulletin No. 68-9

April 12, 1968

To The Heads Of Executive Departments
And Establishments.

Subject: Planning-Programming-Budgeting
(PPB) System.

1. *Purpose and Scope.* This Bulletin contains guidelines for continued development of integrated Planning-Programming-Budgeting (PPB) Systems and outlines requirements for PPB submissions to the Bureau. . . This Bulletin applies to . . . :

Department of Agriculture
Department of Commerce
Department of Defense
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Department of Housing and Urban Development
Department of the Interior
Department of Justice
Department of Labor

Post Office Department
 Department of State
 Department of Transportation
 Department of the Treasury
 Agency for International Development
 Atomic Energy Commission
 Central Intelligence Agency
 General Services Administration
 National Aeronautics and Space Administration
 National Science Foundation
 Office of Economic Opportunity
 Peace Corps
 United States Information Agency
 Veterans Administration

(The following) agencies will be contacted by the (Budget) Bureau with respect to the extent of required compliance to the guidance provided in this Bulletin . . . :

Civil Service Commission
 Federal Communications Commission
 Federal Home Loan Board
 Federal Power Commission
 Federal Trade Commission
 Railroad Retirement Board
 Securities and Exchange Commission
 Small Business Administration
 Tennessee Valley Authority

(End of quotation)

The foregoing list is taken from a 20-page set of originally typewritten, single-spaced instructions explaining to department heads why PPBS is important, and how they are to cooperate by submitting to the executive office at stated times certain tabulations, financial requirements, programme suggestions, special analytical studies, etc. The Bulletin is written in bureaucratese, but a few statements stand out:

"The budget is the financial expression of the underlying program plan. Review by the (Budget) Bureau is conducted primarily in program terms. . . . To meet Bureau needs, agency PFP submissions are to present specified data on outputs, costs, and financing over a *seven-year period*. . . . Responsibility for the development and use of PPB systems rests with the head of each agency. Agency heads are required to take such action as is necessary to insure that line managers participate in operation of the PPB system. . . . Agencies are encouraged both to make use of the various training and educational programs offered through the Civil Service Commission, and to establish internal orientation and training courses as appropriate."

After PPBS was installed in every executive "department and establishment," other necessary steps were taken. First, the Budget Bureau was "restructured," expanded, and made a *Management Bureau* as well; as the new name affirms: "Office of Management and Budget."

Next, plans were made, and finally completed, for the dividing of the Nation into Ten Regions, with Ten Regional Capitals where Regional Councils meld together all separate departments and agencies and then govern their regions, not according to department or agency category, but according to societal programme area.

An essential part of this programming is yet to be completed: the restructuring of the Presidential Cabinet Departments into four departments, to make "area functioning" less complicated.

Also in process of completion are three important steps in the area of budget and finance: 1) Installation of the Revenue Sharing Program; 2) Imposition of personal Income Tax Laws in every State in the Union, and arrangements for collection of same by Federal—not State—tax collectors; and 3) Transfer of all bonds, securities and "public money" held by counties, cities and incorporated communities, to central Federal Reserve Banks, where such funds and securities will be held in "special custody" by the Feds.

Meanwhile, the 1313 Organization launched a pilot project to introduce PPBS at the State, County, and City level.

And most important of all: The Planners began working more than three years ago on a PPBS operational model for the public schools, where it will be used to produce the "new man" trained to fit properly into the total, managed, global society.

These are some of the "programme areas" to be explored in upcoming letters.

(To Be Continued)

 DON BELL REPORTS and CLOSER-UP are privately circulated Newsletters which accent the Christian American point of view. Subscriptions are not available separately. Complete service - - - - - \$24 per year
 Three months trial - - - - - \$6
 Extra copies - - - - - 10¢ each
 (Send extra if 1st class postage is required on bulk orders). Address all correspondence:

DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
 Palm Beach, Florida 33480

PROOFS OF A CONSPIRACY TO BUILD A TOTAL MANAGED GLOBAL SOCIETY

----- Part Four -----

THE MANAGEMENT SYNDROME

"Planning, Programming, Budgeting System (PPBS) is such a deliberately deceptive and innocuous title for so encompassing an operation of internal subversion that it hardly causes a stir with taxpayer, parent and voter who ought to be the most concerned about domestic enemies of the functions and purposes of legitimate government," wrote Marilyn Angle in an article which appeared in the October, 1971, issue of *The Educator*.

"Purveyors of management have done their job so well for so many years," continued the author, "that 'manager' has developed a status in today's world, whether he performs a legitimate function or not. . . .

"A new ruling class whose ascent to power was inevitable was predicted by James Burnham 30 years ago in his book *The Managerial Revolution*. He identified 'managers' as a new type of professional with command of essential skills quite distinct and towering above the capabilities needed for the fairly routine jobs. Rule would be obtained through state ownership, with managers in control.

"When 'performance budgeting' was established in the Truman-appointed Hoover Commission, a whole new ball game, or 'game plan' for managers, who were to become the new ruling class, was set in motion."

This new breed of "managers" was conceived, nourished, developed, trained, and poured into public management positions by the use of funds supplied by foundations—Ford, Rockefeller, Carnegie, Alfred P. Sloan, etc. The funds were used to finance special courses at universities and colleges where these new "managers" were trained. Post-graduate training was often provided by such management-minded organizations as the *Council on Foreign Relations* (Henry Kissinger is an excellent example of CFR training and development). The 1313 Con-

glomerate, located on land owned by the University of Chicago (Rockefeller), has been able to train, unionize, and provide an excellent job-placement service for such public management categories as City Managers, Metro Managers, Regional Council Officials, etc. In addition to the training and placement of freshmen managers, CFR, 1313, and similar organizations provided business men for public management service, universities sent professors to Washington, Ford gave McNamara to the Defense Department, and the newly developed think-tanks began concocting goals and objectives which were to be achieved at the taxpayer's expense and used as guidelines by the new managers.

When McNamara left the Edsel production department to go to the U.S. Defense Department, he took with him two RANDmen (the think tank which developed PPBS). Charles J. Hitch worked with McNamara to "computerize" DoD, then transferred to the University of California, to install PPBS in the California Public School System. Henry R. Rowan also left RAND to help McNamara and Hitch ruin DoD, then he moved to the Bureau of the Budget to install the new "analytical techniques" for other agencies of the Federal Government. His work concluded at the Budget Bureau, Rowan then returned to RAND.

"Implementing PPBS into non-defense agencies," writes Marilyn Angle, "was accomplished by Executive Order of President Johnson in 1965. In 1967 the Bureau of the Budget became the Office of Management and Budget.

"President Johnson's 'Office of the Presidency' set the stage for President Nixon's State of the Union message in which he laid the cornerstone for the 'New American Revolution.' All rioters can line up on the diversionary side! This 'Revolution' is being quietly conducted by Management,

Executive Order and Commissions. . . .

“Nixon’s ‘game plan’ should be called ‘Ready or Not,’ because his action locks the United States into world government and enforces what Congress delays. The issue is not who is the candidate in the election . . . any charismatic can be president who can take and deliver the orders!”

When the Bureau of the Budget was expanded and converted into the Office of Management and Budget in 1967, the swing to the PPB System at the Federal level was completely installed. OMB became the core of the web of internal subversion, and the Planners immediately began to push their programming to take over government at all remaining levels. *Public Management*, an organ of the 1313 Conglomerate, explained the importance of the creation of OMB in an article by Donald C. Stone, which appeared in the issue of March 1971. Because this is a vital part of the plan to create Regional Government as a *management control center* between an all-powerful Central Government and subservient State, County and City governments, we feel it is important that you, the reader, understand what they, the Elite Planners, have to say on the subject. We are, therefore, quoting at length from this article by Donald C. Stone:

OMB: WHAT DOES IT MEAN
TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT?

The recent reorganization of the Bureau of the Budget into the Office of Management and Budget has significant implications for local governments. . . . According to Stone. . . . “It demonstrates that budgeting, programming, management improvement, systems development, coordination, and evaluation all need to be interrelated. Moreover, it shows how budgeting is primarily a policy and program resolution function—the heart of the management function—rather than a fiscal and accounting function.”

Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1970, transforming the U.S. Bureau of the Budget into the Office of Management and Budget and creating the Domestic Council, has important implications for cities, counties, and states. . . . The Domestic Council is conceived as functioning as a complementary organ on the domestic front as the National Security Council functions in the international area. The Plan provides that the Council will have its own staff, but surely it must rely extensively on OMB.

The OMB and Domestic Council are appropriately major elements in the Executive Office of the President. Some members of Congress opposed the Plan, but not a sufficient number to vote it down (Editor’s note: the OMB was actually established by Executive Order in 1967, but was not voted on by Congress until 1970, when the change was made a part of Reorganization Plan No. 2. Insofar as OMB was concerned, the Congressional vote was merely approval of something already put into operation).

The Plan, with the appointment of George P. Shultz as director of OMB (now Treasury Secretary—Ed.), dramatized the functions to be performed. Dr. Shultz, formerly a member of the *University of Chicago’s Graduate School of Business Administration (a 1313 training camp—Ed.)*, had demonstrated well his administrative credentials. . . . He in turn designated Arnold Webber (also 1313) as one of his two associate directors. . . .

The OMB is responsible. . . for developing, in consultation with state and local governments, the organizational and administrative arrangements that will make the federal-state-local system more workable. Under new mandates, and augmented by the Domestic Council, the Office of Management and Budget should accelerate attention to a variety of measures for this purpose. The following proposals are illustrative. Many of these call for close linkage with the *Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (a 1313 agency—Ed.)*

- * More rigorous steps to consolidate and simplify . . . grant-in-aid programs . . .
- * Greater decentralization of federal activities and decision making to regional offices. . .
- * Stronger Presidential leadership with Executive Office staff in each region and major metropolitan area as well as in Washington to foster improved management and cooperation.
- * *Deputizing of state and local officials under contractual arrangements to perform federal services and activities. . .*
- * Stimulation through federal grants of the creation of state OMBs . . .
- * Development of income tax credits, revenue sharing and other transfers of funds.

. . . The National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration is devoting its principal efforts to measures which would produce the trained personnel and knowledge essential to effective federal-state-municipal programs . . .

The new mandate of the OMB makes it the logical agency to incorporate such measures into the program of the President, and to work with state and local governments in their fulfillment. Such efforts require assistance and support by multipurpose groups such as the International City Management Association, National League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors, National Association of Counties, Council of State Governments, American Society for Public Administration, and the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (these are 1313 satellites—Ed.). Hopefully, the State-County-City Service Center will provide an effective mechanism through which these associations can unite their cooperative effort to improving *the total federal system*. (End of quotes; italics added for emphasis).

One of the earliest efforts to install PPB System techniques at the State and local level. Again, it seems important to use *their words*, since we are dealing with a conspiracy. The following, therefore, is quoted from an official PPB document which was intended to coordinate this pilot effort:

IMPLEMENTING PPB IN
STATE, CITY, AND COUNTY

A Report on the 5-5-5 Project

in cooperation with

The Council of State Governments
The International City Managers Association
The National Association of Counties
The National Governors' Conference
The National League of Cities
The United States Conference of Mayors

*State-Local Finances Project of
The George Washington University
Washington, D.C., June 1969*

Five States, Five Counties, and Five Cities examined the feasibility of applying the techniques of planning-programming-budgeting to their governments. As originally conceived, the 5-5-5 road was to be the initial phase of a continuing and widening effort either to set up PPB systems or to use some of the processes of program analysis in states and localities throughout the country. The project served as the nucleus for developing a body of experience on the start-up phase of PPB implementation in the various governments.

The five states participating in the demonstration were California, Michigan, New York, Vermont, and Wisconsin. The five

counties were Dade, Florida; Nashville-Davidson, Tennessee; Los Angeles, California; Nassau, New York; and Wayne, Michigan. The five cities were Dayton, Ohio; Denver, Colorado; Detroit, Michigan; New Haven, Connecticut; and San Diego, California.

Initial discussions began in January 1966 with representatives of the states and later, in the spring of that year, with the city representatives. A more formal relationship was not effected until July 1967, when the George Washington University, on behalf of the State-Local Finances Project, and each of the 15 governments signed Letters of Agreement. The participating governments undertook to carry out the initial phases of installing a system. The State-Local Finances Project of the George Washington University served as the central staff for the project, providing, with the cooperation of the U.S. Bureau of the Budget, a means of communication among the governments, as well as training and technical assistance.

Each county and city in the project received an award of \$20,000 from the George Washington University, out of a *Ford Foundation grant for the project*, and each state \$10,000, with the requirement that the amounts be at least matched "in kind." The primary condition was that the funds be used for *internal* staff training, and project travel, in order to emphasize that a *PPB System stands or falls on the ability of internal government personnel to operate it*.

(End of quotation)

After this PPB System had been tried and tested and found to be generally unopposed by all citizens concerned; and after its installation had begun or been completed at all levels of American Government, so that the OMB would become the Management Control Center for the entire Nation; then came the next step: the creation of a totally new level of government, situated between the Federal Government and the State Governments, taking orders from the Executive Office of the President (OMB) and enforcing those orders upon the State Governments beneath them! Following the pattern already established by the Federal Reserve Districts and the Federal Power and Irrigation Authorities, the fifty States, would be divided between Ten Federal Regions, to be ruled over by Ten Regional Councils made up of the new type Managers that had been produced according to the plan described at the beginning of this letter.

Accordingly, after preliminary tests and pilot projects, on February 10, 1972, President Nixon affixed his signature to Executive Order No. 11647. We published the text of this Order in our Letter of April 14, 1972, but because of its importance in its PPBS context, it seems essential that we repeat its publication:

EXECUTIVE ORDER 11647

FEDERAL REGIONAL COUNCILS

The proper functioning of government requires the development of closer working relationships between the major Federal grant-making agencies and State and local government and improved coordination of the categorical grant system.

I have heretofore directed the Domestic Council to:

- 1) Receive and develop information necessary for assessing national domestic needs and defining national domestic goals, and to develop for the President alternate proposals for reaching those goals;
- 2) Collaborate with the Office of Management and Budget and others in the determination of national domestic priorities for the allocation of available resources.
- 3) Collaborate with the Office of Management and Budget and others to assure a continuing review of ongoing programs from the standpoint of their relative contributions to national goals as compared with their use of available resources, and;
- 4) Provide policy advice to the President on domestic issues.

Furthermore, I have assigned to the Office of Management and Budget the responsibility for assisting the President in developing efficient coordinating mechanisms to implement Government activities and to expand interagency cooperation. Three years ago I directed that the senior regional officials of certain of the grant-making agencies convene themselves in regional councils to better coordinate their services to Governors, Mayors, and the public.

I have now determined that the measures prescribed by this Order would assure improved service to the public.

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, it is hereby ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. FEDERAL REGIONAL COUNCILS

- a) There is hereby established a Federal Regional Council for each of the ten standard Federal regions. Each Council shall be composed of the directors of the regional offices of the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Housing and Urban Development, the Secretarial Representative of the Department of Transportation, and the directors of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The President shall designate one member of each such Council as Chairman of that Council and such Chairman shall serve at the pleasure of the President. Representatives of the Office of Management and Budget may participate in any deliberations of each Council.
- b) Each member of each Council may designate an alternate who shall serve as a member of the Council involved whenever the regular member is unable to attend any meeting of the Council.
- c) When the Chairman determines that matters which

significantly affect the interests of Federal agencies which are not represented on any such Council are to be considered by that Council, he shall invite the regional director or other appropriate representative of the agency involved to participate in the deliberations of the Council.

SECTION 2. FUNCTIONS OF THE COUNCILS

Each Federal Regional Council shall be constituted as a body within which the participating agencies will, under the general policy formulation of the Under Secretaries Group, and to the maximum extent feasible, conduct their grant-making activities in concert through:

- (1) the development of short-term regional interagency strategies and mechanisms for program delivery;
- (2) the development of integrated program and funding plans with Governors and local chief executives;
- (3) the encouragement of joint and complementary grant applications for related programs;
- (4) the expeditious resolution of interagency conflicts and coordinating problems;
- (5) the evaluation of programs in which two or more member agencies participate;
- (6) the development of long-term regional interagency and intergovernmental strategies to the needs of States and local communities;
- (7) the supervision of regional interagency program coordinating mechanisms; and
- (8) the development of administrative procedures to facilitate day-to-day interagency and intergovernmental cooperation.

SECTION 3. UNDER SECRETARIES GROUP FOR REGIONAL OPERATIONS

There is hereby established an "Under Secretaries Group for Regional Operations" which shall be composed of the Under Secretaries of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, and Transportation, the Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Associate Director of the Office of Management and Budget, who shall serve as the Chairman of the Group. When the Chairman determines that matters which significantly affect the interest of Federal agencies which are not represented on the Group are to be considered by the Group, he shall invite an appropriate representative of the agency involved to participate in the deliberations of the Group. The Undersecretaries Group for Regional Operations shall, consistent with the objectives and priorities established by the President and the Domestic Council, establish policy with respect to Federal Regional Council matters, provide guidance to the Councils, respond to their initiatives, and seek to resolve policy issues referred to it by the Councils. The Under Secretaries Group, under the Chairmanship of the Associate Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall be responsible for the proper functioning of the system established by this Order....

RICHARD NIXON

The White House, February 10, 1972

(To Be Continued)

DON BELL REPORTS and CLOSER-UP are privately circulated Newsletters. Complete service: \$24 per year. 3 months trial: \$6. Extra copies: 10¢ each. Address all orders and make all checks payable to:
DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

PROOFS OF A CONSPIRACY TO BUILD A TOTAL MANAGED GLOBAL SOCIETY

----- Part Five -----

TEN REGIONS ARE MORE EASILY SOCIALIZED THAN FIFTY STATES

The planning, programming and budgeting of a Nation's resources—human and natural—by a Central Government, is pure and unadulterated Socialism. When Richard Nixon, as Chief Executive of the United States of America, assumed nominal control of the Planning - Programming - Budgeting System that was being installed in all departments, bureaus and agencies of government at all levels—international, national, state, county and local—it was found that the socialistic system was not working well under our representative republican form of government. There were nearly three thousand separate governments in the Fifty States, and there were hundreds of federal aid and give-away programs being administered by almost as many different agencies. It all made things quite complicated when the Planners wanted to socialize the Nation.

And so it happened that, upon assuming the Presidency, one of the first things Richard Nixon was instructed to do, was to ask the Congress for permission to proceed with the "Restructuring of Government Service Systems." Which meant: the right to make the changes necessary in order to make the Planning - Programming - Budgeting System (PPBS) more easily directed from a Central Office of Management and Budget.

Allegedly in order to "streamline" the services of the Executive Departments which dealt with "human resources" (the Departments of Labor, Health, Education and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Small Business Administration), the Nation was divided into Ten Federal Regions. Few realized then, or understand even now, that "Regional Government" is a new level of government superimposed over State, County and City governments, and is designed to replace State and County governments in

order to make the internationally adopted PPB System operate more effectively.

In our last letter, we reprinted Executive Order 11647 which, among other things, "established a Federal Regional Council for each of the ten standard Federal Regions." These ten new political subdivisions to which the fifty States have been divided and allocated, are:

REGION I: Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont.

Regional Capitol: Boston

REGION II: New York, New Jersey, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands.

Regional Capitol: New York City.

REGION III: Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia, District of Columbia.

Regional Capitol: Philadelphia.

REGION IV: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, Tennessee.

Regional Capitol: Atlanta.

REGION V: Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin.

Regional Capitol: Chicago.

REGION VI: Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas.

Regional Capitol: Dallas-Fort Worth.

REGION VII: Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska.

Regional Capitol: Kansas City.

REGION VIII: Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming.

Regional Capitol: Denver.

REGION IX: Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada.

Regional Capitol: San Francisco.

REGION X: Alaska, Oregon, Washington, Idaho.

Regional Capitol: Seattle.

Thus were the States divided among their Ten Federal Regions, that PPBS might work more effectively in the area of human resources: But one important step remained:

When President Nixon received permission to "Restructure the Government Service Systems," he dared to exceed Constitutional and Congressional limitations in creating ten Federal Regions with ten Regional Councils which would operate under the authority and direction of the Executive Office of Management and Budget, and exercise authority over the States, Counties and Cities within their respective jurisdiction; but *Restructuring the Cabinet Departments* was a bold step which seemed to require Congressional approval. Nixon explained that the proper *management of human resources* demanded Cabinet alterations, but up to the time of this writing, Congress has proved hesitant and unwilling to cooperate.

On March 29, 1972, President Nixon made a stirring appeal to Congress, asking that his Cabinet Restructuring plans be approved immediately. He did not mention PPBS in his appeal, but he did speak of resources and their planning, programming and budgeting as his central need. Here is Nixon's message to Congress:

To The Congress of the United States:

The sand is running in the glass, and the hour is running late, for enactment of a critically needed reform, one that merits the very best support which you as legislators for 208 million Americans, and I as their Chief Executive, are able to give.

That reform is reorganization of the executive branch of the Federal Government—the most comprehensive and carefully planned such reorganization since the executive was first constituted in George Washington's administration 183 years ago. Its purpose is to make American government a more effective servant to, and a more responsive instrument of, the American people. Its method is to organize departments around the ends which public policy seeks, rather than (as too often in the past) around the means employed in seeking them.

The broad outlines of the reorganization proposals which I presented to the Congress just over a year ago are now well known. The seven domestic departments which sprang into being under pressure of necessity one at a time since 1849 would be viewed as a single system for the first time, and their functions regrouped accordingly. *The product would be four entirely new, goal-oriented departments concerned with our communities, our earth, our economy,*

and our potential as individuals — plus a revitalized fifth department concerned with keeping America in food and fiber.

A Department of Community Development, a Department of Natural Resources, a Department of Economic Affairs, and a Department of Human Resources would be created to replace the present Departments of Interior, Commerce, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare and Housing and Urban Development, and Transportation. And the Department of Agriculture—under our plans as I ordered them revised last fall—would be streamlined to increase its ability to serve the farmer and so to serve us all. Several independent Federal agencies would be drawn into the consolidation process as appropriate. Further management reforms would be instituted *within* the new departments, to provide authority commensurate with responsibility at every level and to make form follow function intelligently.

I do not speak lightly or loosely in characterizing this measure as *critically needed*. To say that we must prepare government to perform satisfactorily in the years ahead is only another way of saying that we must prepare for its very survival. *This Republic, soon to begin its third century, will surely grow old unless we take wise and decisive action to keep it young.* "Adapt or die"—the Darwinian choice is ours to make. . . .

In less sweeping reorganizations than the one I am urging, of course, a President can institute changes through plans submitted under the Reorganization Act, whereby the burden of proof rests with defenders of the status quo. However, such authority no longer extends to the creation, consolidation or abolition of executive departments. In any event we would have felt it wise to submit so massive a reform as this one for statutory enactment, so as to permit consideration of amendments and to provide time for full hearings and review. *My hope now is that the Congress will honor the best spirit of democratic change by electing now, in this election year, to modernize the executive structure and redeem the lagging public faith in our ability to order our national affairs effectively. . . .*

I am pleased to note that the Congress, acting through its Committees on Government Operations, has held extensive hearings on my proposals; that testimony, most of it favorable, has been taken from a broad, bipartisan array of expert witnesses; and

that committee work on the House side is nearly complete on the bill to establish a Department of Community Development.

For our part, we in the Administration have continued working to perfect the legislation and the management concepts set forth in my message of March 25, 1971. The Office of Management and Budget has taken the lead in working with Members of Congress . . . There is still much work to do . . .

Twenty-five years ago, when the United States was realizing that World War II had marked not the end, but only the beginning, of its leadership responsibilities in the world, a reorganization of the executive machinery in the defense area was undertaken. That reform, which created the Department of Defense, marks the only major streamlining of the Cabinet and the only consolidation in our history. The new structure thus established has served America and the free world well in the challenging period since.

Now the time has come to take a similar bold and visionary step on the domestic side of national affairs. The 1960s, troubled, eventful, and full of progress as they were, were only the prelude to a period of still faster change in American life. The peace which we find increasing reason to hope will prevail during the coming generation, is already permitting us to turn somewhat from the formerly absorbing necessity which motivated the last major executive branch reform.

Other great purposes now move to the foreground: "to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility . . . promote the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and to our Posterity." To serve these purposes, let us act decisively once again, and forge new institutions to serve a new America.

Richard Nixon

The White House, March 29, 1972.

In his appeal to the Congress, Nixon lays stress on the reorganization of the Defense Department, saying that "the new structure has served America and the free world well in the challenging period since (its reorganization.)" It was the Defense Department which was first converted to the PPB System; and Nixon's real reason for "restructuring" the Executive Cabinet is to make PPBS more effective in these other Departments.

A Socialist System doesn't work well under our traditional representative republican form. Therefore, the Planners insist that the form be altered to accomodate the new system.

This conflict of *form* with *system* is spelled out in oblique manner in an article by Stanley B. Botner of the University of Missouri, which appeared in the July-August 1970 issue of the *Public Administration Review* (a 1313 publication). In calling this article to our attention, American Party presidential nominee John G. Schmitz commented:

"This article spells out the imprecision and failures of PPBS in a dozen different ways. Yet despite its obvious limitations and inadequacies, the conclusion is given that PPBS is precisely what the President needs to 'serve effectively.' It is beyond my understanding how these 'experts' could arrive at such a conclusion, based on their own evidence."

Here are excerpts from that article:

FOUR YEARS OF PPBS: AN APPRAISAL

When President Johnson issued his 1965 order introducing the planning-programming-budgeting system (PPBS) in civil agencies, some hailed the action as a breakthrough in the decision-making process. According to the more optimistic, PPBS would provide a rational basis for allocating resources among competing programs. Techniques utilized in the Department of Defense could be applied to "soft" programs such as health and welfare, it was thought, and DoD specialists were imported to assist in effecting the fiscal renaissance. However, the Bureau of the Budget and the agencies are still struggling to comply with the order more than four years after its issuance. . . .

While some worthwhile results have been achieved with PPBS to date, the system has failed to fulfill the expectations of its more ardent proponents. Why is this so? What are some of the deficiencies and problems which have been encountered?

With the benefit of hindsight, it appears that PPBS was introduced in civilian agencies abruptly, on too large a scale, and without adequate advance preparation and study. Former Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor described the introduction of Cabinet members to PPBS:

The Cabinet members were called together

early one morning without any prior preparation and, after a brief summary by Budget Director Schultz, ordered to be put into effect promptly. There was no meaningful discussion of whether or not it would be applicable throughout the Federal Government, even if successfully applied in Defense.

Mr. Connor commented further that "the timing turned out badly as the Vietnam War financial demands made a shambles out of any reasonable priority system." . . .

Another problem resulted when techniques utilized in the Department of Defense did not prove readily transferable to the civilian sector. . . . It is one thing to quantify the benefits from the application of a stated volume of firepower to a specified target. It is quite another to quantify the benefits to the individual, his family, and society generally of a program to rehabilitate alcoholics particularly if one considers the impact of intervening causative factors. . . .

As BOB Director Robert P. Mayo told the Proxmire Subcommittee: "We are limited. . . by our inability to develop output measures that permit inter-category comparisons of benefits. For better or worse, we have no generally agreed-upon way of deciding quantitatively whether the Nation benefits more by providing greater dignity for the aged (and less financial burden on their families) or by training disadvantaged persons in their early 20's or by making our airways safer or by reducing crime. . . . I am fully committed to the use of economic analysis as an aid in making budget decisions. At the same time, I would insist—as would anyone who understands our form of government—that economic analysis can never be the sole determinant of budget decisions." . . .

(End of excerpts)

Summarizing the above: PPBS will not work effectively under our form of government; but the *elite planners* are committed to the use of PPBS because this is the only way as yet discovered and put into practice, whereby the *controlling elite* can totally manage the global society. Therefore, since the *System* cannot be changed, the *form of government* must be changed to fit the *System!*

This is why, when Nixon succeeded Johnson in the White House, he recalled the former's order of 1965 which began the PPB System in all Executive Departments and, on April 12, 1968, issued a new and revised Bulletin

which gave new instructions on how to use PPBS in all "executive departments and establishments. This is why Nixon asked for, and obtained, the Reorganization Act of 1969, under the authority of which he then issued executive orders setting up the Ten Federal Regions. This is why he then issued Executive Order 11647, establishing ten Federal Regional Councils and placing the Executive Office of Management and Budget in charge of the entire domestic operation of PPBS.

And this is why there is yet the need to "restructure" the Cabinet Departments:

Since the PPB System won't function effectively under our present form of government, the form must be altered to fit the System!

Please bear in mind that this is not merely a domestic operation—it is a worldwide movement to "build a total managed global society."

In this connection, as this letter is being written, the *New York Times* of Oct. 5, 1972 carries the front-page announcement that PPBS has just gone multi-national! Twelve Nations—including the United States and the Soviet Union—have established the *International Institute of Applied Systems Analysis* (another name for PPBS) in the Laxenburg Palace, near Vienna.

"The agreement to create the institute, which was signed today at the Royal Academy in London, is believed to be the first time that the Soviet Union has given official backing and funds to an East-West project not directly linked to either its own Government or to the United Nations."

Adds the *Times*: "Djermen M. Gvishiani, a member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences and son-in-law of Premier Alexei N. Kosygin is to serve a three-year term as chairman of the institute's council. Other council members are French and East German."

Thus PPBS, of the computerized, all-seeing eye, is a camouflaged, innocuous alias for the greatly feared "Big Brother." That a system developed by RAND is to be turned over to Communist "experts" for them to operate at the multi-national level, is a sinister sign of the times!

(To Be Continued)

DON BELL REPORTS & CLOSER-UP are privately circulated. For information, write:
DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

PROOFS OF A CONSPIRACY TO BUILD A TOTAL MANAGED GLOBAL SOCIETY

. Part Six

HOW THE MASTER PLANNERS PREPARE THEIR PLANS

The *Planning-Programming-Budgeting System* (PPBS) is the name given to a highly sophisticated method of governance which was developed in order that certain self-appointed leaders among men might control "the future evolution of mankind." This is to be done by denying the taxpayer any control over budgetary matters, by imposing dictatorial management of all resources, both human and natural, and by establishing a computerized system of thought-control after the manner of *Big Brother* as envisioned in George Orwell's *1984*.

PPBS was "perfected" by Rand Corporation, a "think tank" located in Santa Monica, California, to aid Government in pursuit of certain "goals and objectives" which have been determined by the "planners."

Mrs. Ruth Spencer, Chairman of the Education Policy Committee of the United Republicans of California (UROC), gave this excellent description of the "System": "Going far beyond the traditional processes of budgeting, PPBS provides for:

- (1) 'planning' what governmental policies should be and then measuring behavioral compliance with those policies . . . ;
- (2) 'programming' to establish those state-formulated policies through experimental 'pilot' and propaganda techniques; and
- (3) 'budgeting' to set the programs in action and lock in the state-formulated policies.

PPBS budgeting procedure is very complicated and riddled with new terms and new meanings. It begins with 'planning,' which is the setting of so-called 'goals and objectives.' Goals are general, timeless and long-range policy pursuits. Then subordinate to the goals, 'objectives' are formulated. They are specific, short-range, measurable ways in which individuals are to think, feel and act as a result of certain programs which promote the goals." . . .

"It Begins With Planning..." So, let us learn, from their own words, the who, where, what, when and how of these plans . . .

Back in 1958, one R. D. Specht, of the Rand Corporation, wrote a book entitled *Rand, A Personal View of its History*. We quote briefly therefrom:

"The (fledgling Rand) Corporation had an additional financial problem: that of securing sufficient working capital. This problem was solved initially by a \$100,000 interest-free loan from the Ford Foundation, which enabled Rand to establish a line of credit from the banks. The Ford Foundation upped its loan to \$1,000,000 and in 1952 the Foundation converted this loan into a grant under the condition that the Rand Corporation conduct out of its own funds an equal amount of 'Rand-sponsored Research' on subjects in the national interest. That is, the loan was to be repaid not in cash but in research on problems of national security and public welfare that lay outside the scope of Project Rand's work for the Air Force. . . . The Air Defense Command asked Rand to . . . set up a Systems Training Program. A separate group, the Systems Development Division was set up within Rand to do the work of crew training. This Division soon acquired the additional jobs of *writing computer programs . . . and of developing training methods . . .* As the job grew, the *Systems Development Division* became twice as large as the rest of Rand."

It is this *Systems Development Division* which became the actual planning division of the PPBS scheme.

But, since we are using *their own words* to arrive at an understanding of PPBS, let us now take note of an article written in June, 1969, by R. E. Overbury of the Ministry of Technology, London, and which appeared in their publication *Long Range Planning*. Here we learn, in their own words, how they make their plans. Granted, this article is in

their jargon, makes use of their semantics, but since it was written by a Londoner for perusal by Yankees, translation into lay Americanese is not required.

A mystical note is introduced at this point. There was the famous Oracle at Delphi, which answered all questions, both public and private. Here, at Apollo's preeminent shrine, the priestess Pythia spoke oracles which were interpreted by a priest, the answers thus determining the plans of the ancient Greeks. Delphi was credited with being the unifying influence in an otherwise fragmented life of Greece.

Significantly, the modern PPBS oracles are received and interpreted through what they named the *Delphi Technique*.

Here are excerpts from Technologist Overbury's article:

TECHNOLOGICAL FORECASTING

A CRITICISM OF THE DELPHI TECHNIQUE

(The author—R. E. Overbury—criticises the methods of forecasting technological developments by obtaining a consensus of opinion among the experts. He argues that the problem is not to forecast what might happen, but rather to decide what should happen and he suggests improvements in the Delphi technique which would change it from an ad hoc method of "crystal ball gazing" into a system for continuous consultation among "responsible organizations.")

There have been so many recent references to the Delphi technique that it seems fair to offer some comments which appear to the writer to go to the heart of technological forecasting and to suggest a different approach to an even more urgent problem, that of long-range planning.

The Delphi technique was developed by Olaf Helmer and Theodore Gordon in an experiment carried out during 1963 and 1964 under the auspices of the RAND Corporation, a complete account of which is given in Helmer's book "Social Technology." The experiment was to obtain predictions from individual experts, for periods up to 50 years ahead, about six areas deemed to be of dominating world importance, namely scientific breakthroughs, population growth, automation, space progress, the probability and prevention of war and future weapon systems. The method was to send questionnaires and elicit predictions from six groups

of experts representing the areas chosen. Eighty-two replied out of about 159 approached; of these, thirty-five were members of RAND, seven others were RAND consultants, and the remaining forty were not connected with RAND. Six of these were European respondents. Each panel of experts answered four separate questionnaires spaced about two months apart, and a summary of respondents between the rounds (sic). The aim of the process with the data feedback and experts' criticisms of each others' views, was to reach a "consensus" of views in each of the six areas.

The presentation of all these results in a series of graphs indicated a median or "break-even date" (and the upper and lower quartile of responses) for the events guessed at; for instance, in the case of dates for reliable weather forecasts, controlled thermo-nuclear power, or, in the automation area, for the widespread use (of) teaching machines, household robots, or centralised wire-tapping!

The authors of the experiment seem (hardly surprisingly) to confess some disappointment at the results;...The general immaturity (frankly, it is the only word) of the results follows from the kind of questions asked...The points the writer wishes to suggest are as follows:

- (i) Developments since the 1930's have, in practice, brought about a decisive change in the position and status of technology. ...The difference now is broadly that we can, for practical purposes (not to put too fine a point on it) assume that nothing will happen in the future that is not now, at any rate, conceivable. This means that...we can now contemplate, within natural laws, being able to achieve almost any worthwhile objective however far out. The basic problem is therefore now the altered, and more difficult, one of choosing the right kinds of objectives instead of purely passive crystal-ball gazing.
- (ii) To choose the right objectives, we need to establish a picture...of a desirable end-of-century world, which will naturally also involve human value judgments.
- (iii) The main criticism of long-term forecasting could be that it is not really approaching the right problem. In an age in which we have an unusual power to determine events. It is not realistic to behave like outside observers with no power to influence them. *What will*

happen depends on what we want to achieve. A solution of the world food problem, a more mature or balanced society, possibly through genetic engineering or perhaps the age of leisure through automation and international economic and industrial organization..

(End of direct quotation)

We gave you the preceding in their own words, that you may understand that, even as bumbling and erratic as has been their efforts up to the present, *these are men who are playing God!* They are drawing a picture of the world as they want it to be at the turn of the century, then they are going to make that picture come to life. They are saying: "Come, let us remake the world, let us remake man so he will fit contentedly into that remade world; let us change his culture, his religion, his actions and reactions, his physical form and his mental process. We know what is best for man and for the world, and we have the power to do as we wish. *What will happen depends on what we want to achieve!*"

It is important to understand that this long-range planning (the first "P" in "PPBS") is not confined to the United States and its governments and agencies. Though the experimenting and developing were the work of such think-tanks as RAND, notice that the criticism, which was taken to heart and acted upon, came from London. And the PPBS techniques are for the world, not just for the United States.

In our last letter, we referred to the fact that PPBS had gone "multinational," though the attempt to hide the System is illustrated by the use of the name "Systems Analysis." Because of the importance of this development, we are reprinting the entire article which appeared, beginning on the front page, in the *New York Times* of October 5, 1972:

U.S. AND SOVIET WILL LEAD
A 12-NATION 'THINK TANK'

By Richard D. Lyons

Special to the *New York Times*

Washington, Oct. 4—Led by the United States and the Soviet Union, scientific academies of a dozen nations today set up a joint "think tank" to seek solutions to problems created by the increasing industrialization of societies.

Pollution control, urban growth, public health and overpopulation are among the

problems that will be examined by the *International Institute of Applied Systems Analysis* in the Laxenburg Palace, near Vienna.

Dr. Howard Raiffa, a professor of managerial economics at Harvard, who will direct the new institute, emphasized that its work would deal solely with 'peaceful purposes.'

The agreement to create the institute, which was signed today at the Royal Academy in London, is believed to be the first time that the Soviet Union has given official backing and funds to an East-West project not directly linked to either its own government or to the United Nations.

Moscow will provide one-third of the annual operating costs of about \$3.5-million, while the United States through the National Science Foundation will match that amount. The remaining third will come from other nations.

Djhermen M. Gvishiani, a member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences and brother-in-law of Premier Alexsei N. Kosygin, is to serve a three-year term as chairman of the institute's council. Other council members are French and East German.

Although officials here were reluctant to say so openly, privately they conceded that the institute was yet another step in a bridge-building effort that the United States hopes will eventually bring about the liberalization of the Soviet and East European Communist systems. They said that the United States was "giving more than it's getting" in connection with the institute, but that the investment was worthwhile because of its potential impact upon both the Soviet Managerial class and East-West ties.

During a news conference at the National Academy of Sciences here last week, Dr. Raiffa acknowledged that the United States was the recognized leader in management techniques and systems analysis. These fields of study evolved in the United States in the aerospace industry when the space program was started in the late nineteen-fifties (Rand's Systems Development Division—Ed.)

To cite an example, if the development of a system to provide health care to large numbers of people were under examination, experts on mass transportation would be asked for opinions on how patients should travel to hospitals and clinics. The point is that health care is a much broader problem than just doctors on the one side and sick per-

sons on the other.

Dr. Raiffa said that the institute expected to have 100 scholars not only from the East and West but also from the so-called third world. An announcement about the institute made here by the National Academy of Sciences stated that "projects being considered for the institute fall into four categories—environmental systems, health care systems, municipal services systems, and large engineering design systems."

"A likely first task would be concerned with energy; an analytical study of short and long-range projection of the world supply of energy resources and demands for energy, dynamic substitutions among energy sources, future technologies, and hazards of each source. In preliminary evaluations, this project has been seen as one that is large enough to be significant yet could be completed fairly soon."

Dr. Raiffa said in a position paper that the institute would have "a selective approach which will concentrate on a few problems at a time with the understanding that these problems will vary through time."

The idea for such an institute evolved six years ago from a White House planning group led by Francis Bator, then a specialist on national security affairs and now a professor of political economy at Harvard.

The institute will be housed 10 miles from Vienna in an 18th century palace now being renovated by the Austrian Government at a cost of about \$4-million.

Also participating in the institute will be the leading scientific organizations of Czechoslovakia, Canada, Bulgaria, Japan, West Germany, Italy, Poland and Britain.

(End of article which has been reprinted in full)

It should be understood that the computer is the heart and soul of the PPB System, just as programmed budgeting is the blood stream which permits it to function. Soviet Russia has no financial worries as such, since that imperial conglomerate has been mining and hoarding gold for half a century. But the Russians do not have the technical know-how for building computers; and it would be impossible for Soviet Russia to convert to any new "Systems Analysis" method without first obtaining the necessary computers.

Which explanation will aid in putting the

following information into its proper perspective:

The Soviet Government has ordered 15,000 large, modern computers from the United States. They will be used to implement the Soviet's own version of PPBS and according to the distinguished expert on Russian affairs, Victor Zorza, the computers will be used to compile a massive data bank in which complete information on every individual will be stored. The information system will then be used as a weapon to maintain thought control. Zorza wrote:

"...the main purpose of such a system would be to prevent any disloyal ideas from even taking shape in the heads of Soviet citizens.... The full records of his psychological characteristics and actions could be used to devise an approach that would quickly persuade him...that his best interests require him to conform to the political guidance of his spiritual advisor at the KGB (Soviet Secret Police)."

It seems most evident, though solid proof is lacking, that among the unpublicized but important achievements at the various "Summit" meetings has been the exchange of something more than wheat and machine tools, truck plants and nuclear technology; it appears that the Soviet Government has given our "representatives" its highly developed technique of psychopolitical control of people, in exchange for the U.S.-developed Planning-Programming-Budgeting System. And when Soviet Psychopolitics is combined with American PPBS, the result is a world of contented slaves, even happy slaves.

In the United States at the present time, there is being introduced into the public schools, a system that will not only control political dissent, but will render the people incapable of disliking the system in the first place!

A Planning - Programming - Budgeting System for public schools *seems* so very practical, progressive, beneficial and effective, that uninformed parents are unwittingly approving a system which will make their children slaves to the system!

(To Be Continued)

DON BELL REPORTS & CLOSER-UP are privately circulated. Complete service: \$24 per year. 3 months trial: \$6. Please write: DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223 Palm Beach, Florida 33480

PROOFS OF A CONSPIRACY TO BUILD A TOTAL MANAGED GLOBAL SOCIETY

. Number Seven

SSS - THE NUMBER OF A MAN

PPBS—the Planning-Programming-Budgeting System is applied Scientific Socialism in use to control people, what they produce, what they consume, how they spend their work-time and their leisure time, what they think, and how they react to various stimuli. The PPBS concept, simply stated, goes something like this: If you know what you have to start with, and you know what you want to end up with, it's possible to design a system that will tell you exactly what's needed to make the precise changes that are required. One scientific socialist referred to PPBS as an "accounting system to be used as an instrument of prediction and control," adding that there should be no doubts "about the possibility of a managed society...social technology can be developed so that it will be possible to gain control over societal processes."

The management of society as a whole demands the setting up of special machinery for the observation, control and ordering of each individual member of that society, if the whole is to function as the Planners desire.

That machine is the Computer, its product the Data Bank, and its basic ingredient your Social Security Number. If PPBS is to function as a "people control mechanism," then Big Brother wants your number, not your name; because numbers are the stuff with which Computers deal, and all security systems—social or penal—have found that it is more effective to assign numbers than to accept given names.

Sen. Sam Ervin objects to the misuse of a person's social security number, not because of its use for PPBS purposes as such, but because he feels it to be an unconstitutional invasion of privacy (which it is, of course—but the entire Social Security System was once considered to be unconstitutional—which it is, of course). Because of his

stand on constitutional rights as opposed to social denigration of rights in a sea of equality, the Senator from North Carolina receives a lot of mail about the use of the Social Security Number as an identifier. The complainers seldom realize that there is being built a massive dossier bearing that number with a coded computer card to make it easier to add details and comments to that dossier at any given moment's notice by some unidentifiable bureaucratic clerk who has the power to wreck the lives of those who pay him to serve them. But the individuals who know nothing of PPB Systems still resent the use of their social security number as an identifier. Some examples from Sen. Ervin's mail:

"Why is it necessary to give my Social Security number to the Postal Department in order to rent the same box I have been renting for the past four years."

"I've had to give my Social Security number to donate blood, get a telephone and open a charge account."

"The university has changed all student identification numbers to their Social Security number."

"I had to file suit to get the state to issue my daughter a driver's license without giving a Social Security number."

"I had to give my Social Security number in order to make funeral arrangements for a friend."

"Our state tax form requires a Social Security number for a homeowner to submit a tax exemption claim."

"The company I work for is replacing their file numbers at time of employment with Social Security numbers."

"United Air Lines is asking applicants for membership in its 100,000 Mile Club for their Social Security numbers."

"A coin magazine sent me bore a pasted label with my Social Security number on it. I can only deduce that this came from a mailing list bought from a bank or broker."

Among other cases given were the following:

A California woman vacationing with her husband in Wyoming was denied a fishing license because she had no Social Security number. An Army man had a letter returned to him with a note reading, "APO regulations prohibit mailing of items which do not include the full name and Social Security number in the return address. Therefore this letter is returned to you."

One correspondent wrote: "Since I have lost my personal identity (name) I will sign off with only my number. Punch your computer if you want to know who I am."

Along with these and other anti-testimonials there appeared in the June 1972 issue of *Government Executive*, an article by Samuel Stafford, the publication's associate editor, which highlighted the following charges:

1-The issue of confidentiality of computerized data is getting increased attention from both the Government and industry.

2-Growing use of individual Social Security numbers as identifiers by a broad assortment of governmental agencies and private firms causes pressure for clear guidelines.

3-Big need, however, is for a national policy on privacy safeguards regarding data banks, computers, identifying numbers and other aspects of the complex issue.

The article follows:

IS THE SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER BEING ABUSED?

*By Samuel Stafford
Associate Editor*

During much of the Twentieth Century, a small but single-minded band of social philosophers has repeatedly warned the rest of us that the demands of a technical society are relentlessly robbing us of both our individuality and our humanity.

We are being conditioned, the pessimists say, to passively accepting the yoke of absolute authority—both public and private. We no longer feel a sense of outrage over what appears to be a steady erosion of our most cherished traditional "rights" and prerogatives.

In short, what Big Brother wants from us,

Big Brother gets. We are becoming a society of nameless, helpless ciphers, and we haven't even got the gumption to fight back. So say the most solemn of our prophets.

The Computer, Data banks, Vast information networks from which can be plucked every last bit of information on John Q. that ever has been amassed about him—right down to his sex life, "normal" or otherwise, or how many times he calls his mother-in-law a month or whether he has a mole on his left thigh or whether he flunked out of officer training school or attended a rally for a certain politician or once badmouthed the boss or fell behind in his bills or got some high-point traffic tickets.

Certainly, much highly personal information about John Q. Public already is stored in such information systems, and as computer systems continue to be linked into ever larger networks, much of that data is becoming available to agencies and individuals whose aims are quite remote from those that prompted the original data collection and storage.

Leading the privacy defenders of course, is South Carolina (sic) Sen. Sam Ervin. Not all of those who support Ervin's privacy crusade have his blessing, however. Ervin has little patience with those impractical civil libertarians who would dismantle modern technology and have us return to more primitive ways of living.

It is the senator's unassailable (?) position that since humans created the machinery that permits wide-ranging data gathering and exchange, it is up to humans—especially Government and industry policy makers—to properly control such activities.

Main questions facing those who favor easier information access and those who want tougher controls:

* How far should Government and private industry computer linkage be allowed to progress in the direction of the ultimate in efficient data storage and retrieval—a national data bank?

* What legislation and regulations are needed to provide legal and technical safeguards against improper—and possibly damaging—disclosures of personal information?

* Should a "universal" identification number be assigned to every American? Should a person's Social Security number be used for that purpose? Assuming that everyone

should have a universal identifier, at what age should it be assigned? . . .

Adding a sense of urgency (is) a pending proposal before the American National Standard Institute's Computers and Information Processing Committee to adopt a technical standard which would use the Social Security number to identify all citizens in computerized records. Voluntary standards developed by the Institute usually are adopted by industries.

Ervin noted that ANSI was not dealing with a strictly technical issue, and that any action that it took would represent "a major philosophical decision affecting the rights of individuals in the computer age and the future uses of economic, political and government power in our society." He urged a delay to allow more public debate and legislative and executive branch study of the issue.

Ervin also was critical of the Nixon Administration for writing ANSI that it was taking a "neutral position" on the Social Security number issue. . . .

If Government and industry allow the Social Security number to become a universal identifier, Ervin adds, "I fear Americans may find themselves designated by one digit and that would be zero."

In fact, use of the Social Security number for many purposes has been growing in recent years. Since 1961, the number has been used by the Internal Revenue Service to process tax returns. In addition to its normal Social Security use, it is used by other components of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Civil Service Commission, Federal Aviation Administration and other agencies, by the military services, law enforcement agencies, banks, stock brokerages, universities, public school systems, libraries, state and local governments for tax, driver's licenses and other purposes, businesses in credit card applications, insurance companies, mailing list firms, and private credit and collection agencies.

The urgent need to come up with clear-cut guidelines and possibly legislation regarding use of the number was pointed up by Social Security Commissioner Robert M. Ball's appointment of a task force to study the problem. The task force, headed by Assistant Commissioner Jack S. Futterman, urged a "conservative and cautious approach to any action that might increase

non-Federal use of the Social Security number. . . . The task force also recommended that the Social Security Administration "embark on a positive program of enumerating school children in ninth grade." A Social Security Administration spokesman said recently: "We have already acted on this recommendation and are encouraging ninth grade registration."

(The Senate is considering a welfare reform provision which would require that every child be issued a Social Security card upon entering first grade.)

. . . No one involved in the policy and legislation drafting process expects the complex privacy-technology issue to be resolved soon or easily. But all concerned believe that those actions ultimately taken will have a tremendous impact on future life in America. (End of quotation).

To rob every person of his individuality, to make of every man and woman merely a number, a digit, a "zero;" this is the danger that Sen. Ervin and others of like mind see in the universal application of the Social Security number. The use of computerized data to "keep people in line and obedient" to the dictates of Big Brother, is the thing they fear; and certainly such tyrannical domination is a fearful thing.

However, such people seem to see only the first step. They envision the loss of man's identity, his reduction from man to robot. But the PPB System has no intention of peopling the world with robots. After reducing man to zero, it then intends to remake man in its own image, after its own plan, to conform to its own program, and to be performance budgeted into its own remade New World Order.

As regards the individual, PPBS works something like this—and we are using lay terms rather than their sciento-socialistic jargon:

1. BRAINWASHING PHASE. Traditional beliefs, standards, values, morals, concepts, are to be washed out of man's mind and memory, together with all former regard for individuality, initiative, freedom, and independence. Man thus becomes a "zero," his only identification consisting of his assigned number, his Social Security number.

2. RE-EDUCATION PHASE. Man is now trained (via modernized Pavlovian tech-

niques) in three "taxonomic domains":

- a) how he should think,
- b) how he should feel,
- c) how he should act.

3. ADAPTIVE PHASE. Remade man is then fitted into his proper place (predestinated by the experts) in the Total Managed Global Society.

Virginia McNeil probably expressed it best in an article which was published in the August 1972 *Educator*. She was quoted in a previous *Don Bell Reports*, but not in the precise context of this series of letters. Therefore, we quote:

We are involved in a *Revolution*, a Conceptual Revolution which will attempt to deny the existence of God as the creator of man. The inventors of this revolution are not original, they have been around since the earliest of recorded times. They have never been as effective up to this time, because man has always risen up and battled on the side of God and country. As in any revolution, this one has two sides; one side believes God is a Supreme Being and Creator of man in His image; the other side believes man is God and thus is autonomous and able to create man according to man's image.

You will not be asked to choose a side, because you are not to know of the existence of this revolution. You will only slowly become aware that something is occurring, that subtle changes are taking place. To some this will not be an unpleasant experience, it will denote progress. Others will not approve because they will see time-proven traditions and values being taken away. At first this will be very gradual, but with the *computer as the ultimate weapon*, change will come very rapidly.

Some will be shocked to see a subtle loss of control of individual expression, freedom of thought and freedom of action (how we think, feel, and act.) The conservative thinkers and the liberal thinkers will have to join forces in order to repel this conceptual revolution that attempts to put man into an *Adaptive Framework for Change*.

To create this new man made by man, it is necessary to first change the man made by God. There are various terms used, such as change agents, facilitators, manipulators, etc., who will not be God's agents but man's agents to bring on *change*. These agents have been well trained in our universities and have been liberally financed by federal

grants and foundation money (usually the Ford Foundation.) They are well prepared this time, because they have been given a formidable weapon - *the Computer*. The computer, once it is used to break down man into bits of matter and classify all of his energy cells, will not care if its victim was once a liberal, conservative, communist, socialist, marxist, democrat or republican; because the finished computerized product will be a *new man with a new consciousness and a new set of values*. The programs fed into it will guarantee that the finished products will all think, feel, and act the same. *How does PPBS fit into this Revolution?* Its existence was never meant to be discovered by the public. It is merely a formula - a process. This process has been tried many times without success. Now, because of the use of computers, the timing in achieving a revolution will be shortened to implement the formula in our country. Fascism, Nazism, Socialism, Maoism, Communism, etc., are all products of this formula. It can never be used for the good of man, because it is a formula that denies God as the Supreme Being and insists that there will be a *single absolute decision-maker on earth*. This decision-maker may be as mysterious and invisible to the public as God, and he may not be the one who officially holds the title ...but whatever the name, the semantics, the area covered, *the ultimate goal is to have a totally controlled and managed global society*. (End of quote).

In the preceding, the author properly names the Computer *the ultimate weapon* in this conceptual revolution. And the operator of that weapon *has your number*-your Social Security number.

(To Be Continued)

(Editor's Note: Two important questions are constantly being asked. The answers: No, we don't know how many letters in this current series; they are composed weekly and we have no idea as to when we'll feel the subject covered adequately. And; yes, the series will be stapled, covered, and issued as a booklet, with price depending on size.) DON BELL REPORTS and CLOSER-UP are privately circulated Newsletters which accent the Christian American point of view. Subscriptions are not available separately. Complete service: \$24 per year. 3 months trial: \$6. Extra copies: 10¢ each (please add extra for 1st class delivery.) Write: DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223 Palm Beach, Florida 33480

PROOFS OF A CONSPIRACY TO BUILD A TOTAL MANAGED GLOBAL SOCIETY

. Part Eight

CONTROL OF TAX MONEY THE ROOT OF THE EVIL

In a previous letter in this series, three Harvard professors were quoted as stating that four of the most important *political* achievements in this century are 1) Soviet type of the one-party state as developed by V. I. Lenin from 1917 to 1921, 2) large-scale nonviolent political action as developed by M. K. Gandhi from 1918 to 1934, 3) peasant and guerrilla organization and government by Mao Tse-tung from 1929 to 1949, and 4) cost benefit analysis (PPBS) as developed by Charles Hitch from 1956 to 1963.

These four systems were developed for the *political control* of people. The PPB System stresses preplanned programming and programmed budgeting; and programmed budgeting demands *centralized control of the budgeted monies*.

This means that under PPBS, all programs—Federal, Regional, State or Local—must conform to PPBS aims and objectives, must meet the Budgeting standards set by a Central Authority, and the performance of the Program must meet PPBS guidelines, or the money may be withheld or impounded!

First came the necessity of creating the Central Budgeting Authority. This was done through conversion of the Federal Budget Bureau to the new Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

Next came the need to consolidate and to centralize control over all giveaway and aid programs. This was accomplished through the creation of the Ten Regional Governments and their Ten Federal Regional Councils, overall direction of which is delegated to the "Associate Director of the Office of Management and Budget."

So far, so good, in the eyes of PPBS experts. Creation of OMB and Regional Councils would serve to establish control over all Federally financed programs. But there

were two escape hatches:

1) All Federal programs must be financed by the Congress, and all money appropriations must originate in the House of Representatives, then be approved by the Senate. This meant, in effect and substance, that if the Congress approved a certain amount of money to be spent on a particular program, then that money—no less and no more—must be spent according to the Congressional mandate. This hampered OMB's performance budgeting and cost analysis powers to a considerable extent. And,

2) All programs were not yet Federally financed. Many programs were financed by the States themselves; many more were financed by municipalities and local authorities through municipal bond issues, etc. Over such programs the Central Authority had little or no control, and the effective operation of PPBS demands total control over all public programs, even as in Soviet Russia or the Welfare State of Sweden.

Next priorities of the PPBS experts, therefore, had to do with obtaining the power of supervision and control of *all monies spent for public programmes*.

One of the first steps taken in this connection had to do with the financing of the public school system. It was true that Federal aid to schools had almost transferred all control over local schools to the Federal level. *Almost*, but not quite. Despite the billions being poured into the educational system by the Federal Government and the tax-exempt foundations, the chief support of public schools still came from the property taxes which were collected at the County level by County tax collectors. Over such money, the Central Authority had little control. And if the PPBS operatives were to take over the operation of the American system of education (an essential part of the program to remake man in man's image) then the Central Authority must have full

control over the allocation of money for educational purposes at all levels of government!

Since California had already been selected as a pilot State for the introduction of PPBS into its public school system, California also was the ideal State in which to try out the scheme to eliminate all local financing of school programs by means of the property tax.

First, property taxes were raised and raised until the rates became almost prohibitive. Property owners in California began to sell their property and move to other States to avoid the outlandish tax (pun intended).

Then it began to be publicized that the principal reason for the increase in taxes was the increased costs of maintaining the educational establishments. There was, of course, more than a grain of truth in the allegation; the Planners had seen to that by lavishing money on unnecessary improvements, by building school buildings and then leaving them unused and unoccupied because they didn't fit into the forced busing program, etc.

Then came the charge that education was not equal, because schools were best in the areas where property taxes were highest. Etc., etc.

And the final outcome in California: the State Supreme Court decreed that property taxes could no longer be used to finance the public schools.

Thus, control of the money allocated for educational purposes *at the local level* would be transferred to the Central Authority which operates out of Washington, D.C.

Just as important, if PPBS were to be successful, was the need to eliminate all local control over all public programs at the State and local levels.

And this was the purpose of so-called Revenue Sharing.

Since PPBS has already increased the federal debt by tens of billions and there is no revenue to share, the end objective of the revenue sharing scheme is to induce all States to impose State income taxes, *which Federal agents will collect*, then the money thus collected will be redistributed through integrated aid programs supervised by the designated officials at the Ten Regional Capitals. That is, State and local programs will be funded *if* they meet the performance budgeting requirements of OMB and the

Federal Regional Council. This arrangement will provide absolute control by the Central Authority over all "shared revenue."

Of course, this Federally collected State income tax scheme still will not provide sufficient funds; and since all other sources of tax revenue will have reached the point of no returns, a new kind of national tax will be added: the Value Added Tax. This is a complicated kind of sales tax that was developed in Europe and which can be collected at the point-of-sale to the ultimate consumer of the taxed product.

However, even with Revenue Sharing and Regional Government control over all public aid and welfare programs; there still will remain one area of money collecting which will not be under the direct control of the Central Authority:

Counties and Cities still will have the use of money collected through property taxes, occupational, professional and business licensing, parking areas and parking meters, fines and forfeitures, bond issues, public subscriptions, etc. These "public monies" and other securities held at the local level of government add up to a substantial amount of money over which the Central Authority has little or no control.

To seal up this "escape valve," OMB called upon the U.S. Treasury Department to order all holders of such "public monies" to take such bonds, securities, coupons, collateral and other deposits *out of local banks and safety vaults, and transfer them to the nearest Regional Federal Reserve Bank* (of which there are twelve in these United States).

Thus the Federal Reserve Bank will have local "public monies" in its care and keeping, and the withdrawal and use of such money will be in accordance with Federal PPBS guidelines, or else.

Unbelievable? We have before us a copy of Operating Circular No. 20, from the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, addressed to all Member Banks of the Sixth Federal Reserve District, entitled "Special Custody."

This is a seven-page circular written in the same difficult-to-decipher jargon usually employed by federal departments. But the meat of the message is that: "The Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta... makes available its custody and safekeeping facilities... to hold in special custody securities deposited:

(a) by a member bank as collateral to a

public or governmental body, board, unit or agency (as 'public body') or to a public or governmental official...

- (b) by a bank as collateral pledged to the United States to secure a Treasury Tax and Loan account or deposits of public money...
- (c) as security in lieu of penal bonds...
- (d) by a bank as security in lieu of sureties on its depository bond for bankruptcy funds...
- (e) by a member bank as collateral set aside ...to secure deposits of trust funds awaiting investment or distribution...

"Although parties to deposits of collateral are ordinarily governed by Federal or State laws and regulations, or court orders... *only the terms and conditions of this circular shall govern this bank's duties as custodians of the securities deposited...*

"This bank does not assume and shall in no event be under a duty to inquire into the existence or continuance of the powers or authority of a pledgee for whose account this bank may hold securities in custody, his successors in office or of any other person whose signature has been filed with this bank as authorized to act in behalf of any such pledgee in transactions under this circular....

"The right is reserved to withdraw, add to, or amend at any time the provisions of this operating circular.

Monroe Kimbrel, President."

Unable to fathom the full intent of this Federal Reserve order, one city administration ordered its City Manager to write to their Congressman, asking him to find out what it was all about and why their city bonds, securities and "public monies" had to be turned over to the Feds for safekeeping. We shall withhold all names to protect the innocent; but the Congressman received the following reply to his inquiry:

"Dear.....

"This is in response to your letter concerning the proposed arbitrage regulations.

"On August 18, 1972, Secretary Shultz announced that the Treasury had decided to withdraw the 'Gross Repayment Section' of the proposed regulations. In addition, it was announced that a task force composed of Treasury representatives and experts on state and local finance would begin meeting 'almost immediately' to consider other problems involved in the arbitrage bond regula-

tions. The meetings are proceeding in a mutually satisfactory manner.

"The comments received from interested persons will be carefully considered in the review of the regulations.

Very truly yours,
(signed) Otto G. Stolz
Special Counsel to the
Under Secretary."

Arbitrage, incidentally, is defined as "purchasing in one market for immediate sale in another at a higher price." Which is wholly incidental and has almost nothing to do with the questions asked about the Federal Reserve's "Operating Circular No. 20" which calls for the transfer of local government funds to a Federal Reserve Bank. Note especially that nothing whatever was said about this Fed circular superseding all federal and state laws, and all court orders.

Here is yet another example of the complete run-around given to official queries as to executive department maneuverings.

All we can conclude is that the Central Authority wants to have supervision over the spending of all municipal and community funds!

AND THE CONGRESS, TOO -

Earlier in this letter we mentioned that there are two "escape hatches" which have prevented OMB from having full control of the funds which go into PPBS performance-budgeting; one of them being the jealously guarded power of Congress to appropriate specific amounts of tax money for specific purposes. The attempts of OMB to supplant this Constitutional duty of the Congress has caused something of a feud between the Legislative and Executive Branches of the Federal Government, coming to something of a head when the adjourning 92nd Congress refused to permit the Chief Executive to cut appropriations wherever he desired in holding expenses for the fiscal year down to an alleged \$250 billion.

Congressman William S. Moorhead, of Pennsylvania, pinpointed OMB as the agency behind the feud and, without ever mentioning PPBS by name, he remarked that "the increasing wide-ranging activities of the Office of Management and Budget-OMB-of the Executive Office of the President are becoming a topic of major concern to Members of Congress and the public. Unlike other executive departments and agencies that bask in the sunlight of publicity, the work of the OMB has been shrouded in the

obscurity of the bureaucratic maze—despite the all-powerful quarterback role that it plays in the executive branch.”

The Congressman then called attention to an article by Beverly Craig which appeared in the *Detroit News* of August 30, 1972; one of the few articles in which the author has dared to present critical statements about the activities of OMB. Here again, however, the Planning-Programming-Budgeting System is mentioned only by inference and never by name. Excerpts from that article follow:

NIXON'S BUDGET AGENCY
FEARED, HATED
(by Beverly Craig)

It's called 'the OMB' but critics have shortened even that to 'Tomb.' OMB has so much clout that it sometimes buries, by deferment, programs approved by Cabinet members and enacted by Congress... 'OMB is the most hated of all federal agencies,' said a congressional staff director. 'I'd rather deal with the Politbureau than the OMB'...

OMB, akin to the treasurer or controller of a corporation, is frequently described as the President's right arm. And it implements his policies in the most forceful way of all—cash flow. The agency also helps Cabinet departments formulate budget requests, apportions funds quarterly, assesses the potential cost and efficacy of legislation proposed on the Hill, helps push the President's legislative proposals, and audits existing federal programs.

Congress feels that its constitutional mandate to appropriate money—the power of the purse—gives it the last word on who gets what. That's the major rub between Congress and OMB...

The OMB is close physically as well as philosophically to Mr. Nixon, with quarters in the Executive Office Building next to the White House. Its new director is Casper W. Weinberger, the former deputy who took over after George P. Shultz became secretary of the treasury. OMB is a relatively small agency, with a staff level of 600, of whom about 420 are professional and the rest clerical. But its salaries are among the highest in government. The staff has grown by about one-fifth in the two years since it was reorganized with a management thrust.

(End of excerpts from article)

The first set-back in OMB's drive for power to disburse all funds in accordance with its own PPBS guidelines, came on August

7, 1972, in a federal court in Kansas City. A District Judge held that the impoundment of funds by OMB was illegal.

Congressman Joe L. Evins of Tennessee is author of the following statement:

“We are all concerned about the withholding, freezing, and impoundment of funds by the Office of Management and Budget after Congress has made specific appropriations. The arbitrary action of OMB in this area has become notorious and widespread. It is interesting to note that Chief Judge William H. Becker for the Western District of Missouri has recently issued a decree, holding that the impoundment of funds by the OMB... is illegal. The case was brought by the Missouri Highway Commission against John A. Volpe, Secretary of Transportation, and Casper W. Weinberger, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, alleging that the withholding of funds in this case was illegal. A writ of mandamus was issued, as well as a declaratory judgment by the Federal court against impoundments.”

In the opinion rendered by Judge Becker, it was held that Congress still held the power of the federal purse over OMB, and the Judge cited a Congressional ruling (paragraph (c) of Section 101, Title 23, U.S.C.A.) which reads as follows:

(c) It is the sense of Congress that under existing law no part of any sums authorized to be appropriated for expenditure upon any Federal-aid system... shall be impounded or withheld from obligation, for purposes and projects as provided in this title, by any officer or employee in the executive branch of the Federal Government...”

And therefore, as the 92nd Congress adjourned *sine die* with many of its members never to return because of an intervening national election, Congress had won the first battle in the war for control of all public funds, thanks to a Federal Judge. But neither Congress nor Constitution can long stay the march of the Planning-Programming-Budgeting Systemizers, who really believe it is predestinated that a Central Authority shall rule the world and the people therein, and that control of budgets is the means of rulership.

(To Be Continued)

DON BELL REPORTS & CLOSER-UP are privately circulated. For information, write:
DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

PROOFS OF A CONSPIRACY TO BUILD A TOTAL MANAGED GLOBAL SOCIETY

. Part Nine

GLOBAL ASPECTS OF PPBS

"The end of World War II probably marked the pinnacle of U.S. prestige; the height of the Viet Nam War may well have marked its nadir. Hamilton Fish Armstrong, retiring editor of *Foreign Affairs*, writes in the current issue: 'The methods we have used in fighting the war have scandalized and disgusted public opinion in almost all foreign countries. Not since we withdrew into comfortable isolation in 1920 has the prestige of the U.S. stood so low'."

So reads the opening paragraph of a special article in the current issue of *Time* (Nov. 6, 1972.) But, neither the editor of *Time* nor the retiring editor of the *Council on Foreign Relations's* tactical journal would ever admit openly that the American conduct of the Viet Nam War was so scandalous and disgusting because Robert Strange McNamara, while Secretary of the Defense Department, introduced, and conducted the war, along the strict lines laid down by PPBS—the Planning-Programming-Budgeting System as developed by Rand Corporation.

In an earlier special article published by *Time* (July 5, 1972), titled "The Particular Tragedy of Robert McNamara," the story is told, without ever mentioning PPBS by name, of course. Here are excerpts from the July 5th article:

"It is only the latest paradox in the career of Robert McNamara that he turns out to be a chief victim of the Viet Nam study that he initiated (PPBS—Ed.)... His business acumen enabled him to gain control of the sprawling Defense establishment. Yet he was so infatuated with statistics that he was long blinded to the human factors in the Viet Nam conflict. It was a puzzling outcome for a man who had entered Government renowned for his humane instincts as well as his technological brilliance... He gave a powerful impression of the assured

technician. Even reporters who did not cover the Pentagon liked to attend his press conferences. Briefed to the eyeballs behind his almost rimless glasses, his gleaming black hair immaculately slick, McNamara delivered an unstoppable stream of convincing detail. He had a swift answer for every question, a sharp rebuttal for every doubt.

"McNamara overawed the generals and admirals who worked for him, and he barely disguised his contempt for the military way of doing things... McNamara brought the same technological assurance to the war in Viet Nam... he willingly took command of what came to be called 'McNamara's War.' In 1964, he made his famous pronouncement that American troops would be home by Christmas of 1965. When that did not happen he pressed hard at the White House for a greater troop commitment. He was mesmerized by the fact of getting the forces to Viet Nam: 'We put 100,000 men across the beach in 120 days and did not impose wage or price controls or call up the reserves. The Russians could not do that.'

