

Who's Destroying America?*

by

Joseph D. Douglass Jr.

In 1985, a British sociologist, Eva Etziane-Halevy, broke ranks and turned her microscope in the direction of her colleagues. She focused on the social policies they had been promoting and the effects of those policies.

The key question she raised was quite challenging: If these people who were making social policy knew so much about social change and human nature, *why were they wrong so often?* Moreover, why had they contributed *so little* to the betterment of society?¹

She called these people the “Knowledge Elite,” by which she meant the Western social science intellectuals. She also called them the “prophets who have failed” not because their advice had been ignored, but rather because it had been taken and followed and had failed. Her study of the social problems showed that the years in which the influence of the social scientists on policy had been most pervasive were identically the years in which the policy failures had been most rampant.

Most important, despite being wrong so often, she explained, these intellectual elitists continued to act as though nothing had happened. They became more adamant than ever about the soundness of their advice. To maintain their grants, privileges, positions, and their right to manage society, they could not under any circumstances admit their “stunned helplessness” in the face of crises that they had not foreseen nor understood. They looked for excuses, they rationalized away the evidence, and sought new data that would support their judgments.

Searching for the Origins of the Problems We Face

The underlying nature and cause of the social problems we face and which attracted Etziane-Halevy's attention are of obvious importance. These problems include crime, judicial and political corruption, illegal drugs, AIDS and other treatment resistant diseases, failed welfare programs, growing racial strife, inner-city decay, single-parent families, rising teen-age suicide, illegitimacy (over ninety percent in some inner cities), budget deficits, trade imbalance, an almost wholly self-serving government, and a society increasingly in pursuit of pleasure and materialistic goods.

What is far less obvious is 1) the manner in which these problems do appear to have a common cause and 2) the manner in which they are, indeed, tied to the social scientists, or to be more precise, the liberal or elitist intellectuals and the forces that control their grants, privileges, and positions.

To understand the reasoning behind this conclusion, we need to go back in time and study the rise of influence of the social scientists in policy and the mechanisms that promoted this rise.

* © Joseph Douglass 1995, 1998, 2007

The conclusions that emerge from such a study are even more devastating than those reached by Etzione-Halevy because they reveal the presence of a cabal composed of leftist intellectuals, their entire bevy of scholarly institutions, and the prestigious large tax-exempt foundations – all operating with one clear objective: to undermine the values upon which America was founded and to promote leftist and socialist values and concepts.

The heart of their efforts has been a concerted effort to mold public opinion to support the adoption of new socialist policies in America. To use present day terms, what was to be made “out” were beliefs in the positive value of independence, self-reliance, responsibility, accountability, free enterprise, competition, free markets, free minds, representative government, limited government, our Constitution, nationalism, patriotism, disciplined behavior, law and order, morals, absolute values, and God. What was to be made “in” were the core ideas of socialist ideology; namely, collectivism, the value of interdependency, relativistic morals, government management of all aspects of our social order, rule by an elite, confiscation of private property, forced redistribution of wealth, national and world planning, world government, and globalism.

Congressional Interest Fifty Years Ago: The Reece Committee

The efforts underway to destroy the America our Founding Fathers created have been repeatedly described in books and pamphlets, and occasionally in newspapers and magazines. The detail and documentation in these descriptions is almost beyond belief – beyond belief in the sense that once described, nothing, absolutely nothing, ever changes. The powers at work to change our society simply get more deeply entrenched, the changes become more extreme, and the resultant damage escalates upwards.

Meanwhile, the American people do little more than look to someone else to get involved or fix the problem. Fewer than four out of every ten eligible voters even bothered to cast their ballot in the 1994 election. And, over ninety-nine percent of the time the very people they deceive themselves into believing will fight the problems for them, are actually part of the mechanism working to destroy our culture; namely, the liberal social scientists whose performance Etzione-Halevy described so vividly.

One of the most insightful reports to throw light on the nature of this effort to change America was the final report of The Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations that was formed by Congress in 1953. The Committee became more widely known as the Reece Committee after its chairman B. Carroll Reece.

Actually, this Committee was not focused on the growth of the problems we face today. Most of these problems had not become so serious as to warrant national attention until well into the 1960s. What the Reece Committee was interested in was the growing influence of large tax-exempt foundations on education and the manner in which they had inserted their views into the American government itself.

What they found was the growth of an insidious network of leftists under the patronage of the major tax-exempt foundations. This network had infiltrated both the education system and the government. The clear purpose of this network, or interlocked cabal as they would call it, was to control the marketing of ideas and through these ideas to introduce social change, change that in the Committee’s eyes was not in our interest – indeed, they even ended up calling it “subversive” – and how right they were. The changes being orchestrated by this cabal can now be seen to lie at the heart of the major social, economic, and political problems America is experiencing today.

Identification of the Cabal or “Interlock”

The findings of the Reece Committee were published in December, 1954.² The principal conclusion was direct and unequivocal: A cabal consisting of leftist intellectuals, social science organizations, and the big tax-exempt foundations had come into existence. Their objective was to destroy the American culture and way of life, introduce socialist and Marxist ideas, often under deceptive garb, seize control of our government’s policy apparatus, and place themselves in charge.

There were two main thrusts in the cabal’s strategy. The first was to use the American education system to promote the desire for social change in the public’s mind; that is, to change the thinking and behavior of our youth and young adults. The second was to infiltrate the government and use it to start implementing the social changes.

In their report, the Committee acknowledged that they could find no “conclusive” evidence that this cabal, or “interlock” as they often referred to it, came into being as the result of an over-all, conscious plan. “*Nevertheless, it exists,*” the Committee concluded,³ and that was the important point.

Moreover, the far-reaching power of this “interlock has so influenced the press, the radio, and even the government that it has become extremely difficult for objective criticism . . . to get into news channels without having first been distorted, slanted, discredited, and at times ridiculed.” In other words, the interlock extended into the news media and government, which had become *de facto* part of the interlock.

The inescapable question that arises is, given this power, how can the interlock or cabal ever be broken up or destroyed? As pointed out above, the nature of the cabal, its danger to America, its methods, and its principal elements and benefactors have been recognized over and over – yet nothing changes.

What or Who Make Up the Cabal or Interlock?

The Reece Committee was very clear about who made up the cabal.

First are the big tax-free foundations; namely, the various Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Ford foundations, and a variety of less dominate, but still powerful interests, such as the Maurice and Laura Falk Foundation, John Simon Guggenheim Foundation, Heckscher Foundation, Julius Rosenwald Foundation, Russell Sage Foundation, Twentieth Century Fund, Fund for the Republic, Commonwealth Fund, Alfred P. Sloan fund, and on and on.⁴

Most often, these foundations were established to avoid taxes, while still enabling the donor to retain control over the money. The amounts of money in the larger foundations are measured in the tens and hundreds of millions and billions of dollars. Because they were comprised of stocks and real property, the income and appreciation far exceeded the expenditures and grants, which themselves have dominated the development and marketing of intellectual capital and ideas whose clear target has been public policy. As described in the Committee report, the foundations are responsible to no one insofar as the disbursement of their funds is concerned and leftists have effectively infiltrated the staffs of these foundations and helped insure that the foundations expenditures only supported their leftist colleagues at the universities and research institutes.

Second are the various intellectual institutions and organizations that serve as intermediaries or extensions of foundation interests; for example, the Council of Learned Societies, American Council on Education, National Academy of Sciences, National Education Association, National Research Council, National Science Foundation, Social Science Research Council, American Historical Association, Progressive Education Association, John Dewey Society, The League for Industrial Democracy (whose original name was the Inter-collegiate Socialist Society), the

American Labor Education Service, the Institute for Pacific Relations, and so forth. These institutes are not only tied to the foundations, but to each other as well. They work together in promoting projects and ideas and in working together to see to it that the ideas are absorbed and put into practice.

Third are the leftist intellectuals, dominantly of the social sciences, and the various departments of the leading universities that have been most closely coupled with the manufacture of social change; for example, social science departments at Columbia University, Harvard University, Yale University, Stanford University, Cornell University, and the University of Chicago.⁵ The social sciences most heavily infected include psychology, sociology, economics, political science, history, and anthropology. To the extent there is a lead element, it would be hard to decide which of these eight is most important, although psychology would certainly be near the top of everyone's short list.