"As the war widened he consistently underestimated its cost—in life, in spirit, even in money. He miscalculated the cost of the buildup by \$11 billion in 1965, by \$7 billion in 1966. Because of his confidence in technology (PPBS, that is—Ed.), he did not appreciate the staying power of the North Vietnamese, who could get along without up-to-date military hardware. When the war bogged down and his well-laid plans went awry, he seemed to fit the classic case of the man who falls because of too much pride in his rationality." (End of quotation).

Robert Strange McNamara, the brilliant technologist who understood figures better than facts and things better than people, had initiated that performance-budgeting system called PPBS at the Ford Motor Company, where the end-product turned out to be the poorly-performing and ill-fated Edsel Motor

Car. From Ford McNamara was moved to the U.S. Department of Defense, where the same PPB System was installed, the end-product being a stalemated war in which even CFR-bigwig Hamilton Fish Armstrong could say that "the methods we have used in fighting the war have scandalized and disgusted public opinion in almost all foreign countries."

And then before the utter failure of the PPB System was brought to the attention of the public-at-large, McNamara was moved from the *National* Defense Department to the *International* performance-budgeting agency called the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and more popularly known as the *World Bank*.

In this post, McNamara has been able to entrench PPBS as a *world management system*.

It would be unfair, however, to leave you readers with the impression that McNamara is the "executive head" of this system. McNamara, after all, might be called merely a "computer reader" and "data processor" for an Elite Supranational Organization in which he is an important executive employe, but hardly the "Executive Head." In fact, PPBS methods were being employed at the World level long before McNamara took his post at the World Bank.

Here, a historical "flashback" is necessary if we are to understand the present and anticipate the future:

THE ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

In the *Encyclopedia Britannica* which was printed and released for publication in 1969, under the subject heading "Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development," Vol. 16, page 1089, there appears this unusual sentence:

"U.S. Government at the beginning of 1962 was advised to increase its regular government expenditures to stimulate its economy."

A little later in this same column we read:

"In January 1962 ten of the larger countries pledged \$6 billion to stabilize their currencies through the existing International Monetary Fund."

First, note that here is an international organization "advising" our Government to spend more money; and second, pledge more billions to the IMF at the same time!

Our Federal Government obeyed both of the

orders. And thus began our difficulties with unfavorable balance of payments and the critical drop in the value of the dollar on the international exchange.

Who is this International Group that tells the United States Government how much to spend and how much to pledge to back up its currency?

Let's start at the beginning:

As *Time* observed, "the end of World War II probably marked the pinnacle of U.S. prestige." And the prestigious Nation that had been called upon to make the world safe for Communism, now was called upon to repair, rebuild, and restore Europe; the first actual contract for such endeavor being called the Marshall Plan. As later events were to demonstrate to our sorrow, the United States was not yet adept at what was then an elementary form of Planning, Programming and Budgeting on a Continental scale. So, as if by design, European experts were called in to help the United States spend its taxpayers' money on European reconstruction and Afro-Asian development.

The most important of these official get-togethers of expert Planners and Budgeteers was to be known as the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC). OEEC was set up in 1947 to direct the European Recovery Program; that is, to supervise the spending of your money and mine to rebuild the world's economy (so some of us could ride to work in German made Beetles, and listen to programs on Japanese-made radios and television sets, while others of us, out of work as a result of this international PPBS, could join the expanding welfare program and live off the earnings of those of us not yet unemployed.

There is something which, to our knowledge, has never been explained in an understandable manner: the interlocking Planning, Programming, Budgeting System of certain of the Regional Governmental Agencies which we have been told to support by sacrificing our National Independence in order to create a condition of International Interdependence.

Succinctly: UN was set up as the Universal Holding Company which would keep the books, record and formalize the proceedings between nations until something better and more totalitarian in nature could be devised and forced upon the peoples of the world. NATO was established as a Regional Branch of the UN which would govern the military and defense matters between the

signatory nations. The Atlantic Union was devised to foster *political* union between these same nations. And OEEC was set up to build *economic* and *monetary* cooperation between these same nations.

To put it another way: If you can think of all of the industrial and productive (the "have" nations) of the alleged free world, being joined together in one great Confederation, then NATO would be its Department of Defense, Atlantic Union its State Department, and OEEC its Commerce and Treasury Departments.

Thus, OEEC, in addition to supervising the European Recovery Program, also took steps to establish interstate commerce regulations (eliminate intra-European import quotas, for example), promoted the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, supervised the European Monetary Agreement (a part of the IMF), and created a special fund to ease settlements, create currency convertibility, and regulate the credit between member states.

By 1961, the principle task (Marshall Plan programming and budgeting) was finished, and OEEC went out of business – but not before it had set up an even more powerful agency to supersede it: the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) was to become the most powerful of all these Regional Government Agencies, in that it concerned itself with far more than international commerce and finance, *and became the headquarters for Regional PPBS*, even as the Federal Office of Management and Budget had become the headquarters for National PPBS!

As we noted previously in this letter, it was OECD which "advised" the United States Government to spend more money and give more money to the IMF. Yet another indication of the power of OECD is contained in a report on the international monetary meetings of last October (1971) when the world monetary experts were trying to work out an acceptable method of counteracting the massive U.S. balance of payments deficit which was causing so much turmoil in international monetary circles.

The agents of the central bankers and the finance ministers of the nations involved met in Paris under a veil of secrecy with a group which called itself the *Working Party Three* (OECD representatives) on

October 18 and 19. There the *Working Party Three* "changed hats to become deputy ministers of the *Group of Ten* industrial nations Oct. 19-20." Quotation is from the standard reference service on current events, *Facts On File*, which also notes:

"At the conclusion of the OECD meeting Oct. 19, Otmar Emminger, chairman of the Working Party Three and vice chairman of the West German Bundesbank (central bank) said no agreement had been reached on an appropriate adjustment of the U.S. balance of payments deficit... Rinaldo Ossola, chairman of the Group of Ten deputies and deputy director of the Bank of Italy, said Oct. 20 that the deputies tentatively agreed to permit a 3% swing either side of parity in any new or temporary package of exchange rates. He reported that the delegates had deliberated on an 'average weighted realignment' to implement an agreed-upon turn around of the U.S. deficits."

The above is quoted simply to show that the OECD and its *Working Party Three* are the same as the *Group of Ten* deputies and the Central Bank deputies (our central bank is the Federal Reserve Corporation); and that all are a part of the so-called World Bank – and the *World Data Processing* is performed through this same OECD.

A valued correspondent (who shall be nameless in this series of letters) has obtained an OECD catalogue of publications for 1972, direct from OECD's headquarters at 2 rue Andre-Pascal, 75 Paris 16, France. The catalogue reveals that OECD is interested not merely in monetary matters and in commercial affairs, but acts as a central international agency for information and instruction on the following subjects—all of which fall within the purview of PPBS:

Education, Science & Technology, Manpower, Social Affairs, Land-Use Planning, Environment, Tourism, Transport, Industry, Energy, Fisheries, Agriculture & Food, Development, Statistics, Economic & Financial Affairs, and Information.

Recalling that the Computer and its Data Bank are the very heart of PPBS, it is of extreme importance to know that the Organisation (sic) for Economic Co-Operation and Development has issued "a new series of information studies on *Computerised Data Banks in Public Administration*."

As researchers have come to expect, this announcement from Paris "talks about apple

pie without ever mentioning the applies;" that is, it is all about PPBS but the acronym is never used, as will be seen from the following quotation:

"As governments seek to make the best use of information technology a new trend is becoming evident: the setting up of wide-spread networks of computerised data banks. Since automation is clearly linked to reforms in the public administration, a number of important policy issues will have to be recognised and resolved. Some of these issues as well as a number of technical problems are discussed in this report by a consultant of OECD's Science Directorate."

So there can be no mistake about this series having to do with the universal application of the Planning-Programming-Budgeting System, we quote the Table of Contents of this OECD announcement:

1. Introductory Remarks
2. Data Management Technology and Public Administration
 - 2.1 Data Management Technology and Reforms
 - 2.2 Integration of Data Management
 - 2.3 Political Balance and Automation
3. Data and Data Usage
 - 3.1 Data Types
 - 3.2 Data Management Types
4. Development of Data Management Technology
 - 4.1 Hardware
 - 4.2 Software
5. Data Base Management
 - 5.1 Basic Concepts and Terminology
 - 5.2 Organisation and Querying of Data Bases
 - 5.3 Technical Standards
6. Data Banks in Public Administration
 - 6.1 Operative, Planning and Information Functions
 - 6.2 Centralisation and Decentralisation
 - 6.3 Data Banks and Data Market
 - 6.4 Data Confidentiality and Privacy
 - 6.5 Participation and Transparency

Bibliography

We are informed also that "OECD is the forum in which the governments of 19 European countries plus Canada, Japan and the United States pool their information relevant to current economic trends, exchange ideas, and, when necessary, advise on appropriate courses of action in the light of shared experience."

ENTER PETER PETERSON

In view of the international importance of OECD and the fact that the United States did not have an "economic Kissinger" to handle American commercial and economic affairs at the world government level, as Nixon began the second half of his first term as President of the United States, he created a Council on International Economic Policy, named Peter G. Peterson as its executive director, and himself as its chairman.

Peterson, 45-year-old former chairman of Bell & Howell, will lay down guidelines (supervise PPBS integration) for more than sixty federal departments and agencies. As *Fortune* magazine, March 1971, suggested:

"Peterson's staff should grasp the chance to shift the focus of attention from the plight of individual industries to a *sort of systems analysis* (PPBS-Ed)... We hope he will be guided by a central high principle --that it is in the best interest of the U.S. that business be encouraged to continue its multinational development and that capital and technology be permitted to move ever more freely throughout the world. In some instances, adherence to this principle will mean *overriding narrow domestic politics and local interests.*"

Multinational corporations *seem to be* establishing governments of their own in defiance of national governments and political institutions. But if Government itself becomes a corporation and a network of corporations, (corporate fascism), then there is no serious conflict. PPBS is applicable to corporate management, and it is applicable to governmental management; PPBS is the liaison and the catalyst which permits the mixing of political oil and economic water. And Peter Peterson is the "economic Kissinger" who must bring about in the commercial and economic world what Kissinger has brought about in the political and military world. Especially with regard to Soviet Russia and Communist China.

PPBS is the weapon, and it will deprive all people of their remaining freedoms. But they won't know enough to mind, if PPBS is successful in its supreme task: that of re-making man in man's image.

(To Be Continued)

For information concerning this letter, write:
DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

PROOFS OF A CONSPIRACY TO BUILD A TOTAL MANAGED GLOBAL SOCIETY

..... Part Ten

THE DELPHI TECHNIQUE ENTERS THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

Lawrence P. Grayson, acting director of the Division of Technology of the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, was very frank, and may have said more than he intended to say. In an article appearing in *Science*, March 17, 1972, under the awesome title, "Costs, Benefits, Effectiveness: Challenge to Educational Technology," he gave this succinct view of the situation facing the Planners who are busily installing the Planning-Programming-Budgeting System (PPBS) in the public schools of the Nation:

"Educational decision makers often presume that people who resist a change in an approach to education do not understand the advantages to be gained by that change. This is not necessarily so. It is precisely because parents, students, and others fully perceive the implications of an innovation that they may resist it. This is the case particularly when the innovation may affect established values of the students or impart new ones in a way which conflicts with the values established in his home or community or with those of his background or culture."

He is speaking, of course, of the introduction of PPBS, which does, admittedly, conflict with the established values, traditions and culture of the family, the community, of American Government and of Christian culture.

There are two principal reasons why there has been so little resistance to the introduction of PPBS in the public school systems of the Nation. First, the parents themselves have been effectively brainwashed into acceptance of security as the greatest of blessings and, as in the case of forced busing for example, they are afraid to rock the boat, lest they be punished for non-conformity and independent action and

initiative. People are afraid to resist any change which the so-called experts call a change for the good.

Secondly; and aside from the brainwash, the self-appointed creators of this *New Society in a New World* have been extremely careful in their presentations and in their public utterances regarding PPBS. Their camouflage has been most effective. Like the wolf in sheep's clothing, it is only when one is able to get beneath the surface of their word-coating that the dangers of PPBS become manifest.

Complicated and confusing titles (like the one used by educationist Grayson in the *Science* article from which we quoted) are a part of the technique of deception. Olaf Helmer came out with this one in December, 1966:

"The Use of the Delphi Technique in Problems of Educational Innovations."

A "flashback" is required: In Part Six of this series we described the "Delphi Technique" which is used by the Planners to determine their goals and objectives (after which they fashion their programmes, then apply the performance budgeting technique). This Delphi Technique was developed by Olaf Helmer and Theodore Gordon in 1963 and 1964 under the auspices of the Rand Corporation. Then, in 1966, in an alleged scientific treatise, Helmer explained how his Delphi system of technological forecasting was to be applied to the task of remaking the American educational system so that the educational system would, in turn, remake the American citizenry.

Just to furnish a glimpse at the jargon employed by these egghead re-makers of man, in seeming attempt to prevent any layman from understanding what they're really talking about, we quote from Helmer's paper:

"Since the educational innovations planned

today will probably not be introduced for several years, and since the effects of such innovations—in terms of increased ability among new graduates to cope with the vicissitudes of life—may not be noticed for many years thereafter, decisions regarding such innovations cannot really be made rationally without a reasonably clear image of what the socioeconomic and technological environment of the next few decades will be. . . . In view of the projected character of our future environment and the effect we wish to exert on it through educational endeavor, it is necessary to establish appropriate educational goals. This is largely a matter of preference judgments, to be obtained through the Delphi method. . . .

“After these preparatory steps, a wide survey of suggestions for potential educational innovations should be made; . . . Then an estimate of the dollar cost of each item in the resulting list of contemplated innovations should be made. . . . And finally, on the basis of these cost-benefit estimates a program of educational innovations can be constructed by allocating a given budget among the items on the list of innovative proposals.” (End of quotations.)

The “scientific paper” from which we have quoted in the two preceding paragraphs, was prepared, in 1966, for publication in *The American Behavioral Scientist*. Let us now skip forward five years, to April 1971, and to an article which appeared in *The Futurist*—a publication of the *World Future Society; An Association for the Study of Alternate Futures*.

A preliminary word about these *Futurists*: this is an association of social, behavioral and other professors of the inexact sciences who actually believe that it is their duty to predict the shape of the world of tomorrow, and then set down to the task of making their predictions come true. They believe that it is within the power of man to control his future “evolution,” and that they have been specially trained and delegated to the responsibilities of directing that control. In short, they are playing at being gods, and the new humanity will be their creation! Francois Hetman, a French Futurist, has expressed the goal in the following words:

“To the extent that man fulfills himself by ‘projecting’ himself into the future, the future becomes the realm where he has true freedom to act, the reservoir of his potentialities. By increasing his mastery of the environment, he sees it with new and more

perceptive eyes; the increasing multiplicity of technical choices implies a permanent reappraisal of his social and ecological heritage. It is therefore necessary for him to develop new ‘sciences of man’ which will permit him to make informed choices as to options for the future and to defend his estate against all forms of deprecation. The future is therefore our most precious resource. Its methodological exploration becomes a new dimension of our society. Concern for its implications must therefore increase rapidly.” (From *The Language of Forecasting*, Paris, 1969).

These Futurists who are dedicated to the task of remaking the world and all that’s in it according to the instructions printed out by their computer (which has replaced the Oracle at Delphi even as they seem to have replaced the God of our fathers), these “men of great wisdom” are not crackpots in the usual sense of the term. They are, perhaps, endued with the fanaticism that often accompanies the worshiping of idols, but many are men of renown in their own fields of endeavor. These world reshapers include:

- Glenn T. Seaborg*, once chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and member of the Board of Directors of the *World Future Society*.
Carl H. Madden, chief economist with the Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.
Arnold Barach, senior editor of *Changing Times* magazine.
Orville L. Freeman, presently president of Business International Corporation.
Barbara Hubbard, organizing director of the Committee for the Future.
Michael Michaelis, Washington manager of Arthur D. Little, Inc.
Rowan A. Wakefield, executive vice president of Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies.
Ian H. Wilson, consultant on Business Environment, General Electric Co.
Herman Kahn, director, Hudson Institute.
Charles Levinson, secretary general, International Chemical Federation.
Earl C. Joseph, staff scientist in the Univac Division of Sperry Rand Corporation.
William W. Simmons, director of exploratory planning for the International Business Machines Corporation.
Louis H. Mayo, George Washington University; served on the White House Task Force on Disarmament in 1956; was executive secretary to the network study staff of the FCC in 1956-57.

Isaac Asimov, writer of science fiction.

Anthony J. Wiener, associated with Herman Kahn at the Hudson Institute.

Alvin C. Eurich, president of the Academy for Educational Development in New York City, author of *Reforming American Education, Campus 1980, High School 1980*.

John Dixon, "a widely known consultant in planning, futures research, and the role of voluntary associations in reshaping public policy."

Peter House, president of Environmetrics, Inc.

Sylvan J. Kaplan, chief of the National Park Service's Division of Plans and Objectives.

The above is but a partial list of *Futurists* who participated as speakers and panelists in the First General Assembly of the World Future Society, May 12-15, 1971, in which "people from all over the world" joined in an "exploration of what mankind can and should do in the years ahead."

Sufficient introduction to these "shapers of tomorrow's world" who insist that "the world we live in is increasingly the world we ourselves make, and we cannot do the job wisely without foresight."

Their means of "gaining foresight" has now become an improvement on the *Delphi technique* which is called the *Delphi Conference*. Beginning on page 55 of the April 1971 issue of *The Futurist*, is an article about the *Delphi Conference*, written by Murray Turoff, of the U.S. Office of Emergency Preparedness. This is an adjunct to the Office of Management and Budget, also is situated in the President's Executive Office Building, and is the "executive head" that runs the entire Nation if and when those standby *Emergency Executive Orders* are ever declared to be in effect because of a "national emergency."

There is this picture of Emergency Chief Turoff seated at his Teletype keyboard, to which there is attached an active Computer. The caption under the picture reads:

"Will future committee meetings look like this? Murray Turoff is conferring with 20 other persons, some of whom are located thousands of miles away. Sitting in his office at the U.S. Office of Emergency Preparedness in Washington D.C., he types out his ideas and questions. A computer adds his thoughts to its running record of the conference proceedings. When any other participant has free time, he goes to a teletype similar to this and asks to be con-

nected (by ordinary telephone lines) to the computer keeping track of the conference. The computer prints out the record of the conference; he then types in his comments, which immediately become part of the conference proceedings. When this picture was taken, the conference had been going on for several weeks without a break, but the participants were still living their normal lives."

Excerpts from Turoff's article follow:

The Delphi technique, often used in forecasting future developments, can be combined with computers to create a new procedure called the Delphi Conference. This new method enables a large group of individuals to communicate meaningfully and rapidly with each other both in generating group forecasts and in making policy decisions....

Computers have long promised to bring about a revolution comparable in scope with the industrial revolution. Just as the steam engine brought about a great extension of man's physical powers, the computer offers a large extension of his mental power, specifically, his memory and ability to process information logically. By remembering and manipulating data, computers have offered society the hope of being able to cope with an increasingly complex civilization....

The Delphi technique has been defined as a method for systematically soliciting and collating informed judgments on a particular topic. Under this procedure, participants respond to a series of questionnaires interspersed with summaries of the responses by group members to earlier questionnaires. With the introduction of computers the emphasis begins to change from communications between the group and an outside party to communication within the group.

...In the Delphi Conference, the computer operates as a real-time accounting system. Instead of the usual accounting functions (sales, stock, shipping records, etc.), the computer stores discussion items entered by members of the group and accumulates votes on these items.... With the computer constantly at his disposal, a participant in the conference can interact with the others in the conference at any time of day or night.... Participants can be thousands of miles apart. Their commands can be transmitted to the computer by ordinary telephone lines from the terminals (which can simply

be a teletype keyboard).... At the U.S. Office of Emergency Preparedness (part of the Executive Offices of the President) in Washington, D.C., the Delphi Conference has been used to explore its own potentialities.

The 20 respondents in the initial experiment were located at government agencies, businesses, non-profit organizations, and universities at widely separated locations....

The incorporation of Delphi techniques into computer systems appears to be a first step in making the computer a true extension of man's intellectual capability.

(End of quotations from article)

Talk of the cold, remote, inhuman aspects of government when it is removed from the community level and centralized at a State, Regional, National, or even World level; here is a form of government that is the ultimate in the impersonal and the inhuman; it is a faceless, even voiceless, composite Dictator that prints out our future from a Computer, and then prints out the programme which will achieve that future, and budgets the operation with taxpayers' money, and with nary a taxpayer ever knowing who gave the orders that he must obey in order to become a part of the world of tomorrow!

Think of this manner of ruling a world and a people: A group of unidentified and unseen men who may never even have seen each other, seated in their figurative ivory towered think-tanks perhaps half a continent apart; each of them seated at a teletype keyboard which is attached to a Central Computer, feeding their isolated and impractical theories and conjectures onto a piece of tape; from which a Central Executive Head arrives at decisions and issues orders concerning any and every facet of life from conception to cremation.

This, for example, is the manner in which the American child is to be prepared for a life of usefulness in the world of tomorrow. From some of these conferences, we have a few of the conclusions that have been published in papers and journals not ordinarily made available to the public at large. We are going to quote directly from a few of these sources. The special cant employed by bureaucrats, plus the odd jargon of the educationists, make the following difficult to interpret; but the message will be clear once you become accustomed to the cant and jargon:

"Today's educational planning can claim an unbroken ancestry running back to ancient times... The Spartans, some 2,500 years ago, planned their education to fit their well defined military, social and economic objectives. Plato in his 'Republic' offered an educational plan to serve the leadership needs and political purposes of Athens.... These early examples... linking a society's educational system to its goals... show how educational planning has been resorted to in periods of great social and intellectual ferment *to help change a society to fit new goals.*" (Philip Coombs, "The World Educational Crisis - A Systems Analysis," Oxford University Press, N.Y., 1968).

"Behavioral objectives, written in the affective domain, *will be applied to all persons* in the educational institution, e.g., students, teachers, principals and administrators, educational specialists, families, community groups." (EPIC, "Educational Innovators Press, "Developing Observation Systems.")

"... an observation system must focus on small bits of activity or behavior that is to be categorized... teacher-student verbal interaction... what people do... Individual students are observed and coded... an IBM 1230 form is utilized for data processing purposes.... The most commonly utilized method of observation is the use of audio tape recording... After observations are recorded, they are transformed to a matrix for interpretation." (EPIC, Ibid.)

"Currently in education, the focus is on *accountability*. One necessary component of accountability is the *measurement of behavior*... 'systematic observation' has emerged as a valid and useful technique for obtaining behavior feedback." (EPIC, Ibid.)

"By its very purpose, a program budgeting system is a gigantic consumer of data... The sources of data and the means of collection and analysis are, of course, obvious concerns. Not so obvious, but just as real, are the *fears of the individuals* supplying the data *about the intended uses* of the data." (Rand Corporation, "Developing a Program Budgeting System as an Aid in Planning Higher Education," S.A. Haggart).

(To Be Continued)

DON BELL REPORTS & CLOSER-UP are privately circulated. For information, write:
DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

PROOFS OF A CONSPIRACY TO BUILD A TOTAL MANAGED GLOBAL SOCIETY

..... Part Eleven

ON BUILDING THE NEW MAN TO SERVE THE NEW SOCIETY

The headline asked, "School Management: Is PPBS the Answer?" and there followed an article which did not answer the question but did serve to introduce a very controversial subject to its readers. Appearing in the *Los Angeles Times*, Sunday, July 26, 1970, and written by Robert B. Young, the *Times* Education Writer, this article was one of the first public notices of the fact that the State's Public School System was to be used as a kind of guinea pig in an experiment with a new psychopolitical method for "educating" school children.

Following are excerpts from that article:

It's not a new missile system and if added to gasoline it won't stop smog, but a tongue-tier called PPBS is provoking mixed dread and joy among California education watchers. And its concept is as hard to master as its name is to say.

"The initials stand for Planning, Programming, Budgeting System. And California's teachers, school administrators and district boards will be hearing more of PPBS as 1974 approaches—for that is the target date for overturning the schools' traditional 'line-item' accounting methods, and opening up a bulging bag of new management techniques.

"Can education be charted, or can't it? That is the question, for at the heart of PPBS are goal-setting and progress-measuring rituals that are taken for granted in large industrial firms—especially in aerospace.

"A teacher of journalism and English at Taft Union High School, near Bakersfield, bristles at the very sound of PPBS. 'Teaching is such a personal process,' said Mark Donnelly, ... 'you can't measure it in terms of "efficiency," the way engineers measure things....

"In government circles elsewhere, it has become something of a fad to have a PPBS. Now, 40 states and some cities—notably, New York City—are gaining leverage on complex problems of civil administration with PPBS-style analyses....

"The man closest to California's experiment with PPBS in education is James E. Waters, executive secretary of a Sacramento advisory commission on school district budgeting and accounting.... 'We're trying to move away from the idea of managing education as a process,' said Waters, 'and toward management of the end product....'

(End of quotation)

The "end product" is, of course, the child, who is being 'conditioned' to take his or her place in a future society which has been "evolved" by master planners, using PPBS procedures to bring about the evolution.

PPBS is a complex, elusive, difficult-to-explain and difficult-to-comprehend form of psychopolitical procedure when it is applied to education. Mrs. Ruth Spencer perhaps explained it best by showing the interrelationship of PPBS methods as applied to government, industry, and education. Mrs. Spencer served as Chairman of the Education Policy Committee of the United Republicans of California (UROC), and in that capacity made an intensive study of PPBS. An article by Mrs. Spencer appeared in the February, 1971, issue of *Round-Up*, the organization's publication. We quote from that article:

PPBS - TOOLING FOR "1984" THROUGH BUDGETING

A new sophisticated budgeting system has developed on the government scene with the potential of destroying all taxpayer control over budgetary matters and governmental policies, as well as preparing for the thought-control of "1984." Commonly referred to as "program budgeting," the

Planning, Programming, Budgeting System" (PPBS) has been activated on the national level and recently set in motion for adoption by the California Board of Education, unbeknown to most lay citizens and legislators.

PPBS was designed by Rand Corporation of Santa Monica to aid government in pursuit of its "goals and objectives" and policy reform through the process of budgeting. It is to be applied to the policies of Defense; Law and Order; Health, Education and Welfare; Economic Development; and the current business operations such as the Post Office....

PPBS budgeting procedure is very complicated and riddled with new terms and meanings. It begins with "planning," which is the setting of so-called "goals and objectives." Goals are general, timeless and long-range policy pursuits. Then, subordinate to the goals, "objectives" are formulated. They are specific, short-range, measurable ways in which individuals are to think, feel and act as a result of certain programs which promote the goals. An example of a PPBS goal for a school district might be "Environmental Understanding," and a behavioral objective under that goal might be "Support legislation to control coastline conservation." Objectives of the goal "health" could be "Use existing community mental health services;" or, quoting from the 3M "SHES" curriculum: "Explain conception, parental stages of development, and the birth process." Progressing from "policy" to action, goals and objectives of PPBS in education serve as guidelines in directing not only learning skills but also behavioral change and politically-oriented accomplishments. They are subject to measurement and "accountability" with regard to the teacher's ability to teach the objectives and the student's satisfactory accomplishment. Teachers and students will be "recycled" in case of failure to comply.

"Programming" stands between "planning" and "budgeting" and refers to the countless types of experimental research, operational and evaluation activities or "performance" that are to be funded by "budgeting" to bring about the policy requirements of "planning." How the structure of programs works is illustrated in HEW's Planning-Programming-Budgeting guidelines for PPBS. Therein the federal department's health, education and welfare programs are classified and given a 6 digit coded number for

computer use. A "program" would be indicated by the code entry 1 5 4 5 7 1. This would mean funding under the *major category of education (1), for general research (5), directed at improving International Education (4), through developing innovation (5) at regional laboratories (7 1)*. This example of HEW's existing program code structure shows how programming is an essential component working with the policies of "planning" and with "budgeting," and budgeting becoming the means of setting programs in action, whether those programs are aimed at improving International Education, basic skills, Headstart, sex education, educational parks, or whatever.

At whatever level PPBS program coding originates, whether local, state or federal, a procedure of review and evaluation of the program comes into play. This review involves an extensive data collection effort and written reports giving data evaluation. Although at first the goals and objectives may be set at local governmental level, there will be a point at which the "cost effectiveness" of implementing programs must be evaluated, reviewed and revised. From these processes develops a "program analysis" which then evolves into new, revised, state-federal standardized, centralized programs based upon new goals and objectives, related by program coding to a central budget structure. This revision for centralization is consistent with the nature of computer programming which anticipates the replacement of preliminary, detailed input with a final centralized program. Thus the PPBS process can be compared to a man-wood-fire temperature control situation that could be replaced by a programmed thermostat button. There will be a "button" in PPBS also, at a point where "man," (teachers, principals, administration and school board officials) is eliminated.

Rand Corporation Memorandum RM-4271-RC, p. 41, depicts the anticipated centralization of the PPBS structure: "The first point to emphasize must be the personal responsibility of the executive head of the organization. No one at a lower level has the authority or the right or the ability to acquire the knowledge required to perform the necessary tasks of coordination." Therefore, in the advanced stages of PPBS, after the goals, objectives and programs have been "reviewed" and subjected to elaborate computer mathematics and programming technique, they will become cen-

tralized, revised, standardized, and "irrefutable." Those new centralized policies and programs will then serve as the basis for "decision-making" in budget preparation in requesting funds for new and continuing programs.

PPBS is no simple accounting system. Rand Corporation designed PPBS as "a resource analysis system," involving far more than traditional budgeting as associated with accounting. Several vital changes in the budgeting process are introduced: PPBS "budgeting" eliminates the function concept and puts budgeting on a program basis. This means that PPBS sets up a coded program format, geared to local-state-federal funds, and under each program is included the costs of such functions as salaries, transportation, maintenance, etc. Presently these functions are separated and their costs reported separately. In other words, under PPBS the cost of "salaries" will be distributed throughout the countless programs.

The new PPBS budgeting will also change the fiscal year reporting now designed to limit the exercise of officials' discretion and check their honesty. PPBS "looks beyond" a single year and provides for funding for programs which project into the future over spans of time covering two, five, seven years, depending on the program. A six-digit program budget code number will serve as a "crosswalk" to fit the multi-year programs into annual budgets. This time span of long-range programs involves another change having to do with funding for "future benefits" and the personal judgments involved. PPBS offers no alternative to reliance on such personal judgment and "crude intuition" in requesting money to pay for "future benefits."

These departures from the present budgeting system will serve to seriously decrease the taxpayers' control of budgetary matters, being based on "decision-making" beyond their reach, understanding and refutation. In addition to losing control of spending, under the PPBS "planning" and "programming" system, taxpayers and local officials will lose control of educational curricula content, health and welfare program policy, as those programs become "centralized under state-federal standards. Another sophisticated characteristic of PPBS is its *conceptual* framework, which ties together the total of all governmental functions, so a "manpower" program could involve educa-

tion, welfare and labor programs, further decreasing taxpayer power to control governmental policy (and spending).

CALIFORNIA SCHOOL BOARD SETS PPBS IN MOTION

At its December 1970 meeting the California State Board of Education directed the State Department of Education to proceed with revision of the State School Accounting Manual, a necessary procedure in preparing for "the adoption of the proposed program structure for budgeting, accounting and reporting purposes to become operative in California Public Schools beginning July 1, 1973."...

In the meantime, newly elected State Superintendent of Public Instruction Wilson Riles (he succeeded Dr. Max Rafferty, who opposed PPBS-Ed.) has revealed his plans to expand the roles of the State Board, its Curriculum Commission and the State Department of Education to promote "performance accountability" in the state's public school system, to establish experimental schools to test various programs; to collect information about the program results; to analyze, evaluate and revise the goals and then to broadcast their recommendations under state auspices...When the program coding is completed, and geared for "planning," "programming," and for state-federal funds, California taxpayers will have lost control of their local school budgets and curricula content, will have subjected their students, school administrators, officials and themselves to "behavioral" measurement, and opened the floodgates to federal aid and control of public schools.

PAST IS PROLOGUE

It will behoove taxpayers and legislators who wish to better understand the "Big Brother" potential of PPBS to review the history of the socialist "progressive education" movement in America, for what is past is prologue. The design inherent in PPBS to take control of education-health and welfare as well—from taxpayers and their representatives and put that control in the hands of distant social scientists, with federal funding *has been the challenging vision of collectivist minds in this country for over sixty years.* Great headway toward socializing America already has been made by liberal "progressive" educationists and politicians who have worked deceitfully to create "a new social order," who believe that capitalism is doomed and some form of socialism is desirable and inevitable, and

that *it is the business of the schools* to help build a radically different collectivist form of society, whether fascist or communist. These advocates of socialism, followers of John Dewey and many other Keynesian-Fabian Socialists, *would have the schools assume a propaganda function*; indoctrination, not education, is their watchword. Children are to be prepared for participation in a collectivist order, and therefore the role of the school—from the nursery through the university—is to serve as “an agency” in revising procedures and curricula that will accomplish that end.

It was in 1933 that an important spokesman for the movement, Dr. George S. Counts, counselled the schools to “deliberately reach for power” and “to the extent that they are permitted to fashion the curriculum and procedures of the school they will definitely and positively influence the social attitudes, ideals, and behavior of the coming generation,” where “trust in Providence” must be replaced by “careful planning” and “private capitalism by some form of socialized economy.”

Now, after many years of such growth, PPBS offers its science and technology of business procedure to the human-social realms of health, education and welfare. Careful policy “planning,” “programming,” revision, and the irrefutable access to federal aid “budgeting,” come within closer reach than the socialist Frontier Thinkers ever envisioned.

And PPBS’s totalitarian potential offers this extension: the “democracy” of the teachers’ and the community’s efforts will be discarded when the PPBS “executive head” is ready to finalize the program of “1984” — only make it 1974!

All legislation and action to implement PPBS in the California school system should be repealed, and constant guard against passage of any changes in the law to establish PPBS should be maintained by concerned citizens and loyal legislators in Sacramento and Washington, lest the tooling for a “1984” machine gun is allowed to proceed under the guise of an innocent, baby-carriage budgeting system.

(End of article by Mrs. Ruth Spencer)

The preceding article concentrates on the situation in California, but exactly the same things—with variations depending upon the locale and temper of legislators—are going

on in every State in the Union. There has been more exposure of PPBS, and more opposition to it, in the State of California because a group of very alert “school watchers” in that State were first in the Nation to discover a plot that was intended to remain a secret to all but those Planners who were active in socializing America, deceitfully and clandestinely.

California is spotlighted, too, because that State was chosen as a “project” area for the development and perfection of PPBS techniques. The system was developed at Rand Corporation, which is situated at Santa Monica, and under the alleged conservative leadership of Governor Reagan, it was easier and less questionable to transfer the locally-residing “experts” from Rand to State employment.

But the concerned citizens of all the States should feel grateful to that small band of California citizens and parents who spotted the PPBS plot and began doing their utmost to alert the rest of the Nation to the dangers inherent in PPBS.

Your editor wishes at this time to express his particular thanks to those who did the original research, and made available to us their findings, files and documentation. Our special gratitude is extended to Mrs. Marilyn Angle, Mrs. Virginia McNeil, Mrs. Ruth Spencer, the late Florence Fowler Lyons, Mrs. Mary Pohle, Joseph P. Bean, M.D., Gary North, and others whom we may have overlooked.

We mention these names because they have spoken out or written publicly against the evils of PPBS, and whom we can therefore thank publicly. Also — as we continue to shine the editorial spotlight on the use of PPBS as a political, economic and social weapon against school children, teachers, school administrators, parents and citizens of the Nation; we shall be more and more dependent upon the work that has been done by these Californians Against PPBS. The research and the data-gathering could never have been accomplished by one individual. We are proud to have become a kind of human “data bank” into which their combined efforts can be collated, and then channeled out to the concerned citizens of the entire Nation.

(To Be Continued)

For information concerning this letter, write:
DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

PROOFS OF A CONSPIRACY TO BUILD A TOTAL MANAGED GLOBAL SOCIETY

- - - - - Part Twelve - - - - -

AN EDUCATIONAL REVOLUTION "WITHOUT THE BLOODBATH"?

There is today, in the literature concerning governmental reorganization, social and welfare reorganization, educational reorganization, and every other kind of reorganization, the constant recurrence of the word "revolution." Such use of the word has no reference to the Reds and other radicals who are attacking "the Establishment;" nor to those who are engaged in counter-revolution as ultra-conservatives. Rather, this use of the word "revolution" refers to those who are in high positions in Government (the Nixon Revolution, for example), and to those who are in positions of trust, who are responsible leaders, and who are quick to admit that they are "leading a revolution." An example of this in the educational field recently was brought to our attention: The *UC News*, issued weekly by the University of California, published the following in its issue of Feb. 8, 1972:

'EDUCATIONAL 'REVOLUTION' NEAR, SAYS UCR EXPERT'

"Riverside—Public education in the United States is headed for a revolution—a drastic change in who runs the schools, what is taught and who learns, a University of California, Riverside, educator believes.

"Dr. Laurence Iannaccone, a professor of education and administration at UC Riverside, and one of the nation's foremost experts on public education, said that change of a magnitude rivalling the transformations that took place in American education in the early 1900's, will occur before 1980.

"'There's no question that public education will undergo a revolution in the next ten years,' he said, '*The issue is how we are to avoid the bloodbath that may accompany it.*'

"According to Iannaccone, the new concern about education has been magnified by changes in population, the electronic media,

growing awareness of racial and ethnic issues, and by taxpayer dissatisfaction over mounting taxes. The solution, he says, is *a complete restructuring of school organization, and a shift in funding responsibilities.*" (End of quotation; italics added).

His solution, in other words, is universal application of the method called Planning-Programming-Budgeting System (PPBS).

When PPBS is applied to education, it becomes especially difficult to dig through the layers of semantic confusion and planned word-camouflage, and get down to the basic dangers of the method. Therefore, it seems expedient, first, to define some of the more commonly used terms. This should make it easier to understand what will follow. The definitions are those used by Rand Corporation, by public administrators, and by the educationists who are promoting PPBS:

PLANNING, PROGRAMMING, BUDGETING SYSTEM (PPBS)—"A systematic approach to the allocation of limited resources for the accomplishment of priority objectives."

GOAL—"A statement of broad direction, general purpose, or intent. A goal is general and timeless."

OBJECTIVE—"A desired accomplishment which can be measured within a given time frame."

ALTERNATIVES—"Possible objectives and means of obtaining them."

SYSTEM—"A system involves many parts, or components, that operate independently and in combination to achieve stated goals or mission objectives."

PROGRAM—"A unique combination of personnel, facilities, equipment and supplies, which operate together to accomplish common objectives."

SYSTEM ANALYSIS (also called the Systems Approach, or Systems Management)—

"The process of evaluating the inputs, the costs, and the resources required of a program, as well as evaluating the outputs, the service, the benefits and the payoffs."

FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS—"The technique of breaking down a mission into an organization of jobs or tasks performed."

TAXONOMY—Systematics, or Systems Analysis as applied to education; "The study of the general principles of scientific classification."

Concerning this last term "taxonomy"—About ten years ago a group of psychologists, behavioral scientists and educators under the leadership of Benjamin Bloom, came up with what they labeled "the taxonomy of educational objectives." By the probable process of merely enlarging on the original experimental findings of Ivan Petrovich Pavlov (who worked under the aegis of Joseph Stalin and the urging of Secret Police Chief Lavrentia Berea), Bloom and his associates classified the behavioral objectives of modern education into three categories, which they called cognitive, affective, and psychomotor.

Interpretation:

The *cognitive* domain in education is concerned with the gaining of knowledge, and with recall or memory.

The *affective* domain has to do with what the student believes, what his values and his attitudes are.

The *psychomotor* domain is concerned with what the student does or can do under certain stimuli; his *motor performance*.

More simply: Bloom's taxonomy classifies each student according to:

- 1) What he knows,
- 2) How he feels about it,
- 3) What he does about it.

The PPBS *elite* adopted and adapted Dr. Bloom's taxonomy and "the essence of the PPB System (as applied to education) is to be able to evaluate student performance in each of these three domains," declares Joseph P. Bean, M.D. "Therefore, behavioral objectives are written for each course to determine what the child learns (knows), what his attitudes are (feels) and what action he is able to take (does). The objectives pre-determine what knowledge is necessary or good, what attitudes the child should have, and what action is considered desirable. The right of parents to determine what values and attitudes they wish to

develop is by-passed, and the objectives generate attitudes often inconsistent with those the parents prefer."

Dr. Bean was a member of the Glendale, California School Board, resigned because he found he could do nothing in that capacity to halt the flow of the "River of Pollution" which is the public education system in his State and in the United States. In a classic statement of resignation from the school board, Dr. Bean concluded with these words:

"... Only about ten percent of the decisions affecting school districts are made by the local board of education, the River of Education is too highly contaminated for this small fraction of influence to make an impression at the local level.

"When a new trustee is elected to a local board of education, he intends, of course, to represent the residents who elected him. But usually the new board member, within a matter of six weeks, finds himself representing the educational establishment instead of the residents. When parents come before the board to make requests, they are often treated rudely and as enemies of the board. Rarely will a board member continue to identify with the parents and to serve them and their children. With their districts 90% controlled by the federal and state governments, parents live under complete tyranny when their own local boards identify with the administrative staff instead of the people whom they were elected to represent.

"There is nothing new about attempts to control another person's behavior. Physical force has been used since just after man appeared on earth. However, the techniques of warfare more recently developed, have led to the invention of new weapons which relegate nuclear explosives to the category of the bow and arrow. It is generally agreed that of these new weapons (which include hypnosis, traditional psycho-therapy, behavior modifying drugs, brain surgery on the masses, enzyme inhibitors, and implanted electrodes in the brain) *operant conditioning is the most specific and easiest of manipulation*. Its implementation is being accomplished on hundreds of millions of persons on this planet at this moment.

"When you consider that the ultimate goal of warfare is the control of the behavior of the vanquished by the victor, we are therefore, in the greatest conflict in the history

of mankind. *Welcome to World War III.*"
(End of quotation)

All of these new weapons mentioned by Dr. Bean (plus others such as sensitivity training, sex education, the religion of humanism and data bank surveillance) have been integrated into and become a part of the vast arsenal of PPBS.

When the PPBS *elite* concentrates on the task of controlling human behavior, the emphasis is on the schools of the nation. The older generation—those on the other side of the alleged generation gap—are expendable and their number diminishes with the years. It is the more expedient course with these "wrongly educated grown-ups" not to convert but to coerce. The red tape of governmental restrictions and regulations, the oppression of income tax soul-scrutiny, fear of losing social security, health and welfare benefits, the pesterings of pettifogging bureaucrats; such weapons of coercion keep most of the "over thirty" group anxious to keep in line.

But with the youth there is the need for conversion to a new way of life. And forced education is the perfect vehicle when it is driven and directed by a PPB System which determines what each youth is to *know*, *feel*, and *do*.

The PPBS *elite* will, of course, insist that its design for the schools is merely to get the most out of every dollar spent; to make the teacher and the administrator accountable for the work he should do. Here is the way the designers of PPBS explain it:

"Let us suppose that a school spends a budgeted amount of money for a particular program. It is desirable to learn whether the dollars spent are producing the results expected. To determine the success of the program, behavioral or performance objectives for the class must be written down. The teacher then is to give the type of instruction which will enable the class to meet these written objectives, and within a given time block. Testing is then done to determine whether the students in the class actually did meet the written objectives. Thus, PPBS is merely a system of cost accounting, nothing more."

This is what the proponents of PPBS will tell you. Up to a point, they are correct; it is a system of cost accounting. *But, it also is so very much more!*

The programming, or taxonomy, has three

parts: *know*, *feel*, and *do*. Under PPBS, the knowledge imparted is of a peculiar nature. Johnny can no longer read, write, spell, add or subtract satisfactorily; but he is given controlled amounts of certain scientific, technological, physiological, sociological, and political information. The academic is glossed over, the technical and professional are stressed; so that to *know* is to be prepared *functionally* for the *new society*.

In the "affective" (*feel*) domain, PPBS 'programs' the student with values and attitudes that are in conflict with his home training. And in the "action" (*do*) domain, he is programmed to political and social action, and to sexual action befitting an animal rather than a human being.

We appreciate Dr. Bean's description, because he was on the "inside" of the system long enough to observe it from the professional point of view. He writes:

"When the teacher (under PPBS) has completed an instructional unit and has tested the students, the test results are assigned symbols and computerized. The information flows to a regional data collection and processing center, one of several in each state. There a student profile is built for each student in the region. From this center the data flow to a large data bank serving one or more states (eventually, one of the ten federal regions into which the Nation has been divided—Ed.) In this master bank an enormous amount of information is permanently stored on each student.

"The Rand Corporation, which assisted with the theoretical construction of a PPB for schools, affirms that the entire responsibility for the PPBS operation must reside *with one person at the top*. 'No one at a lower level has the authority or the right or ability to acquire the knowledge required to perform the necessary tasks...' says Rand.

"After students have been evaluated for the first time to determine how well they have achieved the stated objectives, this programmer at the top will be in a position to modify, delete, or add to the objectives, to achieve a standardization of objectives for all classrooms in every school in any one subject. After three or four testings or evaluations, the programmer will no doubt have standardized the objectives for every classroom, and the usual decision-makers will be locked out of the process. The power of the programmer (the one man at the top) bypasses the board of education, the super-

intendent of the school, and the parents. Even the teacher, who is given a chance to write the first set of objectives, loses out because the teacher's power to influence the objectives will be removed by the programmer; the teacher will truly be a facilitator and a manager of the classroom, but not a teacher at all.

"After each child is programmed with the pre-determined knowledge, values, and potential skills, he will be standardized and averaged out, leveled off at a base-line of mediocrity. Subject matter as we know it will no longer exist and very few other aspects of education will remain. The more than forty million children in our nation's schools will be insensitive and unnatural, and will be capable of only highly directive behavior, each holding identical points of view.

"Educators wishing to initiate the use of behavioral objectives in a school district first set the stage for their operations. The use of objectives is a means of creating *change* in the district, and the persons responsible for the *change process* are called *change agents*. *Change agency* is a sociological mechanism now widely used in education. Strategies for initiating and managing the *change process* are taught in seminars to future *change agents*.

"The *change agent* first deliberately subjects the school or district to disequilibrium and sets in motion the forces necessary to change and re-direct the school. When the intended state of disequilibrium has been achieved, the system is said to be *unfrozen*. To crystallize the institutional thrust in a new direction, i.e. to *re-freeze* the system, behavioral objectives in the three domains (*know, feel, do*) are written. The objectives reflect the new direction (new methods, course content, point of view, values and desired ends) for the school....

"Under PPBS management, the information input to the student will be limited; random encounter in the learning process will be eliminated; instruction will be highly prescribed; and programming toward a particular ideological, philosophical, political and social point of view will be the chief characteristic of the system.

"The greatest threat to human freedom which faces man today is a new system of weapons for mind control. Man has always been subject to enslavement by force or by economics. The technological (including

chemical) mechanisms now perfected provide a new dimension in enslavement, mind control, which will dwarf the first two....

"PPBS has evolved out of a long history of developments through research in psychology, sociology, economics, mathematics, anthropology and political science. Planned Programming and Budgeting was developed from 1956-63 by Charles Hitch at the Rand Corporation in Santa Monica with federal funds. It is considered an achievement in *political science*, rather than an advance in economics. It is described by sociologists as a *political administrative technique*. Think about that when your school superintendent, principal or teacher tells you it is an improved format for accounting."

(End of quotation)

For those who want to know "who" is responsible for this mind control enslavement of the public schools, here is a bit of evidence: When the California Department of Education began working (over three years ago) on a PPBS operational model for all California schools, the international accounting firm of Peat, Marwick and Mitchell was engaged to develop the model.

The Senior Partner of this international firm is Walter E. Hansen, who is a member of the *Council on Foreign Relations*, as well as a member of the *United Nations Association of the United States*.

As for the place of PPBS in the world government concept, the following quotation from *Science Magazine*, Feb. 1971, should tell the story:

"The cost-benefit analysis (planned programming and budgeting) of Charles Hitch, when employed at Rand Corporation in Santa Monica, California, has been listed as a political social science innovation by scholars, along with other innovations designated 'Pol' to include Lenin's theory of one-party organization and revolution, the Fabian Socialist movement of gradual transformation toward socialism, Gandhi's large-scale nonviolent political action in India, and Mao Tse-tung's peasant and guerrilla organization and government."

(To Be Continued)

DON BELL REPORTS and CLOSER-UP are privately circulated. Complete service: \$24 per year. 3 months trial: \$6. Extra copies: 10¢ each. Please address orders to:
DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

PROOFS OF A CONSPIRACY TO BUILD A TOTAL MANAGED GLOBAL SOCIETY

- - - - - Part Thirteen - - - - -

THE INTERLOCKING DIRECTORATE AND THE MAZE OF RAMIFICATIONS

"At a PTA meeting at North Hollywood High School on March 14, 1972," writes a California parent, "Dr. William Johnson, Superintendent of the Los Angeles School District, was questioned about the school district's commitment to the Planning-Programming-Budgeting System (PPBS), and what progress had been made so far. He responded:

"Myself and (J) Graham Sullivan have been meeting with Roy Ash to ask how does a large business cope with PPBS.' He stated he also "had three-hour meetings with Tom Jones, president and chairman of Northrup Corporation, and additionally with Al V. Casey, president of the Times-Mirror Corporation, to ask how do you plan, program and budget an enterprise like the Los Angeles School District.' He also compared the L.A. School District's Decentralization to the methods used by Litton Industries."

Roy Ash, who was consulted on how to apply PPBS to the L.A. school system, has been mentioned previously in this series of letters. He is president of Litton Industries, a multinational conglomerate which reported a loss of \$14.23 million in one quarter of a fiscal year, after a loss of \$8.8 million the previous quarter—both losses occurring after Litton Industries had adopted *performance budgeting* (another name for PPBS.)

Roy Ash also served as chairman of the President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization, which recommended a major restructuring of federal departments and agencies during Mr. Nixon's first term as President. It was this Ash Commission that recommended the creation of the Domestic Council, the new White House Office of Management and Budget, the setting up of the Ten Regional Governments, the restructuring of the Cabinet Departments, etc. All of these reorganization measures were

taken (or were to be taken when Congress approved) in order to install PPBS in every phase of Federal Government *on a program basis*.

The President carried out most of the Ash Commission's recommendations by *Executive Order*, but there were some recommendations on which Congressional approval was felt necessary at that time (1970).

Now, however, being "mandated" by the people to carry out the reorganization, the President has decided that he will, if necessary, defy Congress and complete the restructuring recommendations of the Ash Commission.

Hence, when the President retired to Camp David with Henry Kissinger, George Shultz, John Ehrlichman, and others, he called on Roy Ash to "help him decide how to reorganize the executive branch." Ash, according to the *Wall Street Journal* of Nov. 14, 1972, "is spending a week in Washington conferring with H. R. Haldeman, the White House chief of staff, and John Ehrlichman, Mr. Nixon's assistant for domestic affairs." After which conference they all joined the President at Camp David, where the reorganization plans were finalized. And then came the President's announcement:

Roy Ash would become the new head of the White House Office of Management and Budget, a position created by Roy Ash himself, and now to be occupied by Roy Ash himself; a position equal in power and importance to those positions held by Henry Kissinger as Commissar for External Affairs and by Arthur Burns as Commissar for Monetary and Credit Control.

At the same time, Nixon announced the transfer of two other key figures in the PPBS Revolution. Casper Weinberger would move from OMB to HEW, and Elliot Richardson would be shifted from HEW to DoD.

However, a significant fact should be stressed in this connection: The appointment of Cabinet heads must have the "consent and approval" of Congress; while the President's White House Executive Office Staff has been set up as a new branch of government over which the Congress has no control whatsoever. Cabinet heads must appear before Congressional Committees when summoned, to explain and defend their policies, expenditures, proposed budgets, etc. But White House Executive Office Staffmen such as Kissinger, Haldeman, Ehrlichman, and now Roy Ash, can claim a newly discovered immunity called "executive privilege", and both ignore and defy Congress. This is why Nixon, during his first term and on the advice of this same Roy Ash, began to transfer actual decision-making from Cabinet heads to the chiefs of various pre-existing or newly created White House Executive Office bureaus and agencies such as Kissinger's National Security Council, Ash's Office of Management and Budget, the White House Communications Agency, Ehrlichman's Domestic Council, The Council of Economic Advisers, the Council on Environmental Quality, the Office of Consumer Affairs, the Office of Science and Technology, the Office of Intergovernmental Relations, and National Aeronautics and Space Council, the Council on International Economic Policy, etc. These matters, in the past, would have been handled by the appropriate Cabinet Department. But, to divorce them entirely from any Congressional control (and, therefore, from any citizen control), special agencies were created and given "executive immunity." This latter is an essential element of the PPB System, because "the entire operation must be the personal responsibility of the executive head of the organization" and any Congressional—or people—control would interfere with the totalitarian nature of the Planning, Programming, Budgeting System.

Already it will have been observed that the new OMB Commissar is one of the chief theoreticians and organizers of the Nixon Revolution, the "game plan" of which is PPBS. However great or small the particular "program," be it the reorganization of a single school district, or the setting up of a "World Corporation," Roy Ash is the "expert"—even though his conglomerate is said to be a money-loser (at least for taxing purposes.) But, let's learn more about Roy Ash: He's been drawing a salary of \$195,000 a year as president of Litton. He'll give that

up for a \$42,500 salary as OMB chieftain. He'll also sell his 200,000 shares of stock in Litton for an estimated \$2.5 million—a good deal if Litton actually is losing so much money after having installed the PPB System in the multinational conglomerate. Ash also is a director of the world-spanning Bank of America, the Bank-America Corporation, the Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Company, and Global Marine, Incorporated. He received indoctrination at Harvard, then at California Institute of Technology. He is a member of the board of trustees at Caltech, along with such other promoters of PPBS as Tom Jones of Northrup, Robert S. McNamara of the World Bank, Robert Anderson of Atlantic Richfield, Robert Hansberger of Boise Cascade Corporation, Rudolph Peterson of the Bank of America, Simon Ramo of TRW, Inc., Thomas J. Watson, Jr. of IBM, etc. . . .

These men have succeeded in restructuring Caltech and in making it a real training base for PPBS operatives. An indication of this is contained in an article appearing in *Caltech*, the alumni publication, for May-June 1971. Under the heading "Creating the Next Discipline," eleven members of the engineering and science division faculty of Caltech "lay it on the line." Quotes:

"We're a technological society and to effect change you have to understand science."

"Arms control and security problems are examples of the kinds of social problems we at Caltech should try to deal with; and in an environment that is highly skilled technically and scientifically, we ought to be able to get a line on such practical problems. This particular interest is expressed at present in our connection with the *Southern California Arms Control and Foreign Policy Seminar*, which Caltech and RAND Corporation jointly sponsor. Last year the *Ford Foundation* gave a three-year grant of \$285,000 to enable RAND and Caltech to bring together people who are interested in these matters."

In Part One of this series of letters, we quoted extensively from a speech made by Roy Ash before California business men, in a meeting sponsored by the White House staff, the Department of Commerce, and the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce, on March 18, 1972. In that speech Ash predicted the formation of a world economic community by 1990. He stated that the age of national economies is at an end, will become obsolete within the next two decades. This, mind you, is the statement of the man

who is to be in complete and absolute control of all "performance budgeting" of all Federal, State, and local "programs"!

He will be in the powerful position of being able to make his own predictions come true. Even more indicative of the world-mindedness of Roy Ash was a speech he made at the 1969 Awards Luncheon of the School of Business Administration of the University of California. Following are excerpts.

THE WORLD CORPORATION

In its first stages the World Corporation is even now evolving *de facto*—in the actual practice by a very few but increasing number of companies. In its ultimate form the World Corporation will, in law, be just that—a corporation chartered not by one country, but by a *supra-national chartering agency* established by agreement among nations. . . . The World Corporation will be a new species. Its perspective will be different; its philosophy—if you could call it that—will be different. It will consider the whole of the world its productive place, as well as its market, and will move factors of production to wherever they can most effectively be combined. . . . Its ownership will be transnational, its management will be transnational. Its freely mobile management, technology and capital, today's agents for stepped up economic growth, will transcend individual national boundaries. In practice, it will be devoid of any single national identity or home; figuratively, its headquarters could be on the moon. It will be domestic every place, foreign in none—a true corporate citizen of the world. . . .

There will be many obstacles to the establishment and operation of a true World Corporation; it must proceed in stages. A first step, now made possible by enterprising managers of capital and of investment and banking systems, is the internationalization of business ownership. Even more important to the development of the *global mentality, or culture*, that must precede the World Corporation will be the step toward multinational management of companies—the integration of diverse nationalities from the board of directors level down through the corporate officers and operating management. This is perhaps the single most important key to the development of the World Corporation plus its contribution to the ultimate unity of the earth's peoples. . . . The issues to be faced and resolved as World Corporations emerge more fully . . . will tax the wisdom of heads of state, diplomats, bankers, econo-

mists, educators and several regiments of experts on international law. It will be necessary to unravel countless issues involving national sovereignty, regulatory controls, monetary systems and exchange. . . . The peoples of the world are conditioned by *nationalistic thinking*. Just contemplating the existence of organizations that transcend national boundaries is frightening to some. . . . (but) "Nothing can stop an idea whose time has come. . . . (and) historically economic unity has been a major force for political unity. (End of quotation).

Roy Ash "has been where the action is" in helping to develop world "economic unity" and now he is in a position to help develop world "political unity," or World Government through the development of World Corporations.

But this multinationalist who will be in one of the world's most powerful nationalist offices, appointed by a President who is intent upon converting our Government into a Corporation; this PPBS expert who is equally at home telling a superintendent how to run a school district, or telling a President how to run a Nation *has somewhat against himself when it comes to running a Corporation by means of PPBS.*

As of this writing, Roy Ash is president as well as co-founder of Litton Industries. In regard to the activities of that Corporation, there is considerable well-founded speculation. Senator William Proxmire, from Wisconsin, is a liberal, an Atlantic Union enthusiast (as is President Nixon), and has won much fame—or notoriety, depending upon one's point of view—from his unceasing championing of the United Nations Genocide Convention. He is, however, an opponent of waste and extravagance in Government, and is outspoken in regard to the "military-industrial" complex which grew up out of PPBS-minded McNamara's handling of Defense Department contracts with equally PPBS-minded industrial concerns, which led to exposure of the "military-industrial" complex and such strange deals as that of Lockheed.

In line with these continuing military-industrial complex shenanigans, Sen. Proxmire demanded an investigation of Litton Industries and its boss and cofounder, Roy Ash. On June 26, 1972, Proxmire reported to his Senate colleagues:

"I have asked the Securities and Exchange

Commission, the General Accounting Office, and the Navy to investigate the financial capability of Litton Industries to complete performance of its Government contracts. I have also asked Navy Secretary John W. Warner, in a letter I am releasing today, to reject proposals by Litton that the Navy pay inflated and unsubstantiated claims and take other actions in order to help the company solve its financial difficulties.

"It is becoming increasingly clear that Litton is unable to perform any of its major shipbuilding contracts without running up huge cost overruns. Litton's \$450 million worth of shipbuilding claims against the Navy must be seen as an attempt to shift the costs of its own inadequacies to the American taxpayer.

"Litton executives, from the president on down, have been meeting almost daily with Navy officials in an effort to obtain a bailout from its financial plight.

"Because of Litton's cash shortages, the huge cost overruns, schedule delays, and technical difficulties encountered on its shipbuilding programs, a shadow has been cast over two of the largest ship contracts awarded in recent years.

"Litton is now 2 years behind schedule on the LHA contract and there is a serious question as to whether Litton is capable of building even the first LHA ship. The LHA contract has already been delayed with adverse effects to the DD-963 destroyer program and Litton may also be unable to deliver on that contract.

"Litton has given the Navy grounds for declaring the LHA contract in default, and continued failure to take corrective action on the Navy's part could increase the cost to the taxpayers by hundreds of millions of dollars. If the Navy does not pay the unsubstantiated portion of Litton's claims, the company could face a financial crisis of major proportions in the near future.

"For these reasons, I have asked the Securities and Exchange Commission to tell me whether Litton's annual reports correctly state the company's earnings. ... I have also asked the Commission to state whether Litton's reporting methods comply with SEC rules and regulations. ... I have asked the General Accounting Office to conduct an independent investigation of Litton's financial capability to carry out its Government contracts." (End of quotation)

The LHA contract involved the building of nine amphibious assault boats; due to the complaints of Sen. Proxmire and others, the order was cut down from nine to five boats; but Litton is 26 months behind on delivery of the boats. The DD-963 contract was for 30 new destroyers, which critics say cannot be delivered on time because Litton's shipbuilding facilities are choked with overdue LHAs. The original contracts were worth more than \$3 billion, but delays and cost adjustments, says Litton, has raised the amount by \$550 million more.

"In the light of this performance," says AP as of Nov. 30, "Litton's common stock has moved down from a high of \$26 per share to less than \$13."

Clark Hoyt, Washington correspondent for the Knight newspaper chain, opines that "Litton has encountered serious production difficulties at its Pascagoula (Miss.) yard, when it tried for the first time in the United States to apply assembly line techniques to the old art of shipbuilding."

Correction please: Assembly line techniques in shipbuilding were applied in World War II. What Hoyt should have said was: "Litton encountered difficulties when it tried to apply PPBS techniques to shipbuilding."

As we have noted previously: Rolls Royce and Edsel motor cars have tried PPBS and found it wanting; Lockheed and Litton tried PPBS and it cost the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars; Penn Central couldn't make it work economically or efficiently; George Romney threw up his hands and resigned because PPBS wouldn't work for HUD; Mayor Lindsay tried it out in the city government, and New York City is in worse trouble than ever before; likewise the New York City school system, into which Ford Foundation president McGeorge Bundy injected PPBS.

If PPBS is neither efficient nor economical, there has to be *another* reason for the appointment of Roy Ash as chief of OMB.

(To Be Continued)

DON BELL REPORTS and CLOSER-UP are privately circulated Newsletters which accent the Christian American point of view. Complete service: \$24 per year. 3 months trial: \$6. Extra copies: 10¢ each. Please address all orders and correspondence to:
DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

PROOFS OF A CONSPIRACY TO BUILD A TOTAL MANAGED GLOBAL SOCIETY

----- Part Fourteen -----

THE TOTALITY OF THE TAKEOVER

In *The American Nightmare* (Macmillan Co.) author Sidney J. Slomich, who calls himself an "expert," warns that America should beware of experts.

"I have been an expert," writes Slomich, "and I can tell you that experts gone wild—and they have—are like cancer. They know only one thing: more, more, more of the same. Nothing is more expert than cancer, nothing is a better example of power without purpose. Cancer is ignorant, but, oh, it works, it grows...."

"An expert sees his small piece of reality and little else. He confuses understanding with control and makes of the latter his single virtue. One of our leading social scientists has said that the chief accomplishment of this age is to have changed so many political problems into technical ones. We see in Vietnam, as at Auschwitz, the result of technical solutions to political problems."

Slomich certainly qualifies as an "expert's expert." Bachelor's, master's, and Ph. D. from Harvard University where he studied federal and municipal government in America, political philosophy, international law, Russian history, the Soviet economy, and international relations. He did research work for the Army in Czechoslovakia, spent a number of years as an officer of the CIA, worked on strategic problems, including Vietnam, in Army think tanks—among them the Research Analysis Corporation, was with that Arms Control and Disarmament Study Group at Caltech which was mentioned in our preceding letter (No. 13) in this series. In short, Sidney J. Slomich knows just about all there is for an insider to know about the subject of this series: Planning, Programming, Budgeting System (PPBS). He has published advanced technological studies on its application to urban affairs,

served as a consultant to groups installing PPBS, etc.

"In 1964," writes Slomich, "I sat in disbelief in a Washington think tank, listening to a very well-financed Army proposal to develop a computerized electronic warning system to alert the Pentagon when a Latin American country was likely to go "Red," and—the system having been perfected on paper—to rent a whole Latin American country and army to test it out. This stupid and unbelievably naive project was the product of Ph.D.s, men who call themselves and are called scientists. When this project was discovered by Chileans who observed some strangely behaving researchers, it hit the press and was investigated by Congress (Project Camelot—Ed.) ... This is a particularly apt, yet typical, example of the allegedly scientific thinking that lies behind Vietnam and all the horrors it has brought to roost in this country and all over the world."

Now, please read carefully the following warning given by "retired PPBS expert" Sidney Slomich:

"...over the last generation, especially the last 15 years, the United States—at home and abroad—has been preoccupied, not with human life and its purpose, but with ignorant power and control—that is to say with death—and has become, along with the Soviet Union, as a colleague in mindless adversity, the planet's greatest polluter, an agent of potentially total repression, and the greatest threat to continued human life the world has ever faced. I do not like to say these things, but one must speak plainly. There is a monster on our chest...."

In a previous letter in this series we indicated that governmental use of PPBS really began with the post-war Marshall Plan and its extension to include foreign aid to Western Europe and then to practically the whole

world, which we volunteered to rebuild. And in this connection, we have been referred to an article by Melchior Palyi—a bona fide rather than an alleged expert in his field, which is finance and economics—that appeared in the *Commerical and Financial Chronicle*, May 7, 1970. His explanation and description of the workings of PPBS in post-war France, and its essential “input-output-model” will help to clarify some points in this difficult-to-describe PPBS complexity.

Centralized *Planning* was the fashionable thing in Western Europe at the end of World War II (except in Germany that “needed” it most, but became the greatest success without Planners.) France was in the grips of what was called *Programming* — the Russian Planned Economy without Communism. Presently France still has a Planning Ministry which is in the process of elaborating the Sixth Plan. France did not abolish central planning as Communist Yugoslavia did, but the French enthusiasm evaporated; business shrugs it off; the public pays scant attention to the whole thing; Labor virtually ignores it.

The French System

Planning, or Programming, must be based on forecasts. The forecasts of the French experts invariably turned out to be wide of the mark. This was true, especially also, of what became known as the “input-output-models,” which were essential for their blueprints. The principle underlying these forecasting devices is very simple: the “input” of one industry corresponds to the “output” of another industry. If we know the former, the problem of how much the latter should produce is resolved automatically.

The French planning bureaucracy would call in, say, the country’s car producers; each of them would estimate the number of cars of each make and size it would produce the next year (and beyond). Given these data, the steel requirement of the automobile industry can be calculated. Do the same for construction, machine tool, transportation equipment and all other major industries. The total is the steel “input” which should be equaled by the steel “output”—provided that the steel-consumers did not misjudge the prospects. But it is a virtual certainty that they will make serious miscalculations. In some under-developed countries, India in particular, such errors of judgment led

to very serious wasting of capital, their scarcest resource.

How, indeed, could the experts foresee unexpected changes in consumer tastes, shifts in the channels of foreign trade, or new developments in technology? Such changes may annul in short order all advance input-output calculations. The greatest weakness of these ambitious calculations is, however, that they refer to physical quantities, not to values. But in reality, unit costs, prices, dollar volume of sales and profit margins are the overriding considerations. French programming tried to combine the best of both worlds: of centralized Soviet planning and of decentralized competitive American enterprise. It went on the rocks of the French inflation that has upset costs, and everything else.

Input/output constructions belong in the category of econometric models (econometrics is “the application of statistical methods to the study of economic data and problems—Ed.); and scarcely anyone is more critical of the validity of such models than the econometricians themselves.

Generally, they believe that no better than 50 per cent accuracy can be expected, a modest ambition indeed. If it is correct, the usefulness of the method for practical purposes is restricted to special cases.

Nevertheless, input-output analysis has a place of its own, if on a limited scale only, especially so within individual firms—wherever sudden and frequent changes in the underlying conditions are not expected....

(End of quotation)

Note what Dr. Palyi refers to as the greatest weakness of the French Planning, Programming System: It tried to combine *centralized* Soviet Planning with *decentralized* competitive free enterprise. The Soviet system is concerned with *physical quantity*; but the free enterprise system also must consider *quality and consumer approval*. When the French Planners tried to institute Planned Economy *without* coercive Communism, they brought on runaway inflation, and their plans ended with chaos.

Here in the United States, the Planners added to Planned Programming, the new concept of Performance Budgeting; but the Planners arrived at the same dead end: runaway inflation. And —

Unable to revoke and rescind the PPBS

control methods which already had been made applicable to every federal department and agency, President Nixon was forced to do the one thing he swore he would never do: *set up a system of price and wage controls!*

PPBS must be based on forecasts; for it is a system devised to control the future. But forecasts are inaccurate unless all elements are constant and unless unexpected changes can be prevented. In other words, if PPBS is applied to the production of automobiles, not only must the building of the cars be "predestinated" by the Planners, but so must their price, their quality and their saleability be "predestinated," and all of these with reasonable accuracy. Otherwise, the result is an "Edsel."

Conclusion: Since the Planners have determined that the Planning, Programming, Budgeting System is the method of the future, and since PPBS and free enterprise are not compatible, therefore *controlled economy is the New Order for the New Society.*

However, we shall not have a Planned Economy with *Communism*; for the United States the Planners have "predestinated" that we shall have a Planned Economy with Corporate Socialism, commonly called *Fascism*.