Fourth is our own government itself. This was not always the case. Indeed, the government was the last organization to be included in the cabal. It was only after it had been effectively infiltrated and interlocked with the interests of the foundations and intellectual institutes that more and more of the driving force behind the changes was to be found in our government itself. Thus, while in its early days, virtually 100 percent of the financial sponsorship of the development and promulgation of the socialist/leftist ideology was the foundations, by 1954, well over 50 percent of the financial sponsorship was being provided by our government.

The Glue That Binds the Interlock

What holds the interlock together is a confluence of interests, a common ideology, and money.

The fundamental interest of the cabal is to replace America's ideas of limited government, free enterprise, and the importance of the individual with a government controlled economy and society in which the "collective" reigns supreme and in which the cabal represented the interests of this collective.

The common ideology is, depending on the individual and organization, Marxist, socialist, communist, leftist, or just plain liberal. Its essence is the centralized management of the social, economic, and political order by an elite, who by justification of their superior intellect should "make the laws," determine what is "best" for society, and manage the social order.

This idea of an *elite that knows what is best for society* is ever present. As stated by Pendleton Herring, President of the Social Science Research Council, one of the key cogs in the cabal, "it is the men and women in these fields [social science] who are our strongest national resource for advancing the ranges of knowledge that will make us better able to understand our common problems."⁶

This elite never admits the possibility that they are the ones who are wrong, as Etzione-Halevy learned, or, that their theories have no legitimacy. It is society that is wrong. All the elite needs is more money, more power, better data, and more time to show us how right they are.

Two former members of the radical left in the 1960s, Peter Collier and David Horowitz, later reevaluated their beliefs and broke ranks. They wrote about their decision and about the destructive legacy of the left. Their view helps explain why the left never admits to error. the left, Collier and Horowitz write, "have experienced almost everything and learned practically nothing. . . For Leftists, there are only tomorrows. They never talk about the evil they have done, except superficially . . . How does the Left maintain its belief against the crushing weight of its failures in the past? By recycling its innocence, which allows it to be born again in its utopian faith. . . To protect the faith is the highest calling of the radical creed."⁷

The Reece Committee had reached similar conclusions forty years earlier. “What seems most unfortunate, however, is that the foundations have been so rarely willing to admit an error, or the seriousness of it. They assert that they are entitled to reasonable error, as indeed, they are – for all human institutions are susceptible of mistake. But the individual instances of error is generally defended, instead of being frankly admitted.”⁸

These elitists’ ideology is diametrically opposed to the ideology of our Founding Fathers and to the traditional American principles that had served to govern our lives and social behavior since our founding. Their ideology is against free enterprise, free markets, competition, the importance of the individual, and the moral code so important to our order and stability, which is why the Reece Committee found this ideology to be dangerous, destructive, and detrimental to the interests of the United States.

Co-equal in importance with ideology is money and the power that money commands. The cabal has been funded since its inception by the tax-free foundations. As the cabal gained influence and penetrated the government, more and more of the funding has been provided by government agencies which the cabal controls. Behind the foundations and the cabal itself are massive financial interests. Traditionally, these interests dominantly were international finance and the transnational industries that are inextricably connected with finance. This remains the case today.

Many people become confused at this point because they do not understand why big business, which are the ultimate capitalists in the peoples’ minds, would be patrons of socialist and liberal operations. This is the result of confusing free enterprise and free markets with “capitalism.”

Big business and international finance is not a friend of free enterprise or free markets. They favor monopolies and controlled markets – that is, markets that they control. When Saint-Simon and his followers formulated socialism in the 1820s and 1830s, their intent was to change the nature of government from administration to management. Free markets and competition were to be eliminated and replaced with government controlled markets. Who controlled the government? An intellectual elite headed by the industrialists and bankers! Ever since then, Big business and international finance have been the patron saints of Marxism and socialism.