Now, let us note Dr. Palyi's last quoted paragraph: "Nevertheless, input-output analysis has a place of its own, if on a limited scale only, especially so within individual firms—wherever sudden and frequent changes are not expected."

In other words, PPBS might work within an individual firm, but it is impractical and inefficient when applied on an universal basis. And this is where PPBS carries the seed of its own destruction, because the Planners have ordered the application of PPBS to anything and everything: not only to every area of government, but to every aspect of the private sector as well. Using their own source material in proof of this:

In "A Rand Corporation-Sponsored Research Study," entitled *Program Budgeting . . .*, and edited by David Novick, on page XII, 5th paragraph from the top, we read:

"This book concentrates on the program aspects of the budget. It purposefully avoids problems of fiscal policy, revenue, and related issues in order to explain in greater detail than would otherwise be possible the theory of program budgeting, and it presents a limited number of illustrative examples of how this concept, now applied in the Dep-

artment of Defense, might be adapted to other areas of the Federal Government. (*Implicitly, the concept is also proposed for state and local government and for private business.*)

"Thus, when such special subjects as education and transportation are considered in terms of program budgeting, the treatment is intended to be suggestive only and to stimulate research rather than to report on a completed study." (Italics added—Ed.)

On page 70 of the same book:

"Increased emphasis in the Department of Defense on systematic planning and programming will undoubtedly have a profound effect on industry."

Page 71 indicates the necessity for the destruction of the present Congressional System *because the Constitutional limitation on appropriations (two years only) interferes with PPBS long-range budgeting:*

"Though accepting the new process as an essential tool of planning, and even claiming some credit for its adoption, the House Appropriations Committee still wanted the budget format left unchanged. It is of course, *a virtue of the new process that it does not require a change in budget format. Planning and programming are simply superimposed of the budget*, and govern its substance, although not its form. The relationship is explicitly stated in the House Appropriations Committee report: 'Basically, each annual appropriations bill is simply an additional annual increment to the longer range Defense program.'

"The need for an extended budgetary time horizon was recognized in a study of the federal budget by the staff of the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of the Joint Economic Committee. The generalized use of cost-benefit relationships was advocated as a means of achieving better budgets.

"In the Executive establishment, the Bureau of the Budget is encouraging the Departments and Agencies to plan, program, and budget *on a longer range basis*. The Bureau of the Budget, the Department of the Treasury, and the Council of Economic Advisers are cooperating in preparing longer term economic projections."

Explanation: The House of Representatives is charged with the responsibility of initiating all appropriations bills. Since the life of a Congress is but two years, the power of a Congress to appropriate money is

also limited (Constitutionally, that is) to a two-year period. Otherwise, the new incoming Congress (and the people it represents) would lose control over federal spending. Thus, Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States reads: "The Congress shall have power... To raise and support armies: but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years:"

PPBS requires long-term appropriations; and for that reason the Congress and the people it represents *lose all control over federal spending*.

We call your attention to another publication entitled "The Computer in American Education," edited by Don. D. Bushnell of the Brooks Foundation, Dwight W. Allen of Stanford University, with Sara S. Mitter as Editorial Associate; commissioned by The Association for Educational Data Systems; and published by John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

On page 5 of this document, in reference to the use of PPBS (and the computer) in *social engineering*, we are told:

"Another factor that is extraordinarily and radically important to this set of relationships will be the *increasing effectiveness and utilization of what we call social engineering*: the systematic application of knowledge in economics and social and behavioral sciences to the *design, planning, and manipulation of the society and its parts in order to attain efficiently specified goals*. The stimulus is there, especially with the development of such nationwide activities as the poverty program, the extended education legislation, and—while we don't talk about it—the *area of counterinsurgency*. In all these instances we must be able to plan exceedingly complex programs far enough in advance to phase and operate them effectively...." (Italics added—Ed.)

Please note that "what we call social engineering" in the United States is called "psychopolitics" in Soviet Russia. It has to do with mind control and suppression of dissent; and for these purposes, Russia recently purchased some 15,000 computers. The publication from which we have just quoted, states that in "social engineering" the computer "provides an unprecedentedly powerful tool for better understanding men and their institutions, and hence for planning and for implementation of these plans."

Just as the constantly recurring "Five Year Plans" have been the absolute controlling

factor of life in the Soviet Union, the more sophisticated Planning, Programming, Budgeting System is to control all factors of life in the *New Society*, in the new United Socialist States of America. How PPBS is insinuated into state and local government is explained in a research report on "The Application of Systems Technology to Problems of State and Local Government," by Robert L. Johnson of the Stanford Research Institute, Menlo Park, California. We are told (page 10) that:

"The increasing and accelerating centralization of executive, legislative, and judicial authority in Washington has created new and complex problems at the other levels of government. These impacts are especially critical at the local government level, where the demands for federal program supervision, monitoring, or documentation often exceed staff capabilities; and where significant and revolutionary changes must be made in local fiscal management systems (both budgeting and accounting) to satisfy federal program participation standards.

"Mandatory implementation of the Defense Department's Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System (PPBS) in all federal agencies and of the military Program Evaluation and Review Technique (PERT) as a requirement for other agencies' major industrial contracts, as well as the voluntary participation of a number of state governments in the Federal Information Exchange System (FIXS) have had a waterfall effect on local governments. These activities have imposed new information requirements (for local management of federally-financed programs, as well as for reporting program progress and status).

"(Therefore) the federal pattern (PPBS) is becoming the standard for management systems design throughout the government structure." (PPBS has become mandatory with the passage of the so-called Revenue Sharing Act).

PPBS, the monster with the computer for a brain, is the Big Brother who will be watching your every move.

(To Be Continued)

DON BELL REPORTS and CLOSER-UP are privately circulated Newsletters which accent the Christian American point of view. Complete service: \$24 per year. 3 months trial: \$6. Extra copies: 10¢ each, Write to:
DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

PROOFS OF A CONSPIRACY TO BUILD A TOTAL MANAGED GLOBAL SOCIETY

. Part Fifteen

THE RIDDLE WITHIN THE ENIGMA

In its most elemental and least confusing sense the Planning, Programming, Budgeting System (PPBS) is a rather complicated and highly developed method of Political and Economic Planning (PEP), the system by which the United Kingdom was socialized. PEP was developed by the British Fabian society, was transplanted in the United States during the New Deal Era. It remained for the RAND Corporation to make the system more sophisticated through the application of scientific and technological advances, especially the Computer and the Data, or Memory Bank.

It has been brought to our attention that the English historian, science fiction writer and Fabian Socialist, H.G. Wells, gave an excellent description of the machinery by which PPBS was to be manufactured, as early as 1908, in his book *New Worlds for Old*. He wrote:

"It was left chiefly to the little group of English people who founded the Fabian Society to supply a third system of ideas to the amplifying conception of Socialism, to convert Revolutionary Socialism to Administrative Socialism. . . . From saying that unorganized people cannot achieve Socialism, they passed to the implication that organization alone, without popular support, might achieve Socialism.

"... Socialism ceased to be an open revolution, and became a plot. Functions were to be shifted quietly, unostentatiously, from the representative to the official he appointed. . . . they worked like a ferment in municipal politics. . . . The reconstruction of our legislative and local government machinery is a necessary preliminary to Socialisation in many directions. . . . Scientific reconstruction of our methods of government constitutes a necessary part of the Socialist scheme. . . . it supplies us with a conception of the methods of transition, and with a

vision of a great and disciplined organization of officials, a scientific bureaucracy, appointed by representative bodies of diminishing activity and importance and coming at last to be the real working control of the Socialist state. . . . the replacement of individual actions by public organization."

It was in the early 1930s, according to an official U.S. Senate report (Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, by the Subcommittee on Internal Security, July 30, 1953), when:

"A plague of young lawyers settled on Washington. . . . these prattlers were for the most part employees of the government, and had taken the oath of allegiance. But they took the position that their high purpose gave them a super-morality that could not be confused with the morality the nation *had been using*. They were quite above such old-fogy Tory, reactionary stuff as oaths of office or other religious antiquities. They owed allegiance — not to the United States — patriotism was for the non-thinking. . . . They had an allegiance to a higher cause. The end justified the means. . . ."

These young braintrusters had the United States on the verge of collapse when World War II was started in order to make the world safe for Communism; and their Political and Economic Planning had to be delayed while military and logistical planning were the primary necessities of existence. Immediately at the conclusion of the shooting phase of World War II, the Political, Economic and Social Planning began anew. Lyndon Johnson explained the hiatus in planning when, within a month after becoming President of the United States, he went before the United Nations General Assembly to tell that body:

"When I entered the Congress of the United States 27 years ago, it was my great privilege to work closely with President Frank-

lin Delano Roosevelt... As a member of Congress, I worked with him to bring about a profound but peaceful revolution... Now, on the world scale, the time has come, as it came to America, thirty years ago..."

(*Congressional Record*, Dec. 20, 1963.)

In point of fact, nearly two decades before LBJ made that statement, the word had gone forth from the Plotters to the Planners, to pick up where the New Deal had left off, apply new scientific and technological discoveries to the old PEP methods, and call it the Planning, Programming, Budgeting System (PPBS) - or, to give it a more understandable name: Administrative Socialism - Socialism "by organization, without popular support," (the popular support to come later, as a result of education and indoctrination).

Back in 1958, when this editor first issued the booklet *Terrible 1313* (long out of print and now a collector's item), we gave the following formula which was being used to promote Urban Renewal, Metro Government, Regional Government, etc.:

1. Create an "emergency" and popularize the existence of such an "emergency."
2. Present to the public a previously prepared plan that was designed to meet the "created emergency" and solve all the problems created by the "emergency."
3. Publicize, propagandize, form public action groups of "interested citizens" to promote the idea that this previously prepared plan is the only way the problems resulting from the "created emergency" can be solved or resolved.
4. Yield to "popular demand" and enact the necessary law, statute, regulation, or ordinance, in order to put into effect the "previously prepared plan" to solve the problems resulting from the "created emergency."

PPBS, while still utilizing the above formula whenever it is required, has developed a far more sophisticated formula, which we have called the "riddle within the enigma." We'll try to explain:

The "enigma" of PPBS has been explained in previous letters in this series, and deals with the mystery of how PPBS is used as a method for creating a *new political, social and economic order for America, and for the world.*

But there remains the deeper riddle, of how individuals and the people as a whole are to be re-educated and remade so that they

will enter contentedly and even happily into this state of slavery which is called the New Order.

When referring to *tangibles* (manufactured products, materials and natural resources, man-hours, services, etc) PPBS has one set of meanings:

PLANNING:-Determining the final goal or end product, which is done through forecasting by "experts" who use the "Delphi technique" to decide what the final goal or end product is to be.

PROGRAMMING:-Immediate steps to be taken which will work toward the accomplishment of the final goal or end product.

BUDGETING:-The "power of the purse" applied to the programming. If the program does not contribute toward attainment of the final goal or end product, then the budget is not approved and money to implement the program is withheld. (In the final analysis, this means that the director of the Office of Management and Budget (Roy Ash at this writing) has become a virtual dictator).

The preceding is the "enigma" of PPBS, the meaning of the acronym when applied to *tangibles*.

But now for the riddle within the enigma, or the meaning of PPBS *when applied to the intangibles* such as education, mind control, behaviorism, even religion. Here PPBS takes on an entirely different meaning:

PLANNING equals UNFREEZING:-

"Unfreezing" is the term used by the experts to denote what the layman might refer to as "brainwashing;" the wiping out of all pre-conceived (frozen) ideas, concepts, beliefs, fixations, prejudices, absolutes such as truth, the sense of right and wrong, etc. In the case of schoolchildren "unfreezing" includes the elimination of all family influence, all Christian training, etc., so that an entirely new set of "values" can be implanted in the youthful mind.

PROGRAMMING equals RE-EDUCATING:-

After all the old concepts and beliefs have been erased (unfrozen) and the mind has become a "clean white sheet of paper on which the man re-makers may write what they will; then this "re-education" becomes the "programming" which is intended to fit man for the man-made *World of Tomorrow* (to use a phrase made famous by the Armstrongs-father and son-who have spent their lives in an attempt to make Christianity synonymous with Humanism.)

When applied to the schools, this re-education phase involves the 'taxonomic domains' which we explained in a previous letter in this series: (a) Cognitive (how one should think); (b) Affective (how one should feel); and (c) Psychomotor (how one should act).

BUDGETING equals REFREEZING:-

This is the "end accomplished," the new man in the new world; a man-made being forming the smallest unit in a Total Managed Global Society in a Government of the People, by the Experts, for the Elite.

Please note that in explaining this "riddle within the enigma" that is PPBS, we have concentrated primarily on its application to the field of education in the public schools. However, this "Unfreezing, Re-Educating, Refreezing" system *applies to all government programs* and especially in education's companion areas: health and welfare. But, we believe it is easier to understand (and certainly easier to explain) this riddle, if we confine our discussion to the field of education for the remainder of this letter.

The "Parents of New York United" are understandably concerned with the introduction of PPBS into the public schools of New York State. In a very important letter written to Donald H. Bragaw of the State Education Department by Janet Mellon, the State Chairman of PONY-U, Inc., a case in point is made. We quote from that letter:

The Humanists state that one of the aims of Humanist World Fellowship is the advancement of the good life on the basis of a morality determined by *historical human experience* and contemporary scientific research; and Humanism insists that man be treated as *an end in himself*. For, say Humanists, all things must be made subservient to the fullest development of the potentialities of human nature as the Supreme End of all endeavor. This is total denial of God and, as the United States Supreme Court has ruled, *this is a religion without God* (and) this is precisely what is contained in the social studies as spelled out ... as the method of teaching in our State schools today.

"Man: A Course of Study" (M:ACOS) program is being introduced into schools... and that or similar programs are being put into all schools in the State and Nation. It is well known in professional educator and behavioral scientist circles, that before the "Planning, Programming, Budgeting Sys-

tem" can be put into operation, the curriculum had to be rewritten into behavioral objectives; these 3 categories being: Cognitive, Affective, and Psychomotor... The essence of the PPB system is to be able to test or evaluate students in each of the 3 domains... The objectives pre-determine what knowledge is necessary or good, what attitude the child should have, and what action is considered desirable...

M:ACOS was designed to break down, or *untreeze*, the child's values and standards, changing the child by giving him different standards and a different conception of *who he is*, and *refreezing*, to *lock the child into the new self*...

Have you looked at or examined the social science studies books being used in New York public schools lately? ... "Shaping the Western World," for instance, puts an emphasis not only on religion and world government, but states that *Nationalism is a Religion*. It also states that the holy days are the Fourth of July, Christmas, May Day. The shrines are the wailing wall, Lenin's tomb, and the tomb of the unknown soldier.

"Our children will live in yet another 'world' in the future;" is the educational jargon parroted in most all public relations material used to sell innovative programs to the public. If our schools will be concerned with teaching the children their American Heritage and follow the education law and stop slanting the curriculum and developing in them a world sense, they will be able to face the future as it develops, and not on the fantasies of the B. F. Skinners and the Wm. Glassers, and other behavioral scientists. This expanded role of the schools is well stated in one textbook which reads: "allegiance to a nation is the biggest stumbling block to creation of international government. National boundaries and the concept of sovereignty must be abolished. The quickest way to abolish sovereignty is to condition the young to another and broader allegiance. Opinion favorable to international government will be developed in the social studies of the elementary schools."...

... It has been well established that world government could exist only as a collectivist state, so just exactly what are you and your colleagues promoting? It is because parents have seen the results of collectivist governments that parents are concerned with the myriad of behavioral material in our schools, including M:ACOS, that they are

justifiably concerned....

You also point out that local school people are not "servants" but educational professionals. I believe that whether they are paid by the federal, state, or local government, this money comes from the taxpayers and they are therefore *civil servants*. The New York Education Law Sec. 5102.12 clearly states: "The primary responsibility of the education of children rests with the parents and the State, while teachers serve merely as agents of both." In my opinion educators gave up their right to be classed as professionals when they joined labor unions.

Very truly yours,
/s/ Janet Mellon

The brief reference to William Glasser in the above, is important when considering the "riddle within the enigma" of PPBS as applied to education, since Dr. Glasser is the leader of a new "Reality Therapy" movement, a new school of psychology that is having as much influence on education today, as did John Dewey and the Progressive Education Association in a previous era.

In 1955 Dewey's Progressive Education Association found it necessary to disband and its leaders went under cover in a host of "progressive" private schools, or they went underground completely (as did the Communists of that decade). Nevertheless, the collectivism and atheistic pragmatism propounded by John Dewey and his followers has continued to have a profound effect on American education.

After Dewey came the Behaviorists, led by John Watson until his death in 1958. Combining the theories of Sigmund Freud with those of Ivan Pavlov, the behaviorist sees man as merely another type of animal, and he emphasizes external, environmental influences as being most instrumental in the shaping of man and his behavior. Watson put it this way: "The Behaviorist is not interested in his (man's) morals, except as a scientist; in fact, he doesn't care what kind of man he is."

After NEA and the textbook producers had absorbed and transmitted to the classrooms of the nation the animalistic environmentalism of the Behaviorist school, then came the Third Force School, or Humanistic Psychology. Out of this evolved such ventures as the Esalen Institute at Big Sur, Synanon, Gestalt, the various Behavioral Science

Institutes, the General Semantics movement, sensitivity training, encounter and touch therapy, Glasser's Reality Therapy, etc.

And at the head of this Third Force School (since the death of Abraham Maslow) stands William Glasser--and the Third Force School has joined forces with the *Unfreezing, Changing, Refreezing* technicians who provide the "riddle within the enigma" that is PPBS.

Dr. Glasser says children no longer need to be prepared to "make a living," the government will take care of them; children no longer search for goals in life, but for roles in society. So the schools must change and accept the new role assigned by PPBS. A few direct quotes from Dr. Glasser: "We have to let students know there are no right answers, and we have to let them see that there are many alternatives to certainty and right answers." Again: "The truth does not make much difference basically." And yet again, his advice to teachers: "It is very unfortunate that we get so concerned that what we teach is certain and correct."

"The process of sensitizing a child involves three steps: *Unfreezing* his values and standards, *Changing* the child by giving him different standards and a different conception of who he is, and thirdly, *Refreezing* to lock the child into the new self... After the refreezing is accomplished, it is impossible for the child to communicate with the conventional person, including his parents. He operates on a different wave length, and though in conversation he will use the same words he formerly used, the meanings of these words to him will be entirely different from their meanings as understood by his parents. The child is fully sensitized... If PPBS is fully implemented, within one generation we will have a nation of unbelievably uncreative, immobilized, and unnatural inhabitants, all under the control of the very, very few talented elite who, of course, do not permit themselves to be processed through the system."

(To Be Continued)

DON BELL REPORTS and CLOSER-UP are privately circulated Newsletters which accent the Christian American point of view. Subscriptions are not sold separately; Don Bell Reports weekly, Closer-Up fortnightly. Complete service: \$24 per year. 3 months trial: \$6. Extra copies: 10¢ each. Please address all correspondence and orders to:

DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

PROOFS OF A CONSPIRACY TO BUILD A TOTAL MANAGED GLOBAL SOCIETY

----- Part Sixteen -----

HOW PPBS PROMOTES THE NEW RELIGION FOR THE NEW SOCIETY

The messianic character of the Planning, Programming, Budgeting System which now has been integrated into every phase of government activity, with its accent on Health, Education and Welfare, must be thoroughly understood if we are to comprehend the true danger of PPBS.

While posing as a managerial and budgeting system, PPBS is much more. Its controllers and change agents intend it as a means for making a new kind of man, who will be one cell in a new social body, the responsibility of a new government, the inhabitant of a new kind of world, and a believer in a new world religion.

"Behold, we shall make all things new," is the messianic slogan of these God-imitating designers and operators of a man-controlled system of evolution which is to usher in a New Order of the Ages, a very kingdom of heaven wherein Man will be God and there may be no gods before Man. And in this new man-made heaven on earth there shall be no tears to wipe away, no hunger to assuage, no desires left unfulfilled; for the new, man-made inhabitant of this New Society of the World will not possess the ability to comprehend the meanings of such words as sadness, hunger, desire. He will be conditioned to accept his appointed place with contentment, resignation, fatalistic complaisance. In the words of the economist Ludwig von Mises:

"The common man will be freed from the tedious job of directing the course of his own life. He will be told by the authorities what to do and what not to do; he will be fed, housed, clothed, educated and entertained by them. But, first of all, they will release him from the necessity of using his own brains. Everybody will receive 'according to his needs.' But what the needs of an individual are, will be determined by the authorities. . . ."

If such self-appointed "authorities" are to condition all other men to accept their absolute dominion, in spiritual and mental as well as in physical domains, these authorities must go beyond the use of the Delphi Technique in discerning the future, and beyond the mindless Law of the Computer in judging the "here and now." They must fashion for themselves a religion which will act as a cohesive to bind these robot-like men into a social body. This requires some kind of a religion which denies the existence of a transcendent God yet proclaims the authority and infallibility of an invisible and immanent "Big Brother," who is able to open and close at will the "book of life."

The religion of Humanism best fits the aims and objectives of these New World Makers; since it proclaims that there is a god, but at the same time insists that god is man and man is god.

In a recent proselytizing effort, a letter from the publishers of *Humanist Magazine* contained this statement and question:

"There are millions of people in the world who are humanists. There are probably many additional millions who are humanists without being aware of it. Do you fall into this group? That is, do you reject belief in supernatural or authoritarian religion, and do you feel that the basic concerns of man should be directed toward fulfilling the human potential?"

An affirmative answer to the posed question supposedly qualifies one for membership in the religion of Humanism; and an affirmative answer may also make one a believer in the *Planning, Programming, Budgeting System* that is replacing the traditional American *Representative Republican System* of government, just as *Humanism* is replacing the traditional Christian belief in a *Triune Godhead*. For, PPBS and Humanism are complementary and "go together" like sun and day, or moon and night.

First, let's discuss Humanism; then we'll see how it and PPBS go together.

Webster tells us that Humanism is the learning, or cultural impulse, imparted by those who brought the (pre-Christian) Greek and Roman classics into new vogue during the Renaissance. But Webster defines the term as though it were but an intellectual movement, an interest in academics and the liberal arts and, at best, a philosophy of life. But Humanism is much more than this. Humanism insists that man is to be treated *as an end in himself*. No supernatural, no spiritual, no life beyond the grave; life is a one-way street with a dead-end. Hence, the fulfilling of the *human* potential should be the only concern of man.

In early Christian times the Apostle Paul confronted the early Humanists—then called Hedonists—on Mars Hill in Athens, where he told the assembled and querulous philosophers of the (to them) unknown God. The Hedonists were of the “eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow we die” crowd, which included the Cyrenaics and the Epicureans. The Hedonists, however, regarded intellectual pleasures as being of a higher order than carnal pleasures, and they stressed the merits of knowledge for pleasure's sake and aimed at “the greatest happiness of the greatest number,” from which derived the utopian idea that the best of worlds would be a world ruled by scientists and philosophers.

In the 14th century (Renaissance period) the Hedonists began to call themselves Humanists, and by reviving the ancient Greek and Roman—pre-Christian—ideas and ideals, the Humanists affected both education and religion.

“Primarily, Humanism is the assertion of individual, ego-centered liberties—a wholly libertine philosophy,” stated Mary Royer, M.S., who is National Chairman of the National Parents League; was a member of President Kennedy's Committee on Delinquency and Crime; and Oregon State Chairman of the National Justice Foundation of America.

“Humanism has as its goal man himself,” said this acknowledged authority. “The Christian view of man is dominated by the Doctrine of Immortality, which indicates man's special relation to God....The teachings of Humanism are completely divergent from the teachings of Christianity

when the Humanists teach that man is born good, and if left to his own instincts cannot fail to achieve happiness....

“When day after day we continue to permit children to be indoctrinated with the permissive pagan philosophies which are rampant in most social study programs; when day after day we permit children to be alienated from parents through the various money making family life/sex education materials; when day after day we permit children to be paganized, when we permit all virtue and moral values to be destroyed through the vicious techniques of sensitivity training, role playing, diary keeping, operant conditioning, etc.; when we permit the introduction of computerized taxonomy; when we permit our school boards to sit idly by, and through silence, endorse these policies; when we can trace all of these problems directly to Hedonism and Humanism; when we consider all of these things; when we accept all of these indignities, all of these onslaughts against morality and individual integrity, together with many, many more indignities and insults, only then does the grinding insidiousness, the destructiveness of these ancient, barbaric philosophies, and the complacency of the modern day educator become startlingly apparent, only then do we begin to realize how far we have strayed from our Christian principles.

“We need to conclude with one singular inescapable fact: dialectical materialism, and Darwinism, have exceedingly strong roots in Hedonism and Humanism, for both Hedonism and Humanism have flowered and taken on vigorous life under the later thesis and antithesis of dialectical materialism. Each is firmly and unmistakably interconnected, for the latter evolved from the former, and it is the whole of the philosophies of Hedonism, Humanism, Darwinism and dialectical materialism which run rife throughout large segments of that system of progressive education, which includes various social studies courses, as well as studies in the humanities.”

Now we must turn from the subject of Humanistic *Philosophy* to the newer and far more dangerous Humanistic *Psychology*. It is also necessary to demonstrate the interrelationship of Humanistic Psychology with PPBS, and the interrelationship of both with the rapidly developing Total Managed Global Society. And perhaps these interrelationships will be more easily understood if we show the interrelated involvements of

three persons; William Glasser, Clement Stone, and Richard Nixon (not necessarily listed in the order of their importance).

"Fulfilling the human potential" is the aim of Humanism. One particular plan which is intended to develop the individual's potential is called "*Positive Mental Attitude*," and the adherents to this mental cult are led by W. Clement Stone, Chicago multimillionaire. Stone reckons his wealth at around \$400 million and, as is the practice with many such individuals, instead of paying taxes on his earnings from the multinational Chicago-based Combined Insurance Co., his two publishing houses (school textbooks a speciality), his Alberto-Culver Co. of Chicago, his Trans-American Video Co. of Los Angeles, his Texas citrus farm, and the rest of the 95 organizations with which he is affiliated as trustee, board member, stockholder, etc.; he established the W. Clement Stone and Jessie D. Stone Foundation. Through this foundation he finances—among other things—this *Positive Mental Attitude* program.

Clement Stone met Richard Nixon at a time when the politician had "lost faith in himself," and Stone told Nixon about PMA. He contends that "PMA changed a broken, defeatist Richard Nixon, emotionally wracked by his losses in 1960 to President John F. Kennedy and in 1962 to Calif. Gov. Edmund Brown, into a new man in the mid-1960s."

Stone liked Nixon and is sure that his PMA (which was adapted from Norman Vincent Peale's *Power of Positive Thinking*) made it possible for the twice-beaten Nixon to become President of the United States.

However, Stone did not rely entirely on his faith in PMA, just to help the campaign along, Stone contributed over a half million dollars to Nixon's election fund in 1968, and was the largest single contributor to Nixon's campaign fund in 1972 (well over a million dollars personally, plus what he gathered in as Nixon's chief fund-raiser.

The necessary "connecting link" in this story is supplied by a statement appearing in the *Los Angeles Times* of October 8, 1972. In an article by *Times* staff writer Francis Ward, Stone is quoted as boasting of the "secret formula" which he gave to Nixon, and insisting that "if he didn't have PMA, he would never have been elected President." Then comes the following, and it is quoted verbatim:

"'Clem' Stone's support for Mr. Nixon is

not just a matter of party loyalty; it is a clear devotion 'to the man. I could see where the course of history could be changed for the better by backing this man, regardless of what it would take,' Stone said. Since 1968, he has been determined that Mr. Nixon 'wouldn't lose because of a lack of funds.'"

More bluntly: As a corporation executive, Clement Stone was committed to PPBS; as a political executive, Richard Nixon was equally committed to PPBS; and theirs was a partnership of convenience. Together, they would "change the world for the better"—at least for their own betterment—by making PPBS a universal "control system" for the changing world!

Now, let us remember that PPBS is a Fabian Socialist System. And Fabian Socialism relies on the twin powers of *legislation* and *education* for the "selling" of its end product. Nixon, if elected and re-elected President, would be in an ideal position to become the "change agent" for the conversion of the government to PPBS control. As for the educational change agent that would be required, let us consider one William Glasser, high priest of Humanist Psychology, leader in the new *Third Force* in educational circles, and also creator of the new sensitivity training course which he called *Reality Therapy*.

At about the same time W. Clement Stone met Richard M. Nixon and decided to make him President of the United States, he was also introduced to the activities of William Glasser, M.D., who had written a book on the subject of *Reality Therapy: A New Approach to Psychiatry*.

The Glasser approach did not leave the Stone unturned; when the latter discovered that the former had turned from individual seances to group therapy and then to the indoctrination of whole schools, the Stone Foundation financed the establishment of an *Educator Training Center*, operated by Dr. Glasser for the purpose of teaching teachers how to use the PPBS methods in their classrooms. Stone also published the books Glasser found time to write and, in addition, the Stone Publishing companies put out a controversial series of textbooks called "Voices of Life Program." One critic, reviewing these textbooks that are written for grades kindergarten through 8, stated that:

"These social science textbooks are de-

signed to impart little knowledge but concentrate on *attitude change* through using Glasser type methods of group discussion, inquiry technique, peer teaching and role playing. Where school districts have allowed their teachers to depart from the proven method of curriculum instruction... to this new innovative method, we often find that high IQ students become low achievers and chaos results...."

Glasser published his book "Schools Without Failures" (the title describes the content) and at about the same time he was selected as a trainer of teachers and administrators who would introduce the PPBS methods into the schools. Glasser's entre into the school system itself (his *Educator Training Center* had been a private venture) was through the Federally funded Title III programs. After being introduced and installed from the top (HEW), then the program was to be financed on a long-range basis through local school district funds. The following quotation taken from the agenda of a Los Angeles Calif. School District (July 7, 1971) will explain the "M.O.":

"It is recommended that the Board (of Education) ratify the action of the Superintendent, Zone C, in requesting *Educator Training Center* (Wm. Glasser M.D.) to conduct 18 training sessions during May and June 1971, for administrators and faculty of Sunland and Pinewood Elementary Schools, covering *the planning and implementation of P.P.B.S. in the school instructional programs.*" (Italics added-Ed.)

Merely as a matter of confirmation of what we have already written (out of their own mouths), we quote the following from the dust jacket of Glasser's book *Schools Without Failures*:

"...Dr. Glasser has been a psychiatrist in private practice in Los Angeles since 1957 and has consulted widely in the correctional field.... Recently he has devoted himself more and more to education at various levels. He has taught a large group of city and county school administrators, counselors and teachers.... In order to help more people understand his ideas about education he has recently been able to establish, through the generosity of the Stone Foundation, the *Educator Training Center.*..."

Thus, through the generosity of Clement Stone, Richard Nixon was chosen to change the American system of Government, and

William Glasser (among many, many others) was chosen to change the American Educational System. Both are change agents for the promoters of PPBS, and both were able to turn to a Stone for their bread (with apology for the pun which we couldn't resist).

Please don't overestimate the importance of these men as *individuals*. Stone is but one of many moneyed men being used to finance the proselytizing of prospects who can be converted to the faith of Humanism. Glasser is but one of hundreds of *change agents* being used to train other change agents for the "end product" purposes of PPBS. And Nixon could be replaced by any one of a score of opportunistic politicians who are convinced that the *Planning, Programming, Budgeting System* is the wave of the future, and who are trying to ride the wave toward the shifting sands of time.

And there are scores of proselytizers who preach this same Humanism, pretending that it is Christianity, attempting to change the faith of the citizenry-at-large, even as the Nixons are converting the bureaucrats and changing our form of government from a Representative Republic to a Corporate Socialist State in a Socialist World Government, and as the Glassers are fashioning *Newthink* citizens to inhabit this *World of Tomorrow*.

As an example, there is the mysteriously financed church group headed by the Armstrongs, based in Pasadena; and because they are pro-Creation and anti-Evolution, they are accepted as a Christian organization; though in every other respect theirs is the good news of Humanism (as is all other British-Israel teaching), as opposed to the Gospel of salvation through re-birth in the Spirit (John 3: 5,6,7.)

Also, through the efforts of the National Council of Churches and similar organizations in the Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox Churches, this same Humanism is being used to pervert and prepare man for the *New Order of the Ages*, which they present as being of the flesh rather than of the Spirit.

(To Be Continued)

DON BELL REPORTS and CLOSER-UP are privately circulated Newsletters. Complete service: \$24 per year. 3 months trial: \$6. Extra copies: 10¢ each, Please address all orders and make checks payable to:
DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

PROOFS OF A CONSPIRACY TO BUILD A TOTAL MANAGED GLOBAL SOCIETY

----- Part Seventeen -----

THE COMPLETE CONSPIRACY

"Quintus Fabius Maximus was a Roman general whose principal object in life was to gain power of a political nature. He was greatly esteemed as a military tactician because of his innovative strategy of not boldly confronting the enemy but, rather, by using a program of harassment and semi-containment, somewhat in the order of the present day guerrilla warfare. This did not win many battles for him, nor did he lose any; but it served the purpose of fulfilling his political ambition for power.

"Fabius had an enemy in the field, a fellow named Hannibal, who had proved to be a formidable adversary and against whom Fabius had employed his program of non-confrontation.

"When Hannibal had been in Italy for three and one-half years and no longer had his elephants, was no longer being supported by Carthage and was recruiting for his forces from within Italy, Fabius launched a frontal assault on Hannibal's twenty-five thousand-man army. Fabius' forces numbered one hundred thousand. Until that day the Roman legions had never lost a battle, but on that occasion ninety-five thousand Roman troops were slain! Hannibal lost between three and five thousand men.

"Two Roman generals rode away from the battle, one of whom was Fabius, who immediately went to the Roman Senate to plead for more men and equipment. A result of his pleadings was the birth of the expression, 'No Roman can sleep so long as Hannibal lives.' Of course the taxes were levied to provide the requested men and materiel.

"During the three day period that Fabius was pleading before the Roman Senate there was not one Roman legionnaire between Rome and Hannibal's victorious army, but amazingly, Hannibal did not move. And Hannibal is rated as one of the greatest field generals of all time!

To foreshorten the story, Hannibal was in Italy for twenty years with Fabius nipping at him occasionally. After each major altercation Fabius would return to Rome to plead again, with resultant increases in taxes. Fabius had achieved the power he desired by having his ever-present enemy at hand, by having his no-win war, and by being able, almost at will, to impose greater taxation. (Any similarity in the above tactics with those being employed in the present no-win war in Southeast Asia could be coincidental—or copied; we leave this for the reader to judge—Ed.)

"The second chapter of this story was written in the latter days of the 19th century when a group composed principally of dissolute homosexuals formed an organization and, with deep appreciation, memorialized Quintus Fabius Maximus. The name of the organization is The Fabian Society of London." (All of the foregoing, save the parenthetical note, is quoted from the Prologue of a remarkable article: "The Source—of the River of Pollution," by Joseph P. Bean, M.D.)

The third chapter of this story we have attempted to write in the foregoing sixteen serial installments of this weekly Newsletter. Of course, we have not completed the story, for it is current history and new developments occur almost daily. However, a series such as this must be brought to a conclusion within a reasonable time, and this last issue in the year of our Lord 1972 seems an appropriate time for ending this special series.

This does not mean that we have finished with the subject; for this would be like saying that we have finished with the recording of world and national current events. For, this Planning, Programming, Budgeting System is the key to the world of tomorrow if the Planners are permitted to continue with their "restructuring" of the world of

today—and we can see no signs of effective human or positive divine intervention at this time.

So, in this last in a series of Newsletters, let us review and summarize, and take stock of where we stand:—

We are tempted to say, with the late Garet Garrett, that “The Revolution Was;” for, with the landslide reelection of Richard M. Nixon as President of the United States, the Conspirators are convinced that theirs is a mandate to complete, with popular approval, the creation of their Total Managed Global Society, while disregarding the desires, ignoring the words, and perhaps silencing or even liquidating those who oppose their Planning, Programming, and Budgeting.

Here is an overall picture of the completed structure, as we see it:

George Orwell, himself a Fabian Socialist with access to the overall Planning, Programming, Budgeting System (PEP) which was developed in England, had a true vision of the way the world was to be reshaped: it was to be divided into three parts, with each of these parts vying against the others in Fabian-type no-win wars. It required two world wars to create the leader-States for these three world divisions: The United States had to be divorced from its traditional “isolationist” attitude and “forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation... quit our own to stand upon foreign ground” and interweave our destiny with that of “Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice” (from Washington’s Farewell Address, Sept. 19, 1796). After having enmeshed the United States in world controversies, then Soviet Russia had to be nourished, strengthened and made a rival of the United States. And finally, Communist China had to be awakened, armed and equipped, drawn from its isolation into the world arena, and made a rival of both the USA and the USSR. And, by them, the world would be divided into three Great Regions with their own Regional Governments, separate yet united through a series of international treaties and organizations.

These Three Regional Rivals were created and/or positioned as the result of two World Wars. But, to prepare them to assume their places in world government, certain *internal* political innovations were brought about.

1) Lenin brought about the Soviet type, one-

party State;

- 2) To provide “people control” without undue coercion, Gandhi developed the theory of large-scale nonviolent political action;
- 3) Mao Tse-tung developed a system of peasant and guerrilla organization and government which proved ideal for the control of Eastern peoples; and
- 4) Cost benefit analysis (PPBS) was developed by Charles Hitch and associates at RAND Corporation, with U.S. taxpayer money and U.S. Government cooperation.

These four *political administrative techniques*—described in detail in an article by Dr. Karl Deutsch of Harvard, Dr. John Platt of the University of Michigan and Dr. Dieter Senghaas of Goeth University, Germany; published in *Science*, Vol. 171, Feb. 5, 1971. And these four *political administrative techniques* were intended to produce a Soviet Government in Russia, a Commune-ist Government in China, and a Corporative Socialist Government in the United States, with the PPB System replacing the traditional Representative Republican system, with its divisions of Governments into Federal, State, County and Community units, and its balance of powers between Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Branches.

Two unexpected events disturbed the timetable of the Planners:

On the world scene, while the United States was to be one of the Big Three, it was to be such as a *part of the Anglo-Saxon Federation*, which was to include England and the rest of the English-speaking nations of the world. This was the reasoning behind the creation of NATO, the Atlantic Union, the British-Israel politico-religious movement, etc. However, as a result of the enormous American aid given Europe after World War II, and the amazing rebirth of German industry, plus the unexpected competition resulting from the European Common Market, *that Regional Union began to offer serious opposition to the idea of the Three-Part division of the world. And:*

With the equally amazing rebirth of Japanese industry and commerce, that originator of the original East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere opposed the plan of allowing Communist China to exercise suzerainty over the island kingdom that is to Asia as England was to Europe.

England, seemingly losing out in its plan to regain its lost American Colonies, has decided to become a part of the United

States of Europe. And, in an attempt to keep Japan in line, trade restrictions are once again being used (that is what brought about Pearl Harbor), and American and European-based multinational bankers and industrialists are *buying into Japanese mining, manufacturing and merchandising organizations as rapidly as possible.*

As a result of these unexpected happenings, the Conspirators now are said to be considering the possibility of establishing five Regional Governments instead of three; to accommodate the unhappy overlords of Japan and the United States of Europe. The alternative plan would be no better, or worse, for the people residing in the United States.

The second unexpected happening involved a slip of the tongue. Dwight Eisenhower, Democratic General turned Republican President and about to become a gentleman farmer, outsmarted his keepers and speech-makers and made a very loud reference to the dangerous "military-industrial complex" that was threatening to cost the nation billions of dollars and thousands of lives in a planned "brushfire war" in Southeast Asia.

The Computerized Socialist Control System, PPBS, was to have been a closely-guarded secret, it was not to be mentioned to the people-at-large until after having been made a permanent fixture, like the debt money system and the unbalanced budget.

The "military industrial complex" was *PPBS in actual operation*; and when the lame duck President of the United States spoke out against it, panic and pandemonium beset the Planners and their change agents. All the allegedly conservative politicians and periodicals immediately denied the existence of any such thing as a "military-industrial complex," and save for a few liberal outlets, the Presidential faux pas was smothered in ink and oratory. One Oregon Senator talked incessantly of "Mc-Namara's War," but the connection between Vietnam, the Mekong Delta, offshore oil and PPBS was never explicitly explained (nor would it have been understood if it had been explained at that time, it was not until the Control System which had been used on the military, began to be used in the nation's schools, that aroused parents began to suspect the evils inherent in PPBS).

Meanwhile, on the domestic scene, inherent in the overall plan to build a Total Managed Global Society, was the necessity of chang-

ing the American form of Government at every level from the Federal right down to the individual family. The scheme called for the centralization of all political, economic and social control at one point, in Washington, D.C.; then the so-called decentralization of such controls into ten Regional Control points, to be designated as Capitols of Ten Federal Regional Districts.

These Ten Federal Regions are already formed and are in partial operation as a *new level of government operating between the Federal Government and the State Governments.* The fifty States have been divided between the Ten Federal Regions. Each Region has its own government, a Regional Council which is made up of appointed—not elected—officials. The Ten Regional Councils take their orders from a group that has its offices in the White House Executive Offices Building, and is called the *Under Secretaries Group for Regional Operations*, which is headed by the Associate Director of the Office of Management and Budget. The Group is, of course, made up of *appointed* rather than *elected* officials.

Getting this new level of the PPB System of government into full operation is a top-priority task of the New Nixon Administration; and when in full operation, it will function as follows:

The Washington Group will give orders to the Ten Regional Councils, which will in turn, give orders to the fifty States, and the States will then execute those orders — or their operational funds will be cut off! The States will cease to have any rights as *States*, and will become mere administrative branches of the Regional Governments.

Next step: To make supervision of State execution of Federal orders easier, the States themselves will be divided into Sub-Regional Governments. These Sub-Regional Districts and Governments will then replace all Counties and County Governments.

Do you see the whole picture of this proposed New World Government? —

Each State will be divided into sub-regional administrative districts;

The Nation has been divided into Ten Regional Administrations;

The World will be divided into Three (or perhaps Five) Regional Administrations;

All Orders will emanate from one Central Authority.

And that Central Authority will be composed, not of the world's political leaders such as Presidents and Prime Ministers who will merely hold administrative posts; it will be composed of executives and agents chosen by Multinational Corporation tycoons, International Bankers, and others who are the policy planners and decision makers in such organizations as the Round Table, the Bilderbergers, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, etc.

However, there yet remains much to be done before the Planners will have solidified their positions after having won the "quiet revolution."

A timely example: We have a copy of "HEW NEWS," from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for release on Sunday, December 24, 1972. As we quote from this official release, please bear in mind that in PPBS semantics, "decentralization" actually means the opposite, or "centralization." We quote excerpts only:

"HEW Secretary Elliot L. Richardson today outlined action by his Department in the past year to decentralize operations and 'gradually and quietly return responsibility to the people at the local level.'...

"He cited several moves... These included: Expanding the power of HEW's 10 Regional Directors. They now have authority to approve grants with a combined total from all Regions of \$2.3 billion a year. This means, said the Secretary, that the mayor of a small city can seek funds for a community health program, for example, directly from a regional office which can approve or deny the request without having to route it through Washington.... Regional Directors also are increasing their reliance on State and local governments for assistance in its program decisions.... HEW has regional offices in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Atlanta, Chicago, Dallas, Kansas City, Denver, San Francisco, and Seattle."

All of this activity on the part of HEW is, of course, stop-gap action; because *The Plan* calls for the elimination of HEW, HUD, Agriculture, Labor, Transportation, and Interior Departments. They are to be replaced by four new cabinet posts: 1) Economic Development; 2) Community Development; 3) Natural Resources; and 4) Human Resources. "The alignment of closely related functions in four purpose-oriented departments," explains the Assistant Director of

OMB, "would by itself facilitate easier planning and coordination of federal program's resources. When this improvement is coupled with the Administration's action to (give authority to officers in) the ten standard federal regions, the effective program delivery capabilities of the Executive Branch will be even further strengthened."

Also yet to be accomplished is the dividing of the States themselves into "sub-state districts," which will eventually eliminate all Counties and County Governments. A report from the 1313-based *Council of State Governments* says that "States are moving rapidly toward official designation of uniform systems of sub-state districts."

On Nov. 28, 1972, for example, Florida's 67 County governments were merged into 10 sub-state districts, whose appointed directors will control all inter-county affairs.

The chief characteristic of this PPB System of government—whether at world, national, state, or community level—is that it is Government by *appointed* rather than *elected* officials. And it is well to remember that appointed professionals *cannot be voted out!* Bear in mind that under this Planning, Programming, Budgeting System, *appointed* administrators will be giving the orders to the remaining *elected* officials, and that those *elected* officials will carry out those orders, or the funds they require will be withheld by the *appointed* administrators.

And, finally, let it be understood that this Revolution means far more than the creation of a new kind of government, it also means the creation of a new society with a new religion and a new god, and a new man with a new consciousness and a new set of values. It is to be a computerized society in which the finished products will all think, feel, and act the same.

The beginning of the defense of Freedom is to know the Truth. We hope and pray that we have helped in this defense, by presenting these Proofs of a Conspiracy to Build a Total Managed Global Society.

DON BELL REPORTS and CLOSER-UP are privately circulated Newsletters which accent the Christian American point of view. Subscriptions are not sold separately. Don Bell Reports weekly. Closer-Up fortnightly. Complete service: \$24 per year. 3 months trial: \$6. Extra copies: 10¢ each. Write to:
DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

THE CONTRIVED EVOLUTION OF REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

----- Part One -----

"THE TREND IS TOWARD SOCIALISM," declared George D. Aiken of Vermont, dean of United States Senators, and ready to retire and bequeath his mantle of moderate conservatism to a younger and more optimistic Green Mountaineer. Upon deciding to leave the Washington scene, Senator Aiken called in reporters and gave them an interview and a written press release, hoping thus not to be misquoted, we presume. He said nothing startling, nothing new, nothing that will add importantly to anyone's fund of general knowledge. But he did state with both brevity and clarity what might be considered to be the consensus of that group once called "the silent majority," the conservatives who mean well but don't quite understand what's been happening to their Nation.

Because his words do seem to summarize such a consensus, his statement is a good starting point for this series of letters. The publication of this interview implies neither agreement nor disagreement with the Senator's opinions; rather, the interview serves as an excellent launching pad for our own flight into political orbit:

Washington—A steady and perhaps accelerating trend to the left in the United States and throughout the world is seen by Sen. George D. Aiken of Vermont, who is retiring this year after the longest service of any Republican in the Senate today. Only Sen. Allen J. Ellender (D-La.) served longer than Aiken, now 81, who took his seat Jan. 10, 1941.

"The trend is toward what we used to call socialism," Aiken said in an interview the other day. "Communities are more and more dependent on the states, and the states are more and more dependent on the federal government. Government support for education, hospitals and other social purposes has gone up tenfold, I suppose, in the last 10 years. The number of local, state and federal agencies has increased greatly. In Vermont, two-thirds of all the railroad trackage

is publicly owned, either by the Canadian government or the state itself.

"The railroads are operated by a private concern which pays a percentage of income to the state. That is a combination of government ownership and private ownership, and it has worked pretty well so far.

"The cost of programs for feeding people, including the food stamp program, that are chargeable to the Department of Agriculture is about 10 times what it was five years ago.

"Paradoxically, under a supposedly conservative Republican Administration the leftward swing has been most rapid in the last five years. The people and the Congress seem to be for it. People are kicking about paying for these programs, but they are demanding to have them.

"Look what has happened in the case of revenue sharing, which Congress enacted in cooperation with the executive branch. The idea was that revenue sharing would make it possible to cut local taxes, but that is not what has happened. Instead, revenue sharing funds have been used for things that might not have been attainable otherwise, and in most places taxes have not been cut.

"My home town—Putney—got \$15,000 in revenue sharing funds in the first quarter of last year. Out of that, \$1,000 was voted for caring for indigent dogs—and that brought in dogs from the surrounding towns. Some people want to use funds for indoor skating rinks and indoor swimming pools.

"People want more things now than they ever did before, and they want them without delay. Partly for that reason, the federal government is playing an ever greater part in our lives. In 1965 federal grants to state and local governments were a little over \$10 billion. Just 10 years later these grants for 1975 are anticipated to be nearly \$52 billion. Yet even with this 500% increase in federal contributions, state and local indebtedness, as well as local taxes, has continued to increase.

"In all the states, or in the overwhelming majority of them, there are land-use laws. Not many years ago that would have been regarded as a decided infringement on private rights. It would have been unbelievable that you couldn't toss waste in a river."

Aiken has been a slightly left-of-center Republican senator, something of a maverick, who is more famous for his practical wisdom than for the bills he has introduced. As the ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee he has helped carry on the tradition of bipartisanship in foreign policy that flourished under his famous predecessor in that role, the late Sen. Arthur H. Vandenberg (R-Mich.).

In the clash between the hawks and doves during the Vietnam war, Aiken declared himself an owl. When the country was hopelessly mired in Vietnam, he made one of the greatest suggestions ever heard in Congress. He suggested that Congress pass a joint resolution declaring that the United States had won the war and that President Johnson bring the troops home in triumph. Unfortunately for Lyndon Johnson, he did not see the wisdom of it.

"They used to say," the senator recalled in an interview, "that when 35% of the income went into taxes of all kinds, you were a socialist country. Well, I guess we have reached that. It used to be every man for himself, with no restrictions—and no benefits. Devil take the hindmost. That served a purpose in the early days, I suppose. But things have changed. It's a world trend. The things we are doing today would have been called socialism when I first came down here. But there is this paradox—the whole universe is a paradox—that the movement toward socialism has not reduced individual freedom. The individual is almost freer now than he ever was before. Thirty years ago people would not have dared to get together and knock hell out of the government, as they do now. Some people get away with things today that they probably would have been hanged for a generation or two ago. I am thinking of this fellow Daniel Ellsberg. In practically no other country could he have gotten away with what he did here.

"And people are living better now than they ever did before. They never had the educational opportunities, the health benefits, the standard of living, the clothes to wear. If my mother got one new dress a year, she was lucky, and they were gingham dresses, at that. I went barefoot beginning the first of May until it got too cold.

"We should pay more attention to local

government," Aiken admonished. "That is where real democracy starts. It don't start from Washington."

(end of interview)

Senator Aiken confuses freedom with license and fails to realize that people "get away with more today" not because there is more liberty now, but rather because there is less respect for the law and a reluctance on the part of officials to enforce the law and on the part of judges (and even juries) to judge righteous judgment. Senator Aiken should know, too, that true happiness can never be counted in terms of material possessions, educational opportunities or health benefits. And, while real democracy may start with local government, an octogenarian citizen of the Green Mountain State should be among the first to realize that true democracy should never go beyond the local government, because when it gets bigger than the town meeting stage, democracy is the worst form of government ever attempted.

Tom Anderson, in his capacity as columnist for *The American Way Features*, was asked if he thought we should help promote democracy in other countries. His published answer should be forced reading for all politicians in this country. He wrote:

"As someone has said: 'Democracy is the worst of all possible forms of government.' Democracy is mob rule. Perhaps the best form of government is the government a people understand and like. If a people want tribal government, they should have it. People who want to be ruled should be ruled. The great Thomas Jefferson said: 'The best government is the least government.' And some people say: 'The best government is a dictatorship tempered by assassination.'

"The word 'democracy' is derived from the Greek words *demos* (the people) and *kratos* (rule). Aristotle defined democracy as "... A state where the freemen and the poor, being in the majority, are invested with the power of the state... every department of government being alike open to all... the people are the majority, and what they vote is law...."

"So, obviously, pure democracy is mob rule. Our forefathers did not bequeath us a democracy, thank Heaven. Benjamin Franklin said: 'We have given you a Republic, if you can keep it.'" (end of quotation)

We noted, at the beginning of this discourse, that Senator Aiken's statement might serve as a consensus of pseudo-conservative thinking about today's society and today's

American government. If this be true, then the composite American citizenry has strayed so far from the original concepts of American government, that we all need a refresher course, before it is too late to reconstruct, and even too late to remember what was lost.

"Revolution by scientific technic is above morality. It makes no distinction between means that are legal and means that are illegal." So commented the ex-New Dealer Garet Garrett in a monograph entitled "The Revolution Was." His reference was to the second stage of this *Quiet Revolution* (the first stage occurred during the Woodrow Wilson Administration) and the total disregard of the Constitution and the Laws of the Land when they stood in the way of the revolutionists. Garrett cited the case where President Franklin Delano Roosevelt wanted a new "Authority" established and wrote in a letter to a member of the House Ways and Means Committee: "I hope your committee will not permit doubt as to Constitutionality, however reasonable, to block the suggested legislation."

Ours is the third stage of the Revolution. The first—under Wilson—accomplished the task of securing unlimited finances for a Central Government. The second—under FDR—accomplished the task of securing unlimited political power for that Central Government. The third stage of the Revolution aims to achieve the centralization of all power—economic, political, social, monetary—within the Executive Branch of that Central Government.

Over a century ago Abraham Lincoln, who deduced from objective evidence the blueprint of a political plot that was to culminate in a War Between the States; gave the following classic analogy:

"When we see a lot of framed timbers, different portions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places, and by different workmen...and when we see those timbers joined together, and see that they exactly make the frame of a house or a mill, all the tenons and mortices exactly fitting, and all the lengths and proportions of the different pieces exactly adapted to their respective places, and not a piece too many or too few...in such a case we find it impossible not to believe that...all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common plan or draft, drawn up before the first blow was struck."

In applying this analogy to our present plot, it is necessary that we look back, at least briefly, to that time before the very

first blow could have been struck.

We are indebted to Nelson A. Pryor, Representative of Berlin, New Hampshire, for recalling to our mind the historical fact that Americans have traditionally viewed government in one of three ways, which are based upon three different theories:

1. The Compact Theory;
2. The Continental Theory; and
3. The International, or World Theory.

The Compact Theory originated with the landing of the Pilgrims at an unexpected place in the New World, and therefore with no patent to honor or obey. The circumstance was most unusual, truly an Act of God:

When the English Pilgrims set sail, their historian and leader William Bradford wrote: "They knew they were pilgrimes, and looked not on those things, but lift up their eyes to the heavens, their dearest countrie, and quieted their spirits."

The *Mayflower's* destination was Virginia, but when her master hove to on the ninth of November in the year of our Lord 1620, he knew he was hundreds of miles to the north of the intended place of landing.

Before leaving the Old World, the Pilgrims had obtained a patent that gave them power to establish a government, in Virginia. But that patent had no standing outside the limits of Virginia. This left them with no form of government of any kind whatsoever, and some of the Londoners on the ship may have felt as did the Israelites in their new promised land when "there was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (Judges 17:6). Or, as Governor Bradford put it, some felt that "they would use their own libertie, for none had power to command them." Feeling that only chaos and disaster could result from the lack of rules for the common good, the Pilgrim leaders determined that no one should leave the ship until some basis of government had been decided upon.

One can imagine the scene as they gathered in the cabin of the *Mayflower*: William Brewster, spiritual leader of the Plymouth brethren; John Carver, soon to become the first governor of the colony; William Bradford, the chronicler; Miles Standish, the soldier; John Alden, the cooper; all wise and God-fearing men who knew the covenants by which their independent congregations had been governed in England and in their years of exile in Holland. And these covenants they took as their model as they drew up what came to be known as the

Mayflower Compact; this likewise becoming the basis of the "Compact Theory" of government which was much in the minds and the hearts of the Founding Fathers when they assembled a century-and-a-half later to establish a more detailed Compact.

There are three basic tenets comprising the Compact Theory as originally enunciated in the *Mayflower Compact*:

1. The Absolute Sovereignty of God. There is no recognition of innate sovereignty in any man-created institution such as a State, Nation, United Nations, or any other man-made organization.
2. The delegation of that sovereignty to the individual man, who is created in the image of God and made to have dominion over all the earth; so that sovereignty rests in man, not in his institutions.
3. The transfer of a necessary portion of that sovereignty to a *body politic* for purposes of mutual protection and "a better ordering and preservation and furtherance" of desired objectives.

Note how these three basic tenets are included as we quote portions (in modern English) of the original *Mayflower Compact*:

"In the name of God, Amen. We, whose names are underwritten...having undertaken, for the glory of God, and advancement of the Christian faith, and honor of our King and country, a voyage to plant the first colony in the northern parts of Virginia, do by these presents, solemnly and mutually in the presence of God, and of one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politic, for our better ordering and preservation and furtherance of the ends aforesaid; and by virtue hereof to enact, constitute, and frame such just and equal laws, ordinances, acts, constitutions, and offices, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general good of the colony, unto which we promise all due submission and obedience."

First God, then the individual made in God's image, then the Compact made to further the ends of man and his God. This is the Compact Theory, as opposed to and contrasted with the Continental Theory and the International Theory, which we shall discuss in later letters.

As more and more people came to settle in the New World, and as Colonies expanded and become Thirteen in all, this Compact Theory formed the basis from which various and independent constitutions were written and governments formed. Then, when the Internationalist Theory, as proclaimed by George III and his Parliament, began to con-

flict with the Compact Theory held by the Colonists and revolution became inevitable, the Compact Theory was restated and expounded finally in the Declaration of Independence, especially in the last section of that document which contained the Resolution attributed to Richard Henry Lee and quoted by Thomas Jefferson:

"... these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, Free and Independent States; ... and ... as Free and Independent States they have full power to levy war, conclude treaties, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which Independent States may of right do. And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honour."

Note the same formula that was established with the *Mayflower Compact*: With reliance on God, these individuals as representatives of their free and independent Colonies, met to sign a Declaration which was as a compact between the Thirteen Free and Independent States to which sovereignty had been transferred by the individuals, who in turn had received that sovereignty as a delegation, or endowment, from their Creator.

Thus, each of the Thirteen States was a Sovereign Nation unto itself; and because of the war emergency, an alliance was struck. That alliance is known as the Articles of Confederation, and Article II of that document sustains the Compact Theory:

"Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom and independence, and every power, Jurisdiction and Right, which is not by this confederation expressly delegated to the United States, in Congress Assembled."

Within a few years it became apparent that more of that precious sovereignty must be transferred to a Central Government if the States were to maintain their freedom and independence. So, a Constitutional Convention was convened.

And here was staged a great debate: The *Compact Theory* versus The *Continental Theory*. Out of that debate came the Constitution of the United States of America, a Document now being ignored because of the third, The *International Theory*, a tenet of which is called *Regional Government*.

DON BELL REPORTS & CLOSER-UP are privately circulated. Complete service: \$24 per year. Extra copies: 10¢ each. Address: DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223 Palm Beach, Florida 33480

THE CONTRIVED EVOLUTION OF REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

----- Part Two -----

GROWTH OF THE COMPACT THEORY

Since it became necessary to refer to words and works spoken or written in the past, it also seemed fitting and appropriate that we quote directly from the better authors. We preface each quotation with the date, and append each with the quotation's source:

December 16, 1773:—

"...the progress of events served to fix attention more and more on Boston; and its patriots could see in expressions from other colonies that they were relied on to act with firmness and efficiency....

"Business in town was generally suspended. The inhabitants in the morning flocked to 'The Old South Meeting House,' still standing. They were joined by people from the country for twenty miles around. The gathering consisted of nearly seven thousand,—merchants, yeomen, gentlemen,—respectable for their rank, and venerable for their age and character....

"About six o'clock.... Samuel Adams then said: 'This meeting can do nothing more to save the country.' A war-whoop was now sounded at the door, which was answered from the galleries. The shouting became tremendous....

"As the party from whom rose the war-whoop passed the church, numbers naturally followed on; and the throng went directly to Griffin's Wharf, now Liverpool, at the foot of Purchase Street off which were moored the three vessels which contained the tea. A resolute band had guarded them day and night. John Hancock was one of the guard this evening. The party in disguise,—probably his friend Joseph Warren was among them,—whooping like Indians, went on board the vessels, and, warning their officers and those of the customhouse to keep out of the way, unlaid the hatches, hoisted the chests of tea on deck, cut them open, and hove the tea overboard....

"The local exultation was extreme. 'You cannot imagine,' Samuel Adams wrote, 'the

height of joy that sparkes the eyes and animates the countenances as well as the hearts of all we meet on this occasion.' 'This,' John Adams said, 'is the most magnificent movement of all. There is a dignity, a majesty, a sublimity, in this last effort of the patriots, that I greatly admire.' 'We, John Scollay, one of the selectmen and an actor, wrote, 'do console ourselves that we have acted constitutionally,—namely, did no more than was necessary, under the circumstances, to defeat the design of landing the teas.

"The exultation was scarcely less outside of Massachusetts... The Tea Act had the effect to make this question of taxation a living issue.... The popular leaders now sought to give direction to a great movement or to take advantage of a happy disposition in the public mind and extend the organization of committees of correspondence.... The popular party, in their several municipalities, proceeded independently in forming committees...."

(Above excerpts are from Richard Frothingham's "The Rise of the Republic," 1890).

March 31, 1774:—

"In retaliation against the Boston Tea Party, Parliament passed a series of statutes known as the Intolerable Acts. The most oppressive of these was the Boston Port Act, March 31, 1774, which closed the port of Boston to all shipping until reparations had been made to the East India Company.

"...By the spring of 1774, it had become clear that the problems of individual colonies were really the problems of all. United action by the colonies was necessary. One writer to the *Boston Evening Post* said: 'It is now time for the colonies to have a Grand Congress to complete the system for the American Independent Commonwealth, as it is so evident that no other plan will secure the rights of this people from rapacious and plotting tyrants.' One of the first bodies to propose the calling of a continental con-

ress was a town meeting in Providence, Rhode Island, on May 17, 1774. Virginia was the first colony to make such a proposal." (From "Sources of Our Liberties," American Bar Foundation, 1959).

September 5, 1774:—

"Out of protest meetings held in state houses, courthouses, and stores at country crossroads came a demand for a congress to meet at Philadelphia in the fall of the year, there 'to consult upon the present unhappy State of the Colonies....'

"On September 5, 1774, fifty-five delegates representing all the colonies except Georgia opened the First Continental Congress in Carpenters' Hall... Even more important than the declarations and resolutions was the Continental Association, by which the delegates agreed that their constituents would import no more British goods, deny themselves all luxuries, and encourage their own manufactures until the mother country should redress their grievances. In this way they forged into a national weapon coercive measures that had been so far only local and unorganized, and took a long step on the road to independence." (from "By These Words," Rand McNally, 1954.)

April 19, 1775:—

"In mid-April the British military governor of Massachusetts heard that the colonists had collected a supply of muskets and gunpowder at Concord. On the evening of the eighteenth he ordered a detachment of regulars to march out from Boston and seize the supplies. And that was the night when Paul Revere, anxiously watching the belfry of the Old North Church, saw a single light—'one if by land, and two if by sea'—and leaped on his horse to warn the countryside that the British were marching. The next day, at Lexington and Concord, men and boys... died... and exacted a toll from His Majesty's redcoats far heavier than they themselves paid." (from "By These Words," Rand McNally, 1954).

May 10, 1775:—

"So the members of the Continental Congress met again—at Philadelphia, as they had planned... In the ears of the delegates rang the words of Patrick Henry, uttered when the news of Lexington reached Virginia:

"... If we wish to be free... we must fight! I repeat it, sir, we must fight! An appeal to arms and to the God of Hosts is all that is left to us! They tell us, sir, that we are weak, unable to cope with so formidable an adversary. But when shall we be stronger?

Will it be the next week, or next year? Will it be when we are totally disarmed, and when a British guard shall be stationed in every house? Shall we gather strength by irresolution and inaction? Shall we acquire the means of effectual resistance by lying supinely on our backs and hugging the delusive phantom of hope until our enemies shall have bound us hand and foot? Sir, we are not weak if we make proper use of means which the God of Nature hath placed in our power, ... Besides, sir, we shall not fight our battles alone. There is a just God who presides over the destinies of nations; and who will raise up friends to fight our battles for us. The battle, sir, is not to the strong alone; it is to the vigilant, the active, the brave....

"It is vain, sir, to extenuate the matter. Gentlemen may cry peace, peace—but there is no peace. The war is actually begun! the next gale that sweeps from the north will bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms! Our brethren are already in the field! Why stand we here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!" (Excerpted from George Bancroft's "History of the United States," 1898).

June 24, 1775:—

"The (Virginia) Bill of Rights was drafted by George Mason, a well-to-do planter of Fairfax County, Virginia... Mason came from retirement to fill a vacancy in the Virginia Convention caused by George Washington's appointment as commander in chief of the Continental Army... A committee of twenty-eight delegates was appointed to draft the declaration and constitution. It was headed by Archibald Cary, and included Patrick Henry, Edmund Randolph, James Madison, and Mason. Mason assumed the leadership in drafting the documents." (from "Sources of Our Liberties").

VIRGINIA BILL OF RIGHTS

(This is your editor writing; we have ceased from quotations for a time).

In this series of letters, we have referred to three traditional views of government that have been held by Americans: the Compact Theory, the Continental Theory, and the International Theory. And it is the Virginia Bill of Rights which provides us with a clear and complete explanation of what the Compact Theory meant to the Americans of that period in history.

When the thirteen Colonies decided that they must become independent and sovereign States, there came the necessity of writing and adopting State Constitutions. Virginia's document was in three parts: there was the Bill of Rights; then came a preamble to the Constitution, written by Thomas Jefferson and the model which Jefferson expanded and presented to the Continental Congress as his initial draft of the Declaration of Independence; and finally there was the Constitution itself.

The Virginia Bill of Rights exerted a direct influence on similar bills of rights adopted by six other States; while the States that did not preface their new Constitutions with a bill of rights, were careful to have the principles enunciated therein within the body of the fundamental law of the land. Even more important: The Virginia Bill of Rights was the forerunner of the first ten amendments to the Constitution of the United States; and the Federal Constitution would never have been ratified if those ten amendments—now known as *the* Bill of Rights—had not been appended thereto.

Since the Virginia Bill of Rights is such a clear and complete statement of the Compact Theory which guided the majority of the Founders of our Nation, it seems appropriate that the most important provisions of that document be published again in this letter, lest we forget the civic foundations upon which our Republic was built:

CONSTITUTION OF VIRGINIA

June 12, 1776

BILL OF RIGHTS

A declaration of rights made by the representatives of the good people of Virginia, assembled in full and free convention; which rights do pertain to them and their posterity, as the basis and foundation of government.

SECTION I. That all men are by nature equally free and independent, and have certain inherent rights, of which, when they enter into a state of society, they cannot, by any compact, deprive or divest their posterity; namely, the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety.

SEC. 2. That all power is vested in, and consequently derived from, the people; that magistrates are their trustees and servants, and at all times amenable to them.

SEC. 3. That government is, or ought to be, instituted for the common benefit, protection, and security of the people, nation, or com-

munity; of all the various models and forms of government, that is best which is capable of producing the greatest degree of happiness and safety, and is most effectually secured against the danger of maladministration; and that, when any government shall be found inadequate or contrary to these purposes, a majority of the community hath an indubitable, inalienable, and indefeasible right to reform alter, or abolish it, in such manner as shall be judged most conducive to the public weal.

SEC. 4. That no man, or set of men, are entitled to exclusive or separate emoluments or privileges from the community, but in consideration of public services; which, not being descendible, neither ought the offices of magistrate, legislator, or judge to be hereditary.

SEC. 5. That the legislative and executive powers of the State should be separate and distinct from the judiciary; and that the members of the two first may be restrained from oppression, by feeling and participating the burdens of the people, they should, at fixed periods, be reduced to a private station, return into that body from which they were originally taken, and the vacancies be supplied by frequent, certain, and regular elections, in which all, or any part of the former members, to be again eligible, or ineligible, as the laws shall direct.

SEC. 6. That elections of members to serve as representatives of the people, in assembly, ought to be free; and that all men, having sufficient evidence of permanent common interest with, and attachment to, the community, have the right of suffrage and cannot be taxed or deprived of their property for public uses, without their own consent, or that of their representatives so elected, nor bound by any law to which they have not, in like manner, assembled, for the public good.

SEC. 7. That all power of suspending laws, or the execution of laws, by any authority, without consent of the representatives of the people, is injurious to their rights, and ought not to be exercised.

SEC. 8. That in all capital or criminal prosecutions a man hath a right to demand the cause and nature of his accusation, to be confronted with the accusers and witnesses, to call for evidence in his favor, and to a speedy trial by an impartial jury of twelve men of his vicinage, without whose unanimous consent he cannot be found guilty; nor can he be compelled to give evidence against himself; that no man be deprived of his liberty, except by the

law of the land or the judgment of his peers.

SEC. 9. That excessive bail ought not to be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishment be inflicted.

SEC. 10. That general warrants, whereby an officer or messenger may be commanded to search suspected places without evidence of a fact committed, or to seize any person or persons not named, or whose offence is not particularly described and supported by evidence, are grievous and oppressive, and ought not to be granted.

SEC. 11. That in controversies respecting property, and in suits between man and man, the ancient trial by jury is preferable to any other, and ought to be held sacred.

SEC. 12. That the freedom of the press is one of the great bulwarks of liberty, and can never be restrained but by despotic governments.

SEC. 13. That a well-regulated militia, composed of the body of the people, trained to arms, is the proper, natural, and safe defence of a free State; that standing armies, in time of peace, should be avoided, as dangerous to liberty; and that in all cases the military should be under strict subordination to, and governed by, the civil power.

SEC. 14. That the people have a right to uniform government; and, therefore, that no government separate from, or independent of the government of Virginia, ought to be erected or established within the limits thereof.

SEC. 15. That no free government, or the blessings of liberty, can be preserved to any people, but by a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality, and virtue, and by frequent recurrence to fundamental principles.

SEC. 16. That religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and therefore all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience; and that it is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forbearance, love, and charity towards each other.

The Virginia Bill of Rights was adopted by the House of Burgesses meeting at Richmond on June 12, 1776. Five days earlier at Philadelphia where the Continental Congress was in session, Richard Henry Lee—of the Virginia delegation—introduced a resolution declaring that the Colonies ought

to announce to the world that they were acting as free and independent States. This led to the selection of a committee, headed by Virginian Thomas Jefferson, which would prepare a Declaration of Independence; and that historic document was signed and published on July 4, 1776.

However, more than a year before this—on May 31, 1775, the people of Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, published a set of resolves wherein they declared that: "We conceive that all Laws and Commissions confirmed by, or derived from the Authority of the King or Parliament, are annulled and vacated, and the former civil Constitution of these Colonies for the present wholly suspended." The resolves declared that all legislative and executive powers were vested in the provincial congress of each Colony "under the Direction of the Great Continental Congress."

The Mecklenburg Resolves did not declare complete independence from Great Britain, but they did set the stage for the Declaration of Independence which was to follow.

Next there was needed, in the legal sense, Articles of Confederation. On the same day that a committee was appointed to frame the Declaration of Independence, another committee was appointed to "prepare and digest the form of a confederation to be entered into between these colonies." The Articles of Confederation which resulted was agreed to by Congress on November 15, 1777, was not approved by all the States until March 1, 1781, but Congress used it as a guide before that time.

By the Articles of Confederation the States established a Federal Legislature, but no Executive Department and no Federal Judiciary; all sovereignty was retained by the people and the States. *This was the Compact Theory in practice. The Continental Theory*, on the other hand, demanded that all sovereignty be surrendered to the Central Government, with an all-powerful Chief Executive and Judiciary.

Conflict was inevitable, and compromise essential. The Constitution with its Bill of Rights was such a compromise, creating a Republic—if we could keep it.

(to be continued)

DON BELL REPORTS & CLOSER-UP are privately circulated Newsletters accenting the Christian American point of view. Complete service: \$24 per year. Extra copies: 10¢ each. Please address all orders to:
DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

THE CONTRIVED EVOLUTION OF REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

----- Part Three -----

COMPACT VERSUS CONSTITUTION

Land use and land control legislation was a matter of utmost importance to that first generation of citizens of the United States of America. Those Americans who founded our Nation were land oriented men. The very watchword of the Sons of Liberty (Samuel Adams of Boston Tea Party fame was their leader) was "Liberty and Property." In all local elections only property owners could vote. As one historian has pointed out:

"... colonial suffrage legislation... was designed to confine the vote to desirable elements of the population. It was drafted in the conviction that efficiency, honesty, and harmony in government rested, in the last analysis, upon a salutary degree of homogeneity of interests, opinions, and fundamental loyalties—religious, ethnic, and class. Confining the vote in colony elections to those who were free, white, twenty-one, native-born Protestant males who were the owners of property, especially real property, appeared to be the best guarantee of the stability of the commonwealth. The drafters of colonial suffrage legislation, to whatever extent they attempted to formulate ideas, seem to have thought that undue disparity of interest, opinion and loyalty among electors would weaken and distract government" (Chilton Williamson in *American Suffrage from Property to Democracy, 1760-1860*, Princeton University Press, 1960. The author favors democracy over property and writes disparagingly of colonial principles; we disagree with his perspective, which is hardly Christian American).

James Madison of Virginia also held the opinion that "the freeholders of the Country would be the safest depositories of Republican liberty." He wrote that "in future times a great majority of the people will not only be without landed, but any other sort of property. These will either combine under the influence of their common situation; in which case the rights of property & the public liberty, will not be secure in their hands; or which is more probable, they will become

the tools of opulence & ambition, in which case there will be equal danger on another side." (Quoted from *Documents Illustrative of the Formation of the Union of the American States*, a Government paper edited by Charles C. Tansill. G.P.O., 1927).

Madison feared that when propertyless men were permitted to vote, they would become the tools of "opulence and ambition," so that a new "aristocracy" would rule, using the masses as its tools and keeping the favor of the masses by promising propertyless people goodies from the public storehouse. In this, Madison was a true prophet.

Gouverneur Morris of Pennsylvania was even more emphatic: "Give the votes to people who have no property, and they will sell them to the rich who will be able to buy them... Children do not vote. Why? Because they want prudence, because they have no will of their own. The ignorant & the dependent can be as little trusted with the public interest." (Also quoted from above-described paper edited by Charles C. Tansill).

However, there was little controversy at the time because nine-tenths of all the free men residing in the thirteen free and independent States were land-owners; and the federal government at that time had no wealth or property in land which it might give away in subsidies, benefits, welfare or relief payments. In short, land belonged to the people or to the States, and the federal government had no "land policy" because, up to that time, it needed no land policy.

But the situation changed—and the change might have been drastic—after the signing of the Treaty of Paris on Sept. 3, 1783. That treaty not only brought an official end to the War for Independence; it also gave to the United States clear title to all the lands extending inland to the Mississippi. In the beginning these lands were claimed as extensions of the thirteen original States. But the States ceded the territory to the general government, the Treaty of Paris relinquished

all previous claims which the British Crown held to the land. Thus, the United States became holder and caretaker of a vast empire of incredible diversity and fabulous untapped wealth. Some kind of government had to be established for this vast Northwest Territory.

Here was the great temptation: The United States Government could have followed the example of the countries of Europe when the empires and states of that continent were being formed. The federal government might have declared itself the absolute governor of that great area, might have divided it into so many federal districts, or regions (as our federal government is doing today) and there would never have been any States other than the original thirteen; all the rest might have been retained as a Federal Commonwealth, with all political power centered in the National Capitol and the districts or regions being administered from regional capitols with no State or local governments to interfere or intercede. All political power would be concentrated at the top and extend downward, rather than being concentrated at the county or the township level, and proceeding upward. In other words, ours could have become but a copy of the English form of government, against which we had rebelled. Thankfully, the *Compact Theory* of government, as opposed to the *Continental* and *International Theories*, was still the ideal of a majority of the Founding Fathers; and the Continental Congress rendered its greatest service to posterity when it enacted the Northwest Ordinance on July 13, 1787.

The Northwest Ordinance opened up this vast Northwest Territory to orderly and progressive settlement, encouraged self-government (as opposed to government from the federal capitol) and anticipated the creation of new "free and independent States," with republican forms of government and no slavery. The pattern was simple, and it worked:

1. Congress would create a "territory," appointing a governor and judges who would govern temporarily, until
2. the population had reached 5,000 in the territory. Then the people would have a legislature of two chambers, electing the lower house themselves. Finally,
3. When the territory attained 60,000 people, it would be made into a full-fledged State and a new Star would be added to the field in Old Glory.

Thus did the Continental Congress utilize the *Compact Theory* for the solution of its "colonial problem," and this pattern was

followed generally as the Nation expanded from the original thirteen to the present fifty States.

Also enduringly important: The Northwest Ordinance contained the first Bill of Rights to be enacted by the federal government of the United States. Furthermore—and this is one of the facts which Supreme Courts have continually ignored—the wording of Article III of the Ordinance clearly favored the establishment of *Christian* schools, in order that *Christian* civil government might be strengthened. Here is the precise language:

"ARTICLE III. Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged...."

"Schools were thus assumed to be the channels of religion and morality as well as of knowledge," commented Rousas J. Rushdoony in his invaluable *This Independent Republic* (The Craig Press, 1964.) "Education was not statist," Dr. Rushdoony emphasized, "it was local and Christian, and it was the foundation of Christian civil society. The importance of the Northwest Ordinance has not been generally recognized...in that it was not merely the action of the Federation Congress but, after the passing of the First Amendment, the First Federal Congress re-enacted the Northwest Ordinance."

THEN, THE CONSTITUTION

By the Articles of Confederation the States had entered into "a firm league of friendship with each other, for their common defense, the security of their Liberties, and their mutual and general welfare." But so few powers were given to the central government that it could not long endure in peace, mainly because there was no way of keeping peace between the States themselves; trade wars began to develop between the Northern States. In January, 1786, the Virginia House of Burgesses proposed a meeting of commissioners from the States "to take into consideration the trade of the United States; to examine the relative situations and trade of the said States; to consider how far a uniform system in their commercial regulations may be necessary to their common interest and their permanent harmony...."

Such a convention was called, met at Annapolis in September, 1786; but only five States sent representatives: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware and Virginia. The convention was a complete failure insofar as bettering trade relations was

concerned. Before it dissolved, however, at the instigation of James Madison of Virginia and Alexander Hamilton of New York, the Annapolis Convention passed a resolution proposing:

"...the appointment of Commissioners, to meet at Philadelphia on the second Monday in May next, to take into consideration the situation of the United States, to devise such further provisions as shall appear to them necessary to render the constitution of the Federal Government adequate to the exigencies of the Union; and to report such an Act for that purpose to the United States in Congress assembled, as when agreed to, by them, and afterwards confirmed by the Legislatures of every State, will effectually provide for the same."

Copies of this resolution were sent to the States and to the Continental Congress. Congress approved of the plan and in February, 1787, sent its recommendation to the States that they appoint delegates to meet at Philadelphia on the second Monday in May. Congress stated, however, that the Convention was to meet "for the sole and express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation" and not for the purpose of writing a new Constitution. In short, the Congress wanted an *improved Compact*, not a new document based on the *Continental Theory* that was then being championed by Alexander Hamilton, who wanted a strong central government which could interfere with matters within the States and conduct all affairs foreign and domestic, commercial and financial, industrial and agricultural, with full and final authority, superior to the State in all matters great or small.

On the second Monday in May, 1787, not enough delegates for a quorum had arrived in Philadelphia. By the 25th seven States were represented and the Convention was organized. George Washington's name was placed in nomination to preside over the body, and he was unanimously elected President of the Convention.

But that's where the unanimity ended. By the time all the delegates had arrived (the State of Rhode Island did not name any delegates) there were four separate plans and seemingly irreconcilable differences in those four sets of plans.

First to be introduced was the Virginia Plan, presented by Edmund Randolph. It called for some fifteen different changes in the Articles of Confederation. In direct opposition was the New Jersey Plan, designed to protect the interests of the small States. Then there was the plan presented by Chas.

Pinckney of South Carolina, and the ultra-federalist plan of Alexander Hamilton.

With James Madison championing the *Compact Theory*, Alexander Hamilton proclaiming the superior merits of the *Continental Theory*, Benjamin Franklin attempting to be a peacemaker, and George Washington trying to maintain order, the first days must have been hectic indeed. But, on July 24 a Committee of Details was appointed to prepare a draft Constitution, which could serve as the basis for further discussion and amendment. This committee used the Virginia Plan as the basic outline for its draft and Alexander Hamilton, finding himself outvoted and outnumbered, submitted and went along with the majority, later was instrumental in getting States to ratify the Constitution through his most valuable contributions to *The Federalist Papers*.

Once agreement on all essential points had been reached by the Convention, a Committee of Style and Arrangement was appointed to prepare the final draft of the Constitution. These five men: James Madison of Virginia, Gouverneur Morris of Pennsylvania, William Samuel Johnson of Connecticut, Rufus King of Massachusetts and Alexander Hamilton of New York, were responsible for the actual style and wording of the Constitution, which was presented to the Convention on September 12, 1787; was approved and ordered engrossed on Sept. 15; was published on Sept. 17; but did not become binding upon the States until June 21, 1788, when New Hampshire became the ninth State to ratify. The Constitution was ordered by Congress to be put into operation on September 13, 1788.

The following, for its historical interest in an age when history is being rewritten to suit the planned future, *a la Orwell's 1984*, is quoted from *By These Words*, by Paul M. Angle:

"Two days later a clerk read the engrossed copy. When he had finished, the venerable Franklin took the floor and asked his colleague from Pennsylvania, James Wilson, to read a few remarks that he had reduced to writing. The Constitution, Franklin admitted, was far from perfect, but on the whole it was the best frame of government that could be devised under the circumstances. 'I cannot help expressing a wish,' he concluded, 'that every member of the Convention, who may still have objections to it, would with me, on this occasion, doubt a little of his own infallibility, and, to make manifest our unanimity, put his name to this instrument.'

"There was argument over the form in which the members should subscribe their names, and in the end only thirty-nine of the fifty-five delegates who had attended the convention signed. Of the other sixteen, some were absent, and several ranged themselves in opposition. . . .

"The Constitution would go into effect, so Article VII read, when it should be ratified by nine of the thirteen states. A spirited campaign began immediately. Strong opposition developed. Many resented the undoubted fact that the delegates had exceeded their authority; others believed that the new government went too far in the direction of centralized power. Nevertheless the dangers confronting the country were real and pressing, and there might not be time for perfecting an ideal system. Reasoning thus, the state conventions began to pass ordinances of ratification—Delaware, the first, on December 7, 1787, Pennsylvania five days later, New Jersey on December 18, New Hampshire, the ninth state to ratify, acted on June 21, 1788.

"Technically, the Constitution would now go into effect, yet everybody knew that without New York and Virginia the new government would fail. In the Old Dominion James Madison pleaded for ratification, George Washington came to his support (but Patrick Henry opposed and George Mason insisted that a Bill of Rights had to be added before he would approve the Constitution—Ed.). In New York, Alexander Hamilton, through his contributions to the series of newspaper articles that we know as *The Federalist*, and by the force of his arguments to the state convention, produced the margin of victory, and the state fell into line with Virginia. A few weeks later the old Congress chose New York City as the seat of the new government, and specified that the first Congress to be elected under the Constitution would convene on March 4, 1789."

One of the first acts of that First Congress was the framing and passage of a Bill of Rights, an action that had been promised to reluctant State delegations if they would ratify the Constitution. The Bill of Rights was adopted, and ratified, as the first Ten Amendments to the Constitution; and it was Patrick Henry of Virginia, who already had earned the sobriquet "father of the Constitution" who also introduced and shepherded the Bill of Rights through Congress. In introducing the amendments, he spoke words that may seem prophetically timely in 1974, with a "President's council" having caused so much havoc in the Nation, with the legislative branch taking upon itself judi-

cial powers as impeachment proceedings are contemplated, and with a general fear of too much power having been concentrated in the Federal Government, to the hurt of the States and the citizens thereof. Patrick Henry told the First Congress, in part:

"There have been objections of various kinds made against the Constitution. Some were levelled against its structure because the President was without a council; because the Senate, which is a legislative body, had judicial powers in trials on impeachments; and because the powers of that body were compounded in other respects, in a manner that did not correspond with a particular theory; because it grants more power than is supposed to be necessary for every good purpose, and controls the ordinary powers of the State Governments. I know some respectable characters who opposed this Government on these grounds; but I believe that the great mass of the people who opposed it, disliked it because it did not contain effectual provisions against the encroachments on particular rights, and those safeguards which they have been long accustomed to have interposed between them and the magistrate who exercises the sovereign power; nor ought we to consider them safe, while a great number of our fellow-citizens think these securities necessary."

It was the addition of these ten amendments which insured that the Constitution was in the tradition of the *Compact Theory* of government which had begun with the *Mayflower Compact*. In fact, in ratifying the Constitution, the States of Massachusetts, Virginia and New Hampshire declared they were "entering a Compact." John Jay, first Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, in the case of *Chisholm vs. Georgia* (1793) referred to the Constitution as "a Compact between the States."

It has been violations to the Bill of Rights and disregard of the *Compact Theory*, with its careful division and separation of powers which has brought our Nation to the brink of destruction. It is our belief that the importance of the fundamental principles upon which our frame of government was based, must be rediscovered and understood. That is why this series of letters is being published.

(to be continued)

DON BELL REPORTS & CLOSER-UP are privately circulated. Complete service: \$24 per year. Extra copies: 10¢ each. Address: DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223 Palm Beach, Florida 33480

THE CONTRIVED EVOLUTION OF REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

- - - - -Part Four- - - - -

IMPLIED, IMPLICIT & INHERENT CONSTITUTIONAL INNOVATIONS

When the thirty-nine delegates signed the engrossed Constitution of the United States, they felt they had done the best possible job under the circumstances, they had given the people a Republic, if they could keep it, and they signed the remarkable document with pride, and prayer. But they did not sign on behalf of the people of the United States; they signed as representatives of the free and independent States and then submitted the proposed Constitution to the citizens of those States—not to the citizens of the United States—for ratification. The difference may seem trivial in 1974, but it was a vital difference in 1788.

Time and brainwash has caused us to lose the significance of those first three words in the Preamble to the Constitution: "We, the People." James Madison, at the ratification Convention of Virginia, stated that: "We, the People" mentioned in the Preamble were "not the people as composing one great body," but rather "the people composing thirteen sovereignties." The union was seen as pluralistic, not national. Historian James Bryce, in *The American*

=====

CORRECTION, PLEASE:— In Part Three of this series, an inexcusable error occurred. We wrote that Patrick Henry is called the "father of the Constitution" and that it was he who introduced the Bill of Rights in the First Congress in 1789. Such a statement is, of course, patently and historically ridiculous, and due to extreme carelessness in editing. It was James Madison whose memory we maligned. Patrick Henry did not support the Constitution at any time; he feared that it gave too much power to the federal government at the expense of State governments, even after the Bill of Rights was added.

Our apologies to the memories of both James Madison and Patrick Henry, and to the intelligence of all readers of this series.

=====

Commonwealth, published in 1894, gave the following example of how pluralism, as opposed to nationalism, was extant at that time:

"A few years ago, the American Protestant Episcopal Church was occupied at its triennial Convention in revising its liturgy. It was thought desirable to introduce among the short sentence prayers a prayer for the whole people; and an eminent New England divine proposed the words 'O Lord, bless our nation.' Accepted one afternoon on the spur of the moment, the sentence was brought up next day for reconsideration, when so many objections were raised by the laity to the word 'nation' as importing too definite a recognition of national unity, that it was dropped, and instead there were adopted the words 'O Lord, bless these United States'."

This pluralistic sense was so commonly recognized that, up to the outbreak of the War Between the States, the standard usage was "The United States are." It was after the Civil War that people began to be taught to say, "The United States is." In the beginning Congress was also a plural noun; even Alexander Hamilton, who favored the *Continental Theory* of government over the *Compact Theory* which the Constitution implied, stated that "Congress are," admitting that "We, the People" meant the people of thirteen States, not the people of one Nation. The change began with the changes brought about by the Civil War. As historians Samuel Eliot Morison and Henry Steele Commager admitted in *The Growth of the American Republic*, after the War the "Union had been preserved, but only in the narrow sense of territorial integrity had the old Union been restored. The original Federal Union had disappeared and in its place arose a strong national state, federal chiefly in administrative machinery."

But, getting back to the foundations of the confederation of republics; The States, individually, accepted the Constitution under the following terms of power:

1. Enumerated powers (those listed in the Constitution);
2. Residual powers (those reserved to the States and to the people thereof); and
3. Concurrent powers (those shared by the States and the federal government).

In summation: Our Founding Fathers—and this includes Alexander Hamilton—agreed that the government they set up was a “Compact Between the States,” that it was based on the people of the individual States and not on the people of the whole union, and that it was the States that created and put into effect the central government. To further protect the people, the States demanded a Bill of Rights, the Preamble of which reads:

“The Convention of a number of the States having at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added; And as extending the ground of public confidence in the government, will best insure the beneficent ends of its institutions, be it resolved, (Amendments I through X then follow).”

Of especial importance in this connection were the Ninth Amendment (copied almost directly from the Articles of Confederation) which reads:

“The enumeration in the Constitution of rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people;” and the Tenth Amendment, which reads:

“The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.” Thus, as Rep. Nelson Pryor noted, “By preventing *mis*-construction of the Constitution, the States could have *strict* construction.”

The Compact Theory, in short, is for strictly limited government and individual responsibility; a fulfillment of the goals of government as expressed by Jefferson: “Let the national government be entrusted with the defence of the nation, and its foreign and federal relations; the State governments with the civil rights, law, police, and administration of what concerns the State generally; the counties (towns and cities as well) with the local concerns of the counties, and each ward direct the interests within itself.”

It was Alexander Hamilton who disputed this concept of government and introduced the *Continental Theory*, of a strong central government. In 1781-82 Hamilton wrote a series of seven articles for Loudon’s New

York *Packet* in which he outlined his theory of an ideal government for the thirteen States. Titled the *Continentalist Papers*, Hamilton insisted that the central government should have absolute and unquestionable power. His *Continental Theory* borrowed much from Thomas Hobbes and his *Leviathan* (1651), a political philosophy embodying a *superstate* wherein the omnipotence of the ruler owes its existence to an original contract among the governed. The political philosophy spelled out in Col. House’s book *Philip Dru: Administrator* might be considered something of a modernized version of Hamilton’s *Continentalist Papers*. Even while a delegate from New York at the Constitutional Convention, Hamilton went so far as to suggest that the States should be abolished in favor of a federal regional government system (Richard Hofstadter in his historical work *The United States*, Prentice-Hall, 1961).

However, when Hamilton saw that his ideas were thoroughly rejected by almost all of the other delegates at the Convention, he voluntarily abandoned his plan and program and assisted Edmund Randolph and James Madison in promoting the Virginia Plan, which became the very backbone of the completed Constitutional structure. Not only at the Convention, but afterward in the *Federalist Papers*, Hamilton continued to work for the adoption of the Constitution. It is almost a certainty that New York would never have ratified the Constitution had it not been for the efforts of Alexander Hamilton in his home State.

But—when the Constitution went into effect, when George Washington was chosen as the country’s first President, and when Hamilton was named Secretary of the Treasury in that first Cabinet, he immediately began to put his *Continentalist Theory* into operation.

This pattern has become familiar in United States political life. In our own time, FDR was elected on a conservative platform but when installed in office he surrounded himself with Fabian Socialists—even inviting a few from London to come over and help—and the New Deal was inaugurated. Likewise RMN who posed as a dedicated anti-Communist and a hard-hat conservative, but when elected reversed the field completely, adopted Fabian Socialist programs domestically and embraced Communist countries externally—and the New Federalism (or the Quiet Revolution) was inaugurated. But, it was Alexander Hamilton who was first in the matter of changing images in midstream (first in American politics, that is.)

Hamilton treated the Constitution as though it

had been engrossed on rubber instead of parchment. It could be stretched to cover almost anything the federal government wanted to do, reasoned this first Secretary of the Treasury. Certainly, there were enumerated powers, residual powers, and concurrent powers specified and delegated by the Document. But, said Hamilton, there were also inherent powers, implicit powers, and implied powers in the Constitution that were not defined in words but that could be stretched to the point where there would be no effective limits to the power of the general government. Furthermore, those concurrent powers, the dual powers delegated to both the general government and the States, could be taken over by the Federal Government.

In 1787 Hamilton praised the Constitution as the finest possible frame of government; but in 1802 he spoke of the Constitution as "a frail and worthless fabric" and therefore no obstacle when it came to putting his program across (this according to Richard Hofstadter, *The United States*, page 130).

The Hamilton Program included:

1. A protective tariff (favoritism to certain nations, a course against which President Washington had warned, on no uncertain terms.)
2. The Assumption Act (securing Federal Power over the States by assuming their war debts).
3. Creation of a Bank of the United States (a private bank which would issue money, thus giving entry of the International Bankers into American governmental affairs, and also interfering with and partially nullifying the Constitutional mandate that "The Congress shall have the power... To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures.")
4. A number of other precedents that started the Union of States as *Continentalist* instead of *Compactual*, as all of the Founding Fathers had intended and as Hamilton had agreed—until he became a Federal Officer (thus establishing perhaps the worst precedent of them all).

Alexander Hamilton did not complete his *Continentalist* programming; his meteoric political career was cut short by a bullet fired in a duel by his political rival Aaron Burr, in 1804. But, after Hamilton left the scene, his philosophy was carried on from the United States Supreme Court by Chief Justice John Marshall who served in that capacity from 1801 to 1835. It has been said that it was Marshall's doctrines and interpretations which prompted the British historian Thomas Macauley to say: "Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor."

The Constitution devotes comparatively little space to the "judicial Power of the United States," which shall be "vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish." Section 2 of Article III states: "The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under the Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority."

The extent of the judicial power is further explained in Section 2, but as Hamilton wrote in *The Federalist*, comparing the relative powers of the three branches of the federal government: "The Executive not only dispenses the honors, but holds the sword of the community. The Legislative not only commands the purse, but prescribes the rules by which the duties and rights of every citizen are to be regulated. The Judiciary, on the contrary, has no influence over either the sword or the purse...and can take no active resolution whatever. It may truly be said to have neither force nor will, but merely judgment. This simple view of the matter suggests several important consequences—it proves incontestably that the judiciary is beyond comparison the weakest of the three departments of power, that it can never attack with success either of the others, and that all possible care is requisite to enable it to defend itself against their attacks."

Which was certainly true until the celebrated *Marbury v. Madison* case came along in 1803. Over and beyond the legal technicalities of this case, there was a most important question to be answered: In a government copartnership where concurrent powers are involved, and a branch of the federal government is accused of having exceeded the powers granted it by the Constitution, who shall judge the case; the States, or the United States Supreme Court? President Jefferson, and most others, insisted that the General Government should not be given the power to judge itself when the States were the injured parties; and that there should be a review and determination by the States themselves. Marshall and others believed it was the duty of the Supreme Court to determine such controversy. And, in *Marbury v. Madison*, Marshall won out; since that time there has been Judicial Review rather than State Review. Still later, in 1810, in the case of *Fletcher v. Peck*, the Supreme Court assumed the power to review the acts of the States. Then, in 1819 in *Dartmouth College v. Woodward*, the States were denied the right to alter Charters within their boundaries. In two other cases decided while

John Marshall was Chief Justice, the Supreme Court asserted its right to pre-empt and re-try cases that had already been settled by State Courts.

Thus did the *Compact Theory* fare under Chief Justice John Marshall. On the other hand, Presidents at this time were not in sympathy with Marshall. As Representative Nelson Pryor stated in an address before the Massachusetts Americans for Constitutional Action, on Sept. 24, 1973:

"From 1800 to 1860, this Union of States was governed by administrators that, almost to a man, advocated and practiced the ideals of the *Compact Theory*. There were a few notable exceptions; such as James Madison's temporary loss of footing during the 'Era of Good Feelings.' This period saw subsidies and handouts re-instituted; but was soon ended by the efforts of Compact Theorist and New York Senator, Martin Van Buren. The Continentalist majority on the Marshall Supreme Court was used for the advantage of people who sought special privileges from Washington. Knowing that acts which violated the Compact Theory would not be passed by Congress or approved by the President, the Continentalists seized upon court cases, had those cases carried to the U.S. Supreme Court. Wanting a Continentalist principle accomplished, the Supreme Court would settle the case accordingly, and precedent would maintain the principle thus established (the Warrencourt was not original in this respect--Ed.)

"Those were trying days for the States," continued Rep. Pryor, "as they saw the building up of power in Washington. In Congress, *The American System* (1824) was proposed by Henry Clay; this was based upon the ideas of Alexander Hamilton. In 1830 Daniel Webster denied the validity of the Compact Theory and defined the *Nature of our Union* as Continentalist. He proclaimed the Union as based on "one" people and not that of the separate peoples of the different States as having made the Compact. He further proclaimed that the people should look to Washington for the safeguarding of their rights, instead of to the States, as had been the underlying theory of previous governments.

"While the War between the States was in progress, the Northern Congress started to push Continentalist policies which the South had been able to stop while they were still in the Union. The long debated trans-continental railroad was voted through in 1862. This granted land and a Federal subsidy of .7 billion dollars to the builders. The Morrill Land Grant Act was passed the

same year, to finance government colleges. Vote-buying in the *Credit Mobilier* scandal was a direct result as Congress did not regulate that which it subsidized (how could it when people as high as the Vice President of the United States were involved?)

"The people of the States, wanting relief from high railroad rates, attempted to get State Regulation of same. In 1867, the Grange was organized to protect the users. Beginning with Illinois in 1870 the Grangers won control of the legislatures of several Midwestern and Southern States. Munn v. Illinois (1877) established that States could regulate business within their own boundaries. But this precedent was overturned by *Wabash v. Illinois* in 1886....

"Alexander Hamilton's philosophy had thus grown fruit. To accomodate the Grangers who had now transferred their action to the U.S. Congress, the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887 was passed. Events show that neither the Supreme Court nor the Congress ever implemented this law to regulate railroads. And later, the mild Continentalism of these men was replaced by others who wanted strict control over all businesses, and the precedents to do it had already been well established.

"The Compact Theory was, by now, set aside. The Continentalist Theory was pretty much in the saddle by the turn of the century. The third theory, Internationalism, which is a mixture of strong Continentalism and eventual One World Government, was now ready to emerge. A government by technocrats would evolve, with the technocrats consolidating the powers of government and transferring that power to themselves in order to create a better world."

We have compressed the history of a whole century into a few, mostly quoted, paragraphs, because we wanted to get to the twentieth century, where the action really begins and where--to a surprising degree--we find the history of the eighteenth century Counter-revolution against a Central Government in London so very similar to the current history of a Counter-revolution against a Central Government in Washington and an emerging World Government still so difficult to define and delineate that we are at an awful disadvantage in combatting it. However, as the twentieth century begins, the outlines of our real enemy also begin to emerge.

(to be continued)

DON BELL REPORTS & CLOSER-UP are privately circulated. For information, write:
DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

THE CONTRIVED EVOLUTION OF REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

. Part Five

BIRTH OF INTERNATIONALISM

The last decade of the nineteenth century has been called "The Gay Nineties," but the gayety must have been of the kind that is akin to hysteria. For there was a feeling of panic in the air, an uncertainty as to America's future, and a fear of the "Economic Royalists" who were having such an impact on the American economy that the Congress took a hand and passed the Sherman Anti-Trust Act which declared that "Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, is hereby declared illegal." Three months later (Oct. 1, 1890), the McKinley Tariff Act raised the tariff on manufactured goods to the highest levels in American history; but it also provided for reciprocity agreements with other Nations. This led to a Democratic landslide in the November elections, Democrat Grover Cleveland winning easily in the Presidential elections two years later (1892). Meanwhile, strikes and violence swept the country: martial law was declared and federal troops called out to end a veritable war at the Coeur d'Alene silver mines in Idaho; a strike at the Carnegie Steel Company at Homestead, Penn., was put down by State militia, but plant manager Henry C. Frick was shot and then stabbed by a Russian anarchist. And the Socialist Labor Party met in convention in New York City on Aug. 28, 1892.

The financial panic began in 1893. On April 15 the issue of gold certificates was suspended by the U.S. Treasury; securities fell suddenly on the New York Stock Exchange on May 5; the Stock Market crashed on June 27. During the year, 600 banks closed, over 15,000 commercial houses failed, 74 railroads went into receivers' hands (J.P. Morgan and his international banker associates being the receivers in most cases).

1894 saw the organization of the National Municipal League (forerunner of and later amalgamated with Rockefeller's 1313, which

became the chief promoter of Regional Government). On Aug. 27, 1894 a new tariff law was passed which contained an income tax provision. Called communistic, it was declared unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court before it ever became effective as law.

On Feb. 8, 1895 the United States Treasury made a contract with the International Banking houses of Morgan and Belmont (the latter being a Rothschild subsidiary) for the purchase of \$65,000,000 in gold, to be paid for with interest-bearing government bonds.

And here within a five-year period, we have recorded chronologically most of the contrived occurrences which go together to make up a carefully laid plot, a Conspiracy to gain an unlawful end: political confusion abounded, labor relations were at their worst, stick-wielding communism and carrot-dangling socialism along with bomb-throwing anarchism all had been introduced, independent banks were going broke, as were independent business houses, the depression was causing untold sufferings, and the *United States Government was in hock to the International Bankers!* The time was ripe for the final step in this particular series of contrived events; *War!*

We are writing, of course, of Conspiracy, of the willful schemings of two or more persons to bring about an unlawful end; in this case, to bring the United States out of its isolated position in the world, and make it a part of an International Concert of Nations, all to be controlled by the Conspirators.

At that time in history, the United States had fulfilled its "Manifest Destiny," the dream of "one nation, under God, stretching from sea to shining sea." True, there was Alaska, obtained by purchase, and Hawaii, adopted territorially. But, essentially, the United States was a Continental power, with no interests other than trade with other nations of the world; free of Old World intrigues, and pledged to keep South America also free of Old World intrigues, under the

terms of the then honored Monroe Doctrine. (It was this Monroe Doctrine that would supply the loophole through which the Conspirators would creep in—as we shall see in upcoming paragraphs).

First, in connection with the nature of Conspiracy and its application to this series of newsletters, we should like to borrow from the writings of Wilson Thomas, author of *Harvest of Political Wild Oats* (Meador Publishing Co., Boston). He wrote:

Conspiracy does not exist unless there is an intent of two or more persons to accomplish something unlawful. Intent is of the essence of it, and intent is intangible and metaphysical. Nobody can penetrate the secrets of another's thought and produce evidence to establish conclusively another's motive for action or inaction. Conspiracy is a conclusion as to the motive for action which... leads to certain individuals or interests and connects them in such a way as to indicate that they planned and brought about the whole sequence in order to accomplish unlawful ends....

If we were to make a careful survey of the whole field of business and professional activity, it would be seen that banking is unique in respect to the natural opportunities afforded for exploitation, acquisition of information of a secret nature inaccessible to the general public, acquisition of undue influences and controls. International banking differs from nationally organized banking principally in the size of its field of operations, which is now world-wide, and in the extraordinary opportunities available to it by reason of diversities of national systems and conflicts of interest among the family of nations.... The international banker... holds his court in the inner sancta of high finance and power politics, where the adoring high priests of the dollar sign make reverent entrance by appointment, in order to bow down to the gods of wealth. The customers he meets are chancellors of the exchequer, ministers of state, ministers of war and the multimillionaires who control the wealth of the world....

The fact of the existence of a conspiracy is coming now to be widely understood. The conspiracy, I am confident, will never be understood, much less defeated by the processes of searching out whipping boys, trying to fasten blame upon individuals, racial, religious or political groups. The reason why it will not be thus solved is that it is organized entirely upon institutional lines and is moved by the impersonal power of money and credit controls.... International

banking, I suspect, is today the only real world power. It is a power so all-pervasive that its long fingers of control have probed into and are in intimate touch with every phase of the economy of every country in the world; so highly organized that all the countless threads of fiscal policy and system which comprise the banking and monetary systems of the world have been gathered into the hands of one person, or at most a very small group of persons—men without faces, an absolute oligarchy of absolute economic control. Here is money power unlimited... for the most part unseen, never vocal, never identified with the visible forms of government, which is nevertheless well able to determine political policy the world around, and move officers of state as a skilled player moves the figures on a chessboard. International banking is the hidden control of all economic wealth and, indirectly, of all government.... In its concealed mechanism will ultimately be found an explanation of the perennial failure of the American people to get the sort of government they want, no matter how they vote, no matter who they put in office.

Are the foregoing wild statements? Are the ideas incredibly fantastic? If the reader thinks so, let him turn to the records of English and American history. Let him read and let him realize that almost before the ink was dry on the Constitution of the United States, the power of the international bankers had enabled them to set it aside, to nullify its provisions relative to the coinage and value of money, and establish a monetary system pleasing to them. That happened nearly two centuries ago. International control of money and credit was then in its infancy. (end of quotation)

In the last decade of the nineteenth century there had been such industrial development and the promise of technological miracles yet to be developed, that it was time for the United States to be dragged out of its happy isolation and brought into more intimate relationship with the rest of the world. So reasoned the International Bankers, and so was our original *Compact Theory* of government forced to give way to the *Continental Theory* of strong, central government, to pave the way for the eventually superseding *International Theory*, whose end is World Government!

The last decade of the nineteenth century found *imperialist sentiment* running high in most great nations of the world. The partitioning of Africa was being concluded, China was being torn to pieces for the

benefit of the powers, especially England. And the imperialist nations of Europe began casting avaricious glances toward South America, and coveting the almost untouched riches in natural resources existing in our sister continent.

And suddenly, in the summer of 1895, the people of the United States, England—and probably the people of Venezuela and British Guiana as well—were thunderstruck by the news that the United States was threatening to go to war against the British Empire! People wondered how such a situation could so suddenly develop, involving two supposedly friendly powers. The people, of course, didn't understand the machinations of the Money Barons of the World (they still don't.)

This, we believe, was a case where the governments of Britain and the United States were "used" for conspiratorial purposes by a power "bigger than both of them." There had long been an unsettled boundary between British Guiana and Venezuela. No great seriousness was attached to the dispute until, suddenly, the news was spread that gold had been discovered in this disputed territory. The British then claimed the land and, according to the newspapers of that day, started to move in and take over; while the United States invoked the Monroe Doctrine. President Cleveland, apparently at the instigation of his Secretary of State, Richard Olney, sent a message to Congress stating that "Today the United States is practically sovereign on this continent, and its fiat is law upon the subjects to which it confines its interposition." The Presidential Proclamation demanded that a Congressional investigating commission be sent to Venezuela to determine the true boundary line, and the United States must then "resist any encroachments on land assigned to Venezuela."

The boundary dispute proved to be "a tempest in a teapot" and was soon settled to the satisfaction of all parties. However, as a result of the "near warlike condition" that had suddenly developed between Britain and the United States, a special conference was arranged to settle disputes between the two powers. On Jan. 11, 1897, the Olney-Pauncefote Convention was approved by all parties except the United States Senate. So, according to observers at the conference, a secret agreement was arranged, but never sent to Congress. The agreement had little or nothing to do with border disputes in South America. Instead, this was an alliance between Britain and the United States which covered the world,

not just the New World. According to Prof. Roland G. Usher in his book *Pan-Germanism* published in 1915, this was an understanding that in case of war in Europe, the U.S. would promptly declare in favor of England and France, and would do her utmost to assist them. Usher said no papers were signed, but "the alliance, for it was nothing less, was based on infinitely firmer ground than written words and sheets of parchment."

Then, through the Magic of the Money Barons, Spain was to be eliminated as an "Empire Builder" and reduced to simply a State in Europe, and "The lost colonies of North America (the United States) were to be rejoined to Mother England and certain dreams of Sir Cecil Rhodes and Baron Rothschild were to be fulfilled (more about this later). *And the threatened war between the United States and England would be replaced by an actual war between the United States and Spain!*

That the Spanish-American War was contrived, totally unnecessary, and brought about simply to project the United States onto "the world stage" for ulterior purposes, is now admitted by almost all historians. It was a shameful affair for which this Nation has had its share of suffering (to say nothing of the people of Cuba and the Philippines) and it altered the course of the whole world, politically and economically.

In his excellent *The Myth of the New History*; David L. Hoggan comes closer to the whole truth about the event, than does any other historian whom we have read on the subject. We quote:

America was in many respects the most fortunate nation in the world in 1895. . . . Although still a debtor nation economically (European holdings in the United States were much greater than American holdings abroad), there was good reason to expect that, under normal conditions, America would become a creditor nation in about fifty years. In the meantime, paying the interest on foreign investments was no problem in view of the proverbial American favorable balance of trade (except that, as we have shown, those international bankers who had sizeable investments in the United States were able to use that power to manipulate the foreign policy of the United States—Ed.) It was in the context of this happy situation that *American leaders began to wonder if perhaps they did not need overseas colonies and an entente with England* (such leaders as J.P. Morgan, John

D. Rockefeller, Sr., the Jays, Whitneys, Aldriches and other Anglophiles among the "60 families who owned America" at the turn of the century—Ed.)

It was against this background (Hoggan continues) that the United States in 1889 decided to go to war against Spain. In any real or meaningful sense, there could be no military glory in such a war. . . . There was no compelling reason for the United States to go to war against Spain in 1898. . . . It has never been proven that the Spaniards sunk the Battleship *Maine*. . . it is incredible that the Spanish government planned the explosion. . . . McKinley had plenty of time to call off the dogs of war. The president recommended force against Spain two days after the Spanish Government had surrendered to American demands on the Cuban issue. . . .

William Randolph Hearst purchased the New York *Journal* (November, 1895), in a deliberate effort to capture the lead in New York City newspaper circulation from Joseph Pulitzer's New York *World*. Hearst was quick to see the advantage of lurid and sensational reporting about events in Cuba and Pulitzer soon decided to follow Hearst's lead in exploiting this field of sensational journalism (it came to be called yellow journalism—Ed.)

The presence of (Admiral) Dewey at Manila (in the Philippines at the start of the war) was the achievement of Theodore Roosevelt, the Under-Secretary of the Navy, who was to succeed McKinley as President in 1901. During the absence of Secretary of the Navy Long, Theodore Roosevelt had issued the orders which sent Dewey to the Far East long in advance of the outbreak of hostilities. Roosevelt believed that the United States, as a future great naval power, ought to have a naval base in the Far East comparable to the British bastion at Hong Kong. Fortunately, no one suggested attacking the Spaniards at Rio de Oro on the west coast of Africa. . . .

One of the most fateful consequences of the Spanish-American War was the acquisition of an American colony in the eastern hemisphere, which seemed to contradict the original promises on which the Monroe Doctrine was based. Furthermore, the first solid events in Anglo-American collaboration, beginning with Secretary of State John Hay's open door notes in 1900, took place in the Far East. . . .

(End of quotations from David Hoggan's *The Myth of the New History*. The Craig Press, Nutley, N.J. 1965. \$4.50)

"Anglo-American Collaboration," or the entry of the United States into the new world balance of power was the real reason for the Spanish-American War, and for the presence of the U.S. Navy at Manila when hostilities began, and for the presence of the *U.S.S. Maine* at Havana where it could conveniently be blown up, probably by paid insurgents under the command of General Roloff, a Polish Jew who was a naturalized citizen of the United States.

Of the new Anglo-American Alliance, Joseph Chamberlain, Secretary of State for the British Colonies declared: "We now see our cousins across the water entering the lists and sharing in a task which might have proved too heavy for us alone."

A grim and ugly historical footnote: It was later realized that the International Bankers did not need to promote a war with Spain in order to bring the United States into this new balance of power, because the alliance had been concluded before the war began and—as Anglophile Nicholas Murray Butler later complained: "The Spanish-American War was absolutely unnecessary, and if it had not been insisted upon by the belligerent press, aided by numerous influential leaders of opinion, including Theodore Roosevelt, Cuba would have become free without any armed hostilities whatsoever."

Chauncey M. Depew, New York Senator and important and powerful political and financial leader of his day, in *My Memories of Eighty Years*, published in 1924, records a conversation in which Lord Rothschild offered Puerto Rico and the Philippines to the United States and stated the willingness of the Spanish Government to grant independence to Cuba and to comply with every demand the United States can make. Regretfully, he wrote further, "The proposition unfortunately came too late, and Mr. McKinley could not stop the war. . . ."

At the turn of the century, as America began to become an International Power, the *Elite* directing the use of that power began to believe that individual State Governments had powers that should be taken from them and concentrated in Washington, D.C. Thus, plans for Regional Government began to be prepared.

(to be continued)

DON BELL REPORTS & CLOSER-UP are privately circulated Newsletters accenting the Christian American point of view. Subscriptions not available separately. Complete service: \$24 per year. Please write: DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223 Palm Beach, Florida 33480

THE CONTRIVED EVOLUTION OF REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

. Part Six

THE GREAT "ISMIC" INVASION

The United States of America was forced into the Internationalist Arena through being manipulated into a war against Spain for Cuban independence. As a result of that unfortunate adventure, the United States obtained possession of Guam and the Philippines, islands in the Far Pacific. Their possession became a clear and positive violation of the Monroe Doctrine which, up to that time, had been regarded as inviolate as the Constitution itself. True, we were only holding onto the Philippines for purely "humanitarian" purposes and in due course they were granted independence. But Guam in the Marianas remains an unincorporated territory of the United States, and the first witness of our own violation of the most important foreign policy proclamation ever made by the United States.

Then, in rapid succession, came the annexation of Hawaii in 1898, intervention in the Boxer Uprising in China in 1900, diplomatic intervention in the Russo-Japanese War in 1905, Teddy Roosevelt's ordering of that round-the-world cruise of the United States Navy in 1908 along with his threat to the world that we would "speak softly but carry a big stick."

These events established the United States as a world power and, more importantly, established us as an *imperialist power* in the eyes of the other imperialist powers of the world. Consequently, we became embroiled in the intrigues and vicissitudes of the rest of the world. And, we began to be infiltrated and infected, attacked and affected by the various "isms" that were causing upheavals and epidemics in the bodies politic of the nations of the Old World.

It should be noted that there was great unrest in the United States at this time, and thus the country was more receptive to foreign isms than in previous years. In his revealing but biased *Trajectory and Hope*, historian Carroll Quigley refers to this period as "the period of financial capitalism in

which investment bankers moving into commercial banking and insurance on one side and into railroading and heavy industry on the other were able to mobilize enormous wealth and wield enormous economic, political, and social power. Popularly known as 'Society,' or the '400,' they lived a life of dazzling splendor."

"The structure of financial controls created by the tycoons of 'Big Banking' and 'Big Business,' Quigley continues, "was of extraordinary complexity, one business fief being built on another, both being allied with semi-dependent associates, the whole rearing upward into two pinnacles of economic and financial power, of which one, centered in New York, was headed by J.P. Morgan and Company and the other, in Ohio, was headed by the Rockefeller family. When these two cooperated, as they generally did, they could influence the economic life of the country to a large degree and could almost control its political life, at least on the Federal level. . . . The influence of these business leaders was so great that the Morgan and Rockefeller groups acting together, or even Morgan acting alone, could have wrecked the economic system of the country merely by throwing securities on the stock market for sale, and having precipitated a stock-market panic, could then have bought back the securities they had sold at a lower price. Naturally, they were not so foolish as to do this, although Morgan came very close to it in precipitating the 'panic of 1907,' but they did not hesitate to wreck individual corporations at the expense of the holders of common stocks, by driving them to bankruptcy." (A similar situation exists again today, with multinational corporations and conglomerates wielding enormous economic, political, and social power—Ed.)

At the turn of the century, Big Banking and Big Business so ruled the roost, that the importation of Old World "Isms" was easy, and they were welcomed by many.

Into the United States came immigrants and political protagonists promoting peculiar

and unusual doctrines. There flourished for a time and in varying degrees of intensity and expansiveness nihilism, anarchism, syndicalism, national socialism, international communism, Fabian socialism, Fascism, Anglo-Saxon Federation, etc., etc.

Before proceeding, a definition of terms is required, and an explanation of the historical dialectic of all these strange isms which are based generally on the theories expounded by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels:

In the beginning there was what now is called Utopian Socialism. That was the kind of socialism advocated by the social reformers such as Robert Owen, John Stuart Mill, and other like-minded social reformers. Various experiments in Utopian Socialism had been carried out in the United States, beginning with the Pilgrim Colony itself; all failed for varying reasons.

Then came the great change, in 1848, when Marx and Engel were commissioned to write out the socialist credo which they called *The Communist Manifesto*, and which begins with the threat, "A spectre is haunting Europe—the spectre of Communism," and closes with the command, "Workers of the World, unite!" This *Manifesto* marked the end of the peaceable Utopian Socialist period, and the beginning of the political and militant period of Scientific Socialism. After 1848, the International Socialist Movement was marked by three "Internationals," or meetings, each of which changed the course of the overall movement. The First International held sway from 1864 to 1876, twelve years during which time nihilism and anarchism became so predominant that the movement was disrupted and a Second International was founded in 1889. The nihilists and anarchists were expelled and the whole movement began to lose its militancy. This resulted in a showdown between the Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks, with Trotsky establishing a Bolshevik headquarters in Brooklyn, and with Lenin heading a similar Bolshevik group in Geneva. Kerensky, who died in exile in the United States in 1972, was nominal head of the Menshevik group. Then in 1919, all the dissident elements of the old Second International organized the Third—or Communist—International.

The bickering and infighting among the socialists led to a number of schools, increasingly doctrinaire, increasingly bitter toward each other, but always ready to cooperate with each other when called upon by the faceless men who controlled all the schools of socialism.

Most violent were (and are) the nihilists. They believe that conditions are so bad that everything must be destroyed utterly, governments, religions, institutions, civilizations, buildings; perfection exists only in absolute nothingness. The nihilists are the bomb-throwers, the arsonists, those who kill and destroy in the belief that these are worthy ends in themselves.

The anarchists are a milder version of the nihilists. The anarchist believes that man is not sinful, but innately good; all the world's evil arose because man's innate goodness was corrupted and distorted by coercive power. The remedy is to destroy the state and its government, whatever the form of government may be. Destruction of the state will lead, according to anarchism, to the disappearance of all other forms of coercive power and to the liberation of the innate goodness of man. The anarchists believed that the simplest way to destroy the state was to assassinate the chief of the state; this would act as a spark to ignite a wholesale uprising of oppressed humanity against all forms of coercive power. These views led to the assassination of numerous political leaders, including a king of Italy and a president of the United States in the period 1895 to 1905 (the man who shot President William McKinley, Leon Czolgosz, was an anarchist).

Syndicalism was a later version of anarchism, and was more realistic. It aimed to destroy governments, but this public authority was to be replaced by voluntary associations of individuals in communes, cooperatives, and especially labor unions. According to the syndicalists, the state was to be destroyed, not by the assassination of heads of state, but by a general strike of all workers. The general strike would destroy the state and replace it by a flexible federation of free associations of workers (syndicates). The IWW movement in the United States was syndicalism's supreme effort in this direction; but the cooperative movement still exists as a form of syndicalistic socialism in the United States.

Opposed to the nihilo-anarcho-syndicalists in theory were the radical socialists who did not want to destroy governments as such but, instead, to give them all power over all economic life. Public ownership of all industry, all land, all resources, all means of production and all distribution of goods; this was the socialism that was able to conquer most of Europe and, through the late Norman Thomas and his followers, capture control of the National Democratic Party from 1932 onward. In the United

States this form of socialism evolved into the welfare state program espoused by the majority of United States Senators and Representatives who call themselves Republicans and Democrats, but doctrinally are radical socialists.

Yet a different school of socialism evolved out of Bolshevism and came to be called Communism. International Communism has expanded enormously, thanks to efforts on the part of the United States Government to keep it alive. More about this later.

Yet another form of national socialism, called Fascism, developed in Italy under Mussolini. A slight alteration of the same ideology was called Nazism in Germany. Historians are reluctant to point out that much of the New Deal Program under FDR was fascist; and no one in authority in Washington seems willing to confess that Nixon's *New Federalism* program is a direct steal from the Corporate Socialism that was developed—and which still functions—in Italy (which doesn't really have a government, but is run by State-owned or State-chartered Corporations).

Then, there is Fabian Socialism which, because of its extreme importance in the *Contrived Evolution of Regional Government*, will be dealt with in great detail in future letters in this series.

We have listed several of the different denominations of socialism. There are yet others, such as the revisionist communism copied from Mao Tse-tung's interpretation of the writings of Karl Marx, the SLA, other militant and radical cults claiming to be followers of the true gospel of revolution according to Marx. Each of these groups, from the Nihilists to the Socialist Labor Party, has had its part in the destruction of the original American System.

But there is one power, almost nameless, which has had more to do with the socializing of America than all of the socialist cults individually or severally, *because this one power controls them all and uses them all whenever occasion and circumstance demands!*

Perhaps our best way of approaching this subject is to call on one of the opposition's own witnesses. Carrol Quigley, previously quoted, devotes considerable space in his book to a discussion of the *Institute of Pacific Relations*, a satellite of the *Council on Foreign Relations*, which was composed of ten national councils in ten countries, with international headquarters in New York City. IPR was thoroughly investigated by the McCarran Committee (Senator McCarran

was probably the first American in an official position to try to warn the Nation of the danger of Fabian International Socialism). This investigation of the IPR was of especial importance in that it revealed officially the interrelationship between the Council on Foreign Relations, the tax-exempt Foundations such as Carnegie and Rockefeller, the Communist Party, U.S.A., and the Fabian Socialist apparatus which operated out of the Ivy League Colleges, with financial aid also being supplied by Rockefeller and Morgan interests in Wall Street: Standard Oil, Chase National Bank, National City Bank, International General Electric, International Telephone and Telegraph. Individual contributions came from Frederick Vanderbilt Field, Thomas Lamont and Corliss Lamont, and other communists and communist-fronters.

Quigley admits that IPR developed a party line and that "this IPR line had many points in common both with the Kremlin's party line on the Far East and with the State Department's line in the same area." The State Department was (and is) controlled by the Council on Foreign Relations; so the Kremlin and State Department policy toward the Far East being the same at that time, is hardly a coincidence.

However, after Quigley admits so much, he goes on to explain how Nationalist China "fell or was pushed" (IPR-man Owen Lattimore's phrase), then Quigley makes the statement that this whole affair was a "radical Right fairy tale, which is now an accepted folk myth in many groups in America."

"This plot, if we are to believe the myth," writes Quigley, "worked through such avenues of publicity as *The New York Times* and the *Herald Tribune*, the *Christian Science Monitor* and the *Washington Post*, the *Atlantic Monthly* and *Harper's Magazine* and had at its core the wild-eyed and bushy-haired theoreticians of Socialist Harvard and the London School of Economics. It was determined to bring the United States into World War II on the side of England (Roosevelt's first love) and Soviet Russia (his second love) in order to destroy every finer element of American life and, as part of this consciously planned scheme, invited Japan to attack Pearl Harbor, and destroyed Chiang Kai-shek, all the while undermining America's real strength by excessive spending and unbalanced budgets."

Quigley says this is all a radical Right myth. But he has a reservation and isn't quite sure that he believes what he wrote, because he immediately adds:

"This myth, like all fables, does in fact have a modicum of truth. There does exist, and has existed for a generation, an international Anglophile network which operates, to some extent, in the way the radical Right believes the Communists act. In fact, this network, which we may identify as the Round Table Groups, has no aversion to cooperating with the Communists, or any other groups, and frequently does so. I know of the operation of this network because I have studied it for twenty years and was permitted for two years, in the early 1960's, to examine its papers and secret records. I have no aversion to it or to most of its aims and I have, for much of my life, been close to it and to many of its instruments. I have objected, both in the past and recently, to a few of its policies (notably to its belief that England was an Atlantic rather than a European Power and must be allied, or even federated, with the United States and must remain isolated from Europe), but in general my chief difference of opinion is that it wishes to remain unknown, and I believe its role in history is significant enough to be known."

Our concern in this series of letters is with the American affiliates of this secret network, groups which also have "no aversion to cooperating with the Communists, or any other groups" and frequently do so.

Here is a network of secret and semi-secret organizations which originally sought to reunite the United States (England's lost colonies) with Mother England, with a view toward creating a world government that would be administered by an Anglo-Saxon Federation composed of the United Kingdom, the United States, and the British Commonwealth of Nations (Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, etc.). As the control of this network changed, the aims of the secret cabal also changed, so that the final aims now consist of a World Authority administered on behalf of Big Banking and Big Business. This World Authority is to be divided into Regional Authorities, they into National Authorities, and these in turn are to be divided (or have already been divided) into Administrative Regions; as the United States has been divided into Ten Federal Regions for administrative purposes.

To accomplish the total Regionalization of the World there are two principal groups which originated in England, and which now are active (and in a controlling position) in all of the English-speaking Nations of the world. Similar affiliated groups are in control or in positions of great influence in all other developed Nations of the world.

In the United States this control is exerted over economic and monetary affairs by a network of groups, the best known of which is the New York City based *Council on Foreign Relations*, which is directly affiliated with similar organizations in all other nations of the world.

The second group which controls political and social affairs is an organization which might be said to be made up of all officers and no soldiers, and began in England as the Fabian Society. This Fabian Society developed a special kind of Socialism that is especially appealing to men who once believed themselves to be freemen.

Between these two, the groups controlled by the *Round Table* and the individuals controlled by the *Fabian Society*, there is a camaraderie and an interrelationship so that at times it is difficult to distinguish one from the other. And between the two, there is the determination that we shall have a "World Community," whether we like it or not, and that at the nation-state level we shall have Regional Government, whether we like it or not.

If we are to understand what we have called *The Contrived Evolution of Regional Government*, then we must first trace the history of these two power groups, the Round Table Groups, and the Fabian Society. We must understand how they originated in England, one at Oxford University, the other by way of the London School of Economics which was founded for the express purpose of teaching the fundamentals of Fabianism.

Do not expect an exhaustive or comprehensive treatment of these groups in this series of letters. Our principal subject is Regional Government and we shall try to deal with Round Tablers and Fabians only as they relate to Regional (and World) Government.

How a gaggle of defeated diplomats grew to the place where they could dictate to whole Governments, and how a drawing room study group developed into a behind-the-scenes power that could draft programs for Regional and World Governments; these are the topics upcoming.

(to be continued)

DON BELL REPORTS and CLOSER-UP are privately circulated Newsletters that accent the Christian American point of view. Subscriptions are not available separately. Complete service: \$24 per year. Extra copies: 10¢ each. Address all orders to:

DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

PRESIDENT BUSH AND SECRETARY OF EDUCATION LAMAR ALEXANDER ARE PUTTING UNESCO'S PLAN INTO ALL AMERICAN SCHOOLS UNDER GUISE OF RESTRUCTURING/ OUTCOME-BASED EDUCATION/ MASTERY LEARNING.

Don Bell Reports

UNESCO

A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

Year Twenty Number Thirty-Six September 7, 1973

THERE IS TRULY NOTHING NEW UNDER THE SUN!

AND THEY STILL CALL IT EDUCATION

It started many years ago. jmi

"GETTING CHILDREN TO LEARN HOW THEY TICK

"Children at school are invited to repeat to the class 'the lie you often tell about yourself'... to write their own obituary notice... to talk about their loneliness... to drop counters into a cup after predicting how many they will get 'on target'... to express anger through noise and action.

"What are they doing? They are playing games, certainly, but they are also learning—and taking part in a Unesco experiment in international understanding which has been tried out over the past 18 months in 16 schools in Austria, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary, the United Kingdom and the United States."

These are the opening paragraphs of a news release issued as one of a group of "Unesco Features, a fortnightly bulletin for press, radio and television" by United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 7 place de Fontenoy, 75700 Paris.

Unesco's Institute for Education in Hamburg which is running this particular project, explains that "while not neglecting the purely cognitive aspect, it tries to integrate social and affective learning more fully into the school curriculum. In other words, the attempt is to move from the transmission of facts towards getting the children to learn 'how they tick'... Emphasis is on getting children to learn by themselves, not teaching them. Each of the games suggested creates a 'learning experience' from which the pupils draw their own instruction, so the project is right in the mainstream of modern attempts to reform education."

"... One British teacher trying the 'self-exploration game,' which aims at increasing self-understanding, tried Situation No. 4—'Do Something Uncontrolled'—and found his shoes removed and thrown out of the window. (... this illustrates the kind of crisis that teachers on the project must be prepared for.)"

Another Unesco "educational" experiment involves children in schools in Colombia. We are told that:

"There are 3,120 children in Colombia today who have a chance of growing up to be enlightened adults in the full sense of the word—free of prejudices and taboos, able to bring up the number of children they desire and aware of their role in shaping their own lives and those of generations to come as they take an active part in their country's development... Before too long this new form of schooling, which combines sex education and study of population and environmental problems with the usual subjects... may be extended to the Colombian educational system as a whole."

Yvonne Tabbush, who is Unesco Regional Information Officer for Latin America, with office in Santiago de Chile, explains what she witnessed in some of the schools:

"The boys at Bolo primary school showed us neat exercise books in which they had drawn and written what they had learned about genetics throughout the term. The fourth grade girls at Nuestra Senora del Rosario trooped onto the stage one by one to explain, by means of photos and charts, the process of conception, gestation and birth... The children spoke of changing traditional patterns, of their parents' attitudes to what they were learning and sometimes to their resistance to progress: 'They need classes too, but we try to teach them.' ... the curriculum is constantly re-evaluated and adapted to needs and concerns. As time is the great problem, suggestions are made for cutting down on details and descriptions of places and events—the old standbys of geography, history and biology—and emphasizing instead the concept of environment, demography and the ecosystem, giving more time for reflexion and analysis rather than rote of learning and memorizing..."

"And so the experiment proceeds with checks and balances, pre-tests and post-tests in the 24 schools where the project is being carried out, and a parallel selection of 21 control schools where classes have not been changed, the results being compared at each stage to calculate the impact of the new teaching and evaluate changes in attitude. When all the tests have been checked,

codified and analyzed, discussed with educational leaders and the teachers who took part in the experiment and with representatives of the Ministry of Education, the National Population Council, the Council of (Catholic) Bishops and the Parents' Association, the guidelines should be ready for the preparation of a national programme of population education." (End of quotation from Unesco Features).

A few words of explanation are in order:

The United Nations Organization is set up like a World Government (which its creators intended it to become after a few structural changes had been made). The UN has its legislative branch, composed of two bodies: the General Assembly and the Security Council. The General Assembly, or lower house, bears some similarity to our own House of Representatives, in that it is made up of representatives from each of the member States. But there is this important difference to be pointed out: Our House members are elected according to the population of the States they represent, so that the large but sparsely populated Alaska has but one Representative, while the smaller but heavily populated New York State has 39 Representatives. In contrast, in the UN General Assembly, each State, regardless of size or density of population, has but one representative (save for the USSR which has three), thus belying the fiction that the UN is a "democratic" organization.

the UN's "upper house" or Security Council differs from most legislative bodies in that ten of its fifteen member nation representatives are elected every two years, while the Big Five (USA, USSR, UK, France and China) hold their seats permanently, and their representatives (called Ambassadors) also have the power of veto; this fact again belying the fiction of "democracy."

The United Nations Organization also has its Judicial Branch, the world Court, or the International Court of Justice; fifteen judges elected for 9-year terms by the General Assembly and the Security Council.

These two branches, the legislative and the judicial, could be written off as little more than expensive nuisances. Now and then the UN "legislature" will issue a sanction against some State, perhaps Rhodesia or Israel; the sanction will either be vetoed by one of the Big Five, or it will be ignored by the indicted State. Only the United States ever seems to pay much attention to any United Nations decree. The same can be said of the World Court; nobody ever gives much thought to its decisions.

But the "Executive" or "Administrative" branch of the United Nations is an entirely different matter. Not that Secretary General Kurt Waldheim and his staff are of great importance, they do little more than keep the records straight and manage the UN Headquarters in New York City. However -

Somewhat similar to our President's Cabinet and the various bureaus, agencies, authorities and administrations which make up our Executive Branch of federal government; the UN also has its special councils and agencies; bureaucracies wherein resides the real power of the United Nations. These are regulatory agencies which derive their power not from UN Headquarters, but from treaties which are signed by the various National Governments and administered by these UN agencies. For example: the so-called World Bank (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development) and the International Monetary Fund do not derive their power from their relation to the United Nations as such, but from the fact that multilateral treaties are signed by the member Nations, naming these organizations as official custodians and managers of international financial matters involving Nations.

UNESCO is such an international bureaucracy, deriving its powers from the fact that the nations have signed an international agreement giving Unesco diplomatic immunity and powers which actually supersede the powers granted by the United States Constitution.

To put it more simply: If the United Nations ceased to exist as an organization, we'd still have to deal with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the International Labor Organization (ILO), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the World Health Organization (WHO), the World Bank, the International Development Association (IDA), the International Finance Corporation (IFC), the IMF, the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), the Universal Postal Union (UPU), the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO), the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

Many of these international organizations are important, beneficial, and offer no threat to the integrity or security of any nation. Unesco, however, is not one of these. Its activities in the educational field have become little more than attempts to build a

World Community. As Unesco itself says:

"Creating world understanding, of course, has always been the aim of Unesco, whose Constitution lays down that 'since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed.' For the past 20 years, attempts to build these defences have been made in Unesco 'Associated Schools', now numbering more than 900 in 62 countries..."

These "Unesco Associated Schools" are better classified as laboratories, where the many schemes promoted by behavioral scientists, social scientists and educationists are tried out, using the children of various races, religions and nations as guinea pigs for their experimentations. Two such experiments were discussed at the start of this letter. When these Unesco experiments are proved successful in mind control efforts they are then recommended to National and State Boards of Education, and introduced into school systems in the United States and throughout the world.

It should be noted that the management and control method known as the Planning, Programming, Budgeting System, was tried out and adopted in Unesco Associated Schools before it was forced upon American school systems. It should also be borne in mind that this movement which aims at "programming the product (the future citizen) for existence in the newly programmed society," is not an American phenomenon. It is a world-wide movement which aims at mind control for the masses of the world, with only the children of the Elite to be spared. This concept was perhaps best explained by the late humanist and one world advocate, Bertrand Russell. In his book, The Impact of Science on Society, pages 29 and 30, he wrote:

I think the subject which will be of most importance politically is mass psychology... This study is immensely useful to practical men, whether they wish to become rich or to acquire the government... Its importance has been enormously increased by the growth of modern methods of propaganda. Of these, the most influential is what is called "education"... What is essential in mass psychology is the art of persuasion... It may be hoped that in time anybody will be able to persuade anybody of anything if he can catch the patient young and is provided by the State with money and equipment... This subject will make great strides when it is taken up by scientists under a scientific dictatorship... The social psychologists of the future will have a number of

classes of school children on whom they will try different methods of producing an unshakable conviction that snow is black. Various results will be arrived at. First, that the influence of home is obstructive. Second, that not much can be done unless indoctrination begins before the age of ten. Third, that verses set to music and repeatedly intoned (as in hard rock-Ed.) are very effective. Fourth, that the opinion that snow is white must be held to show a morbid taste for eccentricity....

Although this science will be diligently studied, it will be rigidly confined to the governing class. The populace will not be allowed to know how its convictions were generated. When the technique has been perfected, every government that has been in charge of education for a generation will be able to control its subjects without the need of armies or policemen. As yet there is only one country which has succeeded in creating this politician's paradise.

(first published in 1952)

Along the lines suggested by Russell, after the "scientists" and their computers were given control over "what is called 'education'," the term education was itself re-defined. It now has become the objective of education to "measure and diagnose the child in order to prescribe a program that will develop his feelings and emotions, his values and loyalties *toward predetermined objectives*." Traditionally, the purpose of education was to impart knowledge and to develop skills, while at the same time instilling Christian character. But today, the way a pupil feels and reacts is said to be more important than how much he knows, or how much skill he has. As one of our correspondents said: "Conditioning people to behave according to predetermined behavior patterns becomes the objective of educational institutions. Drawing it right down to basics, we are talking about conditioned responses in human terms. Pavlov experimented on dogs!"

The same kind of experimentation is going on right now, with children instead of dogs, in schools throughout the Nation; indeed, in schools throughout the world. Two such experiments have been cited in this letter. We wrote, in our Don Bell Reports of August 3, of other experiments, of one in which the experimentation begins when the child is but two weeks old! It seems that time has proved Bertrand Russell to be wrong in one respect: He thought that indoctrination would have to begin before the "patient" was ten. It seems that "scientific experimentation" has shown that the indoctrination must begin

1990's
← Mastery Learning

FAX: 207-442-0551

JAN AND CHARLOTTE ISERBYT
1062 WASHINGTON ST.
BATH, MAINE 04530

207-442-2899

For More Info.
CONTACT:

1993

before the child is, not ten years old, but only ten weeks old!

Although this mind conditioning was started seriously by Unesco more than twenty years ago, and although we have had our share of educationists such as John Dewey, William Heard Kirkpatrick, Harold O. Rugg, George S. Counts, Theodore Brameld, and others of like persuasion, the real perversion of our entire public school system did not begin until after the Federal Government began taking over control of the schools.

Prior to 1965 there were local, elected, school boards and State heads of education that could make direct decisions regarding educational programs, textbooks and curriculums, because they were funded at the State and local levels.

But it was in 1965 that the means for the actual restructuring of education in the United States was provided by the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which gave the federal government its actual control over school systems. President Johnson once remarked that he considered the passage of this Act the most significant single piece of legislation of his entire administration.

1965 was an ominous year in other respects. That was the year when President Johnson issued the order which introduced the Planning, Programming, Budgeting System (PPBS) throughout the Executive Branch of the Federal Government. 1965 was also the year which unleashed the actual restructuring of governmental processes and formally included education as a legitimate Federal Government function.

Since then we have seen the national administration establish Federal Offices of Human Resources, the Office of Child Development, Head Start Programs, a National Institute of Education, a National Committee of School Finance, a National Office of Child Development, special tuition programs, day care centers, etc., etc. All of these, and other national offices are tools for the total control of all future generations by the State.

PPBS is the systems management tool made possible through computer technology, to affect the planned changes desired by the *Elite* of which Bertrand Russell spoke. As one California Assemblyman, Robert Burke, expressed it: "If you know what you have to start with, and know what you want to end up with, it's possible to design a system that will make the precise changes required."

The management system is perfected, in PPBS. But the "formula for change" is not

yet worked out to the satisfaction of the *Elite's* behavioral scientists, educationists, and change agents (their own designation for the operators who are trained to affect the changes in the attitudes and behavior of the masses; the students of mass psychology spoken of by Bertrand Russell.) That is why there are so many different experiments still being conducted in schools and communities: the perfect formula to make PPBS perfectly effective in education, is still being sought. And your child may be their guinea pig without your ever knowing it before it is too late, if that child is going to a public school.