One of the first states dedicated to building socialism was the Soviet Union. The Soviets described their country as a social democracy, not a communist state. Communism was something in the future, not the present. Their first task was building socialism; communism would come later. Who created the Soviet Union? If you think the answer is the proletariat or Bolsheviks, think again. The real creators were the big names in international finance: the Warburgs, Rothschilds, Lord Milner, J. P. Morgan, Jacob and Mortimer Schiff, Otto H. Kahn, William B. Thompson, Jacob H. Rubin, and Percy Rockefeller.⁹ They financed the ‘revolution,’ organized it, trained cadres for it, recruited support, and moved Lenin and Trotsky to Russia to lead it. Western industrialists then marched in to help restart Russian industry. The first five-year plan was written by U.S. industrialists, and it was Western big business that built the Soviet war machine, assisted by Western finance.¹⁰

Socialism is big government. Big business and international finance like big governments because it is the government that grants the monopolies, gives the big contracts, borrows massive amounts of money, taxes the people, wages wars, and spends massive amounts of money, most of which finds its way into the pockets of big business and international finance. Indeed, this is why international finance and big business are often labeled □Marxist capitalists□ or □corporate Marxists,□ by those who understand what is happening. Interestingly, it is these same capitalists and financiers that set up the foundations that have been used so effectively to

destroy the American free enterprise, free market system in favor of big government and controlled markets.

The Interlock's Mission: Effecting Social Change

The mission of these individuals and institutions has been to denigrate or destroy the economic, social, and political principles established as the core American beliefs, and in their place insert socialist, leftist, or communist ideas. The Reece Committee concluded:

Overwhelmingly, the foundations have promoted and supported ventures and individuals to the left. . . much of this leftist trend of the foundations in the social sciences has been “subversive,” in so far as it has worked to undermine some of our precious institutions, and some of our basic moral and religious and political principles.¹¹

The changes that the cabal was overtly and covertly forcing upon America, the Reece Committee noted, were “intended to lay out a program for enormously increased centralization, a rapidly enlarged participation by government in human affairs, a sharp turn toward paternalism and away from free enterprise and individual freedom.”¹²

As expressed by members of the cabal itself, the changes were intended “to end the age of individualism and laissez faire [free enterprise] in economy and government” and in its place begin a “new age of collectivism.”¹³

“Collectivism” was one of their key rallying words back then. Essentially, collectivism replaced individualism – and everything that smacked of individualism or independence or self-reliance. Collectivism also included “the limiting or supplanting of private property by public property’ or, alternatively, “the preservation of private property, extended and distributed among the masses.” That is, collectivism embraced redistribution of wealth, because wealth was something to be “collectively shared.” Incidentally, what is not explicitly mentioned is who it is that does the redistribution or decides what is in the collective interest. The answer is simple: it is the elitists who are in charge.

Collectivism also involved:

. . . a larger measure of *compulsory* as well as voluntary *cooperation* of citizens in the conduct of the complex national economy, a corresponding enlargement of the functions of government, and an increasing state intervention in fundamental branches of economy previously left to the individual discretion and initiative.¹⁴

The basic line of propaganda was that “our American way of life was a failure; that it must give way to a collectivist society; that educators must now prepare the public for a New Order; and that traditional American principles must be abandoned.”¹⁵

This propaganda line always emphasized the idea that the changes were all happening as a normal phase of history and that all the social scientists were doing was recognizing the obvious and stepping in to help ease the transition. Thus, the free enterprise system was “dying,” there was a “notable waning of the *once* widespread popular faith in economic individualism,” the “age of individualism and laissez faire in economy and government is closing and a new age of collectivism is emerging,” and the Christian tradition is dying and not worth “salvaging.” Again, this is the deceptive manner in which the left typically operates. Again, as cogently explained by

Peter Collier and David Horowitz, “It is not just the weight of history pushing the pendulum but a political movement shoving it ahead for its own reasons.”¹⁶

Two of the themes the cabal pushed that are worthy of special attention are the concepts of “cultural lag” and “moral relativity” because of their negative impact “on our basic moral, religious, and governmental principles.”¹⁷ Moral relativity denies the existence of any absolute right or wrong, or moral authority. This was one of the principal beliefs of John Dewey, who was one of the leading intellectuals in the cabal and who figured prominently in the destruction of the American education system as will be later discussed.

The idea of cultural lag is that we should “keep religion *up to date*, and patriotic sentiments, ideas about marriage and the family.” In other words, nothing is sacred. This idea can also be seen in propaganda designed to promote the idea of a “living Constitution” that *changes to meet the needs of time*. The Reece Committee’s findings here are worth careful reading:

*Moral relativism and the cultural lag theory strike at the very roots of the average American’s traditional values. Promulgation of such unverified, pseudo-scientific theories dissolves the belief that religion gives us certain basic verities upon which we must construct a moral and ethical life, that certain basic and unalterable principles underlie our system of government and should be maintained faithfully for the preservation of our society. It is not our province to prove that such radical theories as relativism and cultural lag are wrong. It is the responsibility of those who advance them under the protecting cloak of “science” to prove that they are accurate and correct. Until such verification has been produced it is difficult to justify the use of tax-free funds for what is an unscientific attack on the very fundamentals upon which the convictions of the American citizen are based.*¹⁸

Laying the base for the cultural lag theory was another of the critical precepts put forth by John Dewey, namely that tradition and patriotism were stifling and ought to be discarded. It should come as no surprise that John Dewey, who has is widely regarded as the father of modern American education, also has been described by leading socialist intellectuals (such as Sidney Hook) as “America’s Karl Marx” and by others as a “gift from the Gods to the radicals.”¹⁹

In examining the massive problems America faces as we approach the end of the twentieth century, it is hard to find any concepts, ideas, or engineered social changes that have cause as much damage as these “theories” of cultural lag and moral relativism.

The people responsible for promoting them were the leftist social scientists and the foundation patrons, that is, the self-appointed elitists. These are the self-appointed social “doctors,” the Reece Committee explains, who would employ the concepts of social engineering to fix all our “ills,” and whose basic assumption is that the social scientists alone are capable of guiding the people into better ways of living and improved principles of action.

It should come as no surprise that the approach of these “social scientists has behind it a wholly materialistic concept of life and behavior.”²⁰ This materialistic focus is another of the bedrock causes of the problems America is experiencing today. Again, one of the key motivators was John Dewey, who was the first president of the American Humanist Association. As clearly stated in the *Humanist Manifesto*, that Dewey also signed, there was no spiritual side of life. The universe was self-existing, not created, all institutions exist for the fulfillment of human life, a socialized and cooperative economic order is the goal, and a complete break with the past, especially with the outmoded religions, is required.²¹

When combined with moral relativism and cultural lag, the overall effect of the cabal's propaganda strategy becomes clearer: It is to replace the spiritual side of our culture with a materialistic side. Christianity, they assert is decaying and not worth salvaging. Man is not a creation of God because there is no God. Man is but an animal, only slightly more evolved than the four-legged variety. Because there is no God, there is no afterlife, no higher authority, and no absolute concept of right and wrong.

Thus, the overall effect of the engineered social change is to destroy the existing moral, legal, and political order so that a new socialist/Marxist order can be constructed. The social scientists are the orchestrators or strategists behind the change and the foundations and big money interests are the patrons and guiding light.

National level coordination is provided by various advisory councils composed of social scientists who were members of the cabal. These councils would be the instrumentalities for "stimulating a coordinated view of national life and for developing mental attitudes favorable to the principle of national planning."²²

The Interlock and "Internationalism"

The Reece Committee also learned that the cabal was as intent on manipulating public opinion on international politics as they were on domestic politics. On the international scale, their efforts were directed to destroy American patriotism, national pride, and sovereignty and in their place promote globalism and world government. As stated in the Committee's conclusions,

. . . by vast propaganda, by supplying executives and advisers to government and by controlling much research in this area through the power of the purse, the foundations have promoted "internationalism" in a particular sense – a form directed toward "world government" and a derogation of American "nationalism."²³

One of the clear motivations for pushing internationalism, as the socialists themselves explained, is that nationalism must give way to internationalism before socialism could be installed²⁴ – hence the need to promote internationalism. Socialism is a global operation. This is doubly the case because so long as there are effective examples of the power of individualism, free enterprise, free markets, and an effective moral order, of which America was the preeminent example, the failures of socialism and the rampant corruption of its self-serving leaders would be evident for all to see, and this has always been a gigantic thorn in the side of socialists of all stripes. This is also why so much of the cabal's effort went into denigrating the American system in all its dimensions.