Schools as laboratories

Some time ago Mrs. Mary Thompson of Santa Clara, California, who has been opposing PPBS and the *new education* for a number of years, was asked what could be done to stop this planned take-over of the Nation's future generations. Her answer still seems valid:

1. Stop thinking of these various education innovations as separate, isolated, individual programs. All of education today is part of the total concept of programming the product, the student...

2. Stop participating in citizens committees and goals committees, and answering questionnaires for data purposes. Your answers are analyzed with a view to identifying the nature and scope of resistance to programs, and how to circumvent such resistance. If you do choose to be on a committee, do so for the purpose of obtaining information and *issuing your own statements publicly* as long as you are allowed to, from within the committee, in order to educate the general public as to the nature of the process.

3. Instruct your children not to supply personal information or answer personal questionnaires in school, or discuss any subjective or introspective matters in school. Teach them how to recognize data collecting techniques.

4. We believe the time has come to establish private schools to keep our children from falling victim to the behaviorists while there is still opportunity to do so. Be aware of the fact that there is a plan (the Voucher system) lurking in the wings to bring the private schools into the national control, alongside the public schools which are already under federal control.

DON BELL REPORTS & CLOSER-UP are privately circulated. Complete service: \$24 per year. 3 months trial: \$6. Please write: DON BELL REPORTS, P.O. Box 2223 Palm Beach, Florida 33480

THE CONTRIVED EVOLUTION OF REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

----- Part Seven -----

SOCIALISM OR EMPIRE?

As early as 1905, Col. Ed. F. Browne was convinced that "the present socialistic tendency to build up the executive power can only end in one of two things, i.e., a socialistic tyranny through legislation, or an imperiator." He considered this in 1905, "the most serious question presented to the American people since the abolishment of slavery" and the question "is not receiving due consideration."

So, Col. Browne wrote an important book, the publication of which "was withheld until after the fall elections of 1906 because it was not desired to have it appear to be an argument intended to influence political action during that campaign." In the campaign of 1906, only Congressional seats were involved. Theodore Roosevelt was President at that time, would remain so until 1908, when he would be succeeded by William Howard Taft, another Republican. Col. Browne was of the opinion that it made little difference whether Republicans or Democrats were in power in Washington, because "at the present time there is no 'conservative' party in the United States. Each one of the parties appear to be vieing with the other, in an attempt to get nearer the beliefs of socialism than its opponent."

There seems to be such a striking political parallel between conditions which existed in 1905 and conditions which exist in 1974, that we believe what Col. Browne wrote in 1905 about conditions in 1905, is far superior to anything we might write in 1974 about conditions which existed in 1905. An "on the spot" report is available, a friend has made available to us pertinent parts of Col. Browne's important book, which he titled *Socialism or Empire*. His explanation of the beginnings of socialism in the United States is noteworthy; therefore, we quote

at length from the preface to Col. Browne's book, which was published in 1906, but still remains timely and instructive

There is an undercurrent of political thought today in the United States, which drifts toward socialism, and this unconscious drift leads up to a grant of power to our Executive Department quite necessary under a socialistic government, but which creates a danger to our institutions. Successive grants of power to an executive have always ended in Empire with Republics of the past, and usually the additional power has been given at the instance of the "common people." While the theory of socialism is a beautiful one, human nature must be changed to make it a success. There are two well defined classes of socialists: the educated theorist who claims to have eliminated greed from his nature, and who prates of the equality of man; and the uneducated socialist who thinks it wrong for any man to have more than himself. The Theorist is a fraud, and should be watched by the police, as mild forms of lunacy soon drift to violence. His only danger is in injury to himself and the advice he gives to others.

It is but a step from the theory that it is only right to work entirely for the public good, to the position that the public should receive the benefit of all personal endeavor.

The theoretical socialist talks of the beauties of socialism from the standpoint of the "giver," while his ignorant followers interpret this to mean that the public should have the power to "take." The unfortunate thing about this agitation is the fact that the latter class is gaining the most headway.

This undercurrent of thought is so sweeping that I have been surprised in conversation

with Senators, Congressmen and Managing Editors of several of our great dailies, when I have suggested that this agitation was a tendency toward socialism, to hear the expression that "possibly it was coming."

If public men and great newspapers fear to attack this argument for fear of loss of popularity, a political question more vital to our future prosperity than any which has been presented since the abolition of slavery may not receive proper consideration.

There is no doubt but that this socialistic tendency is gaining strength and that the disposition on the part of the public to *take* power not consistent with true political economy is growing.

Weak men and designing politicians are accepting part of the theories of socialism either because they know no better, or they desire to take advantage of the political agitation for personal ends....

The demand that the "public" should control, regulate, and investigate everything and everybody who is making money, with a view of seizing any profit over and above a rate of interest that they (the public) think fair, is only the worst form of socialism (Ralph Nader please note—Ed.)

The clamor in some quarters that the public should own utilities, and that the government should regulate and control insurance, railroads, trusts, and other great private business ventures is nothing more or less than socialism, which would undoubtedly end in Despotism or Empire.

It cannot be that the American people wish to change our form of government, and these recommendations mean a change so radical that we would place back in the hands of an executive of our own selection a power we took away from the executive by the war of the Revolution. We are asked to place in the hands of our executive department the power claimed by kings and emperors, and to give to our executive officers the same form of control over business affairs from which we released ourselves by that long and bloody struggle....

The idea of the government "doing things" has grown very rapidly and the evident willingness on the part of our lower branch of congress to turn over to the executive every power requested, is quite in line with the history of Republics which have merged

into Empire.

The lower branch of congress (the peoples representatives) has already built up the power of the executive department to such an extent that the congress itself is fast losing its independence and were it not for the Senate our political institutions would be in danger. But this semi-socialistic agitation proposes to give more and more power to the Executive and all of the reforms now apparently so popular are pointing to a change in the form of government laid down by our Fathers.

In Monarchies or Empires the people have not had the constitutional protection from inquisition, control and regulation which we possess, and this has been our greatest freedom.

My object in writing this book is to show the danger of departing from the written constitution in these matters....

(end of quotation)

Col. Browne, writing the above for publication immediately after the election campaigns of 1906, continually stresses the danger of drifting away from the strict guidelines laid down in the Constitution, or of saddling it with Amendments that would alter the basic nature of the Constitution. He insisted that "if we cut loose from our constitutional moorings which have bound us to individual liberty and personal rights, we cannot fail to drift toward the sands of Socialism or the rock of Empire; there is no open channel between these danger points."

In order to better understand the "mood of the times" in that first decade of this present twentieth century, we should like to quote from the conclusion to Col. Browne's book, wherein he summarizes the political dangers which faced the Nation at that time. In reading the following you may gain the impression that history seems to be repeating itself. We quote:

Thousands of voters who have taken an active part in politics (in the campaigns of 1906—Ed.) failed to see expressions in any of the party platforms which represented their political beliefs. It developed that at the present time there is no "conservative" party in the United States. Each one of the parties appears to be vying with the other,

in an attempt to get nearer the beliefs of socialism than its opponent. The leaders who framed the platform expressions appear to have lost their political bearings.

It is strange to see in a democratic platform a demand that the central national government should control private business ventures owned by citizens. It is far more strange to see in a democratic platform a demand that the national government should control, regulate and possibly purchase our railroads, which have been chartered by the several states and owned by private citizens. It is ridiculous to see a democratic endorsement of a civil service reform which has already created a "class" of office holders four hundred thousand strong. Recommendations such as these would cause Jefferson to disclaim the title of democrat, and a demand that the central government take control of the paper issues of currency instead of leaving that function to banks owned by citizens, should cause the ghost of Jackson to haunt the framer of such a resolution.

The natural concentration of power in the hands of an executive which these demands would bring about would but repeat the mistake of the democracy which made a Caesar possible. Can it be that the democrats have learned nothing in two thousand years and now wish to repeat the error that destroyed the first republic? Representative democrats should know that these things are not democratic principles, and that they are only inserted in their platforms to catch the votes of imperialists or socialists....

From appearances the conservative democrats have been "spewed out" of their party, as Mr. (William Jennings) Bryan expresses it.

The tendency and desire of democratic orators have been to create the impression that their party represents the man without money, and one branch of that party attempts to create popularity by inciting the indigent against the rich. Madison in the constitutional convention frankly stated that with universal suffrage this class of voters would outnumber the other and it is good political economy for some party to guide this class of voters *if it is done through representative selections and in American ways.*

In politics as well as legislation it is well to have an opposition; it creates a balance-wheel in our governmental machinery. Unfortunately at the present time the socialistic trend of thought drifts parallel to democratic beliefs and the democratic party has adopted many socialistic heresies in the hope of attaching that element to it. It would be better for the believers in the theories mentioned if they would join together either as socialists or democrats, and release the conservative element now associated with the democratic party....

Again, for forty years, either the intuitive or expressed knowledge that the democratic party hoped to represent the poor in antagonism to the rich, has had the effect of driving the greater portion of the commercial element into the republican party. The commercial and stockholding classes have assisted the republican party, and it cannot be denied that the party has protected these interests. The party did not protect these interests *as against the poor*, because the protection extended has created the greatest prosperity, and enabled the laborer to receive better pay than in any other country. So that this protection has been the greatest assistance our poor people have received. But in the last campaign the party, through unwise leadership, advocated reforms which ... did not come from the people up to the government, but originated in the government itself, and the untried leaders of the party attempted to engraft these ideas—inspired in Washington—into party platforms. So that we find in republican platforms a demand for the government to regulate and control the greater business ventures of our citizens..

If it is the desire of socialism that the government operate all of the business of the country and that no man should be better paid or better off than his fellow, and that the most ignorant citizen should have as much to say in government as the ablest; it is well to have the expression placed in their platform and every man who holds that belief, vote for it. Let him vote the socialist ticket and be done with it.

If the democrats believe in free trade, in states' rights, and that all the laws should be passed in the interest of the poor, or, as they express it, "the greatest good to the greatest number," it is right to put it in their platform.

But the party leaders who place expressions in a democratic platform favoring (government) ownership of public utilities, control of railroads and regulation of trusts, are practicing a deceit on their followers who do not study political conditions, and are leading them into socialism.

The republican who advocates that the government should regulate, control and investigate privately owned investments with an avowed determination of limiting the profits to a certain percentage to be determined by political parties or "the people," is adopting socialism in an indirect form.

There is no difference between a seizure of profits and a robbery of property. The only object in the ownership of property is to receive the benefits in the form of profit.

Unless one of the parties now in existence ... takes the conservative side in this issue socialism will be an assured fact, or the hardship of a financial panic will be necessary to bring the people back to reason. ... The majority of the people do not believe in these proposed reforms, and the fall elections prove it conclusively.

Are we to drift to socialism, ... or are we building up a power in our Executive Department so strong and comprehensive that some ambitious man when President will cast aside the precedent established by Washington and assume to rule not only eight years, but a lifetime?

If we cut loose from our constitutional moorings which have bound us to individual liberty and personal rights, we cannot fail to drift toward the sands of Socialism, or the rock of Empire; there is no open channel between these danger points.

(end of quotation)

The foregoing should give us a good view of the political mood of the people and their party leaders in the first decade of this century. It should be noted that Col. Browne did not fear the bomb-throwing anarchists, the violence-prone communists, the strike-fomenting syndicalists, or the socialists who formed political parties and declared themselves to be socialists seeking to overthrow our form of government. His fear was concentrated on those socialists who masqueraded as "liberal" Democrats or Republicans and who infiltrated and polluted the parties and inserted socialistic planks in

otherwise conservative platforms. He feared the kind of socialist described by George Bernard Shaw when he spoke of himself and declared:

"...the true Fabian is not, and never can be, a party man or woman. My Party, right or wrong, is not our slogan. All Fabians have their price, which is always the adoption of Fabian measures, no matter what party."

It was the British historian, G. M. Trevelyan, who first identified publicly and wrote openly of this form of collectivism that was to socialize England, and later the United States also. At the turn of the century, Trevelyan wrote:

"The third current of *fin de siecle* Socialism, and the most important, was the Fabian doctrine. ... The Fabian Society was founded in 1883. Its name recalls a Roman General whose motto was 'slow but sure.' Eschewing revolution and intent on the actualities of England at the end of the nineteenth century Fabians exonerated socialists from the heavy obligation of reading Karl Marx.

Without dogmatizing as to the ultimate future of industrial organization, they preached practical possibilities, here and now—municipal socialism and state control of conditions of labor. Equally far from Marx and Morris, they left the New Jerusalem alone, and sought to impregnate the existing forces of society with collectivist ideas. The Fabians became experts in bringing electoral, journalistic, and personal pressure to bear on local bodies, and on the Liberal or Conservative Government of the hour. ... The Fabians were intelligence officers without an army—there was no Fabian party in parliament—but they influenced the strategy and even the direction of the great hosts moving under other banners."

It was this same Fabian doctrine, moving across the Atlantic to America, which captivated the "progressives" and the "liberals" in colleges and universities in the United States, and succeeded eventually in changing this Republic into a Welfare State.

(to be continued)

DON BELL REPORTS & CLOSER-UP are privately circulated. Subscriptions not sold separately. Complete service: \$24 per year. Extra copies: 10¢ each. Address all orders:
DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

THE CONTRIVED EVOLUTION OF REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

- - - - - Part Eight - - - - -

RECRUITING REVOLUTIONARIES

On the 12th of December in 1905 a group of young men held a meeting in a loft above Peck's Restaurant, at 140 Fulton Street in Lower Manhattan, New York. These men were not at all satisfied with conditions in the United States and they met to discuss ways and means of changing things, as things were then being changed in England. They had adopted the ideals of the Fabian Society, and they sought to organize themselves, even as the Fabians in England had been organized under intellectuals such as George Bernard Shaw, Sidney Webb, Graham Wallas and Sydney Olivier, "The Four" of Fabianism who later were to be joined by such intellectual luminaries as Bertrand Russell, H. G. Wells, John Galsworthy, Mrs. (Beatrice) Webb, R. H. Tawney, G. D. H. Cole, Harold Laski, and John Maynard Keynes (whose economic theories they were forced to accept in place of their own.)

In the United States, instead of calling their organization the *Fabian Socialist Society*, they decided upon the name *Intercollegiate Socialist Society* (to be changed in 1921 to the *League for Industrial Democracy*).

The founding fathers of Fabianism in the United States were young men. Upton Sinclair, its godfather, was twenty-seven. Jack London, its first president, was twenty-nine. Morris Hillquist, Harry W. Laidler, Owen R. Lovejoy, Thomas Wentworth Higgins, J. G. Phelps Stokes, Clarence Darrow; all these were young men who attended that first meeting.

But these young men were not members of any of the Communist cults that resorted to violence and sought to change America into a Socialist State overnight. Like their London counterpart, they adopted a program of gradualism, a "slow but sure" approach. First, they would "promote an intelligent interest in Socialism among college men and women." Then, after having indoctrinated

the new school of professors, journalists, administrators and opinion molders, they would move into the political arena with seasoned and well-trained change-agents—as they were to do when FDR accepted their New Deal and their Brain Trust in 1933.

The New York organization copied the London Fabians in yet another important way: Though the Fabian Society sought to promote Socialism in English colleges, especially at Oxford and Cambridge, they felt that they should have their own center of higher education, one that was completely under their own control. So, they established the London School of Economics.

Similarly, in lower Manhattan, the Rand School of Social Science was founded; and here the Intercollegiate Socialist Society established permanent headquarters in 1908.

The next step of the ISS was to organize chapters in colleges and universities. These chapters (there were 61 of them in as many schools of higher learning by 1917) became training bases for future leaders in almost every branch of the overall Conspiracy. For example, Walter Lippmann was president of the Harvard chapter of the ISS in 1909. He went on to become an assistant to Colonel House, helped organize the *Council on Foreign Relations*, was a member of and an American Correspondent for the British based *Round Table* (of which *CFR* is the American affiliate). Lippmann, until his retirement, was on the staff of *The New York Times*, from which position he served as a transmitter of policy decisions and instructions to internationalist agents at home and abroad (a position now filled by James Reston and C. L. Sulzberger, both also staffmen at *The New York Times*).

Heywood Broun was a charter member of the ISS. He organized journalists in support of the CPUSA in the New Deal years. David Saposs, Russian born revolutionary,

was president of the Wisconsin U. chapter of ISS. Became an instructor at the Rand School; wrote *The Development of the American Empire*, which was used as a textbook in Communist Workers' Schools. He is noted for the phrase: "Thus to bore from within and still retain a standing in the movement, militancy must be tempered and circumscribed."

Walter Reuther was president of the ISS chapter at Wayne State University. He is best remembered for his activities after returning from studies in Communist strategy in Russia, to organize the United Auto Workers Union and then head the CIO.

Eugene V. Debs was a member of the ISS chapter at Columbia. Was active in IWW, served a sentence for sedition in Atlanta Penitentiary (Apr. 1919 to Dec. 1921); is reported to have said: "Before serving time here, I made a series of addresses supporting the Russian revolution, which I consider the greatest single achievement in all history. I am still a Bolshevik. I am fighting for the same thing here they are fighting for there. I would go to jail again, yes, I would even go to the gallows for this cause."

Ella Reeves Bloor was a lecturer and organizer for the ISS. She became an anarchist leader.

Frances E. Perkins was an organizer for the ISS. Served as U.S. Secretary of Labor in FDR's New Deal Cabinet.

The foregoing is but a brief sampling of the ISS members who graduated into other branches of the overall Conspiracy. We might also include, among many others, Norman Thomas who headed the political apparatus known as the Socialist Party, John Haynes Holmes who helped socialize organized Christianity in America, W.E.B. DuBois who lent his name so the NAACP could call itself a "colored" organization, John Dewey who is called the father of Progressive Education, Reinhold Niebuhr who popularized the Social Gospel, etc.

These are but a few of the names. It is not our purpose to go into further detail regarding the Fabians, as such. Our study in this series of letters has to do with Regional Government, and we refer to Fabianism only as it concerns the foundation we must lay before discussing current events. For a more complete history of the Fabian movement in the United States, the best work we have seen to date remains, *Fabian Freeway*, *High*

Road to Socialism in the U.S.A., by Rose L. Martin.

There is, however, an interlocking connection between Fabian Socialism and Finance Capitalism that has never, to our knowledge, been fully explored or explained. And this would take us back to England, and to Oxford University in the year 1870:—

Oxford had never had a professorship of fine arts, but in 1870 the university received a special bequest (Slade) which called for the creation of such a professorship, and John Ruskin was named to fill the chair. But Ruskin talked very little about the fine arts. Instead, he talked of the White Man's Burden or, more specifically, of the burden that should be borne by the world's elite, the Oxford undergraduates who were scions of the aristocracy, the ruling class, the privileged who should rule the world for the world's benefit. He told the Oxford students that they were the possessors of a magnificent tradition of education, beauty, rule of law, freedom, decency, and self-discipline; but that this tradition "could not be saved and did not deserve to be saved" unless it could be extended to the non-English masses of the world, by way of a world empire that should be established by and ruled by the English-speaking people of the world.

Ruskin's message had a sensational impact. From it came the British-Israel religious doctrine, the English Speaking Union, the Pilgrims Society, and other organizations calling for the reunion of the United States with the British Empire.

According to Carroll Quigley, author of *Tragedy and Hope*, Ruskin's "inaugural lecture was copied out in longhand by one undergraduate, Cecil Rhodes, who kept it with him for thirty years." With financial support from Lord Rothschild and Alfred Beit, Rhodes was able to monopolize the diamond mines of South Africa as De Beers Consolidated Mines, and to build up a great gold mining enterprise as Consolidated Gold Fields.

"In the middle 1890's," wrote Quigley, "Rhodes had a personal income of at least a million pounds sterling a year, which was spent so freely for his mysterious purposes that he was usually overdrawn on his account. These purposes centered on his desire to federate the English-speaking people and to bring all the habitable portions of the

world under their control. For this purpose Rhodes left part of his great fortune to found the Rhodes Scholarships at Oxford in order to spread the English ruling class tradition throughout the English-speaking world, as Ruskin had wanted."

Ruskin impressed others in much the same manner that he had impressed Cecil Rhodes, not all of whom were to follow the dream of Imperialism. Graham Wallas was such a person, and Graham Wallas was one of the "Founding Fabians." In *This Little Band of Prophets*, the story of the British Fabians by Anne Fremantle, there is this important passage:

"Sir Alfred Zimmern and Walter Lippmann were among Graham Wallas's devoted pupils. And there is scarcely a considerable figure in England among the younger generation of politicians and publicists, who does not owe something to Graham Wallas's slow, fussy manners, his penetrating and inspiring counsels. As an undergraduate, Wallas had been very influenced while at Oxford, at Corpus Christi College, by John Ruskin. 'I heard his lectures,' he wrote, 'and for some time saw him almost every day. His mobile lips were not yet covered by a beard, and he always wore his precise costume, with an intensely blue neck-cloth. His face was that of a man who had seen, and was to see again, hell as well as Paradise'."

So, the record reveals that John Ruskin, who was called, most incongruously, a Christian Socialist, had a profound effect upon Fabian Socialist Founding Father Graham Wallas, just as he made a lasting impression upon British Imperialist Cecil Rhodes. It is, of course, generally explained that Socialism and Capitalism are at opposite ends of the political pole. However, here is Professor John Ruskin inspiring and giving policy direction to both!

Furthermore, there was Walter Lippmann, who began as president of the Harvard chapter of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, sitting at the feet of Fabian Graham Wallas who, in turn, sat at the feet of Christian Socialist John Ruskin.

Lippmann later became an important member of Col. House's *The Inquiry* group, which went with him to Paris where the *Council on Foreign Relations* was created, Lippmann being a charter member.

Ergo, it would appear that functionaries such as Walter Lippmann are members of an

interlocking directorate which connects and controls, and gives policy decisions and instructions, to both the extreme right and the extreme left in world political movements!

Perhaps even more evidential is the very existence of an organization such as the *Council on Foreign Relations*, which has been called the Invisible Government of the United States and which has, among its very carefully chosen members, representatives of all branches of the Conspiracy. In the CFR are Communists, Fabians, Finance Capitalists, International Bankers, and all shades of political and economic ideology which allegedly lie between those two extremes called The Right and The Left. And, furthermore, this *Council on Foreign Relations* is, in turn, the American branch of a world-wide organization originally created to carry out the dreams of Christian Socialist John Ruskin of Oxford, whose two chief disciples were Imperialist Cecil Rhodes and Fabian Socialist Graham Wallas.

And that particular thread in our story must bring us back to Cecil Rhodes, his wills and his bequests and the organizations which were established in his name:-

Rhodes, financed by Lord Rothschild and Alfred Beit, became a multimillionaire but, while amassing his fortune, he kept with him the words of John Ruskin, and on Feb. 5, 1891, with the assistance of his friend and associate, journalist William Stead, he organized a secret society of which he had been dreaming for sixteen years.

"In this secret society," wrote Carroll Quigley, "Rhodes was to be leader; Stead, Brett (Lord Esher), and (Alfred Lord) Milner were to form an executive committee; Arthur (Lord) Balfour, (Sir) Harry Johnston, Lord Rothschild, Albert (Lord) Grey, and others were listed as potential members of a *Circle of Initiates*; while there was to be an outer circle known as the *Association of Helpers* (later organized by Milner as the *Round Table* organization)...the central part of the secret society was established by March 1891. It continued to function as a formal group, although the outer circle was, apparently, not organized until 1909-1913. This group was able to get access to Rhodes's money after his death in 1902 and also to the funds of loyal Rhodes supporters like Alfred Beit and Sir Abe Bailey. With this backing they sought to extend and

execute the ideals that Rhodes had obtained from Ruskin and Stead. Milner was chief Rhodes Trustee and (Sir George) Parkin was Organizing Secretary of the Rhodes Trust after 1902....

"Milner recruited a group of young men.. to assist him.... In 1909-1913 they organized semisecret groups, known as *Round Table Groups*, in the chief British dependencies and in the United States.... They kept in touch with each other by personal correspondence and frequent visits, and through an influential quarterly magazine, *The Round Table*, founded in 1910 and largely supported by Sir Abe Bailey's money (and still being published and distributed to *Round Table* members in eight countries, including the United States-Ed.)"

"In 1919," notes Quigley, "they founded the *Royal Institute of International Affairs* (Chatham House).... Similar Institutes of International Affairs were established in the chief British dominions and in the United States (where it is known as the *Council on Foreign Relations*) in the period 1919-27."

For several years the *Round Table Groups* worked desperately trying to find a way of converting the British Empire into a World Federation. It was even suggested that the United States be cajoled into joining such a federation by making Washington, D.C. the world capitol. But gradually it became clear to the Planners that the English-speaking nations and dependences would not accept the plan for a world federation. So, the plan was dropped for a while, and it was decided that a British Commonwealth of Nations be formed. Lionel Curtis, at this time the chief promoter of the plan, wrote a book (1916) in which he advocated changing the name "British Empire" to "Commonwealth of Nations," giving India and Ireland and other chief dependencies their complete independence on condition that they join this new Commonwealth of Nations; and at the same time the *Round Tablers* would work to bring the United States into this same worldwide orientation, while also "seeking to solidify the intangible links of sentiment by propaganda among financial, educational, and political leaders in each country."

So far as we know, the total American membership in *Round Table Groups* has never been made public. Carroll Quigley names a few, and we can expect his list to be accurate since he has worked with the groups

and had access to some of their secret files. Quigley names the following Americans as past or present members of the *Round Table*:

George Louis Beer, a business associate of J. P. Morgan, a friend of Col. House and a member of the American delegation to the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, a charter member of the CFR.

Walter Lippmann, previously categorized.

Frank Aydelotte, Rhodes scholar.

Whitney Shepardson, member of the original board of directors, CFR.

Thomas W. Lamont, partner and successor to J. P. Morgan, Communist front, financial angel to many Communist and left wing publications, member CFR, etc.

Jerome D. Greene, general manager of the Rockefeller Institute, trustee of Rockefeller Foundation, General Education Board until 1939; then an investment banker, wrote constitution for *Institute of Pacific Relations* which was cited as a Communist front organization by HUAC, supporter of left wing publications, member CFR, etc.

Erwin D. Canham, Christian Science Monitor, American correspondent for the quarterly *Round Table* magazine, member CFR, etc.

The organizational plan laid down by the Big Four-Rhodes, Stead, Rothschild and Milner-has been maintained. There is the secret inner circle, the *Round Table Group*; and there are the semi-secret Institutes of International Affairs, the American organization being called *The Council on Foreign Relations*. There is probably an ultra-secret inner sanctum of rulers within the secret *Round Table Group* which directs the whole world-wide operation, including the Communist Parties of the world, the other Socialist groups such as the Fabians, the Bilderbergers, and all other internationalist organizations. But here, proof is impossible, there can be but speculation and conjecture.

We do know that the vast amounts of money for the widely ramified activities of this organization and its satellites, came originally from the Rhodes Trust, the Rothschild interests, the Beit brothers, Sir Abe Bailey, the Astor family; and since 1925 from the American members of the international banking fraternity and from the tax-exempt foundations. And the world headquarters was moved from London to New York City.

(to be continued)

DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

THE CONTRIVED EVOLUTION OF REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

. Part Nine

1913 AND "THE NEW FREEDOM"

"We originally came from Holland and the name was Huis, which finally fell into House. Father ran away from home... He came to Texas, joined the revolution, fought under General Burleson and helped make Texas a republic. For his services in this war he received a grant of land in Coryell County. He lived to see Texas come into the Union, secede, and return to the Union. He lived in Texas under four flags."

Thus wrote Colonel E.M. House (a Texas Colonel), who had become very prominent as a political boss in Texas, but who was ever seeking broader fields. "During all these years," he wrote, "I had never for a moment overlooked the national situation, and it was there that my real interest lay.

In 1896 I was ready to take part in national affairs. My power in Texas was sufficient to have given me the place I desired in the national councils of the (Democratic) party."

"The great problem," wrote Charles Seymour in *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, "was to find the right leader. In 1910 he came East from Texas and, like Diogenes, sought a man."

"I began now to look about for a proper candidate," wrote Colonel House. And, after rejecting all other hopefuls, including the most logical man, William Jennings Bryan, "I now turned to Woodrow Wilson, then Governor of New Jersey, as being the only man in the East who in every way measured up to the office for which he was a candidate."

Woodrow Wilson and Colonel House first met on Nov. 24, 1911, just a year before the presidential election. Next day, House wrote a letter to his brother-in-law Sidney Mezes, saying in part:

"I had a delightful visit from Woodrow Wilson yesterday afternoon, and he is to dine with me alone next Wednesday... Never before have I found both the man and the opportunity."

D.F. Houston, then chancellor of Washington University in St. Louis, but later to become a member of Wilson's cabinet, also wrote a letter to Sidney Mezes after meeting the latter's brother-in-law:

"My Dear Mezes:... I have just returned from New York, where I saw a great deal of Mr. House... He has a vision. I should like to make him Dictator for a while..."

Col. House understood that if he were to be successful in placing his man Wilson in the White House, it would be necessary for him to gain the approval and the cooperation of William Jennings Bryan, perennial candidate who would want to try again for the Presidency. So, one of House's first tasks was to convince Bryan that he could never win an election but that he could win an appointment as Secretary of State if Wilson should win the election. This accomplished, there were differences of opinion on vital issues which had to be overcome. One of these was the banking issue. Bryan's *Cross of Gold* speech had become a political classic, and he was solidly against any plan offered by the International Bankers, who were trying to create a Central Bank similar to those already installed in England, Germany, and most other large European countries.

Although the Aldrich Plan, which called for the passage of the Federal Reserve Act, was a part of the Republican Party's platform, House (supposedly a Democrat) was an instigator and backer of the Central Bank plan, as was Wilson. As early as 1907, in the financial panic of that year, Wilson had declared that: "All this trouble could be averted if we appointed a committee of six

or seven public-spirited men like J. P. Morgan to handle the affairs of our country." This plea for a financial dictatorship had brought Wilson—then Governor of New Jersey—to the favorable notice of the Big Bankers and they supported Wilson's campaign when he promised to help enact the Federal Reserve Act.

But Bryan was the principal and strongest opponent of the Aldrich Plan; and yet House had to have Bryan's support if Wilson were to win the election. So, House assured Bryan that Wilson and Bryan saw eye-to-eye on this issue, and that he, House, felt differently but that he wouldn't make a big issue of it. The following excerpts from letters from House to Bryan are evidential:

"New York, November 25, 1911
"Dear Mr. Bryan: ... Governor Wilson called yesterday afternoon and was with me for an hour and a half. I am pleased to tell you that when I asked him what he thought of the Supreme Court ruling about which we talked when you were here, he replied in almost the same terms you used to me. As far as I can see, your positions are identical. He is also opposed to the Aldrich plan, but I think you are both wrong there. You will have to convince me the next time I see you. ...

Faithfully yours,

E. M. House."

"New York, December 6, 1911
"Dear Mr. Bryan: ... I took lunch with Col. Harvey yesterday. ... He told me that everybody south of Canal Street was in a frenzy against Governor Wilson and said they were bringing all sorts of pressure upon him to oppose him. ... We are going to try to devise some plan by which we can use this Wall street opposition to Governor Wilson to his advantage. ...

With kind regards and best wishes,

E. M. House."

Biographer Charles Seymour wrote:

"There was in the foregoing letter a cleverness which might escape the too casual reader. ..."

Indeed there was. Bryan was being deceived and so were any number of political leaders: Wall Street and the Banking Interests opposed Wilson publicly and backed him privately. And the Republican party was split in two parts to assure Wilson's election. As Seymour wrote:

"The real struggle of 1912 was for the

nomination. It would have been far otherwise had the Republican Party remained united and presented its normal strength at the polls; in such a case the election of Wilson would have been difficult, if not impossible. But the dissensions which during the spring had already threatened Republican solidarity culminated in Republican disaster at the Chicago Convention, where Taft was nominated; for the adherents of Roosevelt bolted, organized the Progressive Party, and in August nominated their hero. ... Generalizations are usually misleading, but in this case the historian may venture the assertion that Roosevelt put Wilson in the White House. Colonel House was among those who believed that the result of the split in the Republican Party would be certain Democratic victory. Hence he did not cut short the travels that he had planned for the summer of 1912, which included Sweden, Finland, Russia as far east as Moscow, Germany, France, and England. ..."

The election won, the new President inaugurated and House returned from his mysterious grand tour of Europe, a politician gained an audience with Wilson and asked him if House had represented the President accurately on a particular issue. President Wilson replied, according to biographer Seymour:

"Mr. House is my second personality. He is my independent self. His thoughts and mine are one. If I were in his place I would do just as he suggested. ... If any one thinks he is reflecting my opinion by whatever action he takes, they are welcome to the conclusion."

"Thus began House's career as Silent Partner," wrote Seymour. "It was a relationship which rested chiefly upon the political cooperation of the Colonel in meeting the problems of government. His labors were of the most varied kind, and he sought every opportunity to ease the load that bore upon the President, to bring him information, to work out details of policy."

And thus did 1913 become the year of "The New Freedom," which happened to be the title of a book by Woodrow Wilson, published that year, containing major portions of his campaign speeches, and labeled by the author "An attempt to express the new spirit of our politics."

In the year 1913 the following important events occurred:

- * A Rockefeller Foundation was chartered.
- * The Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution, permitting the Federal Income Tax, was proclaimed in force on Feb. 25 by Secretary of State Frank Knox.
- * The Seventeenth Amendment to the Constitution, requiring the popular election of United States Senators, was proclaimed in effect on May 31, by Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan.
- * The Glass-Owen Federal Reserve Bill (a re-write of the Aldrich Plan) was signed into law on December 23, by President Wilson.

And all of these things having been accomplished, Colonel Edward M. House set sail for Europe, this time on his "Great Adventure." His announced mission was to promote a reduction of land and sea armaments. He spoke of using the armies of Germany, England, Japan and the United States "to develop the waste areas of the world." Instead, war came to Europe while House allegedly was promoting his "Great Adventure."

This seems the proper time and place to recall how D. F. Houston (later he would become President Wilson's Secretary of Agriculture) had referred to Col. House as a "man of vision" and how he, Houston, would like to see House made a "Dictator for a while." In all probability, Houston was referring to a book that House was writing, entitled *Philip Dru: Administrator*, wherein this "vision" of dictatorship was thoroughly expounded.

To avoid the charge of bias or prejudicial reporting, we quote what Charles Seymour wrote about *Philip Dru: Administrator*:

"The extent of Colonel House's influence upon the legislative plans of the Administration may be gathered from a remarkable document which deserves some attention. In the autumn of 1912, immediately after the presidential election, there was published a novel, or political romance, entitled 'Philip Dru: Administrator.' It was the story of a young West Point graduate, incapacitated for military service by his health, who was caught by the spirit of revolt against the tyranny of privileged interests. A stupid and reactionary Government at Washington provokes armed rebellion, which Dru joins whole-heartedly and which he ultimately leads to complete success. He himself becomes dictator and proceeds by ordinance

(by Executive Order—Ed.) to remake the mechanism of government, to reform the basic laws that determine the relation of the classes, to remodel the defensive forces of the republic, and to bring about an international grouping or league of powers, (League of Nations—Ed.) founded upon Anglo-Saxon solidarity (Cecil Rhode's dream of world empire—Ed.). His reforms accomplished, he gives effect once more to representative institutions as formulated in a new American Constitution better fitted than the old for the spirit and conditions of the twentieth century....

"Five years after its publication an enterprising bookseller, noting the growing influence of House in the Wilson Administration, wrote with regard to the book, 'As time goes on the interest in it becomes more intense, due to the fact that so many of the ideas expressed by "Philip Dru: Administrator" have become laws of this Republic, and so many of his ideas have been discussed as becoming laws.... Is Colonel E. M. House of Texas the author? If not, who is?'

"Colonel House was, in truth, the author." He became ill in the winter of 1911 and, in House's own words: "When I began to convalesce at home, and before I was able to get about, I wrote 'Philip Dru; Administrator.'"

Here is more about the book from the pen of Charles Seymour, biographer:

"Through it runs the note of social democracy reminiscent of Louis Blanc and the revolutionaries of 1848.... Through the book also runs the idea that in the United States, government is unresponsive to popular desires—a 'negative' government, House calls it.... 'The theory of checks and balances' has developed so as to re-enforce this negative character of government.' The specific measures enacted by Philip Dru as Administrator of the nation, indicated the reforms desired by House:

"The Administrator appointed 'a board composed of economists and others well versed in matters relating to the tariff and internal revenue.... to work out a graduated income tax.... Dru prepared an old-age pension law and also a laborer's insurance law covering loss in cases of illness, incapacity, and death...."

There is one important fact concerning the

book which was not mentioned in Seymour's review: there was outlined in the book a condensed plan which House called "Metropolitan Area Government." The purpose of the plan, said Philip Dru, was "the transference of duties and authority from *elected* representatives of the people to *appointees*."

Another interesting set of facts concerning Edward Mandell House: He was in Europe on a personal mission when World War I erupted. Nevertheless, he travelled freely between the adversary nations, being accorded diplomatic immunity wherever he went. He returned to Washington in the summer of 1914, then sailed again for Europe on Jan. 30, 1915, on the *Lusitania* and in the interests of peace. Returning to the United States, he sailed yet again for Europe on Dec. 28, 1915 for conferences with British, German and French officials. Exactly what House said and did at these meetings is not on record, so far as we know. But we do know that House was on extremely close terms with the leaders of the *Round Table Groups*, and that there were Fabian Socialists on his immediate staff, called *The Inquiry*, which went to Paris with him and with President Wilson, when the Paris peace talks began. And there is also this hint concerning a connection with an esoteric group which claimed to be direct agents of the hierarchy which had charge of the world:

There is a "Group of World Servers" that headquarters in London, its activities being financed by the *Lucis Trust* (original name was *Lucifer*, but was changed to *Lucis* due to unfavorable publicity). A spokesman for this esoteric group is one Foster Bailey, son of Alice Bailey, who headed the "Arcane School" of Theosophy which was said to be guided by a "Tibetan Teacher." The Theosophists were, in their very beginnings under founder Madame Blavatsky, closely associated with the British Fabian Society, and remain so today.

This Theosophist, Fabian, World Server by name of Foster Bailey, wrote a book titled, "Changing Esoteric Values," which was first published in Great Britain in 1955 by Lucis (nee Luciferian) Press, Ltd., 38 Broadway Downs, Tunbridge Wells, Kent. On page 59 of this book we find this rather startling statement:

"Some of you will perhaps remember information given us about the way the old League of Nations came into existence. One

of the Masters at a conference in the Hierarchy made a suggestion toward the improving of the relationships between nations in line with the new-age needed cooperation. It was considered useful. The different Masters thought about it and therefore the disciples in the Ashrams who were close to them and had achieved some telepathic relationships, also thought about it. Eventually one disciple picked it up and said, 'I will do something about it.' He then formulated a plan of physical plane action, and this was considered. The whole field was studied as to what would be practical and could be achieved, and the disciple was given the green light, so to speak, and went to work. In the case of the League of Nations that disciple happened to be *Colonel House*. He worked with all those he could influence, and the Sixth Ray Disciple *Woodrow Wilson* took the esoteric lead, and the League of Nations was born. Thus an hierarchical effort was anchored on the physical plane by a disciple and responded to by those who could catch the vision and serve their fellowmen. This example illustrates an Hierarchical technique."

If the above is to be credited, then House was the disciple of a Terrestrial Authority which supersedes all national loyalties, and proclaims the existence of an Internationalist Theory which can have no traffic with the Compact Theory upon which this Government was founded, and which takes full advantage of the Continental Theory by making strong central governments but regional departments of an all-powerful World Authority.

But we are getting ahead of our story. We must return to that fateful year of 1913, and understand the impact of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Amendments to the Constitution and the chaos that was caused by the establishing of a Central Bank and by the Federal Chartering of certain tax-free Foundations. These shall be the subjects of the next letters in this series.

(to be continued)

DON BELL REPORTS & CLOSER-UP are privately circulated letters accenting the Christian American point of view. Subscriptions are not sold separately. Complete service: \$24 per year. Extra copies: 10¢ each. Please address all correspondence to:

DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

THE CONTRIVED EVOLUTION OF REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

. Part Ten

THE REPUBLIC IS DEAD, LONG LIVE DEMOCRACY!

On May 31, 1913, Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan announced that a sufficient number of States had ratified it, and that therefore the Seventeenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States was in effect. The vital alteration in the American electoral process is contained in the first paragraph of the amendment:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, *elected by the people thereof*, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. . . ."

Never before had *the people* elected United States Senators. Each State determined the manner in which its two Senators should be chosen. And it was the State Legislature, or the State Governor with the advice and consent of the State Legislature, that did the choosing. This was because the Senate was considered to be the House of the States, whereas the House of Representatives was the House of the people.

When the Seventeenth Amendment was enacted, the States lost their control over the Central Government, there were two Houses of the People wherein both Senators and Representatives began to be elected by direct, popular vote. Thus, the Compact Theory upon which the Founding Fathers based our form of government, was destroyed and the Continental—or strong central government—Theory was enthroned. Or, to put it even more dramatically, our government ceased to be a true Republic, and became a Representative Democracy!

Few historians have touched upon the real significance of this change in the American system of government. Back in 1921—over fifty years ago—a patriot named Harry Atwood was saying this same thing. In a precious little volume which he titled

"*Safeguarding American Ideals*" he wrote:

"Has there ever been a United States history written that makes it clear to the average student . . . that during the period of history from the time we wrote the Constitution until we occupied the leading place among the nations of the world, there was little discussion of direct government, but much of representative government; little discussion of socialism or paternalism, but much discussion of individual property rights; little talk of class consciousness and labor unionism, but much of individual freedom in industry and proportionate reward for individual initiative and achievement; little talk of the red flag, but much devotion to the Stars and Stripes; little talk of a democracy, but much talk of the Republic?"

"There are comparatively few people who will insist that there has ever been written a textbook on civics or civil government that makes clear to the average student the form of government that was established here under the Constitution.

"There is much talk of democracy in our schools, and yet there is not a democratic thing in the Constitution of the United States, nor the faintest hint of a suggestion that anything under the Constitution would ever be done in a democratic way, even in the creation of the Constitution itself, or its adoption, or its amendment, or its plan of administration, and we still require our public officials to take an oath to uphold, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, and that is the only thing they are sworn to do.

"The Constitution provided for a representative government, and the founders called it a Republic. It guarantees to each of the States a republican form of government. Those who are talking democracy in our schools should turn to the *Federalist*, the greatest governmental discussion in the

libraries of the world, and ask themselves what Madison means in *Federalist* number X by the following language:

“Hence it is that such democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention, have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property, and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths.... A Republic, by which I mean a government in which the scheme of representation takes place, opens a different prospect and promises the cure for which we are seeking....”

“Was Madison merely playing with words when he wrote the above language into the *Federalist* at a time when the destiny of his country hung in the balance, or was he clearing up a tremendously important distinction on which the world quite generally has been disastrously confused during recent years.” (End of quotation)

This era of progressivism, which culminated in America's entry into World War II, was a planned attack on the American System, and for the first time on a nation-wide scale, the Hegelian formula began to be used. That is, where a change was desired, an attack on the old system was made, the people were told that a national emergency existed and a new plan was offered; and because the old system was made to fail, the new system was installed by popular demand.

In his classic *The Economic Pinch*, by the Hon. Charles A. Lindbergh, Sr., father of the man who gained fame by flying across the Atlantic Ocean, the author refers to one of the ways in which this Hegelian “formula for planned change” was used. His reference is to the maneuvering that brought about the adoption of the Federal Reserve Act, but the movement to remake the U.S. Senate was similar and complementary. He wrote:

“In the early months of 1907 and for some time prior a great number of trusts had, by combination and other means, been formed into larger trusts. We then had what is termed ‘a business boom.’ The big profiteers saw the strain on our financial system and knew that if they were going to keep expanding to larger dealings and bigger profits they must have not only a finance system of their own, but through it the control of all or at least most of the banks. We too were dis-

satisfied with the old system. We complained, but we as a people are always slow to act, if we ever do decide to act on matters of that kind.

“The profiteers saw this opportunity and staged the 1907 (banker's) panic. That was their way of stirring us up. The city banks refused to pay on demands of the depositors—they also refused to pay in cash for checks. Many of the country banks did the same thing.... Secretly, the profiteers in New York and elsewhere organized headquarters in Chicago for a Citizen's League: propaganda to demand a new bank system. Speakers were sent to the cities and to most of the country towns, following the 1907 panic and up to 1913. They formed Citizen's Leagues everywhere. The people were induced to demand of Congress that ‘some bill’ be passed to create a new banking system.... Wall Street had its bill all ready—drafted in 1906....”

The same kind of a propaganda campaign was organized when it came time to destroy the United States Senate and make of it just another “House of the People,” something totally unnecessary since the House of Representatives was a sufficient “House of the People.”

Stories were circulated to the effect that the Senate was simply the instrument of the profiteers and the Big Business People. There was much truth in the claim that many Senators were the paid servants of Big Business and represented the money barons and special interest groups. But this was also true of many Members of the House of Representatives, even as it is true today. However, nobody launched a campaign to clean up the Senate; instead, propagandists demanded that the method of electing Senators be changed (as if that would really help.) The slogan became “property versus people” and the nucleus of the “one man, one vote” theory was launched. Theodore Roosevelt helped when he launched his New Nationalism (progressive) program in a speech he made in Ossawaromie, Kansas on August 31, 1910, declaring: “I stand for the square deal... property shall be the servant and not the master of the commonwealth.”

A fair sample of the propaganda engaged in in order to reconstruct the Senate, is provided by the book *The Big Change, 1900 to 1950*, by Frederick Lewis Allen (Harpers, 1952). He writes of that era:

"Railroad companies issued free passes to lawmakers, officials, journalists, and their families. At one state capital after another, corporation lobbyists with well-filled pockets were ready to go into action whenever there was a threat of adverse legislation or a hope of favorable legislation. And as for the United States Senate—whose members were at that time elected, not by the people, but by amenable state legislatures—it had become the chief citadel for the defense of privilege. Most of the Senators were either rich men or carefully selected allies and messenger boys of the rich; they could deliver orotund speeches about the "full dinner pail" for the workman but their hearts were with the big stockholders. . . ."

Let us concede that there is much truth in the above paragraph, but let us also admit that most Senators are still rich men or the "carefully selected allies and messenger boys of the rich." But this condition has nothing to do with the direct election of Senators. Eternal vigilance, and binding men down by the chains of the Constitution is the way to keep Senators in line. And the Constitution—in order to provide a Republic and prevent a Democracy—had declared that "The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislature thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. . . ."

One patriot who recognized what the forces of "progressivism" were trying to do to the Constitution and to the Nation, was Col. Ed. F. Browne, author of the book *Socialism or Empire*, from which we quoted in a previous letter in this series. One chapter of this remarkable book was captioned *The Treason (?) Of The Senate*. We should like to quote pertinent parts of that chapter:

THE TREASON (?) OF THE SENATE

The socialistic writers of the times appear to derive great satisfaction in attacks upon the Senate of the United States. One young man made quite a reputation by attacking every prominent conservative member of the Senate, who had conscientiously tried to fulfill his duties as a Senator, and a sensational magazine gave his attacks great prominence. The writer gave evidence that he did not know why the Senate was brought into existence or what it was created for. He assumed that because its action was

conservative, that it was not doing its duty, and made an appeal to the people that it should be changed so as to represent the interests of the "common people," as he expresses it.

What are the facts?

When our government was organized in its present form, a great discussion arose over what should vote, i.e., property and the tax-paying interests, or the common people. There was such a disagreement in regard to the class of property and amount which should represent a vote, that in the end the present system of universal suffrage was adopted.

After agreeing upon universal suffrage the framers of the constitution tried to and did provide a check upon the action of the "common people," to save them from an unwise or hasty use of the power given them. Mr. Madison explained the reason for the formation of the Senate, or second branch of the legislature as it was called, when he said that "the objects are two fold; first: to protect the people against their rulers, and second: to protect the people against transient impressions into which they themselves might be led."

In his speech in the constitutional convention he said: "An increase of population will of necessity increase the proportion of those who labor under all the hardships of life and secretly sigh for a more equal distribution of its blessings. These may in time outnumber those who are placed above the feelings of indigence; according to the laws of equal suffrage the power will slide into the hands of the former."

He suggested that among other means to check the encroachments of the most numerous, "the establishment of a body in the government sufficiently reputable for its wisdom and virtue to aid on such emergencies the preponderance of justice, by throwing into that scale." . . .

Another reason for the Senate's existence was the fact that it was feared that an impulsive House of Representatives would encroach upon the rights of the States. Col. (George) Mason in his remarks on this feature said, "The State Legislatures ought also to have some means of defending themselves against encroachments of the National Government, and what better means can be provided than giving them some share in

or rather making them a constituent part of the national establishment?"

The danger of one class obtaining complete control of legislation was fully understood. Mr. (James) Wilson said, "A single legislature is very dangerous; despotism may present itself in various shapes. May there not be legislative despotism if in the exercise of their power they are unchecked or unrestrained by another branch?"

From these extracts taken from remarks made when the Senate was brought into existence, it will be observed that the present socialistic agitation was clearly foreseen, and that the Senate was provided as a definite check on any legislative tyranny attempted by the House of Representatives. . . .

The quotations show that these statesmen fully expected that in time the House of Representatives would be controlled by the laboring and agrarian elements (or by the welfare recipients in our day—Ed.), owing to a preponderance in number.

Mr. Madison, and, in fact nearly every member of the convention expressed frankly their fear that unwise action on the part of the people was the greatest danger to the Republic, and that as we were the first to give universal suffrage, a safeguard should be prepared which would check socialistic or communistic aggression. History was an open book to them as it is to us today. They knew that the destruction of the first great republic was the direct result of the seizure of the power to originate legislation on the part of the burgess of Rome, swayed by the oratory of the "tribunes" and controlled by a mob. The joint degradation of the Roman Senate by executive usurpation and these democratic influences, removed the check between executive ambition and unwise legislation, and disaster followed. . . .

Most of the framers of the Constitution lived to see the day when the socialistic mob in France drenched her fair plains with the blood of 1,022,350 innocent victims (over 46,000 of whom were frail women and innocent children) and if those statesmen had thought they had failed to protect our country from such a disaster, they would have amended the Constitution and corrected the error.

The present agitation in favor of the election of the Senate by "the people" is but

an attempt to remove the check placed by the organizers of our government to prevent hasty, unwise or oppressive legislative action. . . .

Mr. (William Jennings) Bryan, one of the foremost agitators for the removal of this check to legislation, said in an open letter to the voters of Colorado, Oct. 21, 1906, "The laboring man ought to remember, too, that no remedial action is possible until we secure the election of Senators by direct vote of the people. If the Senate can be made elective *then the gateway will be open to all reforms.*"

His reforms mean a change in our constitutional payment of tax (income tax—Ed.), an ownership and control of utilities, a seizure of the property of the rich for the benefit of the state and a limitation of profit on capital to suit the views of "the people." He is a student and evidently recites the orations of Caesar and repeats the street-corner talks of Claudius; there is no new thing in his arguments. Human nature is unchanged; it is the same as it was two thousand years ago. Grant undue power to one faction of the community; it but whets its appetite for more. . . .

If this socialistic agitation succeeds in removing this safeguard provided in our Constitution, how long would the courts be able to withstand the legislative tyrannies attempted?" . . .

If Senators are to be elected by the same class as the House of Representatives and represent the same interests, then why not abolish the Senate and increase the membership of the House and thus remove all check to legislation? . . .

The only weak point in our political system is the failure to have our State Senates appointed or selected in some other way than direct election by the people. This is the reason we have "freak" laws in various States. . . .

It is the hope of Socialism to destroy representative government, but this is the political road that leads to anarchy.

(to be continued)

DON BELL REPORTS & CLOSER-UP are privately circulated. Subscriptions not sold separately. Complete service: \$24 per year. Extra copies: 10¢ each. Address all orders: DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223 Palm Beach, Florida 33480

THE CONTRIVED EVOLUTION OF REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

..... Part Eleven

KARL MARX'S SECOND PLANK

The Sixteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution contains but 30 words. They are: "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration."

This amendment was most popular at the time of its adoption. It was approved by the Senate 77 to 0, and by the House of Representatives 318 to 14. It was ratified by more than the necessary 36 States and therefore certified by the Secretary of State as a part of the Constitution on Feb. 25, 1913. Of the 48 States in the Union at the time, only six failed to ratify it. They were: Connecticut, Florida, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah and Virginia. At the time, thanks to the propaganda accompanying the campaign to have the Marxian amendment adopted, it seemed a small and harmless way for the Federal Government to meet its ever-mounting expenses. People were told that, due to the graduated scale of taxation, the people with small and medium incomes would never feel the pinch; only those making very great incomes would ever be affected by the new income tax, and they by never more than three or four percent of their net incomes. Besides, this was a sure way of preventing the public debt from getting out of hand, and it was a sure way of balancing the budget and guarding against inflation. So, few leaders objected to the ratification of the sixteenth amendment, and the great majority demanded its ratification.

There were a few voices raised in opposition. One of those was the voice of Richard E. Byrd, Sr., who prevented its ratification by Virginia, and who told the Virginia House of Delegates that the Sixteenth Amendment:

"... will of necessity have inquisitorial features; it will provide penalties. It will

create a complicated machinery... business will be hauled into distant courts. Many fines... will constantly menace the taxpayer. An army of Federal Inspectors, spies, and detectives will descend upon the State. They will compel men of business to show their books and disclose their secrets... They will require statements and affidavits... The inspector can blackmail the taxpayer..."

Time has proved the first Senator Richard Byrd to have been a true political prophet in this respect. For, as Martin A. Larson has written in the book *Tax Rebellion, U.S.A.*: "The Internal Revenue Service, like the Inquisition,

- (1) Uses every conceivable method to force its victims to give testimony against themselves;
- (2) Requires its victims to prove their innocence on pain of punishment;
- (3) Employs lies, deceit, and misrepresentation on a colossal scale;
- (4) Demands full disclosure from its victims, but gives no information whatever;
- (5) Requires its victims to confer full power-of-attorney upon anyone representing them;
- (6) Uses testimony of concealed and unknown informers, who may not be questioned or cross-examined;
- (7) Has full power to seize property without due process of law or appeal to the courts;
- (8) Seizes property when there is no evidence or proof of fraud or even of obligation;
- (9) Arrogates to itself the legislative, judicial, and executive power, which is the perfect definition of tyranny and despotism;
- (10) Is primarily interested in confiscating property;
- (11) Seizes property or money due its victims but held by others;

- (12) Pays bribes to spies, informers, and betrayers;
- (13) Is immune to prosecution;
- (14) Invents devious snares to entrap its victims;
- (15) Has filled its laws with esoteric provisions, which almost no one can understand."

There are only thirty words in the Sixteenth Amendment, but they have given power to a thing called the Internal Revenue Code. And, frighteningly similar to the beasts described in *The Revelation* given to St. John while imprisoned on the Isle of Patmos, there has been raised an image of the beast which is called the Social Security System, by which each citizen is given a number destined to become an identification number in a Central Data Bank File; and it has become difficult indeed to buy or sell, or even to work and receive wages, in the market places of the Nation.

However, nothing was said of such future developments at the time of the ratification of the Income Tax Amendment, and the whole Nation was deceived. History had given its warnings: During the War Between the States the Lincoln Administration had levied an income tax to help support the costly civil war. But it had been a temporary measure and a matter of expediency; it was found to be an odious experiment and was allowed to expire as soon as the war ended. Then, in 1893, an artificial money panic was created, bringing about widespread unemployment and the foreclosure of thousands of farm mortgages. As a synthesis, there was elected a Democratic-Populist Congress and this Congress immediately passed an Income Tax Act. But this was an Act of Congress and, when brought before the Supreme Court the Act was immediately declared unconstitutional, was assailed as part of a "socialist-communist conspiracy" and copied directly from the second plank of the Communist Manifesto.

This established the pattern that would be followed by the Planners: A Federal tax on incomes was considered essential; but such a tax had been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Therefore, it would be necessary to amend the Constitution itself, so that such a tax would no longer seem to be unconstitutional. And, just as planned, less than ten years after a Congressional Income Tax Act had been declared unconsti-

tutional, an Amendment had been ratified, providing for a graduated and unlimited income tax levy.

It is interesting to note the use of the Hegelian formula in this instance. In his excellent *The Decline of the American Republic*, the late John T. Flynn notes, without comment, the "switcheroo" that was utilized to secure ratification:

"As it (the agitation for passage) became stronger, the 16th Amendment was offered, strangely enough, in what they thought was a completely objectionable form by the enemies of the income tax, and opposed by its friends. Senator Nelson W. Aldrich offered the amendment believing it would be defeated and thus end the agitation. Seno D. Payne, who offered the bill in the House, denounced it from the floor, and Cordell Hull, the leading advocate of income taxes, denounced the measure as a fraud. Thereafter, to the amazement of everyone, the amendment was approved by the States with unparalleled speed. It became part of the Constitution just as President Wilson was being inaugurated as President of the United States. Thus the enemies of the law proposed a constitutional amendment in its most objectionable form permitting the federal government to impose income taxes *without limit*, expecting it would be defeated. They actually offered a plan for *unlimited income taxes* in order to defeat a proposal for a four percent income tax."

If the above seems confused or unclear, here is how they worked it: The proponents of an *unlimited and graduated income tax* objected publicly to such a measure, and offered, publicly, a more moderate proposal that would limit income taxes to four percent. And because the big moneyed interests seemed to be against it, the democratic majority was for it! It was broadcast publicly that a *graduated, unlimited income tax* would penalize the wealthy and absolve the "common man."

And this would have been true, except for a gimmick that the people knew nothing about: the system of tax exempt foundations that was to be written into the Internal Revenue Code. This would allow these wealthy men to escape the increasingly confiscatory taxes.

It is significant that almost immediately after the ratification of the 16th, Income Tax Amendment, the Rockefeller Foundation was

chartered. This does not mean that this was the first great foundation. From the time the Income Tax Amendment was first proposed, foundations had been established. In 1901 John D. Rockefeller, Sr., had set up the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research. This was followed by the Carnegie Institute of Washington in 1902, Rockefeller's General Education Board that same year, also the Rhodes Scholarships began in 1902. Carnegie funded his Foundation for the Establishment of Teaching in 1905. The Russell Sage Foundation was established in 1907. The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace was established in 1910. And there were many others. But, after 1913, these and similar foundations were no longer a financial burden on their donors. Instead, money that otherwise would have gone to the U.S. Treasury now could go into a foundation where the donor could still have control over the money and how it was to be spent. As one commentator remarked:

"Since the founding of the Illuminati, each generation of *Insiders* has visibly followed, so far as they were able, Weishaupt's stated and aggressive policy of pulling within their conspiratorial circle the sons of the very powerful and the very rich. In the United States this policy, combined with the income tax squeeze on one side and the foundation loophole on the other, has gradually brought fantastic wealth into the service of the conspiracy, while putting even greater handicaps and stronger brakes on the acquisition or the uses of money by those who might oppose their (the conspirators') plans."

Lest there be any misunderstanding, the preceding should not be construed as a general indictment of all foundations and tax-exempt organizations. Our reference is to a few among thousands, those that use this tax loophole for nefarious and conspiratorial purposes.

The concept is above reproach: tax-free enterprises are permitted because private philanthropy plays an important role in our society. Philanthropists can provide private financial aid in areas which should not be entered by government. Section 501 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code provides that a corporation or foundation qualifies for exemption from income tax if it is organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, educational, scientific, testing for public safety, or literary purposes, or for the

prevention of cruelty to children or animals, etc. . . .

Then there are tax-exempt foundations and tax-exempt organizations, and the difference can be important. Tax-exempt *foundations* are usually endowed by one or more original donors who reap certain personal tax benefits by contributing their funds to establish the foundation. The Ford Foundation is an excellent example.

The tax-exempt *organization*, on the other hand, is seldom endowed by original donors with large sums of money. Instead, such organizations usually receive their incomes from grants and donations, sometimes from tax exempt foundations. the *Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions* being an example. It receives most of its money from the *Fund for the Republic* which, in turn, is supported by the *Ford Foundation*. The *Council on Foreign Relations* is another pertinent example; it receives most of its funds from the large corporations in which the Rockefeller brothers have financial interests or important influence.

However, the vast majority of the tax-exempt *organizations* exist by receiving general donations from the public at large, and by collecting dues from the members of the organization itself. All these sources of income are tax-exempt and deductible for the donors and the members.

It is not our purpose to discuss the pros and cons of income tax-exemption in this letter, or to show how the privilege has been misused, *other than to point out that it became an escape hatch for those with wealth who wanted to impose an income tax on all citizens, but who wanted to escape payment of such taxes themselves!*

As for the government itself, after the passage of the 16th Amendment, the federal government had the power to impose an income tax in any amount that might be determined by Congress. However, after the manner already made popular by the Fabian Socialists, the power to tax to an unlimited degree, even unto confiscation of property, was imposed slowly and gradually. The first income tax to be levied under the new 16th Amendment amounted to just one percent on incomes of \$4,000 and over, with a surtax of one to six percent on incomes starting at \$20,000 per year.

The promoters—really the wealthy few—had

promised that "no portion of any income necessary to maintain a decent contemporary standard of living will ever be taxed," and they further promised that "the income tax rates will never exceed a graduated range of from one percent to six percent, except perhaps temporarily in case of a war."

"So," commented Martin Larson, "naive liberals viewed the Amendment as a signal victory, since it purported to be a progressive exaction upon the rich; but the latter grinned and danced with glee as their experts began devising the exemptions, exclusions, allowances, and deductions destined to make their wealth sacred and immune." And, as we have pointed out, the chartering of foundations to gain tax-exempt status, was the first and greatest of the gimmicks used by the Rockefellers, Sages, Carnegie and Rhodes trustees, Guggenheims, Fords, etc.

And so, by the time Woodrow Wilson had begun to feel at home in the White House, three great victories had been won: The direct election of Senators had been accomplished, the graduated personal income tax had been imposed, and tax-exempt foundations came into existence. The fourth great victory—the Federal Reserve Act—would be more difficult. But this was the most important of them all, for, as the First Rothschild had declared:

"Permit me to issue and control the money of a nation, and I care not who makes its laws."

Actually, the Federal Reserve System would grant much greater power than Rothschild had considered necessary. For, in addition to the control of money, the Federal Reserve System also was given the control of the Nation's credit, and with the cooperation of the Federal Government there was granted the ability to spend money that did not even exist, and this with increasing profligacy, and the means to steal continuously from the people by means of the debasement of the currency on the part of the Federal Government, thus causing inflation.

Books have been written on the subject, so we shall try to be brief: The financiers of Europe and the United States wanted to create a central bank of issue similar to the Bank of England or the Reichsbank of Germany, a federally established but privately controlled institution whose notes

would be legal tender.

First, Congress created a National Monetary Commission to study the situation. Under the leadership of Senator Aldrich (a Rockefeller in-law), 16 senators and representatives toured Europe for two years to learn all about central banking. Soon after their return to the United States, a secret meeting was held on Jekyll Island, Georgia, where the senators and representatives spent 10 days with representatives of the Morgan, Rockefeller and other big banking interests.

Also present was Paul Moritz Warburg, a German financier who had come to the United States to join the banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., and to promote the plan for a central banking system. Since Kuhn, Loeb & Co. financed Leon Trotsky's invasion of Russia, and since the German High Command permitted the passage of Lenin and his entourage through Germany and into Russia for the Bolshevik conquest of Russia; it is of more than passing interest to know that Paul Warburg of Kuhn, Loeb had an elder brother who was head of the German secret police during World War I.

The Federal Reserve System was born on Jekyll Island, and when President Wilson signed the Federal Reserve Act into law, he named Paul Moritz Warburg a member of the first Federal Reserve Board. This was in 1914, just two years after the Kaiser had decorated Paul for outstanding services to the Reich.

Most important in connection with our present series of letters, however, is the fact that *Regionalism first began officially with the passage of the Federal Reserve Act.* The United States was divided into twelve regions, or Federal Reserve Districts, for the purpose of controlling the Nation's money supply and its credit.

After that, the idea of abolishing the States and setting up Federal Regions in their place became something of an obsession with the Planners.

(to be continued)

DON BELL REPORTS & CLOSER-UP are privately circulated newsletters accenting the Christian American point of view. Subscriptions not available separately. Complete service: \$24 per year. Please write:
DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

THE CONTRIVED EVOLUTION OF REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

. Part Twelve

THE FIRST BATTLES OF THE SILENT REVOLUTION

"We stand in the presence of a revolution—not a bloody revolution; America is not given to the spilling of blood—but a silent revolution, whereby America will insist upon recovering in practice those ideals which she has always professed, upon securing a government devoted to the general interest and not to special interests."

So spoke the man who was about to become President of the United States. Warming up to his thesis concerning "the silent revolution," the speaker continued:

"We are on the eve of a great reconstruction. It calls for creative statesmanship as no age has done since that great age in which we set up the government under which we live, that government which was the admiration of the world until it suffered wrongs to grow up under it which have made many of our own compatriots question the freedom of our institutions and preach revolution against them. I do not fear revolution. I have unshaken faith in the power of America to keep its self-possession. Revolution will come in peaceful guise, as it came when we put aside the crude government of the Confederacy and created the great Federal Union which governs individuals, not States, and which has been for these hundred and thirty years our vehicle of progress. Some radical changes we must make in our law and practice. Some reconstructions we must push forward, which a new age and new circumstances impose upon us. . . . The whole stupendous program must be publicly planned and canvassed. . . . reason rather than passion. . . will enable us to win through to still another great age without violence."

The speaker might have been Richard Nixon proclaiming his "silent revolution," or it could have been Franklin Delano Roosevelt

in a fireside chat discussing his New Deal which some have called the revolution that was. But, actually, the speaker was Thomas Woodrow Wilson, the 28th President of the United States, telling his listeners how "The Old Order Changeth," and explaining "The New Freedom" that he hoped to bring to America, and later to the world through the League of Nations."

The record will show that there have been three great efforts to bring to a successful conclusion the "silent revolution" that so many of America's people in high places have talked about throughout this century. Woodrow Wilson launched the "silent revolution" in 1913, but the rest of the world was unprepared for that "new order" about which he spoke; and the man who was made President to bring revolution at home, was destined to declare war in Europe against the Central Powers. And, thus, the "silent revolution" was pigeon-holed, could not be spoken of openly or waged publicly during the years of the "return to normalcy" that endured from Harding through Coolidge to the latter part of the Hoover Administration.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt launched the second phase of the "silent revolution," with an all-out crusade lasting through the "first hundred days," which would have been totally victorious had it not been for a tradition-bound and Constitution-honoring Supreme Court that found most of FDR's pet projects unconstitutional. Even so, the nests of Fabian Planners, Brain Trusters, Frankfurter Hot Dogs, and Communist spy cells that polluted Washington were finding ways and means of circumventing courts and the Constitution. They would have been completely victorious had it not been for the economic problem which they could not solve short of imposing a wartime economy. Mills were closed or working at half capa-

city, industry was crippled, breadlines were getting longer and longer, government-made WPAs and CCCs couldn't take up all the slack. World War II was necessary to conquer a depression that had become world-wide. And the "silent revolution" again had to be put in government moth balls.

Then came Richard the Tricky, and the third and final phase of the "silent revolution" was announced, and is being waged behind a camouflage called Watergate, and the people are bemused by being told how people appointed to serve them are serving time instead; and the people are cajoled into worrying about impeachment rather than inflation, etc.

It is important to understand that this system of governance called *Regionalism* has been a basic element of the "silent revolution" from the very beginning.

Which leads us to a more specialized treatment of the subject in these letters:

Up to this point in our Series we have found it expedient to generalize, to lay a broad foundation and speak of many things, of Compact, Continental and International Theories of Government, of the various schools of socialism, of events in history that seemed important as background to a specific subject. From here on, however, we shall try to specialize, to concentrate upon the one theme which, we believe, has not been treated fully or adequately by others. From here on, we shall attempt to devote our study to the subject which gave title to this series: *The Contrived Evolution of Regional Government*.

To properly understand *Regionalism*, a grasp of the growth of power within the Executive Branch of the Federal Government is essential. And one of the first visible signs of this development occurred in the latter part of the 1890s when people in high places in government began to be made aware of the writings and activities of a group of men who had started a new school of political science that they called *scientific management*. One of the leaders of this new school was Frederick W. Taylor, who had been instrumental in establishing the civil service in the United States Government. Because of malpractices that had occurred in the Federal Government after the War Between the States, there had developed a demand that the entire system of Federal

employment be overhauled. This led to the establishment of a Civil Service Commission in 1871. But little or nothing was done until 1883 when President Garfield was killed, allegedly by a disappointed office seeker. The new rules were drawn up to award positions on merit in certain classifications of federal employment. On May 6, 1896, President Cleveland published a new set of civil service rules to improve the system. That set of rules remained more or less unchanged until 1940, when the Hatch Act was passed, forbidding office-holders from contributing to political campaigns.

This Civil Service Commission had nothing to do with elected officials or military officers. But Frederick Taylor and his scientific management school wanted to extend the reformation to include more and more people in government or political office. Briefly: *elected* officials are usually amateurs. They may be trained in law, or in husbandry, or they may be experts in business or professional circles. But the *science of governmental management* (now usually referred to as planning or administration) was a specialized field; and only trained specialists should be permitted to occupy positions as planners and administrators. (This same idea is expressed in *Philip Dru-Administrator*.)

One of the first manifestations of this new school of scientific management was seen, not at the *federal* but at the *local* level of government:—

In 1908, Staunton, Virginia, then a city of less than 10,000 population, "invented" a new system of scientific management by appointing a City Manager. One John Crosby of Staunton is recognized by all City Managers as the "father" of the city manager form of government. Taking his cue from Frederick Taylor's School of Scientific Management, City Commissioner Crosby developed the plan and then helped to popularize it throughout the Nation.

One of the men attracted by the new form of city government was a man named Louis Brownlow, who served as a city manager for a time, but was always looking for that greener pasture. For a time he edited the late David Lawrence's old newspaper, the *United States Daily* (which was said to be financed by Rockefeller money. During this time Lawrence became a member of the Rockefeller-financed *Council on Foreign*

Relations). From this editorship, Brownlow went—in 1927—to the City Housing Corporation of New York, a private real estate company. This corporation was interested in the business of building model cities—now a regular thing with bigtime developers, but something novel in 1927. Fair Lawn, New Jersey was selected as a test site. A model city containing 1,500 acres, named Radburn, with all the legal powers of a full-fledged municipality, was to be developed. But the Great Depression ended that experiment.

But Brownlow was still on good terms with the Rockefellers, and the Rockefellets controlled the University of Chicago. And Louis Brownlow, with Rockefeller money (the Laura Spelman Fund) established the *Public Administration Clearing House*, on land owned by the University of Chicago, at 1313 East 60th Street. PACH was, of course, the nucleus of that organization which came to be known as 1313; about which we shall have much to say later.

Meanwhile, at the federal level, the urge for *scientific management* was growing apace. And one of the first important changes had to do with the establishment, in 1921, of the Federal Bureau of the Budget. In a paper entitled "Office of Management and Budget, Functions and Organization," dated January 1974, we are told—and this is a direct quote—about how important that act of 1921 really was:—

"The basic authority for the Office's (OMB) budget function is derived from the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended. Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1970 transferred that function to the President, who, in turn, delegated it to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. This Act gave the Bureau the authority 'to assemble, correlate, revise, reduce, or increase the requests for appropriations of the several departments or establishments.' The Act also safeguarded the budget as transmitted by the President to Congress by denying Federal agencies the right to seek funds outside regular budget channels except at legislative request. The Bureau was further authorized to make detailed administrative studies for the President with a view to 'securing greater economy and efficiency in the conduct of the public service.' The Act required the Bureau 'at the request of any committee of either House of Congress having jurisdiction over revenue or appro-

priations' to render 'the committee such aid and information as it may request.'

"In response to a request by the Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, the President, in 1921, instructed the Federal agencies to submit to him through the Director 'all requests or recommendations for legislation, the effect of which would be to create a charge upon the Public Treasury or commit the Government to obligations which would later require appropriations to meet them.' The scope of this clearance procedure was later extended to apply to all legislation." (End of quotation)

The foregoing provides us with an excellent example of how, in the name of *scientific management*, duties assigned specifically to the Congress by the Constitution, were transferred to the expanding Office of the Presidency. The Constitution most clearly specifies that it is the duty of the Congress—not of an executive agency called the Internal Revenue Service—to "lay and collect taxes;" and the Constitution also commands that,

"... a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

For almost 150 years it was understood that it was the duty of Congress to prepare and keep the budget, and see to it that government expenditures were kept within that budget. That Congress did a commendable job can be seen by glancing at a record of the public debt before the budget-making task was handed over to a new Executive Bureau.

In a similar manner, in 1913, the power of the Congress to control the credit of the United States and to issue and regulate the value of its legal tender, was transferred to a newly created Federal Reserve Board, over which even the President of the United States has no direct administrative control.

As the growth of new bureaus and agencies expanded, the concept of Regional Government also grew. You'll recall that when the Nation's money was handed over to the control of a private corporation, the board of directors of that corporation determined that control over money could best be accomplished through dividing the Nation into twelve Regions, each Federal Reserve Region with its own Central Federal Reserve Bank.

When the New Deal came the Administration began to fashion innumerable new bureaus, agencies, commissions, councils, conferences, divisions, committees, units, boards, projects, corporations, combines, authorities, associations, trusts, co-operatives, centers, services, schools, companies, plants, factories, expositions, etc., etc. Known as the "alphabet agencies," one article dealing with the subject, published in 1937, commented:

"The following partial list will indicate the number of New Deal agencies and offices created or continued since March 4, 1933, which the average American may study in his fireside moments. Lack of space forbids a complete tabulation; only those bureaucratic growths falling alphabetically under A, B, and C are presented: . . ."

And there follows a listing of 87 different varieties of bureaucratic growth under only the first three letters of the alphabet. The article then goes on to point out this most important fact:

"Washington is merely a clearing house. Virtually all New Deal organizations have set up regional agencies, which exist in each of the forty-eight States *or in groupings of several States together*. Each regional agency is a minor Washington in itself; it maintains a headquarters, a staff of executives, a bureaucracy, and a publicity division. In the manner of Washington, each regional bureau grows year by year, enlarging the scope of its activities until agency overlaps agency and field-unit overlaps field-unit. . . . the White House is the Mother Church; the employees of the regional parishes are hardworking missionaries for the salvation of humanity—via the New Deal. For their creed, the missionaries utilize the words written by the *Fuhrer* himself:

'Only through a clear understanding by every citizen of the objectives, organization, and availability of the government agencies can they render truly effective service and assure progress toward economic security.'"

The preceding is from an article entitled "Dr. Roosevelt's Propaganda Trust," by Gordon Carroll, which appeared in the Sept., 1937 issue of *The American Mercury*. The article shows that, although the Nation had not been divided legally and overtly into Regions, the idea of Regional Government

was already being developed and utilized by the hundreds of bureaucratic growths that characterized the New Deal.

Next big step was the passage of the Executive Re-Organization Act of 1939. The story briefly:

At a meeting of the National Resources (Planning) Board in October, 1935, President Roosevelt brought up the idea of increasing the power of the Presidency by creating an "Executive Office of the President," and by reorganizing the Executive Branch in such a way that it would be less dependent upon the Congress. As a result of FDR's suggestion, the Brain Trusters created a Committee on Administrative Management (scientific management—Ed.), and Louis Brownlow, whom we have already introduced in connection with 1313, was named chairman of this new committee. The committee wrote a proposed Re-Organization Act of 1937, which came to be called "the Dictator Bill," and had to be watered down considerably before even the rubber-stamp Congress of 1937 would approve and pass it.

Consequently, Brownlow's committee went back to work and produced a similar but less power-packed Re-Organization Act of 1939, which was duly passed and signed into law.

A principal feature of this Act had to do with Executive Orders. Up to this time, Executive Orders could be issued by the President at any time; but they also could be revoked by Congress at any time. The new arrangement was more to a President's liking: He could promulgate an Executive Order and, if the Congress did not officially disapprove and reject within 60 days, then Congressional approval was taken for granted and the Executive Order had the full force of law.

There were other New Deal Acts which pre-saged the permanent establishment of the system known as Regional Governance. Power Districts, Conservation Districts, plans to abolish the States entirely; all of these were a part of the New Deal Program.

(to be continued)

DON BELL REPORTS & CLOSER-UP are privately circulated Newsletters. Complete service: \$24 per year. Extra copies: 10¢ each. Please address all correspondence:

DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

THE CONTRIVED EVOLUTION OF REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

----- Part Thirteen -----

THE FIRST CRUSADE

"Regional government as we know it today is a direct descendant of the utopian dream of Robert Owen, first expounded more than a century and a half ago, and described, clarified and structured by H.G. Wells. Through his efforts, the outline of what is now being developed was thus established more than sixty years ago."

So wrote Maureen Heaton in her excellent booklet "*So Desperate a Step*," which was one of the first attempts to point out the dangers of Regional Government and its companion control system known as PPBS.

It should be added that Robert Owen developed the embryo that became Regional Government out of a pure heart and a befuddled mind; he sought sincerely for a way to establish a perfect society on earth, and died still seeking the impossible. H.G. Wells was steeped in the equally impractical ideals of Fabian Socialism when he laid down the principles of what we now know as Regional Government; he recovered from the aberration, but too late for anyone to profit from his awakening.

But Regional Government is presently being installed throughout the world because it is an essential ingredient of the Planned Society. Planners can draw up their plans and write out their timetables, and secure the required finances and leadership- but without the control network that is provided by some system similar to Regional Government, such plans would merely gather dust in some think tank.

In her booklet, Maureen Heaton provided a summary of what we have written in previous letters in this series, but this is information that bears repeating. So, we quote:

"The first major breakthrough in this country came in 1913, when three crucial changes were made in the American govern-

ment system - the graduated income tax, direct election of Senators, and the Federal Reserve System (to which we added a fourth: the federal chartering of tax-exempt foundations-Ed.). Without the access to the substance of the great middle sector of citizens provided by the 16th Amendment*...through the Marxian scheme of progressive taxation, this revolution would still be the impossible dream...unfunded. Without destroying the balance of power between land area and people, administrative government such as this would have been unworkable. Without the machinery for the destruction of the monetary value, the crisis necessary to obtain public acceptance could not have been constructed.

"In 1921, the next most important step was taken, when Congress was persuaded to abdicate its constitutional responsibility as watchdog of the public purse and transferred to the executive the keeping of the budget. Without that free access to the budgetary process, the *Planning, Programming and Budgeting System* could not have become the tool of executive power that it is today...

"During the 1920s, too, the first systemic efforts were made to test the techniques of planning. A preliminary survey was made of the Philadelphia metropolitan area in 1924, and the Tri-State District which resulted included parts of New Jersey and Delaware. By 1932, the Regional Planning Federation of the District unveiled the results of their labors, in a document of almost 600 pages, which included maps, diagrams, population statistics, and socialist plans for highways, transportation, airways and airports, parks and parkways, water supply and sanitation, and architectural and aesthetic elements of planning. This document stated that twenty areas in the northeast section of the country were being planned even then, and among these maps were those showing rudimentary

regions for the greater Boston area, Connecticut, New York and New Jersey; and the Indiana, Illinois and Wisconsin regions.

But the greatest strides into this New American Revolution came in the 1930s, when: '...a plague of young lawyers settled on Washington... These prattlers were, for the most part, employees of the government, and had taken the oath of office. But they took the position that their high purposes

OHIO NOT A STATE, AND 16TH AMENDMENT NEVER RATIFIED?

Since publishing our letter concerning the 16th, Income Tax Amendment, we have been swamped with letters and articles pointing out the fact that Ohio was not legally in the Union in 1913, therefore the 16th Amendment was never legally ratified, since the vote of non-State Ohio wouldn't count.

The facts as we have been able to dig them out of the archives: Ohio did not, legally, become a State on March 1, 1803, because of a Congressional blunder. The oversight was not corrected, legally, until August, 1953 when a Joint Resolution (Public Law 204) was passed, officially admitting Ohio to the Union of States.

However, much as we could wish it to be otherwise, this doesn't revoke the 16th Amendment. Approved by the Senate 77 to 0 on July 5, 1909, and by the House 318 to 14 on July 12, 1909, it was then submitted to the 48 States for ratification. 36 States had to ratify the Amendment before it could be certified by the Secretary of State as a part of the Constitution.

On February 3, 1913, Delaware, New Mexico and Wyoming ratified the Amendment, which made a total of 38 States that had ratified the Amendment (one of them being the non-State of Ohio). On February 4, 1913, New Jersey ratified and on February 19, 1913, Vermont followed suit. Connecticut, Florida, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah and Virginia never did ratify the 16th Amendment. However, when Secretary of State Philander C. Knox certified the Amendment on Feb. 25, 1913, 40 States had ratified (including the non-State of Ohio) and only 36 States were required.

Sorry, but we'll have to find another way to get rid of that cruelest Amendment of all.

gave them a supermorality that could not be confused with the morality the Nation had been using. They were quite above such old-fogy, Tory, reactionary stuff as oaths of office or other religious antiquities. They owed allegiance, not to the United States—patriotism was for the nonthinking—They had allegiance to a higher cause: The end justified the means.'

"So said George N. Peek, first administrator of the Agriculture Adjustment Administration, who soon realized that strange things were taking place in his department. His own allegiance to this country caused him to resist this group, and he was relieved of his duties. Even then the Planners had acquired that much strength, that they could remove someone who posed a threat to the Plan.

"One of the 'braintrusters' who swarmed into Washington at that time was a professor from Columbia University, Rexford Guy Tugwell, who became Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. He also wrote books, and made speeches (and recently wrote a proposed new Constitution for the United States—Ed.). He stated:

"We have a century and more of development to undo. It is, in other words, a logical impossibility to have a planned economy and to have business operating its industries, just as it is also impossible to have one with our present Constitutional and statutory structure. Modifications in both, so serious as to mean destruction and rebeginning, are required....'

"Tugwell publicly supported the theory that a planned economy required three great changes in the American system: first, a breaking down of existing statutes and constitutions of government; second, the destruction of private enterprise; and, third the destruction of the sovereignty of the States. He categorically asserted, '*All three of these wholesale changes are required by even a limited acceptance of the planning idea*'....' (The foregoing is quoted from "*So Desperate a Step*," by Maureen Heaton, revised and updated as of March, 1973, and still one of the finest exposes of Regional Government yet written. If still available, can be obtained by sending a donation (at least 50¢) to National Families United, P. O. Box 445, Camino, California 95709.)

Planning was the key word; and on June 30,

1934, President Roosevelt demonstrated this fact by creating the National Resources Planning Board, which we mentioned briefly in our last letter in this series in connection with the expansion of the power of the Executive Order. But this Planning Board did much more. It laid down a plan for the socialization of the United States which included many features that are familiar to all citizens today. Proposed were: a minimum standard of living with the federal government guaranteeing the family income; a regional police force; rigid zoning and building codes (almost unknown in the 1930s); use of federal planning as a tool for the "better utilization of human and material resources;" a federal requirement that local planning bodies be established and operated in accordance with federal guidelines as a condition for receiving federal grants-in-aid; consolidation of "overlapping authorities" through the creation of regional headquarters (similar to present Regional Districts); a bill providing blanket consent of Congress to all Interstate Compacts that might be created; urban renewal, revenue sharing, uniform tax policies in the States; public land acquisition; re-distribution of industrial areas, etc., etc. This proposed program devised by the National Resources Planning Board also urged increased use of "State and National Associations of Municipalities, and municipal officers," and specifically mentioned 1313's *Public Administration Clearing House*.

As we noted, most of the proposals in this socialization program submitted to Congress by the Roosevelt Administration in 1937, are commonplace accomplishments or proposed programs of the Nixon Administration. But in 1937 the proposals were so revolutionary and so obviously socialistic, that a Congress which has otherwise been called a rubber stamp congress, not only rejected the whole set of proposals, but demanded the dissolution of the National Resources Planning Board as well. The Planners had moved too far to the left too fast and had to start all over again, proceeding more slowly. And many of the proposals would remain dormant for a few decades, awaiting the election of another President who would be elected on a conservative platform and then promote ultra-liberal policies and complete the winning of the New Revolution. It should be noted that FDR was elected on a conservative platform and then broke every promise

he had made to the people by adopting the Fabian Socialist platform proposed by Norman Thomas and installed by the very "masterminds" whom he had denounced in his election campaign. Franklin Roosevelt as a candidate, had told the people:

"The doctrine of legislation and regulation by 'masterminds' in whose judgment and will all the people may gladly and quietly acquiesce, has been too glaringly apparent at Washington these past two years. Were it possible to find 'masterminds' so unselfish, so willing to decide unhesitatingly against their own personal interests or private prejudices, men almost Godlike in their ability to hold the scales of justice with an even hand, such a government might be in the interest of the country. But there are none such on the political horizon, and we cannot expect a complete reversal of all the teachings of history." (From *The New York Times* of March 3, 1930).

During this same campaign, Franklin Roosevelt referred to the 18th (the Prohibition Amendment) and then made a statement that caused conservatives to cheer, and vote for him. He said:

"As a matter of fact and law, the governing rights of the states are all of those which have not been surrendered to the National Government by the Constitution or its amendments. Wisely or unwisely, people know that under the 18th Amendment Congress has been given the right to legislate on this particular subject, but this is not the case in the matter of a great number of other vital problems of government, such as the conduct of public utilities, of banks, or insurance, of agriculture, of education, of social welfare, and of a dozen other important features. In these, Washington must never be permitted to interfere in these avenues of our affairs. . . . Now, to bring about government by oligarchy masquerading as democracy, it is fundamentally essential that practically all authority and control be centralized in our National Government." (Quoted from *The New York Times*, March 3, 1930; an article headed, "Roosevelt Decries Waning State Rule").

In a manner to be copied forty years later by another President from another political party, Roosevelt talked like a conservative before election, then acted like a socialist after winning the election. Roosevelt's

sponsoring of the National Resources Planning Board's proposals—which were dubbed the "Dictator's Bill"—did not prevent its rejection by the Congress. Undaunted, other plans were made for destroying State sovereignty and strengthening the federal executive. On June 27, 1934, the National Housing Act was passed; this was the beginning of Urban Renewal. On September 23, 1935, the Resettlement Administration was established and four "model cities," the so-called "Greenbelt Towns" were started (Greenbelt near Washington, D.C., Greenhills near Cincinnati, Greendale near Milwaukee, and Greenbrook near Bound Brook, New Jersey.) This program was the forerunner of the *New Towns* concept, and established the federal precedent for moving entire communities into new locations.

Then, on February 29, 1936, Public Law 74-461, creating Social Conservation Districts, went into effect. And here we see a particular *modus operandi* being initiated: Model legislation was prepared and sent to all State Governors, with a covering letter of instruction from the President of the United States. Each Governor was advised that he should have this legislation passed by the State Legislature, in order that his State would be in the highest classification when federal aid was doled out. Provisions in this model legislation had to do with the manner in which States levied property taxes, establishment of work programs to relieve the unemployed, land use regulations, and other guideline provisions that are familiar to students of Regional Governance methods.

The gimmick worked like this: When a State qualified for federal assistance, then the federal government would set up "social conservation districts" for the administration of the aid. This program did not die with the New Deal, it carried on. And, by 1952, thirty-eight States were active in the federal program, and 1,981 social conservation districts were in operation in the United States (this according to John C. Bollens, author of *Special Districts Governments in the United States*. Berkeley University of California Press, 1957.)

These first Regional Districts were not mandatory. A State could refuse to comply, and suffer the consequences of no federal aid. Ten States did refuse to go along with the program. But with the passage of the

Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, the States were forced to submit. More of this in a future letter.

Returning in time to that era which some have referred to as the New Deal Daze, a portent of what was being planned for these United States was shown to readers of *The New York Times* when, on April 21, 1935, a map was published, depicting the United States divided into nine "Federal Departments" which were to replace the 48 States. The accompanying article, by Delbert Clark, said, in part:

"There is a growing sentiment—still too inchoate to be termed a movement—among certain members of Congress with advanced social views and a willingness to break with tradition, in favor of drastic change in our form of government to facilitate nationwide reforms frequently blocked by the very nature of our confederation. Since, obviously, there is political dynamite in any proposal to abolish States in so far as they provide a check upon the Federal Government, no one has yet dared to broach publicly the thesis that the abolition would be in the public interest and is, in fact, a distinct possibility in the somewhat distant future. Yet there are those who feel that the change should be made...."

"Aside from the strictly legal and mechanical problems involved, clearly the greatest difficulty in the path of such a profound reorganization of our political system is sheer pride of Statehood... this sentiment is a powerful force. There has appeared of late a remarkable resurgence of State consciousness, a self-assertiveness on the part of States some of which in the old pre-depression days hardly knew they had boundaries.

"Whether the issue will ever be raised is a moot question. The revisionists may never be heard from publicly—..."

The author was correct: there was no fanfare and no publicity. The change was made by Executive Order in 1972, and few knew that a new form of government had replaced the old balance-of-powers form.

(to be continued)

DON BELL REPORTS & CLOSER-UP are privately circulated. Complete service: \$24 per year. Extra copies: 10¢ each. Write to:
DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

THE CONTRIVED EVOLUTION OF REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

. Part Fourteen

TOWARD ECUMENOPOLIS, THE WORLD-CITY

When the Planners began restructuring the United States, one of their first ideas was to get rid of the States and State Governments. This idea was given a trial run by means of an article which appeared in the April 21, 1935 issue of *The New York Times*. A map showing the Nation divided into nine "departments" accompanied the article. We quoted briefly from that article in our last letter in this series, and the map itself is reproduced on page 2 of this letter.

The Planners discovered—as the author of the article suspected—that there still remained in 1935 too much "sheer pride of Statehood," and any plan that included the actual destruction of the States and their governments, would have to be shelved for a few years; or even decades.

So, the Planners decided to concentrate on weakening State governments, by going directly to the cities and urban areas, and by making direct alliances with the cities themselves, while ignoring State governments whenever possible.

One of the most powerful of the New Deal planning agencies was FDR's *National Resources Committee*. You'll understand its power when we tell you that this committee was chaired by Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, and was composed of Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture; Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor; Harry H. Woodring, Secretary of War; Daniel C. Roper, Secretary of Commerce; Harry L. Hopkins, Works Progress Administrator; Frederic A. Delano, Vice Chairman; and Charles E. Merriam. A member of this group's Urbanism Committee was Louis Brownlow, who was to leave the committee to establish 1313, along with Charles E. Merriam (whose son presently heads ACIR).


Charles Merriam, Louis Brownlow, and Beardsey Ruml were chiefly responsible for the preparation of a committee report titled, "Our Cities, Their Role in the National Economy," issued by the National Resources Committee in June, 1937. That you may sense how *The Plan* was developing at that time, we quote briefly from the foreword of that Report:

"This report, made for the President, following the request of a number of national organizations,* is the first major national study of cities in the United States. The Country Life Commission reporting to President Theodore Roosevelt in 1909 explored the problems of rural living for the first time in systematic fashion, but until now there has been no similar examination of urban conditions. There have been many special studies in particular cities, but none of the place of cities in our national scheme of things (italics added)....

"In time of national stress the task of relief and recovery falls not merely upon a single community or segment of the Nation, but upon the Nation as a whole. It is the Federal Government that has to assume the major burdens of providing emergency relief for the city as well as the farm, of stimulating public works in the Nation's urban centers, and even of reviving insolvent municipal finances....

"The Nation's task has now become not only one of relief and recovery but of recon-

* The national organizations mentioned in this Report were: The United States Conference of Mayors, the American Municipal Association, the American Planning and Civic Association, and the American Society of Planning Officials. All of these organizations were to become part of that network of organizations called "1313."



"Map of the United States as it Might Be Redrawn by the 'Revisionists'-States' Rights Would Be Abolished and the Country Would Be Divided Into Nine Departments." So read the caption to this map which appeared in the April 21, 1935 issue of the New York Times. Under the map was the heading: "NINE GROUPS INSTEAD OF THE 48 STATES," which was followed by the subhead: "A Proposal for Rebuilding the Structure of Government in Order to Deal With Issues on a National Scale." Not until 1972 was this plan carried out, when Ten Federal Regions were established by Executive Order.

struction, and this has also been recognized as in part the Federal Government's responsibility (italics added)...."

(end of quotation)

And here we discover one of the elemental precepts of the *New Revolution*: that the Federal Government has a right and a duty to take charge of the relief and recovery and the reconstruction of cities!

Up to this point in time (as the bureaucrats would say) there was a classic court decision which expressed clearly the *Compact Theory* of government, as opposed to the *Continental Theory* that had become supreme by 1937. It stated:

"Home Rule means that, as to the affairs of a municipality, which affects the relations of the citizens with their local government, they shall be freed from State interference, regulation, and control, that the system of public improvements, the building of streets or alleys, the appointment of officers, the designation of their duties, and how they shall be performed, and all other matters purely of local interest, advantage and convenience shall be left to the people thereof for their own determination." (People ex elle Attorney General Vs. Johnson, 86 p. 233, 238, 34 Colorado 143).

In the beginning of American Government, Home Rule meant exactly that: Local Rule without interference from either State or National Government. The County Government was the unit which controlled land use, planning, zoning, schools, and the trial and execution of criminals. Slowly, State Governments began creeping in and taking over where they had neither right nor duty; and in the New Deal Era, the National Government began replacing the States even, in matters of "relief, recovery and reconstruction."

However, when the Planners sought to take over complete authority in States, Counties, Municipalities, School Districts, etc., they soon discovered that they were trying to do too much too quickly. Both National and State Legislatures resisted their encroachments, both Supreme and District Courts decided against the Planners. So, they decided, in the case of Regional Governance at least, to slow down, and adopt the Fabian policy of gradualism. Education and Legislation at State and local levels would be required.

And that is when "*Terrible 1313!*" was or-

ganized and became a part of the Regional Government Conspiracy. With a few of the associations and groups brought together in 1938, 1313 continued to grow in membership and increase in importance with little or no public opposition until the late 1950s. It was on Feb. 21, 1958 that we published "The Story of 1313." A flood of requests for more information, and a storm of protest from the headquarters of 1313, were the immediate results. H.G. Pope, the executive director of Public Administration Service (PAS), published a pamphlet condemning what he termed "The Bell Brigade" for their "vicious and unfounded attacks" on 1313, and defending the actions of 1313. That the officials at 1313 still remember and still dislike "The Bell Brigade" is evidenced from an article which appeared in the June, 1974 issue of the *Illinois County and Township Official*. Entitled "1313 Revisited" and written by the editor, Lee Ahlswede, the article is sufficiently informative to deserve reprinting. Here, edited only to fit space requirements, is that article:

"1313" REVISITED

By Lee Ahlswede

What is the mystery of "1313"—if indeed there is a mystery? These numerals represent, of course, the establishment identified as the Public Administration Service (PAS), located at 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago.

It came into somewhat notorious prominence in the late 1950s, when a newscaster and editor of a newsletter called "Closer-Up," Don Bell, blasted "1313" as "an invisible government which controls you at the grass roots level... aimed at destroying your local government, your state government and welding all into a world government dictatorship." Another newscaster, Upton Close, and a writer for American Mercury magazine, Jo Hindman, spoke and wrote about "1313" in similar veins. In the intervening years, others have referred to this organization as the social and economic planners of our localities, our state and our nation.

An article entitled "What is 1313?" appeared in the November, 1973 issue of the *Illinois County & Township Official*, in the form of a report from Albert W. Palmer of Astoria, Oregon, and reprinted from *Private Property-Free Enterprise*, published by the Ogle County Taxpayers Association. The article identified "1313" as a "clearing

house of master plans which will if successful, affect all phases of our American way of life. Its number one objective is to change our elective system of government to a Regional Metro type of government of appointees over which the people have no control."

Following the appearance of this article, we received a letter from E. F. Ricketts, Executive Director of PAS (protesting what was said in the article, and asking Editor Ahlswede to come and visit him—Ed.)...

On May 3, 1974, we visited 1313... met with Director Ricketts and four of his associates. (He is told that 1313 is now comprised of Public Administration Service, American Public Works Association, American Society of Planning Officials, International Association of Assessing Officers, International Personnel Management Association, Building Officials and Code Administration International, Inc., Federation of Tax Administrators, and the Municipal Finance Officers Association. The article continues)...

Two recently moved out of the location. The American Public Welfare Association went to Washington, D.C., and the Council of State Governments, Midwest Office, moved to the Chicago Loop. Back in the 1950s there were 22 associations in the building. They have either moved elsewhere or have been modified and consolidated...

An earlier pamphlet (listed all of the organizations and) expanded on the purpose of PAS: "Each of these organizations is separate and distinct and entirely independent, but it has been possible for their secretariats to cooperate in many helpful ways. The organizations share the belief that government in the United States can be made more satisfactory if administrative organizations, techniques and methods are improved, and that the responsibility for such improvement rests primarily upon public officials."

Another statement is made which definitely establishes "1313" as a world-wide operation: "Several of the organizations have rendered services to foreign governments and to international agencies..."

The references to PAS's interests in Metro government came out during our conversations with Director Ricketts, when we were exploring the reasons why "1313" acquired a reputation of being radical social planners,

destroyers of local governments and Soviet oriented... His response was, "No, I don't know. That is a question I wanted to ask you..."

The image of "1313" certainly was formed during the 1950s as a result of its ardent activities on behalf of Metro government—and particularly as a result of its participation in establishing Dade County Metro. Don Bell, the outspoken critic of "1313," was a Florida resident with headquarters in Palm Beach... One of Bell's statements reads like this: "Perhaps the choice of the word 'Metro' is coincidental as a name for this type of regional government, since the underground railway which connects Moscow with its suburbs also is called 'Metro'."

If, of course, Metro government is interpreted purely as a Soviet type institution, then any supporters of it may be labeled as being Soviet inspired. If, however, the view of Metro government is that it leads to greater centralization of government (which it does) and that it ultimately can produce a totalitarian state (as it could), then the supporters of it are not necessarily "red," but instead are in the "master planners" category for a new variety of government in the United States.

In further discussion with Director Ricketts and the other four individuals we visited with on May 3, we voiced our objections to Metro government along the above lines. We upheld the position that as centralized government became stronger it weakened the individual rights and freedoms of the people.

There was a tendency on the part of the "1313" people to look upon government as "needing improvements" which could be accomplished by more centralization...

There is more to be said about "1313"...
(end of quotations from article in
June, 1974 IC&T Official)

Editor Ahlswede is correct: there is more to be said about "1313," but the saying must await the publication of our next letter.

(To be continued)

DON BELL REPORTS & CLOSER-UP are privately circulated newsletters. Complete service: \$24 per year. Extra copies: 10¢ each. Please address all correspondence to:
DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

THE CONTRIVED EVOLUTION OF REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

. Part Fifteen

MORE ABOUT ECUMENOPOLIS

Walter Lippmann was a student of pioneer Fabian Socialist Graham Wallas when the latter was teaching at Harvard University. Lippmann organized the Harvard chapter of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, went to become an associate of Col. E. M. House, went with him to Paris where he became a member of the *Round Table Group* and a charter member of the *Council on Foreign Relations*. He eventually found his niche with *The New York Times*, where he was to remain until his retirement. It was Lippmann who described the principle dogma of Regional Government in his book "*The Good Society*" (Little Brown & Co., Boston, 1937). He wrote:


"Throughout the world, in the name of progress, men who call themselves communists, socialists, fascists, nationalists, progressives, and even liberals, are unanimous in holding that government with its instruments of coercion must, by commanding the people how they shall live, direct the course of civilization and fix the shape of things to come. They believe in what Mr. Stuart Chase accurately describes as 'the overhead planning and control of economic activity.' This is the dogma which all the prevailing dogmas presuppose. This is the mold in which are cast the thought and action of the epoch. No other approach to the regulation of human affairs is seriously considered, or is even conceived as possible. The recently enfranchised masses and the leaders of thought who supply their ideas are almost completely under the spell of this dogma. Only a handful here and there, groups without influence, isolated and disregarded thinkers, continue to challenge it. For the premises of authoritarian collectivism have become the working beliefs, the self-evident assumptions, the unquestioned axioms, not only of all the revolutionary regimes, but of nearly

every effort which lays claim to being enlightened, humane, and progressive.... For virtually all that now passes for progressivism in countries like England and the United States calls for the increasing ascendancy of the state: always the cry is for more officials with more power over more and more of the activities of men."

The increasing ascendancy of the state, and the overhead planning and control of economic activity! This is the dogma that supersedes all dogma with the Planners, whether they be "communists, socialists, fascists, nationalists, progressives or even liberals." And Regional Governance has come to be the approved method for the achievement of this "ascendancy of the state" and the ultimate goal: the "overhead planning of all economic activity" on a world scale.

However, the Planners did not all agree, until quite recently, upon the best way in which to install this Regional Governance System. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, they seemed satisfied that their Regions be set up around "core cities." This was the original "Metro" system that was promoted and installed in Miami, St. Louis, and other metropolitan areas. "Metro" is a modernization of the old Greek city-state concept, expanded to include the world-city or ecumenopolis idea, which was conceived by the man who also coined the term 'social science' and called himself the world's first 'social scientist': Claude Henri de Rouvray' de Saint-Simon, a French aristocrat who survived the French Revolution and lived to develop a socialistic concept upon which to organize all of society. In the book *The Great Deceit*, a Veritas Foundation staff study of Fabianism and the social pseudo-sciences (1964), there is the following note regarding Saint-Simon:

"When he was a youth Saint-Simon felt that



**Fifteen Super-regions
of the United States**

he was destined to great things and had his valet awaken him each morning with the words, 'Remember, monsieur Le Comte, that you have great things to do.' It was during the revolution, while suffering a temporary imprisonment in the Luxembourg that visions of a new social system, based on scientific principles and not on political conventional-ity, first unfolded themselves to his ardent imagination. His ancestor Charlemagne appeared to him one night in a vision and said: 'Since the world existed, only one family enjoys the honor of producing a hero and a philosopher of the first rank. This honor is reserved for my family. My son, your success as philosopher will equal that which I reached as soldier and politician.' ...Throughout his life Saint-Simon was afflicted with mental disorders....It is an irony of history that 'social science' was born in a mind completely lacking in scientific training...."

Saint-Simon's plan, briefly stated: he wanted to divide the whole world into city-states, after the manner of Athens, Sparta, etc. in ancient Greece. Each city-state would be governed by a company of philosophers; and overall rule would come from a world-city, a world capital which he would build on the site of Constantinople, then considered to be the geopolitical center of the world.

It is remarkable that the Planners at "1313" took these plans for ancient Greece, the concept of world government imagined by Saint-Simon, and the promotional scheme of

a modern Greek Planner, and try to rebuild the United States according to such a pattern, and in line with the map that is reproduced on this page. When we first published this map (March 8, 1963), we wrote:

"Back to the Golden Age of Ancient Greece —this could well sum up the dreams of the *New World Planners*....It was a Greek Planner, bearing ideological gifts to a 1961 Conference of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials (this was a 1313 project), who showed how the "Super-Metro" concept fits into the "City-State" plan.

"According to a report prepared for the Ford Foundation, 'Dr. C. A. Doxiadis, Urban Consultant from Athens, Greece ... said: "Most of the evils from which we suffer today in urban areas stem from the fact that we have overlooked the trend that is heading top-speed toward an ecumenic city, and that we are, instead, struggling with the image of the city of the past.... The city has become a network of urban settlements which will one day cover the whole earth.'

"...Dr. Doxiadis traced the development of the city from a static to a dynamic force: The city first became a metropolis and then a megalopolis....The next stage will be merging into settlements which will cover the whole earth, and which Dr. Doxiadis called ecumenopolis. Ecumenopolis is the city of the future, and will have to be based on a new network of centers and lines of

transportation and communication that will be able to stand the pressure and demands of the growing populations of the earth.'

Here, then, is the 1313 formula:

Metropolis to Megalopolis (Super-Metro);
Megalopolis to Ecumenopolis (City-State, or Universal City);

A new network (world authority) to bind together these 'urban settlements which will cover the whole earth.'

"This world-wide network of urban settlements will, of course, have spaces in between, which are commonly called rural areas, the land usually devoted to farming and stock-raising... Now comes the plan to put all land under the direct control of the Federal Government. According to a plan first published in the April, 1962, issue of *Nation's Business*, all land in the United States would be divided into eight classes:

"1) A "greenbelt" area 30 miles in depth which would surround each ecumenopolis or universal city, in which area no industry, no home building, and practically no gardening or truck-farming will be permitted.

2) Areas where farming will be permitted.

3) Areas where 'federally combined farming' will be pursued (co-op farming as in Russia?)

4) Areas where government controlled conservation prevents the use of land by individuals.

5) Areas around 'historical sites.'

6) Areas set aside for 'hikers only.'


7) Areas which will be set aside for 'government use,' and in which the people may have access to the land, but for recreational purposes only.

8) Areas which might be called 'the people's land,' since these are for mass use'." (End of extended quotation from

Don Bell Reports of March 8, 1963).

Reproduced below is an illustration that accompanied an article written by *International Planner* Constantinos A. Doxiadis, for the book *Cities of Destiny*, edited by Arnold Toynbee, published by McGraw-Hill and retailing at \$30 per copy. In other words, the book was not intended for mass circulation, and only "insiders" would be expected to read it. Hence, Doxiadis is not reluctant when he explains the *international* application of this form of Regionalism. He writes:

"...This (world-wide) city is already under construction. It will absorb almost all the important cities of the present, and will gradually grow out of them through their dynamic growth, as well as through the dynamic growth of new settlements that are going to be created. It will be composed of almost all the major cities of the past and the present. This city is going to expand widely over the plains and the great valleys, especially near the oceans, seas, great lakes and rivers, since the most restrictive factor in its formation will be the presence of water. Even when de-salinized water can



The city of the future will form a world-wide network consisting of centres of several orders interconnected by settled parts of various importance.

be used economically for urban purposes, it will be available only near the level of the oceans and lakes, so these will attract the city of the future, as the small rivers attracted primitive settlements.

"The ecumenical city is going to pass through two phases. In the first phase, which has already started, it will gradually build up through the expansion of dynamically growing settlements. It will consist of dynamic parts and thus will change automatically from more primitive towards more developed forms. When it finally reaches the maximum calculable population and estimable area, it will not expand any more, and in this phase it will undergo only those minor alterations that will be indispensable for the re-adjustment of the population, the economy, and the functions necessary for the world-wide city.

"The city of the future is going to form a world-wide network. The centres of a higher order are going to be located mainly where the greater concentration of population are, i.e., in the greatest plains which have the best climate and best water-resources. The connections between them will follow the natural lines of communication as well as some underground and submarine tunnels and the corresponding air-corridors.

"In this network of major and minor centres, the Ecumenopolis will have a hierarchical structure of centres. The structure will range from the very small centre corresponding to present neighborhoods, through centres of middle importance with a population corresponding to the large metropolitan areas of the present, i. e., from 5 to 10 million, to centres of the highest order with populations running to hundreds of millions. These centres are going to form networks of different orders within the major network.

"Several of these centres are going to comprise all types of functions, since they will provide administration, management, transportation, culture, production and pastime for a wide area. Several others, though, are going to be specialized centres catering for special local factors or traditions. Such cities—for example, Cambridge, Massachusetts—will attract all types of educational facilities and become important specialized centres of education of a very high order in the network of the world-wide city, while others will be important cultural, political or pleasure centres.

"...The city as a whole will be the result of good programming and planning, based on very careful calculations of man's needs and of the possibilities of modern technology. The universal city of the future should be, as a whole and as a frame, the product of the creative work of every mind which can comprehend, and give shape to, the total habitat of man on this earth...."

(End of quotation)

But Planner Doxiadis and his 1313-oriented backers were to learn that this plan for the Universal City, or Ecumenopolis, made up of a global network of connected cities, contained a fatal flaw: The Master Planning required to change these "primitive" cities into "more developed centres" did not supply the dynamism the Planners hoped for. Instead, master planning began to kill once healthy cities. As the urban epidemic took hold, population changes began to occur. This was especially true when the racial integration fever reached its climax. Once prosperous cities began going broke, downtown shopping areas and high-tax districts began resembling ghost towns. Well-to-do whites moved out, poor blacks moved in, and cities went into the red. Suburban neighborhood shopping centers began doing most of the business previously transacted on Main Street.

The Master Planning that was supposed to provide the dynamism that Doxiadis talked about, began to provide death instead. So, the plan for establishing a world-wide network via cities and Metros has been relegated to the utopian cemetery.

Then came the "better plan," that of disregarding population and resources *per se*, and establishing geographical regions, these regions divided into smaller regions, and the smaller regions divided into sub-regions.

Thus, the whole world has been divided into Regional Governments, Nations are being divided into Regional Districts, and the Regional Districts are being divided into sub-regional districts. The world-wide network will be, not by connected cities, but by connected regions. All else will remain the same.

(to be continued)

For information concerning this letter, write:
DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

THE CONTRIVED EVOLUTION OF REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

. Part Sixteen

SOCIALISM BY ANOTHER NAME

On March 30, 1945, the United States was engaged in a war in which International Socialism (Communist Russia) was an ally and National Socialism (Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy) was an enemy. At that time the eminent economist Ludwig von Mises was attempting to explain the difference between the two forms of totalitarianism to members of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, meeting in Philadelphia. He addressed the distinguished audience, saying:

“There are two different patterns for the realization of socialism. The one pattern—we may call it the Marxian or the Russian pattern—is purely bureaucratic. All economic enterprises are departments of the government, just as is the administration of the army and the navy, or the postal system. Every single plant, shop, or farm, stands in the same relation to the superior central organization as does a post office to the office of the Postmaster General. The whole nation forms one single labor army with compulsory service; the commander of this army is the chief of state.

“The second pattern—we may call it the German (or Italian Fascist) system—differs from the first one in that it, seemingly and nominally, maintains private ownership of the means of production, entrepreneurship, and market exchange. So-called entrepreneurs do the buying and the selling, pay the workers, contract debts and pay interest and amortization. But they are no longer entrepreneurs. In Nazi Germany they are called shop managers or *betriebsfuehrer*. The government tells these seeming entrepreneurs what and how to produce, at what prices and from whom to buy, at what prices and to whom to sell. The government decrees at what wages laborers should work and to

whom and under what terms the capitalists should entrust their funds. Market exchange is but a sham. As all prices, wages, and interest rates are fixed by the authority, they are prices, wages and interest rates in appearance only; in fact they are merely quantitative terms in the authoritarian orders determining each citizen's income, consumption, and standard of living. The authority, not the consumers, directs production. The central board of production management is supreme; all citizens are nothing else but civil servants.

“This is socialism, with the outward appearance of capitalism. Some labels of the capitalistic market economy are retained, but they signify something entirely different from what they mean in the market economy.” (End of quotation)

Then there was this third form of Socialism which was used so very effectively in Britain and then exported to the United States when other forms of Socialism failed to conquer. Called Fabian Socialism, one of its early disciples, the “eminent historian” H. G. Wells, described the program and exposed the machinery in a book published in 1908 and titled “New Worlds for Old.” He wrote:

“It was left chiefly to the little group of English people who founded the Fabian Society to supply . . . the amplifying conception of Socialism, to convert Revolutionary Socialism to Administrative Socialism. . . . From saying that unorganized people cannot achieve Socialism, they passed to the implication that organization *alone, without popular support*, might achieve Socialism. . . .

Socialism ceased to be an open revolution, and became a *plot*. Functions were to be shifted quietly, unostentatiously, from the *representative* to the *official he appointed*.

They worked like a ferment in municipal politics...the reconstruction of our legislative and local machinery is a *necessary preliminary* to Socialization in many directions...Scientific reconstruction of our methods of government constitutes a necessary part of the Socialist scheme...It supplies us with a vision of a great and disciplined organization of officials. A *Scientific Bureaucracy*, appointed by representative bodies of diminishing importance, and coming at last to be the *working control* of the Socialist State, the replacement of *individual action* by *public organization*..." (emphasis added).

Can you see how the citizens were deceived by the chosen few who really "knew the score"? We have been advised to build bomb shelters in our back yards, have been taught how to evacuate whole cities, and how to survive in case of invasion by hostile Socialist soldiers and airmen from across the seas. We have sent millions of men across those same seas to battle fronts in Korea and Southeast Asia, and to guardposts in half the countries of the world, in order to prevent the advance of this Socialist enemy. And we have given billions of dollars and inestimable technological aid to countries throughout the world, to help them to build or rebuild according to the capitalistic pattern, shunning Socialism of the type Ludwig von Mises called German, or the *Zwangswirtschaft* system.

But here at home we have been made the unwarned victims of another form of Socialism by means of which, in the terminology of H. G. Wells, our governmental functions have been shifted gradually from the *elected* officials to their *appointees*. Citizens have been made accustomed to "city managers" and "county administrators" and appointed officials of uncounted other kinds, from citizens advisory committees to administrators of special districts and Regional Councils that dictate to State Governors and Legislators. And the final achievement in this category: As this is being written we have an *appointed* President of the United States who is empowered to *appoint* his potential successor, the Vice President of the United States.

It all began, of course, just as Wells explained it, at the municipal or local level. Then it spread to the State level, and at last to the Federal level; and now it is in-

vading the international level as Regional Governance becomes universal!

Tracing its beginnings and its maturing at the local level, Maureen Heaton wrote, in "So Dangerous a Step":

"The city manager now fulfills the duties formerly the responsibility of the elected city council, who now only act on the recommendation of their appointed successor. So, too, with the county administrator, who has become the appointed supervisor of the elected Supervisors. The appointed county counsel has usurped the position once held by the elected district attorney, who is now reduced to little more than a prosecutor. This situation holds true in the schools, as well, where appointed superintendents whittle away at the functions of the elected Boards, and 'experts' appointed by the appointed superintendent really make the decisions, which are then 'rubberstamped' by the 'representatives of the people.' All this has come about piecemeal, and has conditioned acceptance of the idea of government by appointed officials, so that many who would have resisted bitterly, now seem indifferent to it all.

"Like regional government itself, these changes are always sold to the people under the label of 'progress,' or because of 'proliferating government,' 'too heavy a workload,' or 'an expert is needed.' In the case of regional government, the people are told that existing government is not 'flexible' enough; or that a regional approach is necessary to handle the growing problems; or that there are so many overlapping areas which could be simplified under Metro. This last has some truth. Compared to a totalitarian state, our historic system is quite complicated. But do we want to pay that price for simplicity?"

It was this last reason which was used to sell Metro in Dade County, Florida. There were some 26 incorporated municipalities within the county, the city of Miami being the largest. The consolidation of functions previously performed by each incorporated area independently, was supposed to bring greater efficiency, save money, insure safety and the pursuit of happiness, etc. It did none of these things, but this was the sales pitch in 1958.

We were against Metro from the start and knew that plans called for the creation of a

Tri-County Authority which would replace the existing functions of the local governments of Dade, Palm Beach, and Broward (Fort Lauderdale) Counties. If the movement could be stopped or limited to Dade County, the final plan would have been defeated. So, we "editorialized" in our August 8, 1958 issue of *Closer-Up*, saying in part:

"Let's see what happened in Dade County. On May 1, 1958, the offices of county assessor of taxes, county tax collector, county surveyor, purchasing agent and county supervisor of registration were abolished and the powers and functions of these offices were transferred to the county manager, an appointive officer who was given power to appoint and remove all administrative officers subject only to Civil Service regulations.

"The so-called 'Home Rule Charter' gave the board of county commissioners the right to abolish the offices of sheriff, constable or any other county officer except the supervisor of public instruction and the judges and clerks of constitutional courts.

"In one fell swoop the greatest right that Americans have, to elect and continue to supervise the conduct of their local offices, was destroyed under the high sounding name of 'Home Rule.' Instead of giving home rule to the voters of Dade County, the charter removed home rule from the voters and put it in the hands of an appointive county manager.

"From now on out the county manager, and not the voters, will determine the nature and the character of all local officials who were formerly elected. No one, not even the Board of County Commissioners of Dade County, who will be the only important administrative elective officers of the county, can 'direct or request the appointment of any person to, or his removal from, office by the Manager.' No matter how ruthlessly the citizens may be hounded by appointed police, you the voter have no recourse and the county commission cannot 'give orders to subordinate of the Manager, either publicly or privately.'

"Instead of home rule by the voters of Dade County, the charter gives such power to one man, the manager, who does not have to be a resident of the State at the time of his appointment and who may be extremely un-

familiar with the needs of the county.

"To show you the power of the county manager, let me quote Section 4:01: 'There shall be departments of finance, personnel, planning, law and such other departments as may be established by administrative order of the Manager. All functions not otherwise specifically assigned to others by this Charter shall be performed under the supervision of the Manager.' And to top this off, under the very next section, 'The Manager shall have the power to issue and place into effect administrative orders, rules and regulations.'

"Is this 'home rule' by the people? No, indeed. It is almost dictatorship by an appointive official who can be brought here from a distant point to run your life and mine... This we must never do if we want home rule in the true sense of the word. Let those who would give us home rule be sure and bring home rule to you and me, and not dictatorship."

As we indicated previously, the foregoing was published August 8, 1958. There is no reason to change a word of it, for all things in the Metro department are much as they were sixteen years ago; except for one sad difference: proliferation. Dade County was the first such experiment in the United States and, while this "growth" has been confined to the one county in Florida, there are many other Metros in existence today. We have a publication of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations that carries the title: "Regional Governance, Promise and Performance." This 356-page book lists and discusses Metros that have been established in areas where the "core cities" are Miami and Jacksonville, Florida; Nashville, Tennessee; Atlanta, Georgia; Indianapolis, Indiana; the San Francisco Bay Area where nine counties are involved; the Twin Cities Area of Minnesota where seven counties are tied together; Sacramento, California; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Portland, Oregon; the New York Interstate Metro which includes counties and planning regions in a three-state area; etc.

But, as we indicated in a previous letter, since the establishment of the Ten Federal Regions, the ACIR planners have been far more interested in the "Substate Districting Systems" which are being developed in the fifty States.

For example, in an ACIR report on Miami

Metro author Aileen Lotz (staff consultant for the Joint Center for Environmental and Urban Problems, Florida International University), begins her report with the statement: "For the purpose of this paper, Dade County, Florida is defined as a 'region.' Although most of the present discussion will be confined to...Dade County...it is recognized that the region, under more traditional definitions, includes additional area..."

And this is certainly true as of August 16, 1974. Because, as a result of the passage of a legislative package prepared by *1313 Planners*, this "region" now includes five counties: Dade, Broward, Palm Beach, Martin, and St. Lucie.

Since about the same thing has happened in all of the 50 States, and since much the same story could be told about any of the 49 other States, here is what happened in Florida, briefly and to the point:

On March 27, 1969, the President of the United States announced the division of the Nation into ten federal regions. Florida was placed in Region IV along with seven other States. Then, on February 12, 1972, the President authorized the staffing of the capitals of these ten federal regions, with Federal Regional Councils which would administer all federal programs in the multi-state region.

Meanwhile, in Florida, the State Legislature was induced to pass two 1313-prepared and prepackaged legislative acts: the Florida State Comprehensive Planning Act of 1972, and the Florida Environmental Land and Management Act of 1972. These Acts authorized the establishment of substate regions, which would act as local administrative branches of the Federal Region, whose capital is in Atlanta, Georgia.

The Governor lost no time in designating ten geographic, multi-county planning regions within the State "...for the purpose of preparing studies, reports, and plans, and all other planning, programming and budgeting activities (PPBS-Ed.), including but not limited to the activities named in (appropriate) Florida Statutes."

Protesting the progress of Regionalism in his home State, Dr. John L. Grady of the Florida Legislative and Research Committee, spoke before the Governor and the

Cabinet of the State of Florida on Feb. 20, 1973, saying, in part:

"...This is Regional Government. And, as any informed and objective citizen can see, Regional Government means control. Control of all land, business, development, utilities production, services, property and people. Control by appointed councils and committees, not be elected officials. Bureaucrats, paid by federal grants, will direct programs effecting social and physical planning and federal regulation over cities and counties and their people. Even local police and county sheriffs will be controlled through Regional Criminal Justice Planning Councils of the Governor's Council on Criminal Justice, which will administer the Federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administering program for the LEAA czar in Atlanta—paving the way for a dangerously powerful national police force.

"The Governor's ten regional 'sub-states' and their respective councils dovetail very neatly with the President's ten regional provinces and their ruling councils. And should anyone question our remarks here today, let them study the record and the statements of government leaders themselves, such as Robert C. Weaver, former chief, Department of Housing and Urban Development, who said, 'Regional Government means Federal control over all property and its development regardless of location, anywhere in the United States, to be administered on the Federal Official's determination. It would supersede state and local laws.... Through this authority we seek to recapture control of the use of land, most of which the government has already given to the people.'

"And when the regional councils are soon functioning, with federal authority and federal funds, and there is no longer a need for mayors and city councilmen, and county commissioners, then the municipalities and counties will be dissolved; and unnecessary too will be state senators and representatives, many of whom did not even read, let alone understand, the enabling legislation which they passed."

(to be continued)

For information concerning this Newsletter please address all correspondence to:
DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

THE CONTRIVED EVOLUTION OF REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

----- Part Seventeen -----

SUBSTATE REGIONALISM IN THE NEW FEDERAL SYSTEM

That socialistic form of control that is called Regional Governance took a giant step forward in the United States with the passage of the Area Redevelopment Act of 1965. According to the terms of this legislation, any State or any "distressed" area of any State wanting federal assistance, was required to prepare and submit to the proper agency in Washington, an "Overall Economic Development Plan," and to set up a Regional Planning Commission to carry out the program once it had been approved by the Central Authority. Any State or area thereof that was not conversant with the procedures required for the drawing up and submitting of plans, or filling out the proper forms, etc., need merely apply to 1313's Public Administration Service, and expert assistance would be forthcoming and federal financing would be assured.

However, it was the Economic Development Act of 1965 that succeeded in popularizing Regional Planning Commissions. Title V of this Act provided for the establishment of *Multi-State* Regional Commissions. The first of these to combine more than one State in a Regional Development Program was the Appalachian Regional Development Plan. This was a part of President Johnson's War on Poverty, but LBJ had a little difficulty in putting this one across. The appropriation required for launching the Appalachian Program required Congressional consent.

Congress balked at approving such an expenditure for just one section of the country. So, LBJ held out a carrot—he promised the Congressmen and Senators that if they would approve the Appalachian Regional Commission, then they could have a Regional Commission for their own District! It worked; LBJ's famed "art of compromise" brought about the Appalachian Regional Commission, the New England Regional Commission, the Coastal Plains Regional Commission, the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission, the Ozarks Regional Commission, the Four Corners Regional Commission (New Mexico, Arizona, Utah and Colorado), the Old West Regional Commission, and the Pacific Northwest

Regional Commission—eight in all and all of them still in existence and competing for funds with the Ten Federal Regional Districts that would be established a few years later!


Former President Nixon usually gets the blame (or the praise if one is a Socialist) for having installed Regional Governance in the United States; but it was President Johnson who began the actual work. In a memorandum dated Sept. 2, 1966, President Johnson directed the Bureau of the Budget (now the Office of Management and Budget) to *coordinate at the Federal Level*, all Regional Planning in the Nation. As a result, the Director of BOB (now OMB) issued circular A-80. According to Rep. Nelson Pryor of Berlin, New Hampshire, 1313 then got into the act in this manner: Governor John Love of Colorado, at that time Chairman of the National Governor's Conference Committee on State Planning (1313), wrote to the Governors of all States urging them to comply with BOB's Circular A-80, and *establish State Regional Planning Commissions!*

Later, July 24, 1969, Circular A-95 was issued. Briefly, this gives the federal executive the right to establish rules and regulations governing regional projects, and also gives federal agents the power to veto local plans and programs whenever any federal funding is involved. Thus "home rule" is abolished and thus power is taken from the people and redelegated to regional chiefs who are appointed by Washington.

Then, on March 27, 1969, under the authority of the Executive Re-Organization Act of 1949, President Richard M. Nixon told the American people, by means of one of his rare press conferences, that the United States was being divided into eight federal regions. After that announcement there was a flurry of jealous protest from some of the cities that had not been chosen as Regional Capitals, and Nixon revised his order to provide for Ten Federal Regions, as illustrated in the accompanying map.

By Executive Order 11647 of February 12, 1972 and Executive Order 11731 of July 25, 1973, the process had been completed: Each of the ten federal regions would have a Governing Regional Council composed of appointed administrators

REGIONALISM



MAP COMPACTING FIFTY SOVEREIGN STATES INTO TEN FEDERAL REGIONS
 (Per, "Statement by the President on Restructuring of Government Service Systems," 27 March, 1969, and Executive Order #11647, "The Federal Regional Councils," 12 February, 1972.)

from each of the following departments or agencies: Department of Transportation, Office of Economic Opportunity; Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Department of Agriculture, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Department of Labor, Environmental Protection Agency, Department of the Interior, and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration; and with the Office of Management and Budget in overall charge of the entire operation.

It was with the establishment of these Ten Fed-

eral Regions that the program of ACIR and 1313 was changed from one of setting up Metros, Megalopoli and Ecumenopoli to one of creating Sub-State Regions within the Ten Federal Regions that had been ordered into existence by Executive Orders.

First, however, we must go back in time and pick up yet another strand that has been woven into the Regional Blanket that is smothering the Republic:

In previous letters we have explained how 1313 was established with Rockefeller money on Rockefeller property at 1313 East 60th St., Chicago, and how 1313 was designed to do at the domestic level what its companion organization, the *Council on Foreign Relations*, was created to accomplish at the foreign level. 1313 worked with State, County, Municipal and local governments; but the time came when it was felt that a more direct tie-in with the Federal Administration was needed. Consequently, there was created, in 1959, the *Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations*. From this time on, we begin to hear more of ACIR and less of 1313, since ACIR now is the official "front" and mouthpiece of 1313.

"The system" used by ACIR is partially explained in one of its publications, which tells us that:

"Commission recommendations for State action are translated into draft bills and proposed Constitutional amendments which constitute ACIR's State

Legislative Programs. The proposals have been made available in separate 'slip bill' form. They are brought to the attention of key legislative and executive officials of all the States, as well as other interstate groups and individuals."

After ACIR began to function, and the PPBS management and budget control system had been forced upon every federal administrative department, then came the division of the Nation into Ten Federal Regions, and the ensuing campaign to force all States to likewise divide themselves into Sub-State Regions.

The following is taken from an official publication of the ACIR, and is self-explanatory:

WHAT IS ACIR?

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) was created by Congress in 1959 to monitor the operation of the American federal system and to recommend improvements. ACIR is a permanent national bipartisan body representing the executive and the legislative branches of Federal, State and local government and the public.

Of the 26 Commission members, nine represent the Federal government, 14 represent State and local governments and three represent the general public. Twenty members are appointed by the President. He names three private citizens and three Federal executive officials directly and selects four Governors, three State legislators, four mayors and three elected county officials from slates nominated, respectively, by the National Governors' Conference, the Council of State Governments, the National League of Cities/U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the National Association of Counties (all are 1313 organizations—Ed.). The other six are Members of Congress—three Senators appointed by the President of the Senate and three Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House.

Commission members serve a two-year term and may be reappointed. The Commission names an Executive Director who heads a small professional staff.

After selecting specific intergovernmental issues for investigation, ACIR follows a multi-step procedure that assures review and comment by representatives of all points of view, all affected levels of government, technical experts and interested groups. The Commission then debates each issue and formulates its policy positions. Commission findings and recommendations are published and draft bills and executive orders are developed to assist in implementing ACIR policies." (End of statement).

A petition protesting the activities and the very existence of ACIR was prepared and presented to Congress by *Statewide Committees Opposing Regional Plan Areas* (SCORPA). The petition charged that ACIR is unconstitutional since Senators and Congressmen serve on its 26-member commission and the Constitution clearly states, in Article I, Section 6 (2), that: "No Senator or Representative shall, during the time for which he is elected, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States."

Further objections: ACIR is controlled by 1313, "a syndicate of like-minded affiliates and adjuncts linked by interlocking directorates and/or common purpose....;

01
"ACIR operates a 'law factory' and distributes pre-packaged legislation throughout federal, state and local governments, preempting the right of citizens to form their own laws through their representatives elected for that purpose...;

"The very existence of ACIR's federal-state-local collusion is a violation of both the word and the meaning of our Federal Constitution and the 50 State Constitutions....;

"ACIR promotes an implacable drive to eradicate local and State governments under its concept of Regional Governance, etc., etc."

From various ACIR reports and publications, we have gleaned the following pertinent information:

ACIR organization covers three major areas:

1. Taxation and finance;
2. Governmental Structure and Functions; and
3. Program Implementation.

ACIR devotes a major—and growing—proportion of time and resources to encouraging the implementation of the recommendations it makes to the legislative and executive branches of Federal, State, and local government.

Legislation to implement ACIR recommendations to Congress is usually introduced by United States Senators and Representatives who are members of the Commission.

The Council of State Governments includes most ACIR bills in its annual volume of "Suggested State Legislation" (copies of which volume of "mail order legislation" are sent to all important officials of every State for suggested State action—Ed.)

Attempts by the States to modernize their basic charters (State Constitutions) and to revamp the structure and organization of their governmental branches are basic ingredients of the continuing drive to *put more muscle in federalism's frame* (emphasis added).

The Commission and its key staff members submitted statements and testified before House and Senate committees on legislation of vital interest to *federalism*.

The creative partnership between Federal, State and local governments in responding effectively to old and new social, economic and developmental needs in urban and rural America can only flounder *unless antiquated State Constitutional provisions are revised*.

It should be noted that these Substate Regions that ACIR promotes are *federally controlled if a single cent of federal money is involved in the project*. This is brought about through the application of the provisions contained in that Circular A-95 which was previously mentioned in this letter. Under ACIR's official "Glossary of terms," there is given the following definition:

3. An areawide comprehensive planning organization or State agency recognized by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to notify other affected local or State governmental units of proposed Federal-aid or direct Federal projects before they are funded, and to perform reviews of such projects and comment upon them as to their consistency with areawide or State policies. This process is established by OMB Circular A-95, pursuant to Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 and Title IV of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968."

Translated into common English:

Any State or local agency desiring Federal assistance on a development project, must notify a "clearing house" of its intentions, furnishing a description of the project and other pertinent information. If the clearing house approves, then the request is forwarded to OMB for final action. If OMB approves, the project is coordinated with and made to conform to the computerized *Planning, Programming, Budgeting System*, by which all programs in which the federal government has any part, are managed and controlled. If the local project does not fit in with the long-range *Planning* for the Region, if it does not conform to "piggyback" *Programming* in the area, then the *Budgeting* of the project is denied. In more formal language, a bulletin issued by OMB to all executive departments and establishments states:

"The principal objective of PPB (Planning, Programming and Budgeting—Ed.) is to improve the basis for major program decisions in the operating agencies and in the Executive Office of the President. This requires clear statements of alternatives and of the reasons for decisions. Program objectives are to be identified and alternative methods of meeting them are to be subjected to systematic comparison. Data are to be organized on the basis of programs, and are to reflect the future as well as current implications of decisions. As in the case of budgeting, planning and programming apply not only to current programs but to proposals involving new legislation.

"The budget is the financial expression of the underlying program plan. Review by the Bureau (OMB) is conducted primarily in program terms. It is essential that the products of the PPB System—the Program Memoranda, Special Analytic Studies, and Program and Financial Plans—provide adequate bases for program decisions."

At the local level, it is the job of the clearing house to see to it that the local project fits in with all other projects in the area or Region; and OMB then determines that the project is in accord with overall long-range planning for the Region.

According to ACIR, there are three types of planning and developing clearing houses below the Multi-State Federal Regional level:

- The metropolitan clearing house;
- The regional clearing house, which approves planning and developing projects in the non-metropolitan areas;
- The State clearing house which... "usually is the State comprehensive planning agency."

"As of April, 1973," says an ACIR publication "53 State clearinghouses existed (including the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and American Samoa). Of the 212 metropolitan clearinghouses, 185 were intrastate and 27 were interstate, while only one of the 238 regional clearinghouses was interstate. The 450 substate and multistate clearinghouses in the United States covered over 2,000 counties, in which an estimated 88 percent of the nation's population lived."

Why these clearinghouses? According to ACIR:

"OMB's objective, then, is to provide the opportunity for achieving greater interlocal and intergovernmental cooperation in the long run and better coordination of specific State and substate planning and development activities in the short run. According to Dwight Ink (an ACIR Planner): 'A-95, in effect, forces people who should be talking to each other to talk to each other. Communication is fundamental to coordination. It has been our modest expectation that the intergovernmental dialogues contrived by A-95 would lead State and local governments to an identification of common interest which, quite possibly, would stimulate common enterprises and perhaps even continuing systematic cooperation... In short, we view A-95 and the laws on which it is based as institution building mechanisms—and institution building is a long term enterprise'."

In plainer language: A-95 forces everybody to obey OMB's PPB System, which is a long term enterprise aiming at a Total Managed Global Society. And there is not yet complete coordination at local levels because those OMB clearinghouses at present have control over only those development projects where some federal money is involved.

This is why *federal land control* is so important to the Regionalists: When the federal bureaucrats can determine just how every square inch of land is to be utilized or developed; once these clearinghouses hold dictatorial power over *all land development*, whether or not it is federally financed, then total tyranny will have arrived.

(to be continued)

DON BELL REPORTS and CLOSER-UP are privately circulated Newsletters. Complete service: \$24 per year. Extra copies: 10¢ each. Write: DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223 Palm Beach, Florida 33480

THE CONTRIVED EVOLUTION OF REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

. Part Eighteen

ACHIEVING NATIONAL GOALS

In a Communist country such as Russia or Mainland China, or wherever an absolute dictatorship exists, the business of setting up national goals that are to be achieved at some future date, is a comparatively simple procedure. This does not mean that the goals are going to be attained, usually they are not. But putting the plan into operation is simple: The Big Bosses get together, decide upon what they want to come to pass, draw up a program that will supposedly bring about what is desired, publish the package and call it a New Five Year Plan – and the bureaucrats and the people will follow instructions – or else.

However, in a “participatory democracy,” such as ours (that’s what our former representative republic has become, they tell us), things are a bit more complicated. Here there must be more publicity, more fanfare, persuasion and education, more carrots and fewer clubs. Of course, things are the same up to a point: Here, too, the Big Bosses get together and make the decisions, have their underlings draw up the plans, etc. But then they launch a crusade, a propaganda drive in order to convince the people that they, the people, know what’s going on, are in favor of what’s going on, and demand that the Big Bosses’ plans be put into effect.

That’s participatory democracy, as opposed to the hard-line socialism of Russia and China. You will already have understood, of course, that participatory democracy is just a synonym for Fabian Socialism. And here is a current and pertinent example of how it is used to promote Regional Governance in these United States:

Although 1313 and its allies and satellites have been preaching the gospel of Metro and Regionalism for nearly a quarter of a century the people are not yet convinced that it’s a smart idea to toss out all the old forms and adopt this *new federalism* in their place. So the Big Bosses have decided that some “participatory democracy” is required. Now, whenever an “educational crusade” is

needed, there is one army of propaganda propagators that has proved its worth to the Big Bosses time after time. We refer to the League of Women Voters. And the following, from The New York Times of September 1, 1974, needs no further explanation:

**URBAN GOVERNMENT
IS FOUND TO FALTER**

Washington, Aug. 31 (AP)—A new study by the League of Women Voters Education Fund says that urban governments around the country are malfunctioning and “ripe for reform” but not quite ready to rush into improvements. The study, published under the title “Supercity, Hometown, U.S.A. Prospects for Two-Tier Government,” concludes that current attacks on problems of urban government are piecemeal and hamstrung by antiquated political machinery devised when the country was chiefly rural.

Metropolitan areas are composed of too many governments, the study says, while none actually have the scope or authority to deal with problems adequately. The league’s study finds that a majority of both citizens and government officials support the suggested solutions of two-tier government but are cautious. The two-tier government provides a broad central government, such as a metropolitan government covering an entire county, coupled with sub-governments covering neighborhoods or smaller communities within the larger governed unit.

The foregoing report about the work of the League of Women Voters in regard to Metro and Regionalism, is an excellent example of how pre-conceived plans handed down by the Big Bosses as “National Goals” are promoted at the local level. However, before proceeding, we should be a bit more explicit about those Big Bosses:

Back in the 1950s, when Regional Governance began to be installed, there was a “Goals For Americans” Committee which was composed primarily of Rockefeller

underlings, CFR members and 1313 agents. Some of those proposed "National Goals" were adopted, some set aside for future action. Then in 1969, when Richard Nixon was still on the Rockefeller team, the President established within the White House a "National Goals Research Staff," directed by Leonard Garment and with Daniel P. Moynihan acting as Counsellor to the President and authoring the report, which was submitted on July 4, 1970. This particular National Goals report was titled "Toward Balanced Growth: Quantity with Quality," and was primarily an argument for the establishment of PPBS on a national scale, along with the need for "Regionalizing" the USA. A few brief quotes from the report should be sufficient:

"Social data...becomes indispensable to meeting the principle of accountability. There is no serious way for the Nation to know whether the (goals) are attained unless there is a steady, readily accessible, and understandable flow of information as to the actual results, which is to say the outputs, of government programs. *In this respect, one of the most important legislative measures in American history was the Budget and Accounting Act of June 10, 1921, which established the Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office (italics added).*"

"...The art of national goal setting, then, is to be realistic about what can be attained, and to use social data in such a way as to enable both the expert and lay publics to understand that progress toward any seriously difficult goal is going to take place by increments..."

"New tools and techniques have been developed to help make the complex comprehensible: for example, computerized information systems..."

"Last year, the National Governors' Conference (1313-Ed.) resolved to petition the Congress to...provide a sense of direction in Federal planning and in Federal programs which would seek to alleviate the growing national frustration that is occurring in overpopulated areas and in areas which are now losing population. Similarly, the National League of Cities (also 1313-Ed.), called for a specific policy for the settlement of people throughout the nation to balance the concentration of population among and within metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas while providing social and economic opportunities for all persons."

More recently: Nelson Rockefeller quit his post as Governor of New York, to create a

"National Commission on the Future of America in its Third Century." In other words, another National Goals Commission!

Here are startling coincidences: Rockefeller announced the creation of his new Goals Commission from the White House, Jerry Ford was named a member of the new Rockefeller Commission, shortly thereafter Ford was appointed (not elected) Vice President of the United States, and then after a brief delay Nelson Rockefeller was appointed (not elected) Vice President of the United States as his friend Jerry succeeded to the Presidency (by appointment).

So much for the nonce about the way the Big Bosses operate. Now let us shift our attention to the local arena, and here we find the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) laying down the rules for the development of that program that is being promoted and popularized by the League of Women Voters.


We have a copy of a rather lengthy directive issued about a year ago by ACIR. So you'll know exactly what ACIR has in mind for your area, we shall quote at length from that directive:

SUBSTATE REGIONALISM: A STAFF ANALYSIS

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations adopted five recommendations at its June 22-23 meeting in San Francisco which endorse a concerted, Federal-State-local strategy for bringing greater order, accountability, and sense of direction to more than 250 metropolitan regions and practically all rural areas.

A comprehensive 18-month Commission study of substate regions shows that this Nation faces a major problem regarding proliferating districts in urban and rural areas—especially at that new but active level above cities and counties but below the States—the substate regional level. Most of these districting developments have emerged over the past decade because of combined Federal-State-local efforts to treat areawide problems in an areawide context. What has been missing in all but a handful of cases, however, is a regional unit with the capacity to link areawide planning with program implementation, to coordinate the diverse activities of separate districts having single-function planning and operation responsibilities — in short, to serve as an effective regional decision-maker.

In these substate areas, the country now confronts the dilemma of sorting out the roles, responsibilities and relationships between and among towns, cities and counties; over 600 regional councils of government dominated by city and county spokesmen; nearly 25,000 special districts and authorities...approximately 1,800 Federally encouraged regional districts



FLORIDA MULTI-COUNTY DISTRICTS

The United States have been divided into Ten Federal Regions, each State has been divided into sub-state districts, as in this map, and the sub-state districts have been divided into sub-regional districts and authorities. This is the New Federalism!

under 19 grant programs; ... and 488 substate districts in 40 States officially sponsoring this regional system (as of 1972).

A typical metropolitan area is made up of 90 units including general and special purpose local governments, Federally encouraged districts (not governments), and a regional council or planning agency. These include:

- * 2 counties
- * 13 townships
- * 21 municipalities
- * 31 special districts and authorities (local and area-wide), such as fire protection, water supply, sewers, housing
- * 3-4 Federally supported areawide planning districts, such as law enforcement, comprehensive health, manpower, transportation
- * 1 regional council/A-95 clearinghouse (to review and comment on areawide impact of certain Federal grant applications)

To coordinate these diverse bodies and develop an effective decision-making mechanism at the substate level, the Commission adopted a strategy building on areawide units—councils of government and regional planning commissions—that now exist in all metropolitan areas and over 300 non-metropolitan areas as well as on substate districting systems already instituted by 44 States. This strategy emerges from the five recommendations adopted by ACIR in San Francisco. Commission staff will now develop draft legislation to help individual States and the Federal government implement the plan. The following analysis describes the regional bodies that would result from adoption of the Commission's strategy.

Basically, ACIR envisions a multi-jurisdictional organization composed mostly of local general government officials, with some State representatives. It would have policy control over all areawide planning, programming and policy development programs in its region along with comparable authority over the actions of multi-jurisdictional special districts. This body also would have the capacity to resolve conflicts between certain State agency and local governmental actions having an areawide impact on the one hand, and officially adopted regional plans and policies, on the other....

- The council would:
- * adopt and publicize regional policies and plans

- along with a program for their implementation;
- * provide planning and programming inputs into the State's planning and budgeting process;
- * serve as the region's A-95 review agency;
- * assume the responsibility for implementing all Federally encouraged areawide planning, programming, coordinating, districting, or even servicing programs as well as for similar State undertakings.
- * act as the basic policy board for multi-jurisdictional special districts;
- * promote mutual problem-solving among counties, cities, and towns, and provide such services as these units may singly or jointly request;
- * resolve differences between certain State agency and local government programs and projects that have spillover effects on policies adopted by the council; and
- * in certain instances, assume direct operating responsibilities under such terms as may be set down in the State authorizing legislation, provided half the local member units representing 60 percent of the region's population concur.

This reformed regional council would be a comprehensive and functional planning, coordinating, programming, servicing and implementing body.

A mix of Federal-State-local actions are recommended to provide the council with the arsenal of powers needed to help guide substate regional development.

The proposed council would become the preferred implementing instrumentality for Federally encouraged districting programs under State legislation establishing a comprehensive substate districting system and promulgation of a new OMB directive covering all Federally assisted programs having a regional thrust....

The council would be assigned special review authority over State agency actions having a regional impact....

In addition, the council would have its officially adopted regional policies or plans recognized as guides for pertinent local governmental programming, planning and implementation activities, pursuant to proposed action by the governing bodies of such jurisdictions.

With these powers conferred by Federal-State-local actions, the revitalized regional council could speak with authority....

ACIR's strategy for reforming regional councils is not an idealized dream of regionalism, but is rooted in the real world of substate development.

- * Regional councils with A-95 review and comment authority already exist in 212 metropolitan and 238 non-metropolitan areas.
- * Two-thirds of the 488 substate districts established in 40 States now are authorized, and action is underway in four additional States.
- * The boundaries of eight of the most significant of the Federally encouraged districting programs coincide (or are in harmony) with those of the State-established substate districts in about 50 percent of

the cases. The Federal government has relied on substate districting organization in more than one-third of the possible cases in these eight program areas.

- * Approximately half of the regional councils already are the preferred unit for four-to-nine of the Federally encouraged areawide districting programs operating in their respective regions.
- * Seven States have given review and approval authority to some or all of their regional councils over certain State projects.
- * Four-fifths of the 3800 city and county officials surveyed by ACIR agreed that regional councils should perform the duties of an "umbrella" agency, especially with regard to the activities of independent special districts.
- * The Metropolitan Regional Council in Minnesota's Twin Cities area and the Atlanta Regional Council along with at least 5-10 percent of the other existing councils already possess many or most of the proposed powers and functions assigned to the reformed regional councils under the Commission recommendation.

To conclude, the Commission's proposed reforms for regional councils rely heavily on the building blocks already in place at the substate level. But they go well beyond the status quo in their systematic effort to provide an effective umbrella unit that can cope with the growing demand for better management, coordination, implementation—in short, decision-making—in those programs and institutions that are areawide in nature. (End of ACIR Staff Analysis)

ACIR is confident that Regionalism is here to stay, as the foregoing analysis asserts. Regionalism, more accurately identified as a corporate state, is promoted at municipal, county, State and Federal levels of government, aided and abetted by elected officials. Government leaders are no longer responsive to the will of the people; they have become mere implementing agents for programs promulgated by and for the dictating oligarchy of which the Rockefeller dynasty is a principal part, now having captured the White House itself!

Not only is Regionalism the new American form of government; it is the new form of World Government, as we shall see in our next letter in this series.

(To be continued)

DON BELL REPORTS is a weekly Newsletter accenting the Christian American point of view. Two copies of each issue are sent to each subscriber. Extra copies: 10¢ each. Complete service: \$24 per year. Please address all correspondence and orders to:
 DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
 Palm Beach, Florida 33480

THE CONTRIVED EVOLUTION OF REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

- - - - - Part Nineteen - - - - -

REGIONALISM – THE NEW WORLD ORDER

If you were asked to name some of the many forms of government that exist throughout the world today, you would probably name republics and democracies, kingdoms and monarchies, and the various forms of totalitarian government that have cropped up since socialism became a fashionable economic system. But whenever a person thinks of a *government*, he is thinking of some kind of a *political system*.

Regional Governance is different in this respect: It is *not* a political system *per se*. It is a corporate management system, a social control system, an accountability system, a system that seeks to manage and direct all human development. But these are not the functions of a *political system*.

We need to get back to first principles and understand that political systems, whatever their form and however good or bad they may be considered to be, properly concern themselves with three distinct yet related areas of civic organization: with the making of laws, with the administration of those laws, and with the maintenance of those laws through a system of justice which repairs broken laws by punishing those who broke them.

Law, then, is the principle concern of any political system; it is out of a proper regard for the revealed law of God that there must develop a proper regard for life, liberty and property. But *Regional Governance* has no regard for law as the cardinal principle of social organization. For law it substitutes regulation, and for justice it substitutes the Marxian concepts that the end justifies the means and that the greatest good is the "good society," as that utopian ideal is extrapolated by the Regionalists.

Webster's Third Unabridged Dictionary gives an excellent definition of what makes up a political system in its ethical and purest sense. "Politics," says the dictionary, "is primarily concerned with the conscious definite purpose of society to establish

authority (*government*) and to determine its function (*law*); it does not go back to the origins of social institutions (*sociology*) nor to the causes of human actions (*psychology*) nor does it deal directly with social phenomena connected with materials (*economics*) nor with individual human beings as causative factors (*history*)..."

The point is important: political systems should not concern themselves with sociology, psychology, economics, or even history; their concern is with Law (and happy is the Nation whose Law is the Lord's).

In diametric opposition to this, Regional Governance does not concern itself with law as such. Indeed, under the concepts of Regionalism, laws upholding representative government are negated and *appointed* officials replace *elected* officials (even in the case of Presidents and Vice Presidents) and equal justice for all is ignored in the treatment of those guilty of political crimes. But Regionalism does concern itself greatly with *sociology* (in its attempts to create a new kind of world society); with *psychology* (in its attempts to develop a new kind of human who will fit properly into this new kind of society); with *economics* (in its determination to control land use, natural and human resources, production and distribution, etc.); and with *history* (in its attempts to predestinate and direct the evolution of man and the world which man inhabits).

In short, Regional Governance is not a political system; it is a corporate management system designed for the control of the world and all that's in it, on it, over it or under it!

If Regionalism is a management system for the whole world, then one would not expect this concept to be confined to the United States' Regionalism would be rearing its authoritarian head in other Nations of the world. And this is exactly what is happening.

As an example, the following press release came from the French Embassy, 972 Fifth Avenue, New York 21, New York; and we quote verbatim:

REGIONAL REFORM IN FRANCE

It has taken two hundred years for France to move from the system of provinces set up under the *ancien régime* to today's 'regions.' The original idea for regionalization was proposed as far back as 1890, but it was not until 1944 that certain reforms were undertaken to reorganize regional administration and establish a new administrative hierarchy. From that time on France has been engaged in adapting regional administration to the exigencies of the modern state.

The chronological development of regionalization is shown below:

- * 1955: interdepartmental zones were designated for the drafting and execution of economic development programs at the interdepartmental level;
- * 1959: a law was passed in January of that year providing for "interdepartmental conferences" prefects to coordinate their activities, and gradual coordination of the various administrative districts;
- * 1960: 21 groupings of departments, known as Districts for Regional Action, were set up to handle economic planning at the regional level.

Subsequent major stages in regional reform were:

- * 1964: the appointment of regional prefects and the founding of the Regional Economic Development Commission (CODER), a 40 to 50-member consultative body. It is composed of departmental delegates, mayors, representatives of various professions and labor unions, and qualified persons designated by the Premier (CODER corresponds to our ACIR-Ed.);
- * 1969: rejection by a nationwide referendum of President de Gaulle's proposal to set up regions with autonomous powers and considerable financial resources;
- * 1972: Parliament votes the law on regional reforms.

The major steps taken toward decentralization in 1964 and again in 1970 were dictated by the need for an efficient economic administration; in other words, the level at which "flexible, liberal and adaptable" decisions in administrative matters are made passed from the national ministries to the regional administrations.

Among the new (regional) institutions are:

- * Regional Councils composed of local deputies, senators and delegates from

towns and departments. The number of seats on these councils is proportional to the number of inhabitants in each region.

- * Economic and Social Committees composed primarily of representatives of labor unions and management.

Both groups may be consulted on matters concerning regional development and land-use planning, particularly in respect to the formulation and implementation of the economic Plans. The two bodies also participate in determining the use of public funds for investments in projects of regional or departmental interest....

...The future of the regions will depend to a large extent on the way in which the existing legislative framework will be utilized and expanded. Additional resources will eventually be channeled into the regions either in the form of allocations from the state or from local communities. The Regional Councils and the Regional Economic and Social Councils do in fact serve to promote the policy of regional development. In view of their composition and representative character, regional bodies like these bring imagination and creative talent to regional activities just as much as they assist in deciding and implementing regional development policy.

(End of press release from the
French Embassy)

The accompanying "administrative map of France" carries this descriptive caption:

"France has traditionally been divided into Departments, each headed by a Prefect representing the Government. In July 1964, new Departments were created in the Paris Region, raising the total number of Metropolitan Departments from 91 to 95. All these Departments have been regrouped for economic and administrative purposes into 22 Regions, each headed by a Regional Prefect who coordinates activities in the Departments composing his Region."

We have quoted at length from this French Regionalism report to illustrate how, though the French Republic and the United States Republic are basically different in composition and construction, *the concept of Regionalism follows exactly the same blueprint in both France and the United States!*

There are 51 million Frenchmen in an area only about one-eighteenth the size of the United States. Because of this population density, France has been divided into 22 Regions, whereas the United States has been divided into only ten Federal Regions. Italy, also densely populated, has been



split into twenty-odd Regions. On the other hand, that huge land mass known as the USSR has also been Regionalized, and the fifteen "Republics" which make up the Soviet Union have been regrouped into only seven regions, to be governed by seven Regional Councils (taking their orders from Moscow, of course).

This same general trend of delineating Regional boundaries according to population density is especially apparent in Canada. Here the "Metro" pattern has been followed and, rather than Regions as in USA, France, Italy, USSR, etc., Canada has concentrated on "reorganizing government in metropolitan areas."

An ACIR report of some 134 pages on the subject of "Canadian Regional Experience"

begins with the statement that "Americans interested in local government reform have remarked enviously about Canadian success in reorganizing government in metropolitan areas." It seems that this success is partly due to the fact that "most of Canada is uninhabited" and "in area, Canada is larger than the U.S. and second only to the USSR." More important, however, is the fact that Canada's governmental structure is different from that of the United States:

"In the Canadian version of federalism, the provincial legislatures have limited, explicit powers, while Parliament has general and residual powers. This reversal of the United States constitutional formula has been the subject of continual debate. . . . Our Constitution does not mention substate govern-

ments, but the British North American Act of 1867, Canada's Constitution... gives the provinces complete authority over municipal institutions.... As Donald Tansley expressed it, in Canada, 'Local government... is whatever the provincial government says it is'."

In other words, because of the difference in Constitutional authority, it has been much easier to install Metros and Regions in Canada than in the United States.

In Canada, as in all other countries of the world that are not patterned after the United States Constitutional system, political power extends from the top downward to the local level; whereas in the United States—before Regionalism began—the political power began at the local, or grass roots, level and extended upward to State Capitals and then to the Federal Capitol in Washington. In order to make the United States "more like Canada and the other countries of the world," the United States Constitution has been amended, misinterpreted and ignored, while State Constitutions have been entirely rewritten, and local governments have been swallowed up by Federal Regions, Substate Regions, and Metros.

ACIR makes the point that Regionalism has been quite successful in Canada, although it has been installed only in the more populous areas such as Montreal, Ottawa, Quebec, Toronto, Vancouver and Winnipeg.

In ACIR's summary of the "Canadian Regional Experience," written by Guthrie S. Birkhead of Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York, we are informed that "Canada no doubt is on the threshold of a period when a reordering of policies and priorities among the levels of government may take place. A few critics are asking the federal government to establish direct relations with major municipalities, and there is even a suggestion that Toronto and Montreal ought to be made separate provinces. The parallel with the United States in the sixties is again salient. If we may judge from the Canadian record of local reorganization since World War II, however, more firm action to strengthen local governments may be at hand. The case studies in this volume are, therefore, timely indeed."

If ACIR thinks that Canadian Regionalism has developed better than United States Regionalism, but is still not good enough; it is regrettable that ACIR has not published (yet, at least) a case study of the "Russian Regionalism Experience." For the way in which Regionalism can be developed in a totalitarian nation should please ACIR im-

mensely.

You see, Regional Governance is not necessarily the management system that has been selected and that will be installed as the World Authority simply because the Western Nations such as Canada, France, Italy, et al, have followed the United States in the Regionalization of their countries. This could be but an Atlantic Alliance project, not a Regionalization of the whole world.

But when the USSR also adopts the concept of Regionalism so that Regionalism is made to apply to totalitarian as well as so-called democratic political systems, then we can assert with evidence to back up the statement, *that Regionalism is the Corporate Management System that has been selected for the Rulership of the World!*

Soviet Party leader Leonid I. Brezhnev, in his keynote speech marking the 50th anniversary of the Russian Revolution, spoke of the changes that were being planned. Then, the April 1973 issue of the Soviet Government's planning journal, *Planned Economy*, made the establishment of seven Regional Councils official. The overall policies of the USSR, declared the journal, now would be based on the new Regional Planning Units.

Of course, the concept of Regionalism includes the use of a Planning, Programming, Budgeting System (which is little more than a technological modernization of a Soviet Five-Year Plan); and computers and data banks are essential to Regional Governance. In this latter requirement, IBM and other computer manufacturers have been happy to help the Communists. Recently Control Data Corporation announced a \$500-million deal with the Soviets for the development of an advanced computer and communications network. So, with Soviet Secret Police techniques, concentration camp knowhow, brainwashing methods, torture chamber knowledge *plus* American technological superiority in accountability systems and computerized memory banks, the USSR soon should be able to lead the world in corporate management, even as it is now said to lead the world in nuclear fire-power.

(to be continued)

DON BELL REPORTS is a weekly Newsletter accenting the Christian American point of view. Two copies of each issue are sent to each subscriber. Extra copies: 10¢ each. Complete service: \$24 per year. Please address all orders and correspondence to:
DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

THE CONTRIVED EVOLUTION OF REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

. Part Twenty

THE REGIONAL CONGLOMERATE

The Concept of Regionalism can become a quite confusing subject for study because of the many overlapping jurisdictions, bureaucratic rivalries, conflicts of interest between politicians at various levels of government, etc. A report by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR), dated February 1974, admits:

"The assignment of governmental responsibility for urban functions is presently an un-systematic if not haphazard process. These patterns of functional assignment have resulted from national program initiatives; State decisions about whether to perform a service directly, indirectly or by mandating it to a lower governmental tier, or through the workings of its intergovernmental aid system; fiscal pressures . . . and the historical and legal status of different types of local governments within a particular State. . . . With respect to levels of government, the national government is the foremost direct provider of natural resource development and air and water transportation services. State governments are the major providers of higher education, highway, welfare and correctional services. Local governments remain the dominant actors in providing education, police, fire, sewerage, refuse collection, parks and recreation, and library services. The hospital function is evenly divided between State and local levels of government.

"However, these data do not adequately reflect the true assignment of functions since they do not take into account the impact of intergovernmental aid on these functions. When this factor is considered, the Federal government replaces the States as the major financier of welfare services and supplants local governments as the chief source of funds for housing and urban renewal, while State government becomes a more prominent financier of educational services. . . ."

It is when the Federal government moves in to replace State and local governments in

the dispensing of services, that the situation becomes very complicated indeed. The various Federal departments and agencies then begin duplicating services, stepping on each others' figurative toes, and causing chaos generally.

Regionalism was supposed to alleviate the bureaucratic bedlam. And it was supposed to work like this at the national level:

1. The Federal Administration was to take charge of *all* administrative functions;
2. State and local governments were to serve merely as administrative assistants until such time as Federal Regions and Sub-regions could be established and empowered to replace State and local governments.
3. All Federal departments, agencies, etc. to be brought together in Regional Councils so they would cooperate rather than compete in their administrative functions.
4. When the Ten Federal Regions were established by Executive Order in 1972, and the Sub-regions expanded to cover every locality in every State, *the concept of Regionalism* would seem to have become a reality, installed, established, accepted and ready to function.

However, the Ten Federal Regions that were created by Executive Order do not provide the total administrative control that is demanded by the Planners of the New Order! Even more weapons of control are required, and there are other factors to be considered:

"Administration of services to the people" is the stated purpose of the Ten Federal Regions. Into each of the Ten Councils that manage these Regions were placed appointed administrators representing each of the principal agencies of the Federal government that *render services directly to the people*: The Departments of Labor, HEW, HUD, Transportation; LEAA, OEO, EPA, with OMB in charge of the overall rulership of the people through its computerized control of *Planning, Programming and Budgeting* — with the general policy-making

being handed down through channels from the Office of the Chief Administrator via the Domestic Council.

The "control mechanism" in this case revolves around the Budget. An excellent example of how this control is maintained over every tiniest locality is illustrated by this article which appeared in the *New York Times* of Sept. 14, 1974:

**"LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FACE DELAYS
"IN REVENUE-SHARING FUND SNARL**

"Washington, Sept. 13 (AP)—Some 6,000 state and local governments may face delays of three months or more in receiving millions of dollars in Federal revenue-sharing aid because they have not filed the proper forms. A Treasury Department official said that if the forms were not in by next Wednesday, the money would be delayed until early 1975. A spokesman for the Treasury Department's office of revenue-sharing said that the total amount involved were substantial (sic). Boston (scene of current school-busing controversy—Ed.) might have to wait until January at the earliest to receive \$5-million it is entitled to receive next month....

"The stumbling blocks are what Priscilla R. Crane, information officer for the government's revenue-sharing operation, describes as two, simple, one-page forms. One form, called a planned use report, describes how the revenue-sharing recipient plans to use the money.... The other form, called an actual use report, lists how the recipients spent the checks they received every three months between July last year and June this year...."

These reports are important to the appointed controllers in Washington because, as has been previously explained: Local Politicoes and Sub-State Regional Administrators are permitted to prepare and effectuate their own local programs *provided* these programs fit into and complement the overall plans for the area and region, and *provided* the money budgeted by OMB was spent as promised and for the program as approved (the italicized words illustrate the application of the *Programming, Planning, Budgeting System* (PPBS) to the revenue-sharing scheme).

So much for the control and management of the people and their State and local governments through the control of "services to the people" via the Ten Regional Councils. But this is just one important part of the whole monstrosity known as the *Concept of Regionalism*. There are other regions, other councils, other methods of control.

For example: When the Ten Federal Regions

were established by Executive Order for the "control of services to the people," there already existed Twelve Federal Reserve Bank Districts which had been established more than sixty years ago for "the control of money," or, as the Board of Directors said in an official publication: "to make possible a flow of credit and money that will foster orderly economic growth and a stable dollar" (the Feds certainly control credit and money but that bit about a "stable dollar" is no longer a joking matter).


Note that when the Ten Federal Regions were established to "control services to the people," those Twelve Federal Reserve Districts that had been established to "control money and credit" were neither altered nor abolished; instead, they continued to operate as usual.

The point we wish to make: Just as the "control of services" is essential to the Regional Concept of Governance, so is the "control of money," the "control of power and energy," the control of the development of natural resources, the control of waterways, birth control, the control of population density and the movement of people into new communities, etc., etc.

Here is where many other aspects of the Concept of Regionalism are involved, and in many instances whole new sets of Regions have been created. *But they are not competitive, they are cooperative, they are all parts of the whole concept and they complement each other.*

A recent exchange of correspondence will serve as an adequate explanation:

Merritt Newby, publisher of that excellent series of bulletins called the *American Challenge*, has on several occasions published a set of four different maps, or charts. One with which all readers of *Don Bell Reports* are probably familiar, delineates the World Government Plan which was drawn up and published originally by the *World Association of Parliamentarians* following the third annual conference of that British-based organization in 1953. Originally called the *Parliamentarians for World Government*, this group divided the world into eight Zones made up of 51 Regions. There would be a World Director, eight Zone Directors and 51 Regional Directors. The Regional Directors were to be aliens, as were the troops stationed throughout the world to enforce World Law. For instance, the United States and Canada would be divided into six Regions, each of which would be governed by an alien and policed by alien troops.



On the same page and below this World Map Mr. Newby placed the map of the United States as it has been divided into the Ten Federal Regions. On page 2 of Mr. Newby's paper was published the map which divides the United States into 22 different Regions according to the watersheds or river basins of the Continent, a map which received much publicity after exposure of the Potomac River Basin Compact.

And finally, on page 4, Mr. Newby published a map showing the "computerized population control" which will be used to resettle the people of the United States in order to prevent too much population density in any one area of the United States. Forced migration would be utilized to create 25 Regions with controlled populations in each Region.

At first glance, it would seem that since one map shows the United States divided into Ten Regions, another shows it divided into twenty-two Regions, a third shows it divided into twenty-five Regions, and a fourth shows the United States and Canada divided into only six Regions, *there must be something wrong with the overall picture.*

Mr. Newby was challenged on the veracity of his *American Challenge*, the writer saying in part: "You and others have told us the United States had been divided into ten Regions. Now you tell us it has been divided into *twenty-two* Regions. This does

not seem to make sense at all. It has to be one or the other *not both*. This is very confusing to us Patriots. What Happened? I know you never change horses in the middle of the stream unless one of the horses drops dead or falls down and breaks a leg. Did the CFR change horses in the middle of the stream?"

Here is Merritt Newby's concise answer, slightly edited to provide even greater conciseness:

"Dear"

"*Regional Government* (the Ten Region Map) is the *Ruling Government over all*. Study the maps separately, noting the intents and purposes of each. . . . :

"*The Master Land Plan* (the 22-region map) is to control the Land, Water, Natural Resources of America.

"*The Population Map* (the 25-region map) is a forced movement of the people into various sections of the Nation, etc.

"*The Police Map* (the world map) means exactly what it represents. *You will be Policed!*

"No horses have been changed. You have to watch Four Horses at the same time doing the same thing in a different way which, of course, is complete bondage and slavery."

We agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Newby's

explanation. However, he has called attention to the four leading horses and there are others which also are "doing the same thing in a different way." There is the Federal Reserve and its Regions, the Public Power and Irrigation Districts, various Interstate Compacts, school districts that cross county and even State lines, etc., etc.

These are all a part of the Concept of Regional Government and are in complete opposition to the Representative Republic Concept which was the very foundation of the original American System of government.

A note of importance concerning the "Population Map" which is mentioned in previous paragraphs: This map came about as the direct result of a report on "Population and the American Future," which was prepared by The Commission on Population Growth and The American Future," submitted to the President of the United States on March 22, 1972, by John D. Rockefeller 3rd, Chairman.

Among other things, this Rockefeller Commission which was appointed by the President of the United States to make a study of population control, recommended:

"that state governments, either through existing planning agencies or through new agencies devoted to this purpose, give greater attention to the problems of population growth and distribution. . . .

"that the federal government develop a set of national population distribution guidelines to serve as a framework for regional, state and local plans and development. . . .

"that the process of population movement be eased and guided. . . .

"that governments exercise greater control over land-use planning and development. . . .

"that a task force be designated under the leadership of the Office of Management and Budget to devise a program for the development of comprehensive immigration and emigration statistics. . . .

"the creation of an Office of Population Growth and Distribution within the Executive Office of the President. . . ."

This Rockefeller Commission also recognized "the importance of human sexuality" and recommended that sex education be available to all...especially schools; that federal, state and local governments make available funds to support abortion services; that unwanted fertility be controlled, etc.

All such matters are included within the Concept of Regional Governance.

Land-Use Control is one of the chief

reasons for the creation of the 22 River Basin Regions. The Ten Region "services to people control" does not deal explicitly with land, water and natural resources. This is where the River Basin Compact scheme becomes useful to the Planners.

It will be recalled that the Federal Land-Use Act was defeated in Congress. So, on August 27, 1974, the Federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) had placed in the *Federal Register* an Executive Order which does exactly what the twice-defeated Land-Use Control Law would have done. Under present procedure, an Executive Order automatically becomes "law" thirty days after its publication in the *Federal Register*; so, this Land-Use Law will have become effective by September 26.

EPA is, of course, one of the "service to the people" agencies included within the Ten Regional Councils...but in the case of Land Control, EPA prefers to work through the 22 Regions formed by Interstate River Basin Compacts. As an example: The New England River Basins Commission (one of 22 in the Nation) works with the State Departments of Environmental Protection, which are in turn controlled by the federal EPA. NERBC's annual report for 1972 says: "With anticipated enactment of National Land Use Policy proposals, the cost and complexity of state natural resources planning programs will have increased several orders of magnitude (one order of magnitude means ten times-Ed.)"

This River Basins Commission report uses the words "resource management" 70 times in an 80-paragraph text, uses the words "control" and "regulation" time after time. . . . And one wonders how they were so sure in 1972 that federal Land Use Controls were to be established in 1974 despite Congressional rejection of the legislation?

But this is the Concept of Regionalism at work: If Congress won't cooperate, then an Executive Order will do the same thing in a different way. Not only at local, State and National levels, but on a world scale as well. For, in the final analysis, Regionalism is World Management and Control.

(to be concluded next letter)

DON BELL REPORTS is a weekly Newsletter accenting the Christian American point of view. Two copies of each issue are sent to each subscriber. Extra copies: 10¢ each. Complete service: \$24 per year. Please address all orders and correspondence to:
DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

THE CONTRIVED EVOLUTION OF REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

- - - - - Part Twenty-One - - - - -

THE WRAP-UP

Regionalism is a control system designed to provide corporate management of all production, development, and use of all the resources, both natural and human, of all the world. It is a plan to secure control over all things and all persons at every social and governmental level, from the local community to the entire world. It is a highly developed form of corporate socialism.

Regionalist Richard C. Hartman, executive director of the National Association of Regional Councils, is in partial agreement with our statement. He wrote:

"To demonstrate the breadth and lack of clarity of the term regionalism ('region'), one can check a dictionary and find definitions such as:

- * Any large part of the earth's surface.
- * A place, space, area.
- * Sphere, domain.
- * A division of the earth according to plant or animal life.

"Regionalism is based on a geographic and community denominator. How you define region is based on the need or objective to be achieved...Historically, the national government has been the initiator and moving force for regional programs and agencies. The earliest concrete federal interest was in terms of multi-state regionalism to deal with specific concerns such as water resources or economic development. The noteworthy products of this interest are: creation in 1913 of the twelve-region Federal Reserve System; establishment in 1933 of the Tennessee Valley Authority...; cooperation with states to create... water resource compact agencies (22 regions-Ed)...and, finally, creation in 1965 of the Appalachian Regional Commission and, under Title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act, five economic development commissions. In the last two years Congress has considered additional proposals to establish more multi-state commissions for land use and transportation. There is also a

pending proposal to expand the number of economic development commissions from five to ten to encompass the entire United States....

"In 1968, by executive order, President Nixon did take a significant step in multi-state regionalism. He established ten geographically defined federal regions...."

All of the foregoing is quoted from *The Regionalist Papers*, a research project by Metropolitan Fund, Inc., published in April 1974 and consisting of twelve "Regionalist Papers" which are compared quite brazenly with the "Federalist Papers" written by Madison, Hamilton and Jay to explain the United States Constitution and the new form of government which it provided. These "Regionalist Papers" are similarly written to explain the new form of governance which is to replace the old federal form—if the Regionalists continue to have their way.

This Metropolitan Fund is a nonprofit research corporation, financed by Ford and other foundations, and by "contributions from business, industry, and labor organizations." These "Regionalist Papers," 284 pages in all, deal with Regionalism within the United States, but a similar set of propaganda papers might well deal with the progress of Regionalism on a world-wide scale.

Students of the World Government Movement will recognize the fact that one of the chief arguments used by One Worlders was the success which our Founding Fathers had in taking thirteen sovereign and independent States and welding them into one Federal Union. One Worlders argued that, if such a plan was successful with the United States, then why couldn't the plan be extended to form a United States of the World?

Regionalists have a more practical idea: Why not create, first, a series of Regional Governments, and then, when circumstances permit, bind them all together under one World Authority (as Orwell had foreseen)? This was the purpose behind the establish-

ment—under the authority of the United Nations Organization—of a series of Regional Organizations: NATO, SEATO, CENTO, the USSR's Warsaw Pact Satellites, etc.

It was understood by the Regionalists that a Regionalist World Authority could not be established while Iron Curtains and Bamboo Curtains and other divisive ideologies cut the world into separate parts.

This, we believe, was the chief purpose of Henry Kissinger's secret negotiations with Communist leaders in Moscow and Peking: In the interests of production, development, and use of the world's resources, both natural and human, the time had come when all the Regional Organizations of the world were to be brought together under one World Authority.

Meanwhile, Regionalism was progressing at National levels very satisfactorily. As we illustrated (with maps) in previous letters in this series, France and Italy had "Regionalized," behind the Iron Curtain the USSR had been Regionalized. And in that so-called "Third World" which consists of States not directly controlled by East or West Authoritarians, the United Nations was taking charge of Regionalization:

From the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations, we have a report on "Planning for Economic Development in Czechoslovakia and Hungary." An interesting observation: After describing a series of government agencies very similar to our own OMB, Domestic Council, Central Bank (FRS), Regional Councils, and an overall control system similar to PPBS, the UN report states:

"All of these agencies are specialized Government organs for the management of certain sectors of the economy, though they usually do not directly manage any enterprise or economic establishment. The enterprises and other economic organizations are managed by the Government (assisted by the above-named agencies) either through branch ministries or through *regional agencies of the state power* . . ."

Here is an example of Regionalistic double-talk: The regional agencies don't manage or control, the Government manages and controls through the regional agencies!

But, let's get back to Regionalism in the United States.

At the very beginning of this series of letters, we wrote about the three theories of governance which have developed in the United States:

1) The Compact Theory.

2) The Continental Theory.

3) The International, or World Theory.

We explained that the Compact Theory originated with the Mayflower Compact and implied true home rule, or local rule; that the Continental Theory looked toward a strong central government in Washington, with a corresponding diminution of State and local political power; and the International Theory implied World Government.

We find an echo of what we wrote at that time being used as an argument for Regionalism in the Foreword to these *Regionalist Papers* from which we have quoted previously. Instead of Compact Theory this author writes of "localists" and instead of the Continental Theory, he refers to "centralists." And he very carefully avoids any mention of the Internationalist Theory. However, just as the One Worlders point to the founding of the United States as an argument for World Government; just so does this author (Kent Methewson, president of the Metropolitan Fund) pervert the meaning of home rule, or localism, and use it as an argument for Regionalism. We quote:

I believe that *The Regionalist Papers* represents a clear and compelling call for strong and effective local government... albeit on a regional scale... a call for united strength in a metropolitan context... a strength that has been dissipated through fractionation and debilitating competition among a gaggle of weak and ineffective political subdivisions.

Though it may be an imprecise analogy, I must liken the existence of our metropolitan regions today under voluntary councils of governments (in which this writer shares responsibility for creation of the COG institution) to the "disunited states" of America under the Articles of Confederation in the late 1770's and 1780's. And as others have said, the prospect for the future of our metropolitan regions is as bleak now in the absence of unity as was the future of our country in those critical times that spurred Madison, Hamilton, and Jay to write the Federalist Papers.

Our metropolitan areas now are undergoing that same struggle between the ideologies of the "localists" and the "centralists" as existed in 1787 at the national level. We are reminded that Hamilton found himself outnumbered two to one by the "localist" delegates when he and his followers arrived at the New York convention to ratify the new "centralist" constitution of the United States. The odds, actors, and arguments seem much the same today in the struggle

to achieve an institutional arrangement sufficient to unite our metropolitan regions.

As pointed out by the authors of the Federalist Papers, the "excess of democracy" is as much to be feared as over-centralization. The balance between the two will be as difficult to chart in our metropolitan regions as our founding fathers found it to be in institutionalizing our nation. In Fairfield's introduction to his edition of the Federalist Papers, he speaks to this point when he describes the concerns of the Federalists in this way: "Can a republic, sometimes successful in small states, survive in a large geographical area—or will the forces of localism triumph where men regard themselves as citizens of Massachusetts, Maryland, or Georgia, rather than the United States?" Let us today similarly ask: "...or will the forces of localism triumph where men regard themselves as citizens of Detroit, Warren, and Pontiac rather than Southeast Michigan?"...

In 1974 an effort should be underway—this time at the regional level—to create and gain acceptance of an institution to meet a challenge of similar magnitude to that faced by our forefathers. . . . Nearly two hundred years ago, authors of the Federalist Papers promised no miracle from a federated union but saw no alternative save to try. Today, enforced regional coordination of governmental services would provide no panacea for our urban condition, but because logic and experience tells us that benefit can be expected, it would seem that the time has come to move the discussion from whether regionalism should be attempted, to consideration of the best arrangement for the New City. Accordingly, the Regionalist Papers are presented for that purpose.

(end of quotation)

We have quoted extensively from *The Federalist Papers* because it seemed important to present evidence of the passionate intensity with which these professional Regionalists pursue their pet version of the utopian mirage. They present their cause as being just as critical as that of Madison, Hamilton and Jay when they urged the adoption of the U.S. Constitution. Just as the Founding Fathers urged adoption of the Constitution in order to install the *original federalism* which has distinguished our form of government, these Regionalists urge the adoption of Regionalism in order to install the *new federalism*. And, just as the Constitution saved the Union in 1787, Regionalism is supposed to save the Union and create a *World Union* in 1894 or thereabouts.



REGIONAL FLAG

These Regionalists are so serious and so dedicated that they have drawn up a new flag which is to replace Old Glory if they have their way. The Regional Flag shown here was reproduced in the *Smithsonian*, a monthly magazine published by the Smithsonian Associates, 900 Jefferson Drive, Washington, D.C. 29560.

"Smithsonian asked for a new design from Whitney Smith of the Flag Research Center in Winchester, Massachusetts," says the 3-page, unsigned article which appears in the December 1973 issue of the magazine. In an article exposing the Smithsonian action, Jo Hindman commented: "It may be that the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, S. Dillon Ripley, might supply the answer to the question, who, or what tax-supported fund paid the vexilologist's fee for designing the unauthorized flag to replace the Flag of the United States of America?"

The seriousness, and the progress, of the Regionalists in achieving their aims, can be illustrated in two other ways:

1) A chief objective of the concept of Regional Governance is to replace *elected officials* with *appointed administrators*. As this is being written, the President of the United States is an *appointed administrator*, and the Vice President designate is to be an *appointed administrator*—the latter being, in addition, a principal proponent and financier of Regional Governance.

2) In this series of letters, we have concentrated attention upon the Ten Standard Federal Regions which were established by executive order and which are governed by appointed regional councilmen located in the Ten Regional Capitals. We have also referred to other federal regions, such as the 22 regions established through federally controlled interstate river bed compacts, the twelve Federal Reserve System regions, etc. But we merely scratched the surface in this respect. The official U.S. Government Organization Manual contains some *80 different regional maps!* While the Ten Region Map is

the most important, and is called the map of the "Standard Federal Regions," other regional maps include environmental geology regions, mineral resources regions, oil and gas operations regions, food and nutrition service regions, the 13 Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Regions, Federal Communications Commission Regions, Federal Power Commission Regions, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Regions, Federal Trade Commission Regions, etc., etc.

These are multi-State Regions; some of them disregard State boundaries; all are Federal Agency Administration Regions ruled over by *appointed administrators* often in total disregard of all State and local government officials, or even all Federal *elected officials*. These regions have nothing to do with Congress once they are established; their orders come from the eleven Cabinet rank Departments, or from the sixteen chief agencies within the Executive Office of the President (himself an appointee), or from one or more of the thirty-four independent offices and establishments of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government.

Key control center of this Regional Dictatorship is the Office of Management and Budget. It does *manage* the whole operation and it does approve the *budget* of every one of the regional and sub-regional operations. It also commands the computers and keeps the keys to the data banks.

However, anyone wanting to oppose this governmental behemoth should begin at the local level; for here is where real political power can best be applied by the individual citizen. And the Regionalist Conspiracy begins as an attack against home rule *in the name of home rule!*

In August 1974, in his brilliant minority report to the El Dorado County (California) Modernization Commission's Regionalization scheme, Supervisor William V.D. Johnson made the following important observations:

"In the beginning of American government, home rule meant exactly that: Local rule without interference from either State or National Government. The County Government was the unit which protected property, built roads and handled trials and execution of criminals. Slowly, State governments began creeping in and taking over where they had neither right nor duty....

"This governmental reform (that is, Regionalism-Ed.) is a long-term project because it includes attitude adjustment of our young people in their education, with de-emphasis of the Constitution, patriotism and nationalism, and emphasis on the false premise of

antiquated constitutions, laws, etc., plus attitude adjustment of adults through the news media and television, as well as financial manipulation by the Federal Government; all of this done to induce the citizens to think this is what they want....

"...a report published by the Committee for Economic Development in 1966 contained the following recommendations:

- 1) The number of local governments in the United States about 80,000, should be reduced by at least 80 percent.
- 2) The number of overlapping layers of government in States should be severely curtailed.
- 3) Popular election should be confined to members of the policy-making body....
- 4) Each local unit should have a single chief executive, preferably appointed, with all administrative agencies and personnel fully responsible to him; election of department heads should be halted....
- 8) The 50 State Constitutions should be revamped....

"In recent years the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) has been promoting these same ideas...."

And so have all the agents and agencies of 1313, the Fabians in our midst, the gullible officials who ought to know better or ought never to have been elected, and the culpable politicoes who do know better but find that revenue sharing, federal grants and fine titles are commendable ways of enlarging their bank accounts or exalting their egos.

It was Franklin Delano Roosevelt, an early advocate of Regionalism, who made the statement: "We have to get over the notion that the purpose of reorganization is economy.... The reason for reorganization is *management!*"

And total management is the purpose behind Regional Government; management of you and yours, of the community, the State, the Nation, and eventually the World.

But effective opposition must begin at the personal, and the local level. It is our hope that this series of letters will help you in educating friends, voters, and officials.

(end of series)

This series of 21 letters on "The Contrived Evolution of Regional Government" in booklet form, stapled and with appropriate cover:
Single Copies \$2.00 each
10 or more Copies \$1.50 each
25 or more Copies \$1.00 each

Please address all orders to:
DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

RESTRUCTURING EDUCATION

Every now and then, when TV cameras are made available, our Education President may be seen in some school classroom talking pleasantly to young students. Or perhaps he'll be discussing his America 2000 education strategy with teachers or principals. This staged scene is a part of his need to be considered a Domestic Affairs President as well as a Foreign Affairs President, and incidentally as a candidate for reelection next presidential election time. This does not mean that he's neglecting his New World Order dream. In fact, these incidental exposures are part of the same program. Because the development of a New World Citizenry is an essential ingredient of the final goal. That's why his National Education goals provide that "All children in America will start school ready to learn," and "Every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship." In other words, while the architects of the NWO are busy restructuring Eastern Europe and the Middle East, academics and educationists will be working with the tax-exempt foundations to develop a citizenry worthy of the NWO. What kind of a citizen would this be? We think John D. Rockefeller's General Education Board chairman, Frederick T. Gates, described the "new citizen" quite clearly when he wrote in 1904: "In our dreams, we have limitless resources and the people yield themselves with perfect docility to our molding hands. The present education conventions fade from our minds and, unhampered by tradition, we work our good will upon a grateful ND and responsive rural folk."

Lately in education circles the words "restructuring" and "re-learning" are often heard. And the people, knowing only what the Insiders desire to tell them, and distrusting them, ask for a better answer. Mrs. Cris Shardelman of Poulsbo, Washington, has spent considerable time and effort studying this so called educational reform movement, and what these catch-words restructuring and re-learning really mean. She has sent her conclusions, with permission to reprint. Her study deals specifically with the situation in her own State of Washington. But this same program in one form or another is being presented - or has been presented - in all 50 States. So, and particularly if you have children of school age, please read the following carefully:

EDUCATION REFORM OR RESTRUCTURING, THE ILLUSION

State by State parents, teachers, and taxpayers are being deceived by the education reform movement. They are led to believe schools will be freed from paper work to teach academics and have local control restored. True results will be five-fold: 1. It is dumbing down education. 2. It replaces responsibility for education from elected representative government to control by an unelected commission (commissar government). 3. The Governor appointed commission will alter the entire purpose of education from teachers transmitting academic information to students to the function of restructuring and controlling society. The elitist commission will have power to determine all the knowledge, skills and attitudes of students and teachers (public, private and homeschool). A total management system will guarantee no one can escape being "politically, spiritually and socially correct". 4. Existing State and Federal laws which inhibit this management

system may be waived (broken) without legislative action or citizen input. 5. The education reform movement will change local and state control of education to national and international control. This has been orchestrated for years by those whose influence in education contributed to U.S. illiteracy and moral decay. The orchestrators will control education.

In 1991 [the State of] Washington's House of Representatives passed two radical education bills that were defeated by the Senate. Since Governor Gardner threatened to convene a special session to force passage, HB1023 and HB2240 are certain to be revived in January, and should be studied by citizens. Citizens should recognize, particularly through HB2240, the reenactment of the so called "Children's Initiative" that was rejected by voters in every county. The "at risk" category is so broadly defined any child may be included in clientele to provide full employment for "the services of mental health professionals, child psychiatrists, health care providers, social service caseworkers or social workers, school counselors, school psychologists, school nurses, and school social workers".

Academic excellence cannot be the goal, since both specific time for academics and solid subject matter are to be repealed, i.e. teaching English and the requirement for U.S. and Washington State Government and History. Perhaps one does not need to learn English or understand U.S. Government if the orientation is World Citizenship.

Both bills give the unelected commission power to determine what will comprise "essential learnings" stated to be all the knowledge, skill and more importantly attitudes needed by the student for a certification of mastery. The National Education Association defined attitudes in Issues In Training as, "how an organization can influence the beliefs, attitudes and values (hereafter simply called attitudes) of an individual for the purpose of "developing him," i.e. changing in a direction which the organization regards to be in his own and the organization's best interests." The process was to unfreeze old attitudes, change and internalize new ones, and refreeze new attitudes. Developing student's attitudes, beliefs and values borders on State Religion.

PARADISE POSTPONED

If anyone looks upon the end of a recession as the start of a new chapter in financial paradise, they had better be prepared for a rather long wait. ...Those who have suggested that the United States economy was about to roar ahead have also been proved wrong. The events of the last year or so, in both the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, have had a very dramatic effect on the ability of economic planners to chart a viable course... Effectively the massive changes taking place have started a totally new game - and most commentators are totally lost in comprehending this. They simply choose to ignore what is going on and make their projections as if nothing had happened. Make no mistake, the world is now being dominated by new forces that have not had this grasp of power for several generations. The new world order, as many choose to call it, is in fact the old world order in new clothes. The old order was a socialised form of society controlled by the wealth of the world, controlled by the large banks. The so-called new world order is little different. Instead of the extremes of communism (as we know it) we shall have an apparently watered-down socialist society which is still controlled by the same people. It is all a question of new packaging which is more readily accepted by the populace. (Allen Keyte in his World Affairs Review, 1/15/91. Vernon Court, 48-54 High Street, Cheltenham, Glos. 50 1EE, England. Subscription rates on application).

Society will be restructured through a management system: 1. The individual student is tracked through a statewide assessment (evaluation, not testing). He must master the "essential learning" components, including attitudes, or be recycled until he is "developed". This includes public, private and homeschools. 2. Schools and teachers are subject to a statewide accountability system wherein locally identified outcomes must be linked to the commission's essential learning outcomes. Failure brings state intervention assistance. 3. College entrance may be adapted to essential learnings, which controls higher education. 4. Laws, rules and regulations that hinder this management will be waived without legislative hearings.

This management system will require record keeping of students and teacher attitudes as well as knowledge and skills. Federal and State legislation that prohibits privacy invasion of student and parent beliefs will have to be waived in order to keep the files and use psychological and behavior modifying techniques to bring about the "essential learnings". These records pose a threat for everyone, but are especially dangerous for the "at risk" category. Federal legislation was needed to prohibit use of secret files on students categorized as potential criminals, although they had never committed a criminal act. These could be used by the justice system, and employment references, and could stop secret clearances. (1989 statistics state 1/3 of state students at risk.)

Further control of society can be accomplished through a national and international assessment system. President Bush has stated he wants the national assessment to be used by employers for hiring and for higher education entrance requirement. His Choice in Education is meaningless if all schools will have the same "essential learning and accountability." Bush's Secretary of Education, Alexander Lamar, stated tax dollars bring Federal Control.

Schools are being reformed and restructured, but not for academics or freedom to teach. Laws and statutes that "hinder" are being removed. but they are laws that prevented abuse of parental rights, children's privacy and freedom from psychological indoctrination. The National Education Association declared schools would become "clinics" for "psycho-social treatment of students". That defines education reform! The most fundamental argument is whether "developing the child" should begin in the womb or after he is out of diapers! (Prepared by Mrs. Cris Shardelman, 17198 Viking Way NW, Poulsbo WA 98370).

* * * * *

"Where government goes, corruption follows," declared Hillsdale College President George Roche. And government tells the people that money is the cure-all for all ills, including education. This lie has been told so often that most people believe it. Brainwashing is a most effective weapon. Consequently, as the man-made recession refused to go away and became more and more painful to industries and individuals, governments at State and District levels began to cut down on education costs. Here in Palm Beach County, near panic followed. This has been true in almost every case where education cuts have been announced. This report from Annapolis, the capital of the State of Maryland is more or less typical: "About 5,000 angry teachers, parents and students marched on the State House last night (10/16/91), demanding that Gov. William Donald Schaefer veto legislation that could cut education aid across Maryland....Police were forced to cordon off streets surrounding the capitol to accomodate the throngs chanting "Save our Schools," and "Send down Schaefer." They carried posters saying 'No cuts to education' and banners reading 'ignorance is more expensive'." But Dr. Roche, who presides over a highly respected

conservative college which refuses federal funds of any kind, insists that "It is not lack of money spent on education--we spend billions. It is not some sweeping social injustice--we live in an age that offers unprecedented freedom, diversity and opportunity, it is not even that we have forgotten the best ways of teaching knowledge or inculcating virtue, although we have indeed forgotten and are paying a heavy price. So what is the root cause? It is the dead hand of political influence (Education President Bush, please note)...As early as 1952, a national academic commission warned: 'We are convinced that it would be fatal were federal support to be substantially extended....the freedom of higher education would be lost'." This commission was prescient. Not only was freedom of education lost; all our freedoms are endangered because of what government has done to education. Dr. Medford Evans commented: "Government schools make it a matter of policy to spend as much money as possible, and impart as little knowledge as possible since spending demonstrates power while keeping the scholars ignorant monopolizes power in the hands of the government insiders." However, Bush's America 2000 professes to be different. It doesn't keep scholars ignorant, it intends to "unfreeze old attitudes, change and internalize new ones, and refreeze new attitudes." Teaching is not the purpose, training and brainwashing is the goal, the making of "docile, contented" new subjects prepared for happy existence in the Socialist World Government which will secure the New World Order for at least a thousand years.

Restructuring education is but a part of the program of restructuring the world. So, don't expect to see our Education President presiding over students in a schoolhouse in the upcoming months. There's other restructuring of emergency proportions. So our Peregrinating President is off again. Madrid and the Middle East peace conference. Then Rome and NATO. A pause for Thanksgiving and then he's off to the Far East: Japan, Korea, Australia, Singapore. He should be home for Christmas. James McCartney, often unusually outspoken head of the Miami Herald Washington bureau, commented: "It's as though the President is trying to escape what voters are now saying emphatically is the nation's No. 1 problem area - the economy....Bush has been in a free fall in the polls since last March, right after the Persian Gulf war....George Bush may be shooting himself in the foot" by ignoring domestic problems and spending his time restructuring the world.

"Finally, while the builders of the New Babylon strive to meet their designated millennial dateline, those who should oppose them are silent. Scripture says: "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it." That Scripture is known and observed by Christ's enemies, but is generally ignored by those who say they love Him. Many willingly permit their children to be trained in government schools when homeschooling is possible. Let there be this warning: So long as there are government schools which children are forced to attend, there will be world government, whether we like it or not.

"Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." (Colossians 2:8).

Don Bell Reports is a privately circulated newsletter, published every other Friday, emphasizing the Christian American point of view. Reproduction is permitted when credit is given. Postal rates permitting, two copies of each issue are mailed first class to each subscriber. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$40 per year; Foreign Air Mail, \$50 per year. Extra copies of same issue to same address: 1 to 9, 50¢ each; 10 to 49, 40¢ each; 50 to 99; 30¢ each; 100 or more, 20¢ each. Address all orders and correspondence to: Don Bell Reports, Post Office Box 2223, Palm Beach, Florida 33480.

REDUCATION MONOPOLY

The Education President of the United States has made it plain that, in attempting to balance the federal budget, additional money for educational purposes are out of the question. The Governor of the once Republican State of Florida, among many other Governors, agreed that government schools are not going to get their expected grants. Professional educationists in Florida didn't like it and high school students were encouraged to write to the Governor, State Legislators, their US Representative and two Senators, protesting the refusal of financial aid. A reporter on our local daily obtained and published quotes from some of the letters. One high school student wrote: "You should give a larger budget to education for that is were (sic) your priotaties (sic) lie." Another student complained: "We we'll (sic) have to go without air conditioning, penicals (sic), pens and even paper. I have a class of 25 people and I get a wonderful education (sic)." A third student wrote: "This letter is in reference to the edgucation (sic) budget cuts." Another protested that "If you make these cuts our classrooms will be over crowded (sic). The students of Browerd county (sic) will be deprived of there (sic) right to get an edgucation (sic.)" Another student offered a suggestion: "My point is that education must be tailored more to the need of the intellegent (sic) than the needs of the unintellegent (sic). As you may have gessed, I am among the intellegent (sic)." The reporter summarized: "The state of education in the State of Florida is defishent."

Of course, it isn't funny. But it is proof that our government schools are not trying to teach students "reading, writing and arithmetic." What they are doing to our children has been said and written many times to little avail. But one thing that hasn't been stated often enough or clearly enough is that the aim of the professional educationists in America is to make education, from cradle to college, a national monopoly. There are some church connected and private schools that survive without taking orders and curricula from Government. But they are few and far between, especially at high school and college level. And there are home schoolers who have managed to survive in spite of efforts to stop them. And now, once again as schools reopen, the drive to induce parents to accept tax tuition credits or vouchers from government sources. Among our long time subscribers is a home schooler and promoter of home schooling, Virginia Birt Baker, has written some words of warning regarding the tax voucher scam. She knows whereof she writes and has the documentation to back it up. So we are pleased reprint:

* * * * *

Educational choice: An Innovative Report
(July 9, 1990)

To parents who have been paying taxes for the public schools yet are privately educating their own children, a government-paid incentive would be a welcome relief from financial strain, seemingly encouraging a free-market approach to education. But let's look at the facts:

Once private education accepts tuition tax credits or vouchers it can no longer remain private, because through government regulations, it will be forced to become one and the same with its public counterparts. "Any

system for credits will be exactly that, a wholly owned subsidiary of the State and a bureaucratic agency for the propagation of ideology and the enforcement of standards. And the standards will be devised not by the enthusiasts of vouchers, but by the same old coalition of educationists... who know exactly what they want, and exactly how to get it." (1)

What do they want and how will they get it? To start with, George Bernard Shaw of the socialist Fabian Society of England, said, "Nothing will more quickly destroy independent Christian schools than state aid; their freedom and independence will soon be compromised, and before long their faith." (2)

His protegee, Keynesian economist Milton Friedman, began in 1960 (3) to promote the voucher plan, at first unsuccessfully in his Alum Rock Experiment. (4) In 1970 he wrote Free to Choose, and in July, 1980, the First Global Conference on the Future was held in Toronto, Canada. One of its prime objectives was to push education choice on an unsuspecting American, Canadian and European citizenry. (5) Some of the participants were Edward Cornish (World Future Society); Aurileo Peccei (Club of Rome); R.T. Francouer (Aquarian Cabal); Miriam and Edward Kelty (Natl. Inst. of Mental Health); Dorothea MacLean (Findhorn Foundation); Barbara Marx Hubbard (prominent new ager); Mark Satin (anarchist, Green Revolution activist); Marilyn Ferguson (world's leading new ager); Maureen Murdock (occultist); Moshe Davidovitz (American Assoc. for Humanistic Psychology); and many others.

Then, in 1981 the American Legislative Education Council, formed by Paul Weyrich ("We are radicals who want to change the existing power structure. We are not conservatives...") (6), mailed to 16,000 state and federal officials and legislators a suggested educational voucher. Thomas A. Shannon, Executive Director of the National School Boards Association, said, "Tuition Tax credits for private schools profoundly change the character of private education. Private schools that operate with public money will be subject to public regulations." (7)

Sure enough, concurrently, on July 18, 1971, key federal legislation underlying and controlling any subsequent education legislation was adopted. This master control system, "The Interagency Day Care Standards," hinged upon the federal government's own definition of day care: "Day care is defined as the care of a child on a regular basis by someone other than the child's parents for any part of the 24-hour day." (8) It states that "Any agency, public or private, which receives federal funds directly or indirectly through a grant or contract...or by way of a voucher plan" must meet all programs that are set down for public schools. Acceptance of Federal funds is an agreement to abide by the requirements." (9) The chronology, or evolution, of events has, by law, now placed the standards ("guidelines") within state agencies. (10) It has linked increased school costs and unasked for, unwanted, yet mandatory programs, through "back door" administrative guidance policies and procedures and without the knowledge or involvement of elected representatives, to federal requirements as conditions of funding! These mandatory programs include sex education, psychological services, organizational changes, human relations activities, busing, bilingual education, etc., etc.

In March, 1984, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that private schools are subject to government regulations because they enroll students who receive tuition money from the government. Even though the checks are payable to individual students, not the school, the Court says any scholarships, loans, or grants to students "constitute federal financial assistance." (11)

Continuing in the same direction, on January 28, 1988, the U.S. Senate

passed the Civil Rights Restoration Act (Pub. L 100-259) which extends the reach of the civil rights measures that were limited by the 1984 Supreme Court ruling. The legislation makes it clear that the entire institution must not discriminate if any component receives federal aid. (12)

On April 28, 1988, the Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988 (Pub. L 100-297), commonly known as H.R.5, amending and reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, became law. It contains a by-pass provision which allows the Secretary of Education to circumvent any state law (13) in order to assist (14) in the education of any child who lives in any school district. The reasoning is, that all local school districts receive financial aid, so, therefore, all children who live in those districts must be allowed to participate in the "services, purposes, and benefits" of this bill if they receive any kind of government subsidy (15) Not only can the Secretary by-pass any existing state laws or agencies "unwilling to provide for such participation, (16) he may make any regulations necessary to ensure compliance, (17) consulting with no one in emergency situations. (18) The bill specifically includes "home-based" and "residential" schools. (19)

The government intends to "restructure the total educational environment at the level of the individual school" (20) and H.R.5 provides funds "to develop innovative approaches for surmounting barriers that make the programs...difficult to administer. (21). Educational choice, by whatever name "tuition tax credit, voucher, open enrollment, opportunity grant, etc.) is that innovative approach.

How were these federal standards imposed upon State agencies and into State laws, bypassing our elected representatives?

Prior to 1975 the Department of Health and Human Services issued model State child care standards, which were adopted on a selective basis by the States. (22) Then federal aid for any day care services that "meet applicable standards of State and local law" was consolidated into a single grant and funneled through the existing Social Services Block Grant Title XX of the Social Security Act. Title XX of the Social Security Act is administered by the Office of Policy, Planning, and Legislation, Office of Human Development Services, department of Health and Human Services. Title XX appears in the United States Code as § 1397-1397f, subchapter XX, chapter 7, Title 42. Regulations relating to Title XX are contained in part 96, subtitle A, Title 45, Code of Federal Regulations. (23)

The original Paperwork Reduction Plan Act of 1980, 44 U.S.C. et seq., gave the White House Office of Management and Budget (OMB) power to control the form and the content of agency rule-making, and to keep information dealing with regulatory reviews secret from Congress and the public. The White House, by the way, continues at this date to oppose any efforts that would require the OMB to make information dealing with all regulatory reviews available to Congress and the public or to restrict OMB's control. The White House opposition has been led by White House Chief of Staff John H. Sununu and White House counsel C. Boyden Gray. (24)

Executive Order 12291 of February 17, 1981, signed by Ronald Reagan, further provided for presidential oversight of the regulatory process of present and future regulations "designed to implement, interpret, or pre-scribe law (emphasis added) or policy or describing the procedure or prac-tice requirements of...any agency specified under 44 .S.C. 3502(1)." The Order stated that the Director of OMB "shall have authority...to prescribe criteria" for requiring any set of rules. The Director of OMB is subject to the Presidential Task Force on Regulatory Relief and has wide authority

under the Paperwork Reduction Plan of 1980, 44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq., and the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 4 U.S.C. 601 et seq. (25)

You can see how the federal bureaucracy defined to the States what a day care facility is, what day care standards to adopt, then made those mandatory guidelines a condition of funding, buried those conditions in the Social Security laws, and to this day absolutely controls them from the White House without congressional or public scrutiny!

FOOTNOTES

(1) "Voucher, Smoucher," by Richard Mitchell, The Leaning Tower of Babel, Little, Brown & Co, 1984 p. 119. (2) "Vouchers, Freedom and Slavery," R.J. Rushdoony, Chalcedon Report 290, Sept. 1989. (3) Milton Freidman, Economics and the Public Interest, 1960. (4) "The State Factor," American Legislative Exchange Council, Nov. 1981. (5) "Through the 80s Thinking Globally, Acting Locally," World Future Society, p. 10, quoted in Distant Drums, Ron Miller, editor, Aug. 1982. (6) Richard A. Viguerie, The New Right: We're Ready to Lead, 1980. p. 59. (7) "School Board News," July 1981. (8) Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements, pursuant to Sec. 522(d) of the Economic Opportunities Act (approved Sept. 23, 1968). (9) Ibid., (10) Model Child Care Standards Act - Guidelines to States to Prevent Child Abuse in Day Care Facilities, Dept. of Health & Human Services, Jan. 1985. (11) Grove City College v. Bell. (12) Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, Washington, DC, May 28, 1988 p. 1481. (13) through (21) Pub. L. 100-297 §5143. (23) Model Child Care Standards Act - Guidance to States to Prevent Child Abuse in Day Care Facilities, Dept. of Health & Human Services, Jan. 1985, Margaret M. Heckler Secretary, p. 3. (24) Compilation of the Social Security Laws, through January 1, 1989, Vol. 1, p. 1083. (25) Congressional Quarterly, July 9, 1990, p. 1785. (26) Federal Register, Vol. 48, No. 33, February 18, 1981.

World Government Rehearsal? M.B.Zuckerman, CFR, Editor USNews, warns: "Today a specter is looking over the US economy. America's financial institutions are stretching thin and the resulting turmoil threatens a serious recession. Everyone knows about the savings & loan disaster, but disaster is also looming for the American banking system and that is more serious." History tells those that listen: When trouble threatens Megabanks, they maintain their power by finding or creating a war to finance. Since Hussein of Iraq is emulating the well financed Hitler, war could eventuate. May God forbid. But regardless of future events, we are now witnessing, by plan or accident, a United Global Action which simulates a step toward World Government and the New World Order. For the first time in history virtually all Nations are acting in unison against a declared human enemy. The UN which aspires to become a World Government enacts a sanction with all member Nations concurring. Here is the semblance of World Government in action. Overlook the trees for a moment and consider the forest. Is this a harbinger for the World of Tomorrow? "Therefore is the name of it called Babel...." (Gen. 11:9).

Don Bell Reports is a privately circulated newsletter, published every other Friday, emphasizing the Christian American point of view. Reproduction is permitted when credit is given. Postal rates permitting, two copies of each issue are mailed first class to each subscriber. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$40 per year; Foreign Air Mail, \$50 per year. Extra copies of same issue to same address: 1 to 9, 50¢ each; 10 to 49, 40¢ each; 50 to 99; 30¢ each; 100 or more, 20¢ each. Address all orders and correspondence to: Don Bell Reports, Post Office Box 2223, Palm Beach, Florida 33480.

THE "NEW SOCIALISM" IN THE UNITED STATES: THE PLANNERS TO REPLACE THE POLITICIANS

THE "TECHNOSTRUCTURE" AND THE MARKET SYSTEM

"There is undergoing within this Nation," wrote a Florida couple to their congressman, "a planned, systematic, organized effort to change our system of government. This new system of government is one that will be controlled by bureaucrats, not answerable to the people, free from the influence of election, referendum or recall."

Therein lies the key to the understanding of much of what is occurring politically and economically within the United States in this last half of the Twentieth Century. Those who are to rule over us in the future will not be those whom we *elect*, but those who are *appointed*. The election process will not be discontinued, but it will come to mean nothing more than it already means in totalitarian State: the nominees will be selected by the Central Party Presidium and we will be commanded to vote for or against the selected nominee (never a nominee of our own choice.)

Of course, it won't make any real difference who is elected anyway, because the whole election routine will be merely an exercise in "participatory democracy" to make the people feel that they still have some part in the formation of governments, (this feeling will engender loyalty when things are going well, and a sense of guilt when things are not going so good.) The *elected* officials in such a government will merely serve as mouthpieces, whipping boys, and rubber stamps (as the case dictates) for the *appointed* officials, who will really rule the Nation and its proletariat, on behalf of the *Elite* which will rule them, and the world.

Too far-fetched to be believable? Actually, such a situation already exists, but most people won't believe it because it has not yet been affirmed by *The New York Times*. But, how else can one explain the present predicament of *elected* officials, and the honor and glory and trust being accorded such *appointed* officials as Henry Kissinger, Elliot Richardson, Caspar Weinberger and Roy Ash, to name a few?

The current sequence of downgrading the politicians and their immediate staffs, and the consequent upgrading of all non-partisan *appointees*, began with the character assassination of all Democratic aspirants who had even the remotest chance of defeating Nixon in 1972, notably Henry Jackson and Edmund Muskie (Ted Kennedy knew better than to run in 1972, and they shot George Wallace.) The uncanny nomination of George McGovern was a model of professional intrigue and dirty-trickery, as was the 1,000 per cent backing given Tom Eagleton, only to be withdrawn at the time when it would do the politician-defamers the most good.

The Democratic politicians of presidential caliber thus having been defamed and disgraced, the next step would be to "go and do likewise" to the front-running Republican politicians. And Watergate did exactly that! Remember, the Watergate caper would serve no purpose whatsoever in defeating the Democratic candidates; they were already defeated long before any bugging began. But Watergate, hushed up until *after* the election, could serve a great purpose in downgrading Nixon and his "1,000-year Reichstaff," even as all the Democratic prototypes had already been politically drawn and quartered.

History shows that things much worse than Watergate have happened in previous campaigns and administrations. But never before had so much publicity and name-calling ever been permitted or encouraged. Nor have so many layers of evil ever been exposed to the public. Why?

We believe that the time had come for all partisan politicians and their henchmen to be denigrated, and for all planners and permanent bureaucrats to be exalted. Because this new system of government that was being installed called for non-partisan bureaucrats and planning specialists, rather than elected administrators and legislators.

How else can one explain the dilemma in which Mr. Clean (Spiro Agnew) finds himself? Having evaded and avoided all con-

nection with and contamination from Watergate, the dirty tricksters went back into Agnew's personal history before he became a politician of national repute, and dug up allegations of payoffs for favors rendered to Baltimore builders and contractors. The facts of the case are not pertinent, whether Agnew is guilty or innocent is not important; the important thing is to smear the politician who is most likely to succeed. Politicians are fair game for the *new era builders*, because the time has come for a new system of government.

This should not be construed as any exoneration of politicians. Generally speaking, politicians as a class have become so corrupt that they deserve whatever exposure they get. In the case of Richard Nixon, for example; not only has he fouled his own nests, but he has disgraced the Office of the Presidency by doing exactly as the Planners dictated, reversing his public stand on almost every principle on which he ever took a stand, from anti-Communism to anti-price and wage controls, and all points between. So that, every word of the following criticism of Richard Nixon, written by a correspondent whom we shall not identify, is well aimed and hits the target:

September 8, 1973

Open Letter To:

President Richard Nixon
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Mr. President:

As a lawyer you must appreciate the irony of a litigant's building his case on a document he, himself, has ignored, circumvented and even lent the power of his position to its final destruction.

I refer, Mr. President, to our United States Constitution (the document) and you (the litigant) who invoked it to lend credence to your claim of Executive Privilege in your quarrel with Congress and the Courts anent Watergate.

Where in our Constitution (a compact between the States and the Federal Government) is there provision for the Chief Executive to abolish those States? Yet, you, by Executive Order 11647 set up ten Regions with a framework of appointees answerable to Federal regulations. Our Constitution states, Article 4, Section 3: "No new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of another State; nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of

the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as Congress." That legislative power you usurped. To all practical purposes *there are no Sovereign States*. Their elected officials are but expensive anachronisms to perpetuate the myth that we choose our representatives to govern us. Without the State-Federal compact our original Constitution is inoperative!

A second, more damning example (since this involves the destruction of our national sovereignty) of your contempt for our Constitution (whose protection you seek) lies in the Mutual Relations Pact you signed with Leonid Brezhnev May 19, 1972, in Moscow.

Article 6, paragraph 2 of that Pact reads: "The USA and USSR regard as the ultimate objective of their efforts the achievement of general and complete disarmament and the establishment of an effective system of international security in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations."

Where, in our Constitution, Mr. President, is the Chief Executive authorized to enter into an agreement with a foreign nation to disarm the United States of America and to trust the "security" of the American people to the jurisdiction of the United Nations?

Further, you have gone on record as favoring Atlantic Union, a supra-government of Atlantic Nations in which our Country would be but one of a Federation of States with common defense, taxation and economy.

You have recommended also Senate ratification of the UN Genocide Treaty which, in effect, would repeal the Connally Amendment and place your fellow Americans under the jurisdiction of the World Court, depriving us of the safeguards of our American Constitution—that Constitution you, in your present extremity, have invoked.

Noting the destruction your Executive Orders and Agreements have wreaked, a court of law might well ask, "Does such a document as the original United States Constitution still exist to serve as a defense for American citizens—including the President of these United States?"

Since you have abrogated the Constitution, on *what* do you base your claim of Executive Privilege?


Sincerely,
(name withheld).



FEDER
REGIO



*Region
UNITE!



STATES IS NOW 10 REGIONS

Perhaps these crude, corrupt, criminal, and often asinine machinations can be more easily explained and understood if we first realize that there was one single, overriding purpose behind every dirty trick and Machiavellian maneuver; that purpose being to change our system of government. And to the change agents, the end justifies every means, including that of sacrificing their own leaders if such act seems propitious.

We quoted a Florida couple at the start of this letter. Their statement is pertinent, so permit us a further quote:

"Planning is the first step toward accomplishing any totalitarian government, for the people (Occidental people, that is) do not succumb to manipulation of their lives when it is done openly... And so the Planning, Programming, Budgeting System (PPBS) has become a system covertly imposed. It is a totally inter-related management system wherein each sub-system is linked together. ...After PPBS was installed in every executive department of the Federal Government, the Budget Bureau was restructured and it became the Office of Management and Budget. The entire PPBS framework is now managed from the OMB.

"Next, plans were made and completed for dividing the Nation into Ten Regions. Each Region has its own capital (see above map for details-Ed.) ...

"Essential to implementation of PPBS will be Revenue Sharing and a State-imposed (but Federally-collected) Income Tax.

"The PPBS will not work effectively under our form of Government; but the *Elite Planners* are committed to the use of PPBS, because it is the best way yet discovered and put into practice whereby the *Controlling Elite can totally manage society*. Therefore, since the system cannot be changed, the form of government must be changed to fit the system."

Does this help to explain the otherwise unexplainable events that have taken place at Democratic Political Conventions, at the Watergate, on the Watergate Airplane?

This practice of defaming elected officials and exalting appointed officials is nothing new in the history of modern so-called democratic governments. Back in 1908, the eminent British historian, science fiction writer and for a time leading Fabian Socialist, H.G. Wells, wrote a non-fiction book titled *New Worlds For Old*. In the book he told what the program was to be, and exposed the machinery by which it was to be developed. One thing he did not foresee: the perfecting of the Computer, which is essential to the working of the system. Otherwise, Wells was quite accurate when he wrote:

"It was left chiefly to the little group of English people who founded the Fabian Society to supply... the amplifying conception of Socialism, to convert Revolutionary Socialism to Administrative Socialism... Socialism ceased to be an open revolution, and became a *plot*. Functions were to be shifted, quietly, unostentatiously, from the representative to the official he appointed.

... Scientific reconstruction of our methods of government constitutes a necessary part of the Socialist scheme... It supplies a *Scientific Bureaucracy*, appointed by representative bodies of diminishing importance and coming at last to be the working control of the Socialist State, the replacement of *individual action by public organization.*"

In our day, the one person who is free to write about and propagandize for public acceptance of this new system of government is John Kenneth Galbraith, who seems to fancy himself to be the American counterpart of the late British Maynard Keynes, and who says that what we need in the United States is "a new kind of socialism," although what he describes is little more than the old Corporate Socialism (Fascism) that has been brought up-to-date through the use of computer banks and the application of that technoscientific control system which we know as PPBS.

In 1958 Galbraith wrote *The Affluent Society* in which he played on the theme that production for private profit caused public squalor. Nine years later (1967) his book titled *The New Industrial State*, explained why, in his opinion, our system produced "such an overabundance of dog food and such a shortage of decent housing, medical care," and general welfare.

Those two preliminary tomes paved the way for his latest, *Economics and the Public Purpose*, in which he conditions us for the end of what's left of free enterprise and prepares us for the coming of the *managed society in the managed State*.

Galbraith first makes it clear that government should be a matter of economics, not politics as we know the term, and "the growth of power in both public and private bureaucracies is now the decisive force in economic and political life."

Galbraith uses the term "technostructure," by which he means the lawyers, accountants, advertising men, engineers, and salesmen who run the great corporations. This technostructure is the real power center in the United States, and each giant corporation is like a government within itself.

Contrasting and competing with this technostructure is what's left of the free enterprise system, which Galbraith calls the "market system" and which he characterizes as the world of "the farmer, repairman, retailer, small manufacturer, plumber, television repairman, service-station operator, medical practitioner, artist, actress, photographer and pornographer — the last refuge of the individual entrepreneur."

Then, speaking as a confirmed Fabian Socialist, Galbraith engages in a bit of semantics and changes terms in midstream. The technostructure becomes the "planning system" and he laments the fact that there is still a semblance of a "classical market" operating in this world of small business. Happily, however (for Galbraith and his ilk), the "planning system" is steadily accumulating ever greater power, and the dominant "planning system" is exploiting the weaker "market system."

Galbraith then points out that this accumulation of the power of a few hundred large corporations to exploit the rest of the United States economy is an extraordinary *political accomplishment*.

Since this "planning system" controls technology, finance, communications and markets, and since the mature corporations function like a government, the sensible thing for the Government itself to do is to become a gigantic "planning system" and function like the great corporations function.

Galbraith does not use the terms familiar to students of the "revolution" and the *New Order* which it is to produce, because he is writing for the general public. But what he would be saying if he were using accurate rather than semantic terms, is this:

The CFR, CED, 1313, Bilderbergers, and other representatives of the Corporate Structure are really running the country; so let's get with it and plan with the Planners, and create, in place of a government, a gigantic Federal Corporation, a "planning system" to handle all the things the private corporations can't handle monopolistically: health, education, welfare, control of rugged individualists and entrepreneurs, etc.

In other words, let us become, in truth, a *New Industrial State* (Galbraith's term), and convert our representative republic into a Federal Corporation.

This is the "*New Kind of Socialism*" which is being forced upon us through the establishment of Regions to replace States, Revenue Sharing to replace local control of governmental functions, PPBS which is government by regulation as opposed to government by law, and with *appointed Planners* replacing *elected officials* at every level of management.

And it is happening here!

DON BELL REPORTS & CLOSER-UP are privately circulated. Combined service: \$24 per year. 3 months trial: \$6.. Please write: DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223 Palm Beach, Florida 33480

APPOINTED MANAGERS – THE NEW RULING CLASS

THE FEDERAL CORPORATION

“The issue will no longer be who is the candidate in an election – any charismatic can be president if he can take and deliver orders.” So wrote a correspondent who recalled that “a new ruling class whose ascent to power was inevitable, was predicted by James Burnham over 30 years ago in his book, *The Managerial Revolution*. He identified ‘managers’ as a new type of professional with command of essential skills quite distinct and towering above the capabilities needed for fairly routine jobs. Rule over the United States would be obtained through state ownership and control, with appointed managers rather than elected officials in control.”

The current denigration and mistrust of elected officials, from the President of the United States on down to the Mayor of a city, has been brought about to a large extent because managers have been trained and are ready to take over, and the government itself has been restructured in such a way that the take-over by the new ruling class seems not only logical, but desirable.

This new breed of “managers” was conceived, nourished, developed, trained and poured into public management positions by the use of funds supplied by foundations—Ford, Rockefeller, Carnegie, Alfred P. Sloan, etc. The funds were used to finance special courses at colleges and universities where these new “managers” were trained. Post-graduate courses were often provided by such management-minded organizations as the *Council on Foreign Relations* (Henry Kissinger being an excellent example of such a trainee.) The *1313 Conglomerate* was able to train, unionize, and provide a job-placement service for such public management categories as City Managers, Metro Managers, Regional Council Officials, etc.

And Big Business began to provide the top echelon of managers for this new kind of government.

When the federal Bureau of the Budget was restructured and expanded to become the Office of Management and Budget, then the

Revolution was won. Looking back:—

In 1972 and the early months of 1973, the Great Controversy between the Congress and the Executive had to do with the impoundment of funds which had been appropriated by the Congress for specific uses, and which the Office of Management and Budget refused to spend as directed. The real reason for the impoundments had nothing to do with trying to cut down on expenses and live within the federal budget; rather, OMB had not yet placed its stamp of approval on any specific Planning, Programming, Budgeting System (PPBS) for the particular expenditure which had been designated by Congress. OMB wanted it understood that it, the OMB, was the *managerial control center* between the all-powerful Central Government and the subservient State, County and local governments. The Congress could—and should—appropriate the money, but OMB would determine just how, where, and when, the money would be spent.

Of course, Congress was angered, and most rightfully so. Its authority was being taken from it by a new, upstart bureau which the Congress had only recently permitted the Chief Executive to establish as a *Management Center*. There was a Congressional move to require formal Senate approval of any man selected to head OMB. But the move was defeated, and the controversial Roy Ash was named OMB Director.

Shortly after this impoundment controversy had come to a boil, the whole affair was drowned by the Watergate overflow. Then came the alleged energy crisis. Meanwhile, OMB continued to grow and increase in power and importance.

As an example, we quote from a recent column by the eminent Edith Kermit Roosevelt:

* * * * *

CONTRACTING OUT THE GOVERNMENT

Washington—The beleaguered administration faces a new charge of “big business bias” with the disclosure that the Office of Management and Budget, headed by a former

big conglomerate head, would contract out to private industry much of the vast bulk of military base operations. The services to be replaced are now performed by 185,000 military personnel and career civil servants at 74 installations. The military presently has control of these operations in order to "run a tight ship" in time of war or other national emergency. But under a still unpublished proposal by OMB, the military would have to go through a contractor at each base, who would control the support functions. The effect would be to civilianize vital support functions with a resulting erosion in the command responsibilities of Navy, Air Force, and Army.

The OMB proposal not only covers such support services as commissary, food service, postal service and base hospitals but also extends to more sensitive matters such as law enforcement, transportation and base supply. Also embraced under the new plan are transient aircraft maintenance, computers and audiovisual services.

A number of military men are privately voicing objections to the OMB plan to their Congressmen. Obviously, security and the prevention of sabotage become more difficult when a non-military, private party is involved. Each of the three Services is expected to provide its initial official responses to OMB's proposed schedules for contracting out by the end of this month.

Meanwhile, Rep. Jerome R. Waldie (D-Ca.), who secured a copy of the text of OMB's proposal, has charged in a press conference here:

"OMB's proposal was understandable and perhaps even inevitable in view of the previous background of Roy Ash, now head of OMB. Ash was the former Chief Executive for Litton Industries, a major corporate contractor of services to the military, and among those corporations most likely to receive any new contracts to provide the base operational support services."

According to documents in the California Legislator's possession "the proposal has the approval of the highest levels within the Office of Management and Budget." Presumably, the highest levels would be Director Ash.

Significantly, the OMB proposal calls for *all work* to be contracted out by *one contractor per base*, eliminating any possibility that small, specialized companies would be able to compete for a portion of the work. This ensures that the contracts will go to such corporate giants as ITT, RCA, and, of course, Ash's former company, Litton.

Ash's former conflicts of interest have long been a subject of criticism on Capitol Hill.

Some of them are detailed in a paper entitled "The Case Against Roy Ash" that was inserted in the Congressional Record on Feb. 26 of last year by Sen. Les Aspin (D-Wis.). The compendium reads in part:

"The Washington Star-News Pentagon reporter, Orr Kelly, recently obtained a copy of the minutes of a meeting between top Navy personnel and Litton officials, including Ash. According to this record, written by an Admiral in attendance, Ash threatened—as part of Litton's attempt to heist approximately \$400 million in bailout funds which the company needs to pay for its miserable performance on the five-ship program—to go over the heads of Navy officials and take his case to John Connally and the White House. With Litton still trying to grab \$400 million in bailout funds, and Ash, its former chief executive, publicly expressing an interest in the Navy's budget, Ash's conflict of interest is hard to ignore." (Note: The Defense Department is currently preparing a suit against Litton for failure to fulfill its defense contracts. Ash's conflict of interest seems really to be in conflict with the Nation's best interests—Ed.)

Obviously, Navy officials and professional service men are concerned first and foremost with providing for the proper defense and security of this Nation and not in guaranteeing the profits of an individual conglomerate. Hence, some big commercial interests would like to see their responsibilities downgraded. What is worth emphasizing too, is that this contracting out of government functions has nothing to do with genuinely free enterprise in the traditional sense. What is being created under the OMB proposal are inefficient "cost-plus" contracts which guarantee profits for those companies who are awarded the contracts.

Furthermore, past conversions demonstrate that corporations submit bids which show an initial savings in comparison to the number of dollars spent on the Civil Service function. Then after the first year of having a function contracted out, the costs increase substantially in the succeeding years. The result is that these increased costs of the contractor erase any initial military cost savings which might have been realized. (End of column).

The idea of "big business" taking over the management of United States defense establishments carries some ominous overtones

which spell danger to our Nation, and to what's left of our government itself. However, before offering further comment on the strange circumstance of OMB making such a proposal, we should like you to read one more article which further demonstrates the scope and area of activities being taken over by OMB.

If Nixon had any special plan to fight unemployment, under normal circumstances such a plan would be announced by Nixon himself, or by his press secretary, or perhaps by the Labor Secretary if he and the President were in agreement on the plan. Under no circumstances would one expect to hear a Deputy Director of the Budget telling the Nation what "Nixon's Plan" is going to be. Nevertheless, the following article was released by Associated Press for publication in dailies of Dec. 26, 1973. The following is reprinted from the Santa Cruz (Calif.) *Sentinel* of that date:

NIXON'S PLAN TO FIGHT UNEMPLOYMENT

Washington (AP)—The Nixon administration plans to step up federal spending quickly next year to create new jobs if unemployment reaches close to six per cent, Deputy Budget Director Frederic V. Malek says. Malek said plans to inject money into the economy might include increasing the rate of federal construction or military procurement. The injection would be made if the jobless rate, now 4.7 per cent, approaches "the high ends of our estimates," he said. Administration economists have said the fuel shortage could push the jobless rate close to six per cent next year.

Malek also told the Associated Press that the fiscal 1975 defense budget will have to go up, possibly as much as \$5 billion. The new federal budget over-all will be tight, in the range of \$300 billion, and carry a sizable deficit, he said:

Excerpts from the interview:

Q. Because of the energy crisis, it appears the federal budget deficit is going to be larger than you originally thought. About what will be the size of the deficit in fiscal 1975?

A. First of all, the deficit is not going to be influenced that much by the energy crisis. In fact, the impact is going to be less than one per cent. It's less than a \$3 billion impact, when you take into account added unemployment benefits plus the funds for energy research and development, plus a couple of hundred million for cost of

living adjustments because of price increases.

Q. That's on the energy crisis. But, considering the budget as a whole and the other programs that have to be funded, you are still going to have a sizable deficit, aren't you?

A. We are going to have a deficit in fiscal 1975. It's really too early to say what the size of that deficit is going to be. The budget we're looking at now is in the \$300 billion range. We have a range of \$6 billion to \$8 billion. The final determination of how much the budget is will depend on the latest economic data that is available, the latest advice of the President's economic advisers, and his determination of what the appropriate fiscal policy is, balanced against the programmatic considerations. Along about early January we will be coming to a determination about what the total should be. . . .

Q. What about national health insurance? How much is in the budget for that?

A. Well, the national health insurance won't have much of a budgetary impact in 1975. So we don't have to factor that into the budget very much. Let me tell you a couple of more things on the total size of the budget. We are predicating the 1975 budget on the fact that inflation is going to be the No. 1 economic problem. Therefore, we are trying to keep spending down. We are trying to come in with a very tight budget. Now, you might ask how a \$300 billion range is consistent with a tight budget? We are going to have about \$273 billion in expenditures in fiscal 1974. We've got built in, before we or Congress get a chance to work on the discretionary programs, about \$25 billion increment in noncontrollables. What I mean by noncontrollables are those programs that are fixed by prior legislation. Individual entitlement programs are the biggest portion of that—Social Security, medicare, medicaid, public assistance, veterans benefits, unemployment benefits, civil service retirement benefits and the like.

Q. It doesn't sound like you are going to have many new initiatives in fiscal 1975, except for the start of the national health insurance program, because of the tight budget situation.

A. There are a number of other things that are being considered for the President's State of the Union address. There are two ways to answer that comment. One, there are a heck of a lot of initiatives that we've already proposed that haven't been acted on

yet that we think merit consideration. Among those is further action on the President's new federalism program, mainly, enactment of the four special revenue-sharing acts. The other way of answering that is there are going to be some other new initiatives, some of which will come out in the State of the Union and others of which will come out in the budget... We're considering welfare reform again... There's the possibility of an urban mass transit revenue-sharing program, where we combine the city highway funds with the urban mass transit funds into a single fund and distribute on a proportionate basis to the cities and states.

Q. On the economy, is there any change in the administration's forecast of the economic impact of the energy crisis? Your economic advisers said recently there would be no recession, but unemployment might rise close to six per cent.

A. We firmly feel that there will not be a recession. We're trying to put together the budget in a way that helps avoid a recession. Now, that's somewhat contradictory to say, Well, we're keeping it down to avoid inflation but we're putting it together to avoid a recession. We're going to be watching very carefully the unemployment trends on a monthly basis. If we see we're approaching the top range of our estimates, we're going to do something to inject into the economy some stimuli. Our staff is working on a categorization of those kinds of things that can be done that can provide an injection into the economy... And as we watch the economic trends that are developing—you might call this an unemployment watch—if we are approaching the high ends of our estimates, we are prepared to take those actions that will avoid unemployment going much higher... I can't give you too many specifics on that, because it's something we're developing now...

(End of quotations from Malek interview)

SUMMARY:—The Congress and the people customarily look to the President of the United States for the annual State of the Union Address and the Budget Report in accordance with the commandment laid down in the Constitution. But it seems that the President has been pre-empted by an assistant director of the Office of Management and Budget, a manager whose appointment need not be confirmed by the Senate, a man protected by executive privilege and responsible to no man other than his immediate superior, Roy Ash, who also is appointed to his czardom and is in no way responsible

to the electorate or to the representatives of the electorate.

Similarly Roy Ash, as director of OMB, pre-empts the Presidency, the Pentagon and the Congress in laying down plans for the restructuring of American military bases. If you have been following the headlines, you will have noticed that appointee Henry Kissinger pre-empts the President in all foreign affairs, just as George Shultz speaks for the President in "Nixonomic" affairs, and William Simon in "energetics." And so on down the line. They speak, and the President approves. As our correspondent implied, it no longer matters who is President, any man will do if he can take and deliver orders, and approve orders given by the appointed managers who really run the show!

This seems to be the game plan:

1. The Office of Management and Budget, through the Regional Governance establishment, and absolute control over the Planning, Programming, Budgeting System, will exercise dictatorial control over all domestic governing bodies.

2. The Treasury Department through William Simon's "crisis control" (he is said to be slated to replace the resigning George Shultz shortly), will control *the people*, even as OMB controls governing bodies, by means of rationing, and through the use of the Internal Revenue Service as a police to keep all individuals in line (corporations are classified legally as "individuals," unless they become conglomerates or multinationals, in which cases they tend to become "governments" in their own right.)

3. While OMB is keeping government and public bodies under strict control, and while IRS is keeping the people under strict control, appointee Kissinger will be keeping—or trying to keep—other Nations under control.

Thus has developed the Federal Corporation, with its New Ruling Class operating through Appointed Managers. And our only worldly hope of liberation lies in the fact that the people at large are beginning to ask questions. May they ask the right ones, and demand the right answers!

DON BELL REPORTS & CLOSER-UP are privately circulated Newsletters accenting the Christian American point of view. Subscriptions not sold separately. Complete service: \$24 per year. 3 months trial: \$6. Extra copies: 10¢ each. Address all orders:

DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

PPBS - PHASE TWO

Whenever President Clinton finds himself facing a sympathetic audience or an inviting microphone, he is apt to mention the need for "reinventing government." He never defines or explains what the term means, except that it's supposed to "restructure" government so as to make it "more efficient and compassionate." Being such a catchy phrase, we wondered if something special was hidden behind the word "reinventing." It brought to mind stories of the various stops and studies of existing governments which Clinton had made while on the way to the White House. Under the tutorship of Carroll Quigley he would have learned much of the conspiracy and the conspirators connected with the creation of their New World Order. In the preface to his remarkable book Tragedy and Hope Quigley wrote: "Much of my adult life has been devoted to training undergraduates in techniques of historical analysis which will help them to free their understanding of history from the accepted categories and cognitive classifications in which we live....The present work is the result of such an attempt to look at the real situations which lie between conceptual and verbal symbols." So young Clinton had been given the story of the inner workings of the conspiracy first hand. Then at Oxford, birthplace of Fabian Socialism, he learned of the system that was then controlling Britain and had come so close to controlling the United States as well under FDR's Brain Trust and their New Deal. Still in England, while promoting anti-US demonstrations because of America's involvement in the Vietnam War, Clinton received with other "scholars of government" an invitation to visit Moscow where he could study the type of government initiated by Lenin and side-tracked by Stalin. Then, lucky scholar, he was able to visit Rome where he could learn of the techniques and methods of Fascism under Mussolini. Returning home, he must have felt the effect that David Rockefeller's brother Laurence made while he was trying to take over Arkansas as a private preserve for the study and development of environmentalism as a tool of government. Laurence would have made an interesting study. While trying to run Clinton's home state of Arkansas, he also managed to hold the Rockefeller family seat on the New York Stock Exchange, approved a plan for the takeover of South American industry and agriculture, and represented the family in the CFR-promoted and Communist cited Institute of Pacific Relations; all this at the same time heading the parade of politically inspired environmentalists, a post now occupied by VP Al Gore.

In all of his first hand observation and study of government systems, Clinton may have learned that governments are often invented (Lenin, Mussolini, FDR), but few are reinvented. And when the reinventing time came, Clinton was presented with the plan and he was told how to carry it out. We say this because when it came time for the president to take a vacation, he did a very unusual thing, he went to Martha's Vineyard for an eleven day period of virtual isolation from the world. He stayed at the estate of Robert Strange McNamara, where he was probably told about the reinventing was to be made, and how he would conduct the operation. You'll probably remember McNamara. He was the man who had to do with the Edsel, probably the worst failure in all of American automobile building

history. He was the "Whiz Kid" in the Defense Department who designed the system that was used in fighting the Vietnam War, where untold numbers of people were killed because of the failure of his plan. That plan is known as the "Planning-Programming-Budgeting System (PPBS), sometimes known as "Management by Objective" or "Accountability." McNamara went on to become president of the World Bank, and he is said to be known by others of the Conspiracy as the real expert whenever PPBS is mentioned. So it is very likely that Clinton's vacation was planned that he might "sit at the feet" of McNamara and learn of the government reinventing he was to manage as President of the United States.

Recently we received a letter and considerable important information from a long-time subscriber of our Don Bell Reports. "I am a great admirer of your work and read all your reports faithfully over the years. I know you will keep it up as long as you can....I don't think you have forgotten your special report in 1972 on 'Proofs of a Conspiracy to Build a Total Managed Global Society.' Well that was just Phase One and now we have entered Phase Two. Twenty-one years have passed since that day and now we are all a lot older, and I hope as wise. May God Bless Us All.' True, we had forgotten much of what we had written twenty-one years ago. So we went to our files, and found our report consisted of a seventeen part series having to do with PPBS, begun on September 8, 1972. It's now out of print and no longer available. In the first of the seventeen letters, we concluded with this statement: "This revolutionary plan [PPBS] for the reshaping of the world is complex, difficult to understand because of its semantics. Even the name of the plan is disarming, seemingly innocent and innocuous. It is called Planning-Programming-Budgeting System and few people other than its operators even know of its existence." Our recent correspondent said: "That was just Phase One and now we have entered Phase Two." So Clinton was sent to the Vineyard to learn that while Phase One was a failure except in its destruction of the public education system, Phase Two must succeed if Clinton is to succeed.

At this point we quote our correspondent who told us about Phase Two: "Back in the 60s under President Johnson our government destroyed the only logical and accepted method of budgeting, that of the line-item budget, and shifted into Program Budgeting. This began the problem of the uncontrolled and the massive and also uncontrolled federal deficit. All functions of the government were grouped into programs that were locked into place with multi-year fundings (5-year plans, same as in the Soviet Union). This deprived Congress of the ability to make changes to the federal budget unless they eliminated the whole program or changed the budget process. Since no one in government, especially those in congress, really knew how to Program Budget, unwanted programs continued until they were finally phased out, and the deficit grew and grew. Every president since Johnson has gone along with this concept until they got into trouble with the deficit and started mouthing words about a 'line-item veto.' That was Program Budgeting (a part of PPBS). Moving into Performance Budgeting will just take the process to another level, that of measuring the individual performer. On Tuesday, August 3, President Clinton signed into law the "Government Performance and Results Act (Phase Two). The Act says that Federal agencies will have to say what they will do with the money they get and will be measured against those promises. This major step will move the government out of Phase One, Program Budgeting, into the long awaited Phase two, Performance Budgeting. This action was pre-planned by those who originally designed the PPB System.

Once Program Budgeting was declared a failure, as it was with the 1993 Budget process, our government was programmed to proceed to Performance Budgeting, and of course President Clinton is making sure that will happen." That's why he went to the Vineyard. "However," we are told, "the federal bureaucracy could not take this step until it was established that the federal computers had the capability of measuring the performance of every government employee [of which there are 3,033,215 according to Standard & Poor], not to mention every private citizen. These measurements will not be limited to the job performance, but will be done in the taxonomic domains (cognitive, affective and psychomotor), how the individual thinks, feels and acts."

The computers are now ready to record how every individual thinks, feels and acts, so President Clinton was directed to get down to the business of what he calls "reinventing government."

While we were writing this report, the Clintons came to Miami to visit with and again promise the people whose homes and businesses were destroyed more than a year ago by Hurricane Andrew will receive help, but are still waiting for the very inefficient FEMA to fulfill its promises. Clinton then explained that he would be engaged for some time with the promoting of NAFTA, a vital part of the NWO Economic Program. Also, he would be very busy touring the country with Hillary, selling her new health program. So, Al Gore had been assigned to job of "reinventing" the legislative branch of government. Accordingly, as soon as Congress was back from its summer vacation, Gore was on the spot telling legislators about how Performance Budgeting would work. In an apparently exclusive article written for USA TODAY, Gore asked, "Can't we create a government that works better and costs less?" and answers himself, "Yes. President Clinton created the National Performance Review to do just that and today we present to the president the results of our work [Performance Budgeting]. Gore explains that "the president can make some changes right away. But others require new laws. Accomplishing the whole job requires a partnership between all branches of government - as well as between the private and public sectors." This is where "How the individual (in the private sectors) is monitored and recorded as to "how he thinks, feels and acts". Finally, Gore refers to The National Performance Review (his assignment) and says it "is about change - historic change in the way government works."

As Clinton and Gore describe it, one would think that something really new and original had been "reinvented". Actually, back in February, 1968, twenty-five years ago, Robert McNamara, the PPBS expert, published a book titled The Essence of Security, Reflections in Office. We have a quote from page 94 of his book: "One of the first things we did in 1961 was to design a new mechanism which would provide this information and integrate into a single, coherent management system. The product of this effort was the Planning-Programming-Budgeting System, which is now being applied throughout the US Government..." He was, of course, talking about Program Budgeting because the computers had not yet been created to accommodate Performance Budgeting. However, on page 100 he touches on Performance Budgeting when he mentions of "how to motivate them [the thousands of managers in the field] to do their job more efficiently. And how to determine whether or not they have done so, have always been the most difficult and elusive problems facing the top management." Moving into Performance Budgeting is now supposed to solve that problem.

We should also mention that McNamara did not invent (or reinvent) his management system. He stole it from the United Nations Department of

Economic and Social Affairs which in 1965 published a manual titled A Manual for Programme and Performance Budgeting. This UN Manual also described the difference between Program Budgeting and Performance Budgeting as follows: "In the adoption of programme and performance budgeting, it is best to introduce the various elements of this approach in evolutionary and orderly fashion. For this purpose a useful distinction might be made between programme budgeting and performance budgeting. In programme budgeting, the principal emphasis is on a budget classification in which functions, programmes, and their subdivisions are established for each agency and these are related to accurate and meaningful financial data. Performance budgeting involves the development of more refined management tools, such as unit costs, work measurement, and performance standards....In this sense, performance budgeting is an all-inclusive concept embodying programme formulation as well as measurement of the performance of work in the accomplishment of programme objectives." This is where "how the individual thinks, feels and acts" becomes a part of performance budgeting. The "Big Brother" sequence will have been completed when the personalized ID Card which can be read by computer, plus the computerized cashless society are added.

It is obvious that a cautious approach has been made to this dangerous system as it has taken 44 years and the election of President Clinton to introduce this new phase. The system was developed by the United Nations in the early 1950s and was forced on all developing countries. The Soviet Union had been toying with it since the 1920s with their five-year plans and setting top-down targets which proved to be unworkable.

Our correspondent, who had studied the system ever since we first published our series on PPBS in 1972, concludes: "So here we are now with President Clinton [acting on orders from his superiors] locking us into a system that will take us into a 'Total Managed Global Society' and pave the way for the 'New World Order' under United Nations control. Performance Budgeting following the Crisis created by Program Budgeting will only lead us to Chaos. This system has been forced on every school district and has caused the downfall of our educational system. We are programming students instead of teaching them. Its introduction into the Soviet Union was the cause of its economic collapse. Private industries that have tried it have all gone into an economic crisis unless, like Sears Roebuck they tried it and dumped it in hopes of regaining the public's support."

In 1972 we concluded a series with these words: "And finally, let it be understood that this Revolution means far more than the creation of a new kind of government, it also means the creation of a new society with a new religion and a new god, and a new man with a new conscience and a new set of values. It is to be a computerized society in which the finished products will all think, feel and act the same."

"The beginning of the defense of Freedom is to know the Truth. We hope and pray that we have helped in this defense by presenting these Proofs of a Conspiracy to Build a Total Managed Global Society."

Don Bell Reports is a privately circulated newsletter, published every other Friday, emphasizing the Christian American point of view. Reproduction is permitted when credit is given. Postal rates permitting, two copies of each issue are mailed first class to each subscriber. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$40 per year; Foreign Air Mail, \$50 per year. Extra copies of same issue to same address: 1 to 9, 50¢ each; 10 to 49, 40¢ each; 50 to 99; 30¢ each; 100 or more, 20¢ each. Address all orders and correspondence to: Don Bell Reports, Post Office Box 2223, Palm Beach, Florida 33480.

THE THREE LIVES OF DON BELL

EXPLANATION

As a reporter we have always believed that the answer to the question "What is Truth?" is vastly more important than "Who is Don Bell?" Consequently, in our reporting, commenting and analyzing we have always tried to avoid using anything more personal than the editorial "we."

However, there are those new and prospective subscribers who almost inevitably ask the question "Who is Don Bell?" There are also many who, showing our letters to someone else, or quoting from them, are asked the same question. If they are unable to answer factually, credibility is questioned and facts are discounted. Too, there is the elemental fact that subscribers have a right to know something of the qualifications and the professional background of anyone they are supporting and trusting in any patriotic work of the nature of "Don Bell Reports."

Therefore, due to numerous and continuing requests, and to the insistence of the one who is "bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh" and who answers all of our personal mail, this autobiographical sketch of Don Bell is presented in lieu of a regular weekly "Don Bell Reports."

In many instances we have had to rely on memory, records having been lost when the Japanese fire-bombed our former home in Manila. Later, upon leaving Japan to cover the Bikini atom bomb tests, all possessions were lost in transit. This, then, is the story of a journalist, not a life history, as we remember it.

FIRST: THE PREPARATION

As a very young man with a very large aim in life, we decided that the quickest way to become a foreign correspondent was to get into a foreign country and start corresponding; with the right people, of course. Furthermore, the easiest way for a penniless youth to get into a foreign country in the winter of 1926 was to join the U.S. Marines, requesting overseas duty. This latter seemed easy because there was trouble in both Nicaragua and China, and Marines were sure to be sent to both places. Fresh out of boot camp, we were one of the large force sent to China under General Smedley Butler, "to protect the interests of Standard Oil and

Texaco," as the General said a few years later. The situation was critical for a while because Chiang Kai-shek had kicked the Communists (Russians, Americans, and Chinese) off his staff and his nationalist forces were battling to unite all the provinces into one great republic. Our job was to prevent that battling from seeping into the international settlements of Shanghai and Tientsin. In this we were fairly successful, and after things had settled down and the occupation had become routine, the Chaplain wanted someone to publish a magazine. So *Walla Walla* (meaning much talk) came into being as the official organ of the Fourth United States Marine Expeditionary Force, headquartered in Shanghai, China. We were selected as its editor, and our journalistic career began where it had left off in high school. (Oh, yes, we had also decided in the winter of 1926 that on-the-spot self-education was better for a budding foreign correspondent than an on-the-campus college education. Hence the Marine correspondence school instead of a University).

Having served our country for six years, we were discharged in Shanghai to become an executive with the *Shanghai Evening Post & Mercury*, American-owned, English-language daily which was later "liberated" by the invading Japanese. Our "executive" duties consisted of managing the printing plant, acting as features editor, writing a daily column, doing string reporting for the United Press, other chores that gave us a well-rounded education in fourth estate affairs, and later when the company acquired a radio station, we became its news editor and commentator.

This all ended in 1937 when Japan invaded China, driving Chiang Kai-shek's government back to Chungking, and forcing us to flee China and accept a post with an American-owned, NBC-affiliated radio station. There we became a full-fledged foreign correspondent with NBC, and also became a prisoner-of-war when the Japanese occupied Manila in January, 1942.

Shortly after our broadcast of the "Little Pearl Harbor" bombing of Nichols Field, we were commandeered by the Philippine Government and by General MacArthur's headquarters to help maintain morale by continuing to broadcast hourly until the

radio transmitters were destroyed to prevent their falling into the hands of the enemy. When our radio voice was thereby silenced, Col. Hap Harries of G2 (intelligence) would drive in, pick us up, take us to Corregidor, where we would join General MacArthur's staff. But Hap Harries never made it. A bomb got him before he got to me, according to his widow, Mary Harries, who wrote the *Saturday Evening Post War Anecdote* which is reproduced from the original and which appears on the opposite page.

As for us, a Filipino friend slipped into the prison camp to tell us about the beautiful memorial broadcast he had heard over KGEI, a short-wave radio station broadcasting from San Francisco. It seems that Don Bell was captured, tortured because he wouldn't give information to the enemy, paraded through the streets and then executed; the first war correspondent to die in World War II.

SECOND: THE OCCUPATION

But an error had been made. Someone else had been mistaken for Don Bell—we never learned who—and had died in our stead. The incident probably saved us, because the Kempei Tai (Japanese military police) quit looking for us, and we spent a miserable three years, one month and one day in Santo Tomas, Japanese Prisoner of War Camp Number One, Manila, the Philippines.

At Christmas, 1954, we published a letter which we titled "The Last Christmas." It dealt with the last Christmas spent at Santo Tomas. We reprint a part of that letter:

* * * * *

Colonel Hayashi knew it was to be our last Christmas. He had received precise and complete instructions regarding the time, place and method of our mass execution. He may have felt that since time was running out for us, he could be indulgent. He approved our plans and gave permission for a Christian observance of the birth of our Lord and Saviour....

We had an electric organ. We built a stage to accommodate an 80-voice chorus. A Spanish priest smuggled in enough instruments to outfit a 30-piece orchestra. All inmates contributed as they could....

We planned our program carefully: Previously we had discovered a splendid male quartet through talent searches to provide occasional entertainment which had made endurable the long evenings of prison boredom. We had almost lost the quartet to the torture chamber because of a previous performance that the Japanese called insulting to them (it was meant to be). And the first tenor died of starvation during final rehearsals for our Last Christmas on Earth. A quick shift in plans and the remaining

three—a French Catholic, a Russian Orthodox, and a Baptist preacher—performed gloriously as the Three Kings of Orient. The voices were weak with the enduring pain of enduring hunger. But we had microphones. And their costumes were of sackcloth. But we still had imagination — —

The finale of the evening performance was an abbreviated version of Handel's *Messiah*, closing with the immortal *Hallelujah Chorus*.

Came time for the finale:

Some of our prisoner audience had benches or chairs; others sat on the ground. None had the strength to stand throughout the performance. I'm sure many in the audience had gone into that coma-like substitute for sleep which invests a body infested with the ravaging beri-beri, to numb the pain of the sting of death.

But — as the first glorious tones of that inspired chorus were heard, something began to happen. The people began rising. Four thousand prisoners of twelve nationalities and fourteen religions began to rise as one. They stood erect, looking straight ahead; not at the stage or the people on it, but beyond the stage. They were looking beyond the pain and suffering brought them by three years of prison life; seeing a vision of the life that should have been on the birthday of the King of Kings and Prince of Peace. We were of fourteen religions, yes. But the bias and the bigotry, dogma and diversion was gone. We were as one, unified in the only kind of one-world that a just God can ever condone or bless — one in spirit with our Father, observing with praise and thankfulness the birth of His Son — —

The miracle of the moments endured after the music had ended, finally to be punctured by the harsh-pitched screechings of the Japanese guards, ordering us back to the rooms of confinement.

That's when reality struck us: from heaven to hell in the time it takes to hear and comprehend one shrill voice of command. It had been a most wonderful experience — but for what purpose? We were being ordered back to the little wooden bunks, hungry, tired, without hope of an earthly tomorrow. (Looking back on years of remembering, it seems that was the worst night of all —)

Then, just before dawn the bombers came. We couldn't see them clearly in the first light-flakings of a tropical dawn, but we had learned to distinguish the big, beautiful, silvered B-17s by their sound. And we wondered which of the enemy camps would be obliterated this Christmas morning.

But we heard no sounds of exploding bombs as the planes droned away. We learned why a few minutes later.

The Japanese had tried to pick them all up and destroy them; but there were too many of them. Our American airmen had bombed the island with Christmas Cards!

I had one of the cards, one of my most treasured possessions. It was lost with other "memories" when I was shot down and reported killed (the second time) off the China coast three months later. But I can remember the cover: the delicately drawn scene of the Nativity. And inside (as best I can remember after all the years) were these words:

"The Commanding Officer, Officers and Men of the Army of Liberation extend the Sentiments of the Season and the promise of the realization of your fondest hopes in the coming New Year."

That promise was kept. For General of the Army Douglas Arthur MacArthur walked into Santo Tomas Prison Camp just forty-three days later, to greet those of us still alive." (unquote)


We were so emaciated we felt sure he wouldn't recognize us as we walked forward to speak to him, so we said, "General, I am Don Bell." And he said, "Hello, Lazarus, I am happy to see you have returned from the dead."

Returning to work was a different matter. NBC, thinking us dead, had written us off. But Mutual Broadcasting System offered us an immediate place as their correspondent with MacArthur's headquarters, in spite of my physical condition at that time. I accepted and after some hair-raising experiences in Luzon, Borneo and a few other islands, we talked the Commanding Officer of the Navy's air fleet, to let us go as thirteenth man on a patrol bomber mission along the China coast.

And so it happened that

On March 22, 1945, the PB4Y2 in which we were flying, disguised as a radar technician, ran into real trouble.

Japan was dependent on oil supplies that had to be shipped by tankers via the South China Sea. Our job was to prevent any tankers or Japanese merchant ships from getting to Japan. Spotting a nest of ships off the coast near Amoy, we went down to identify them, were hit by unexpected anti-aircraft fire off Quemoy, and we kept right on



Right Past the Japs' Ears

A P O S T W A R A N E C D O T E

AS I listened to Don Bell, one of the radio commentators who described the Bikini atom-bomb tests, it reminded me of the hoax he played on the Japs toward the end of our three long years in the Japanese prison camp at Santo Tomás, Manila.

The Japs let us have a public-address system in the prison, to broadcast occasional scraps of vague, highly censored news they fed us from the outside world and to notify us about daily work assignments. In broadcasting the so-called news, Bell was a great morale builder; knowing how starved we were for information about the war, he often took chances on slipping through important facts by resort to clever double-talk.

The time came when persistent rumors were being whispered through the prison that MacArthur had landed on Leyte—a dramatic moment for the 4000 starving prisoners who had been waiting so long for the Americans to come yet dulled by the memory of many rumors which had proved false.

Our starvation ration of five ounces of food a day had just been

reduced again because the Japs insisted they could get no rice for us. Each evening Bell was allowed to broadcast that rice had again failed to arrive that day, so that the few families who had a little saved up could budget out a bit of it for their children and grimly go on hoarding the rest.

Finally, as the starving continued and the Leyte rumors persisted, Bell stepped to his microphone one evening and, following the routine work-detail broadcast, began the announcement I'll never forget. "And now I have some grand news for you," he said. "Today the rice ration arrived."

No doubt the Japanese thought that the roar of applause which rolled through the camp when he had finished what he had to say signified our delight at the arrival of the food. Well, that did please us. But what really made us cut loose was the wonderful news he finessed through in his closing remark. "This has come a little late," he said. "It has been a long time. But . . . better Leyte than never!"

—MARY M. HARRIES.

Reproduced courtesy Saturday Evening Post

radio transmitters were destroyed to prevent their falling into the hands of the enemy. When our radio voice was thereby silenced, Col. Hap Harries of G2 (intelligence) would drive in, pick us up, take us to Corregidor, where we would join General MacArthur's staff. But Hap Harries never made it. A bomb got him before he got to me, according to his widow, Mary Harries, who wrote the *Saturday Evening Post War Anecdote* which is reproduced from the original and which appears on the opposite page.

As for us, a Filipino friend slipped into the prison camp to tell us about the beautiful memorial broadcast he had heard over KGEI, a short-wave radio station broadcasting from San Francisco. It seems that Don Bell was captured, tortured because he wouldn't give information to the enemy, paraded through the streets and then executed; the first war correspondent to die in World War II.

SECOND: THE OCCUPATION

But an error had been made. Someone else had been mistaken for Don Bell—we never learned who—and had died in our stead. The incident probably saved us, because the Kempei Tai (Japanese military police) quit looking for us, and we spent a miserable three years, one month and one day in Santo Tomas, Japanese Prisoner of War Camp Number One, Manila, the Philippines.

At Christmas, 1954, we published a letter which we titled "The Last Christmas." It dealt with the last Christmas spent at Santo Tomas. We reprint a part of that letter:

* * * * *

Colonel Hayashi knew it was to be our last Christmas. He had received precise and complete instructions regarding the time, place and method of our mass execution. He may have felt that since time was running out for us, he could be indulgent. He approved our plans and gave permission for a Christian observance of the birth of our Lord and Saviour....

We had an electric organ. We built a stage to accommodate an 80-voice chorus. A Spanish priest smuggled in enough instruments to outfit a 30-piece orchestra. All inmates contributed as they could....

We planned our program carefully: Previously we had discovered a splendid male quartet through talent searches to provide occasional entertainment which had made endurable the long evenings of prison boredom. We had almost lost the quartet to the torture chamber because of a previous performance that the Japanese called insulting to them (it was meant to be). And the first tenor died of starvation during final rehearsals for our Last Christmas on Earth. A quick shift in plans and the remaining

three—a French Catholic, a Russian Orthodox, and a Baptist preacher—performed gloriously as the Three Kings of Orient. The voices were weak with the enduring pain of enduring hunger. But we had microphones. And their costumes were of sackcloth. But we still had imagination — —

The finale of the evening performance was an abbreviated version of Handel's *Messiah*, closing with the immortal *Hallelujah Chorus*.

Came time for the finale:

Some of our prisoner audience had benches or chairs; others sat on the ground. None had the strength to stand throughout the performance. I'm sure many in the audience had gone into that coma-like substitute for sleep which invests a body infested with the ravaging beri-beri, to numb the pain of the sting of death.

But — as the first glorious tones of that inspired chorus were heard, something began to happen. The people began rising. Four thousand prisoners of twelve nationalities and fourteen religions began to rise as one. They stood erect, looking straight ahead; not at the stage or the people on it, but beyond the stage. They were looking beyond the pain and suffering brought them by three years of prison life; seeing a vision of the life that should have been on the birthday of the King of Kings and Prince of Peace. We were of fourteen religions, yes. But the bias and the bigotry, dogma and diversion was gone. We were as one, unified in the only kind of one-world that a just God can ever condone or bless — one in spirit with our Father, observing with praise and thankfulness the birth of His Son — —

The miracle of the moments endured after the music had ended, finally to be punctured by the harsh-pitched screechings of the Japanese guards, ordering us back to the rooms of confinement.

That's when reality struck us: from heaven to hell in the time it takes to hear and comprehend one shrill voice of command. It had been a most wonderful experience — but for what purpose? We were being ordered back to the little wooden bunks, hungry, tired, without hope of an earthly tomorrow. (Looking back on years of remembering, it seems that was the worst night of all — —) Then, just before dawn the bombers came. We couldn't see them clearly in the first light-flakings of a tropical dawn, but we had learned to distinguish the big, beautiful, silvered B-17s by their sound. And we wondered which of the enemy camps would be obliterated this Christmas morning.

But we heard no sounds of exploding bombs as the planes droned away. We learned why a few minutes later.

AND THEY STILL CALL IT EDUCATION

"GETTING CHILDREN TO "LEARN HOW THEY TICK

"Children at school are invited to repeat to the class 'the lie you often tell about yourself'...to write their own obituary notice...to talk about their loneliness...to drop counters into a cup after predicting how many they will get 'on target'...to express anger through noise and action.

"What are they doing? They are playing games, certainly, but they are also learning—and taking part in a Unesco experiment in international understanding which has been tried out over the past 18 months in 16 schools in Austria, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary, the United Kingdom and the United States."

These are the opening paragraphs of a news release issued as one of a group of "Unesco Features, a fortnightly bulletin for press, radio and television" by United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 7 place de Fontenoy, 75700 Paris.

Unesco's Institute for Education in Hamburg which is running this particular project, explains that "while not neglecting the purely cognitive aspect, it tries to integrate social and affective learning more fully into the school curriculum. In other words, the attempt is to move from the transmission of facts towards getting the children to learn 'how they tick'...Emphasis is on getting children to learn by themselves, not teaching them. Each of the games suggested creates a 'learning experience' from which the pupils draw their own instruction, so the project is right in the mainstream of modern attempts to reform education."

"...One British teacher trying the 'self-exploration game,' which aims at increasing self-understanding, tried Situation No. 4—'Do Something Uncontrolled'—and found his shoes removed and thrown out of the window. (...this illustrates the kind of crisis that teachers on the project must be prepared for.)"

Another Unesco "educational" experiment involves children in schools in Colombia. We are told that:

"There are 3,120 children in Colombia today who have a chance of growing up to be enlightened adults in the full sense of the word—free of prejudices and taboos, able to bring up the number of children they desire and aware of their role in shaping their own lives and those of generations to come as they take an active part in their country's development... Before too long this new form of schooling, which combines sex education and study of population and environmental problems with the usual subjects... may be extended to the Colombian educational system as a whole."

Yvonne Tabbush, who is Unesco Regional Information Officer for Latin America, with office in Santiago de Chile, explains what she witnessed in some of the schools:

"The boys at Bolo primary school showed us neat exercise books in which they had drawn and written what they had learned about genetics throughout the term. The fourth grade girls at Nuestra Senora del Rosario trooped onto the stage one by one to explain, by means of photos and charts, the process of conception, gestation and birth... The children spoke of changing traditional patterns, of their parents' attitudes to what they were learning and sometimes to their resistance to progress: 'They need classes too, but we try to teach them.'... the curriculum is constantly re-evaluated and adapted to needs and concerns. As time is the great problem, suggestions are made for cutting down on details and descriptions of places and events—the old standbys of geography, history and biology—and emphasizing instead the concept of environment, demography and the ecosystem, giving more time for reflexion and analysis rather than rote of learning and memorizing..."

"And so the experiment proceeds with checks and balances, pre-tests and post-tests in the 24 schools where the project is being carried out, and a parallel selection of 21 control schools where classes have not been changed, the results being compared at each stage to calculate the impact of the new teaching and evaluate changes in attitude. When all the tests have been checked,

codified and analyzed, discussed with educational leaders and the teachers who took part in the experiment and with representatives of the Ministry of Education, the National Population Council, the Council of (Catholic) Bishops and the Parents' Association, the guidelines should be ready for the preparation of a national programme of population education." (End of quotation from Unesco Features).

A few words of explanation are in order:

The United Nations Organization is set up like a World Government (which its creators intended it to become after a few structural changes had been made). The UN has its legislative branch, composed of two bodies: the General Assembly and the Security Council. The General Assembly, or lower house, bears some similarity to our own House of Representatives, in that it is made up of representatives from each of the member States. But there is this important difference to be pointed out: Our House members are elected according to the population of the States they represent, so that the large but sparsely populated Alaska has but one Representative, while the smaller but heavily populated New York State has 39 Representatives. In contrast, in the UN General Assembly, each State, regardless of size or density of population, has but one representative (save for the USSR which has three), thus belying the fiction that the UN is a "democratic" organization.

the UN's "upper house" or Security Council differs from most legislative bodies in that ten of its fifteen member nation representatives are elected every two years, while the Big Five (USA, USSR, UK, France and China) hold their seats permanently, and their representatives (called Ambassadors) also have the power of veto; this fact again belying the fiction of "democracy."

The United Nations Organization also has its Judicial Branch, the world Court, or the International Court of Justice; fifteen judges elected for 9-year terms by the General Assembly and the Security Council.

These two branches, the legislative and the judicial, could be written off as little more than expensive nuisances. Now and then the UN "legislature" will issue a sanction against some State, perhaps Rhodesia or Israel; the sanction will either be vetoed by one of the Big Five, or it will be ignored by the indicted State. Only the United States ever seems to pay much attention to any United Nations decree. The same can be said of the World Court; nobody ever gives much thought to its decisions.

But the "Executive" or "Administrative" branch of the United Nations is an entirely different matter. Not that Secretary General Kurt Waldheim and his staff are of great importance, they do little more than keep the records straight and manage the UN Headquarters in New York City. However -

Somewhat similar to our President's Cabinet and the various bureaus, agencies, authorities and administrations which make up our Executive Branch of federal government; the UN also has its special councils and agencies; bureaucracies wherein resides the real power of the United Nations. These are regulatory agencies which derive their power not from UN Headquarters, but from treaties which are signed by the various National Governments and administered by these UN agencies. For example: the so-called World Bank (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development) and the International Monetary Fund do not derive their power from their relation to the United Nations as such, but from the fact that multilateral treaties are signed by the member Nations, naming these organizations as official custodians and managers of international financial matters involving Nations.

UNESCO is such an international bureaucracy, deriving its powers from the fact that the nations have signed an international agreement giving Unesco diplomatic immunity and powers which actually supersede the powers granted by the United States Constitution.

To put it more simply: If the United Nations ceased to exist as an organization, we'd still have to deal with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the International Labor Organization (ILO), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the World Health Organization (WHO), the World Bank, the International Development Association (IDA), the International Finance Corporation (IFC), the IMF, the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), the Universal Postal Union (UPU), the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO), the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

Many of these international organizations are important, beneficial, and offer no threat to the integrity or security of any nation. Unesco, however, is not one of these. Its activities in the educational field have become little more than attempts to build a

World Community. As Unesco itself says: "Creating world understanding, of course, has always been the aim of Unesco, whose Constitution lays down that 'since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed.' For the past 20 years, attempts to build these defences have been made in Unesco 'Associated Schools', now numbering more than 900 in 62 countries..."

These "Unesco Associated Schools" are better classified as laboratories, where the many schemes promoted by behavioral scientists, social scientists and educationists are tried out, using the children of various races, religions and nations as guinea pigs for their experimentations. Two such experiments were discussed at the start of this letter. When these Unesco experiments are proved successful in mind control efforts they are then recommended to National and State Boards of Education, and introduced into school systems in the United States and throughout the world.

It should be noted that the management and control method known as the Planning, Programming, Budgeting System, was tried out and adopted in Unesco Associated Schools before it was forced upon American school systems. It should also be borne in mind that this movement which aims at "programming the product (the future citizen) for existence in the newly programmed society," is not an American phenomenon. It is a world-wide movement which aims at mind control for the masses of the world, with only the children of the Elite to be spared. This concept was perhaps best explained by the late humanist and one world advocate, Bertrand Russell. In his book, *The Impact of Science on Society*, pages 29 and 30, he wrote:

I think the subject which will be of most importance politically is mass psychology... This study is immensely useful to practical men, whether they wish to become rich or to acquire the government... Its importance has been enormously increased by the growth of modern methods of propaganda. Of these, the most influential is what is called "education"... What is essential in mass psychology is the art of persuasion... It may be hoped that in time anybody will be able to persuade anybody of anything *if he can catch the patient young* and is provided by the State with money and equipment... This subject will make great strides when it is taken up by scientists under a scientific dictatorship... The social psychologists of the future will have a number of

classes of school children on whom they will try different methods of producing an unshakable conviction that snow is black. Various results will be arrived at. First, that the influence of home is obstructive. Second, that not much can be done unless indoctrination begins before the age of ten. Third, that verses set to music and repeatedly intoned (as in hard rock-Ed.) are very effective. Fourth, that the opinion that snow is white must be held to show a morbid taste for eccentricity...

Although this science will be diligently studied, it will be rigidly confined to the governing class. The populace will not be allowed to know how its convictions were generated. When the technique has been perfected, every government that has been in charge of education for a generation will be able to control its subjects without the need of armies or policemen. As yet there is only one country which has succeeded in creating this politician's paradise.

(first published in 1952)

Along the lines suggested by Russell, after the "scientists" and their computers were given control over "what is called 'education'," the term education was itself redefined. It now has become the objective of education to "measure and diagnose the child in order to prescribe a program that will develop his feelings and emotions, his values and loyalties *toward predetermined objectives*." Traditionally, the purpose of education was to impart knowledge and to develop skills, while at the same time instilling Christian character. But today, the way a pupil feels and reacts is said to be more important than how much he knows, or how much skill he has. As one of our correspondents said: "Conditioning people to behave according to predetermined behavior patterns becomes the objective of educational institutions. Drawing it right down to basics, we are talking about conditioned responses in human terms. Pavlov experimented on dogs!"

The same kind of experimentation is going on right now, with children instead of dogs, in schools throughout the Nation; indeed, in schools throughout the world. Two such experiments have been cited in this letter. We wrote, in our *Don Bell Reports* of August 3, of other experiments, of one in which the experimentation begins when the child is but two weeks old! It seems that time has proved Bertrand Russell to be wrong in one respect: He thought that indoctrination would have to begin before the "patient" was ten. It seems that "scientific experimentation" has shown that the indoctrination must begin

before the child is, not ten years old, but only ten weeks old!

Although this mind conditioning was started seriously by Unesco more than twenty years ago, and although we have had our share of educationists such as John Dewey, William Heard Kirkpatrick, Harold O. Rugg, George S. Counts, Theodore Brameld, and others of like persuasion, *the real perversion of our entire public school system did not begin until after the Federal Government began taking over control of the schools.*

Prior to 1965 there were local, elected, school boards and State heads of education that could make direct decisions regarding educational programs, textbooks and curriculums, because they were funded at the State and local levels.

But it was in 1965 that the means for the actual restructuring of education in the United States was provided by the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which gave the federal government its actual control over school systems. President Johnson once remarked that he considered the passage of this Act the most significant single piece of legislation of his entire administration.

1965 was an ominous year in other respects. That was the year when President Johnson issued the order which introduced the Planning, Programming, Budgeting System (PPBS) throughout the Executive Branch of the Federal Government. 1965 was also the year which unleashed the actual restructuring of governmental processes and formally included education as a legitimate Federal Government function.

Since then we have seen the national administration establish Federal Offices of Human Resources, the Office of Child Development, Head Start Programs, a National Institute of Education, a National Committee of School Finance, a National Office of Child Development, special tuition programs, day care centers, etc., etc. All of these, and other national offices are tools for the total control of all future generations by the State.

PPBS is the systems management tool made possible through computer technology, to affect the planned changes desired by the *Elite* of which Bertrand Russell spoke. As one California Assemblyman, Robert Burke, expressed it: "If you know what you have to start with, and know what you want to end up with, it's possible to design a system that will make the precise changes required."

The management system is perfected, in PPBS. But the "formula for change" is not

yet worked out to the satisfaction of the *Elite's* behavioral scientists, educationists, and change agents (their own designation for the operators who are trained to affect the changes in the attitudes and behavior of the masses; the students of mass psychology spoken of by Bertrand Russell.) That is why there are so many different experiments still being conducted in schools and communities: the perfect formula to make PPBS perfectly effective in education, is still being sought. And your child may be their guinea pig without your ever knowing it before it is too late, if that child is going to a public school.

Some time ago Mrs. Mary Thompson of Santa Clara, California, who has been opposing PPBS and the *new education* for a number of years, was asked what could be done to stop this planned take-over of the Nation's future generations. Her answer still seems valid:

1. Stop thinking of these various education innovations as separate, isolated, individual programs. All of education today is part of the total concept of programming the product, the student. . . .
2. Stop participating in citizens committees and goals committees, and answering questionnaires for data purposes. Your answers are analyzed with a view to identifying the nature and scope of resistance to programs, and how to circumvent such resistance. If you *do* choose to be on a committee, do so for the purpose of obtaining information and *issuing your own statements publicly* as long as you are allowed to, from within the committee, in order to educate the general public as to the nature of the process.
3. Instruct your children not to supply personal information or answer personal questionnaires in school, or discuss any subjective or introspective matters in school. Teach them how to recognize data collecting techniques.
4. We believe the time has come to establish private schools to keep our children from falling victim to the behaviorists while there is still opportunity to do so. Be aware of the fact that there is a plan (the Voucher system) lurking in the wings to bring the private schools into the national control, alongside the public schools which are already under federal control.

DON BELL REPORTS & CLOSER-UP are privately circulated. Complete service: \$24 per year. 3 months trial: \$6. Please write:
DON BELL REPORTS, P. O. Box 2223
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

PIECE-BY-PIECE

Rhetoric...(2) Artificial eloquence that is showy and elaborate but largely empty of clear ideas or sincere emotion.

Ethics...(1) The study of the general nature of morals and of the specific moral choices to be made by the individual in his relationship with others.

Reference...The John Tower Controversy.

The "first hundred days" of a newly elected President's tenure is looked upon by interested observers as a forecast of the changes and innovations to be expected on the part of the Chief Executive for the next four years. But when George Bush moved into the White House, few changes or innovations were apparent. True, he was the central character in an inauguration extravaganza that was more expensive but less sensational than many that had preceded his oath-taking. Personally, our only lasting impression had to do with our youngest grandson. The King's Academy band played in the biting cold, he was in the band, and he came home with the sniffles. But in the national sense, nothing much happened in the first of the "hundred days." President Bush's nominations were approved with little or no objection. It was called a honeymoon because the Republican President was figuratively quiescent in the arms of the Congress and there was nothing to excite or incite attention on the part of We the People. In such cases a crisis has to be found or created. Accordingly, the President received the suggestion or order that the long-standing but little publicized Savings and Loan scandal should be expanded to crisis proportions. So the President, following the Hegelian Dialectic formula, presented an anti-thetical solution to the thetical S&L problem. But the solution involved the spending of at least \$50 billion of taxpayers' money, and the Congress took it all under advisement; therefore no continuing crisis commanded headlines. But to comply with the New World Order program, there had to be a crisis; one that would keep the people interested; one that would serve as a cover-up for the really important but unpublicized ongoing activities of the Administration. As we said, the President's nominations were being accepted quickly and readily by the Senate. Perhaps something could be done in that area to create a crisis. The post of National Defense Secretary was a natural. George Bush and John Tower were long-time Texas buddies. Each of them probably had enough on the other to cause political suicide if exposed. So, swearing he would stand by him to the end (as he had better do or else) President Bush nominated his friend John Tower, to become Secretary of Defense. Tower had been a Senator, a negotiator in Geneva, an arms adviser to Defense contractors, and his reputation was so well known by those who knew him that approval by the Senate would be long, tedious and rhetorical, and a people-exciting crisis would surely develop. It was probably planned from the beginning that if Tower was rejected, then Brent Scowcroft would be moved from National Security to National Defense, and Tower could replace Scowcroft as National Security Advisor, a post that didn't require Senate approval. So, the approval or disapproval of Tower by the Senate wasn't the "bottom line" in the program. However, Tower's addiction to wine, women and conflict of interests added spice to the creation of a headline-catching crisis.

In previous DBRs we have called incidents such as this Management by Crisis. Peter Lalonde of "Prophecy Newsletter" says "it is working in

America as psycho-political techniques are used through mass media to condition an unsuspecting public." When used on a global scale, Harlan Cleveland of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, the Council on Foreign Relations and similar New World Order Insider groups, calls it Piecemeal Functionalism. Drs. Ray & Marilyn Lewis of "Christian Awareness Ministries" give an excellent explanation of how this Hegelian Dialectic formula is used by the Insiders. We quote:

"Management by Crisis is a threefold technique. First of all, a crisis must either be invented or an existing one discovered. Secondly, that crisis must be widely publicized, creating a super-awareness that the problem exists. Finally, after the entire nation is sufficiently alarmed and convinced that there is a crisis, those who have the sufficient power and financial resources to manage the problem, step in to take charge, and in a manner that never would have been accepted by the public otherwise. Piecemeal Functionalism is the gradual creation of seemingly separate agencies established to solve the problems brought about by each crisis. For example, pornography and the sexual revolution of the 60s resulted in the establishing of many programs and agencies designed to curb the problems of venereal diseases and unwanted pregnancies caused by the unleashing of

PEARL HARBOR INTRIGUE

On December 4, 1941, US intelligence intercepted and decoded the signal "Higashi no kaze ame," or "East wind rain." This meant the breaking of diplomatic relations between Japan and the United States, signifying war. This crucial signal was never relayed to Admiral Kimmel and General Short, thus setting the stage for the Pearl Harbor catastrophe. Larry Abraham brings new information which ties together the Pearl Harbor investigation and the trial of Oliver North. We quote:

"This needless disaster has been the subject of nine investigations, including John Tolland's most recent Infamy: Pearl Harbor and its Aftermath. Tolland concluded, as did others before him, that President Roosevelt and General George C. Marshall wanted the US to take the first blow so America would be forced to enter the war. Today, there is absolutely no doubt that Roosevelt and Marshall participated in a cover-up of the suppression of vital intelligence available to them during those crucial days of December 4-6, 1941.

"Congress finally got around to a full-blown investigation of Pearl Harbor on November 15, 1945 and like the Iran-Contra hearings, it was a highly partisan affair. The party in power controlled the agenda, the admissibility of evidence, and the hiring of lawyers to conduct the probe. The Democrat majority wanted to protect the reputation of the Roosevelt Administration and did all it could to keep the decoded messages from being introduced as evidence.

"Those who had seen the message and other intelligence were badgered by committee counsel. It was so obvious that the two lawyers representing the Democrat majority were part of a planned cover-up that they were finally replaced. Both men went back to their respective law firms and slowly but surely, the truth of the disaster at Pearl Harbor started to seep out.

"I can hear some of you saying, 'That's ancient history, Abraham. I knew it all anyway.' Well, here's one tiny fact you may have forgotten. One of the two lawyers most responsible for the attempted cover-up was none other than Judge Gerhart A. Gessell, who is now banging the gavel against Lt. Col. Oliver North." ("Insider Report," 2/89. P.O.Box 84903, Phoenix, AZ 85071. \$145 per year).

pornography and the sexual revolution by the young. Population control committees and agencies (including those within the United Nations) all jumped on the bandwagon to solve the problem. Planned Parenthood gained much popularity and was welcomed by the public school system. SIECUS (Sex Information and Education Committee of the United States) was one of the most visible organizations beginning in the 1960s. The result: instead of eliminating venereal diseases and unwanted pregnancies, sex education became a "how to" course, and not only have more teenagers gotten pregnant and illegitimacy on the rise, but abortion became a method of birth control: AIDS now threatens to wipe out entire civilizations.

"So much for Management by Crisis. But as each crisis arose and 'authorities' came to the rescue via the United Nations and various other organizations, Americans were - piece by piece - relinquishing traditional values, until now we find ourselves enveloped in a totally new method of learning and control over the young." (Christian Awareness Ministries, Inc. Newsletter. 1223 Virginia Drive, Leesburg, FL 32788.)

In this management-by-crisis dialectic the goal of the Insiders is to solve the existing or created crisis through the enactment of legislation at the national or state level; or, if it's called an international crisis, to establish a new agency or create a declaration or commission to handle the problem at the global level (piecemeal functionalism). All this, of course, must meet the approval or at least the acceptance of the majority of We the People. How this plan works at the national level can be illustrated by the piece-by-piece manner in which federal control over education has been accomplished. The key element: Whatever the government finances, the government controls.

During and after the Vietnam Crisis there developed an economic crisis that touched families throughout the nation. Millions of housewives found it necessary to seek employment outside the home in order to "make ends meet." This family crisis for mothers who had to leave their children in day care establishments when they went to work created the "Day Care Crisis" which led to legislation stating that all educational facilities whether public or private, that received federal funding, either directly or indirectly, are obligated to (shall, must, will) comply with all laws, rules, regulations, techniques, licensing and certification requirements, ideology, philosophy, administrative policies, and anything else covered that are set down as standards for the public schools. If one school in the entire system receives federal funds, all other schools in that system must comply. Interpretation: All public schools are grouped into school districts that are controlled by the State. But if any one school in the State receives federal money, the entire State must abide by the federal inter-agency standards.

You'll remember that when President Reagan began his first term, he promised that the federal Department of Education would be abolished. Instead, it grew in power. In an important pamphlet titled Educational "Choice" - The Education Voucher, Mrs. Virginia Baker, home school specialist, explains: "On April 28, 1988, President Reagan signed into law HR5, now known as PL100-297, the "Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988." This \$7.4 billion law is an omnibus law, which means it contains miscellaneous, unrelated, all-encompassing provisions....PL100-297 is a uniform, universal educational system, not just nationally, but internationally....It affects all children from birth to age 24, in every 'school attendance area'." And it's all done through vouchers to students or financial aid of any kind, direct or indirect, to "any school in the system." Mrs. Baker warns:

"Parents, pastors and administrators, do not think your children, your students, your parents, your teachers, or your educational programs can accept any form of money, whether in the 'choice' of a tax credit or a voucher, and escape these networking interrelated federal and state laws." (We have quoted from this 8-page pamphlet which contains much vital information concerning federal control over education. The complete text of this pamphlet can be obtained by writing to Virginia Birt Baker, asking for "The Education Voucher" and enclosing 50¢ per copy. Her address: Route 1, Box 297, Van, Texas 75970.)

In the programming of the builders of The New World Order, crises are always with us. They keep building up on top of one another. Some are long-lasting. Some are shortlived. Some happen simply because of the evil that exists in men. Many are planned by evil men for an evil purpose. As the short-lived S&L Crisis began to fade into back page coverage, the John Tower crisis was pushed into the headlines and stayed and stayed. At about the same time an international crisis was being built. In England a rather remote novelist wrote a book which he titled The Satanic Verses. Someone read the book and suspected that its author, Salmon Rushdie, might be guilty of blasphemy in the eyes of faithful Muslims. Ayatollah Khomeini of Iran was told of the book and, defender of the faith to millions, he offered \$5 million to anyone who would murder Rushdie. As the affair developed into crisis proportions undiplomatic words were hurled at each other as British diplomats severed relations with Iranian diplomats. The 11 other members of the European Community (soon to become a Regional World Government) recalled their top diplomats. As a result, Iran began to lose face among the Nations of the west, while Iran and the Soviet Union (with enslaved Muslim millions to appease) drew closer together. Meanwhile Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze was calling on all the arab governments of the Middle East, as well as holding conferences with Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir. The Soviets now have an important role in the Mideast, thanks at least in part to a crisis created when a comparatively unknown author wrote a novel; not a very good novel according to critics who have read it.

Here in the United States a classic crisis arose, one that would have pleased Karl Marx no end: a "capital versus labor" controversy that spelled destruction to an airline and potential breadlines for its former employees who chose to strike, and threatened to strike against other airlines and what's left of American railways.

There are other crises. A long-standing evil known as child abuse, which has always existed, suddenly is spotlighted by the media, and the hoped for solution to the crisis is sure to add power to government against decent families and more loss of liberty for those that cherish it. One critic remarked that crises are created so fast that we find ourselves saddled with more problems than we can solve. And "perhaps soon, out of desperation, we will demand that an authority (world Government) be created to relieve us from the stress of it all."

However: "The fear of man bringeth a snare: but whoso putteth his trust in the Lord shall be safe." And "Many seek the ruler's favour; but every man's judgment cometh from the Lord." (Proverbs 29:25,26).

Don Bell Reports is a privately circulated newsletter, published every other Friday, emphasizing the Christian American point of view. Reproduction is permitted when credit is given. Postal rates permitting, two copies of each issue are mailed first class to each subscriber. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$40 per year; Foreign Air Mail, \$50 per year. Extra copies of same issue to same address: 1 to 9, 50¢ each; 10 to 49, 40¢ each; 50 to 99; 30¢ each; 100 or more, 20¢ each. Address all orders and correspondence to: Don Bell Reports, Post Office Box 2223, Palm Beach, Florida 33480.