For example, the Carnegie Endowment was very clear in its condemnation of American economic strength: "economic nationalism . . . is still running riot and . . . is the greatest obstacle to the re-establishment of prosperity and genuine peace."²⁵ Again, the insights of former leftists Peter Collier and David Horowitz are most pertinent: The idea "that America had become rich and powerful not through its own efforts but by making the rest of the world impotent and poor" was the Left's "most irresponsible and destructive myth."²⁶

Rene Wormser, the Reece Committee general counsel, observed that nationalism was referred to as a "violently reactionary movement" by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He then explains:

Nationalism is held to be “violently reactionary” in the United States, but the organizations supported by the Endowment apparently feel that nationalism abroad is a fine thing. Under the slogan of anti colonialism, they have supported rabid nationalistic movements, often Communist stimulated, in undeveloped areas and have underwritten measures abroad highly detrimental to American prestige and American private investments.²⁷

To serve their ends, the foundations promoted the “deliberate distortion of history,” lobbied heavily for the United Nations as the hope of the world, supported that organization to an extent well beyond general public acceptance, and promoted a “leftist approach to international problems.”

The principal foundations operating in the international field were, again, the Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Ford Foundations. The most important intermediate organizations sponsored by these foundations and identified in the Reece Committee’s final report were the Institute of Pacific Relations, the Foreign Policy Association, the Council on Foreign Relations, and the Royal Institute of International Affairs.²⁸ The Royal Institute is the British counterpart and forerunner of the American Council on Foreign Relations. Both are internationalist organizations funded by the same big-money interests. To comprehend the power of the interlock, it is only necessary to examine the membership list of the Council on Foreign Relations. Without question, the Council membership contains a grossly disproportionate portion of the top U.S. government policy-making position holders. Even as far back as 1953, this was clearly recognized as the case to such an extent that the Reece Committee itself wrote that the Council had become “in essence an agency of the United States government.”²⁹

The Cabal’s Strategy to Change America

The strategy employed by the cabal is succinctly summarized in the Reece Committee’s statement that the cabal used the American education system and infiltrated our government to achieve “social changes.”³⁰

While accurate, this description does not begin to do justice to the brilliant strategy behind the cabal’s operation. Nor does it reveal why their operation has been so successful, and continues to succeed, notwithstanding the destruction and injustice it has caused.

Most critical is the concept of “education.” Education is not just schooling. It includes everything that influences our thinking. This includes schools, both public and private, colleges and universities, beginning with those responsible for training teachers, the news media and book publishers, through which we gain information, and even entertainment, which is one of the most effective tools for use in controlling how we think.

One of the key intermediates in the drive to corrupt the American education was the National Education Association. While numerous examples of the NEA’s subversive operations are described in the Reece Committee’s final report, one example is particularly pertinent. In 1948, the NEA published a report on *Education for International Understanding*. In it, they stated that their goal was to produce citizens who might be called “world-minded Americans”; that is, advocates of a “world state.”³¹ This world state is clearly not voluntary: “the preservation of international peace and order may require that force be used to compel a nation to conduct its affairs within the framework of an established world system.”³²

Moreover, and this is where the cabal’s strategy shines forth, the NEA report explains that education is the “recommended road . . . [to] . . . social and political organization and control.” Education is:

. . . a force for conditioning the will of a people . . . It utilizes old techniques and mass media such as the printed word, the cinema, the radio, and now television.³³

The key objective is to control our thinking – not knowledge, but thinking; that is, our beliefs, morals, prejudices, aspirations, desires and wants. The overall objective is to control the thinking of individuals and thereby mold public opinion. Public opinion is important because that determines how easy (or difficult) it is to seize control of the government and introduce socialist concepts.

The powers that established and later ran the foundations recognized that public opinion, in the long run, was greatly determined by the influence of intellectuals.³⁴ This explains why the marriage of social science intellectuals and the foundations, or financial powers, took place. The mission of the social scientists – psychologists, sociologists, economists, anthropologists, and so forth – is to learn what makes people tick. The mission of the cabal was to utilize this knowledge, turn it around, and apply it to learn how to change people’s thinking and, hence, mold public opinion. This is what is meant by the first thrust of the cabal, “education” and the operant strategy was to replace education with manipulation or, to call a spade a spade, with brainwashing.

The second thrust of the cabal’s strategy was to infiltrate the government and begin implementing the changes; that is to begin installing socialism from the top down. This was done by using the education system; that is, by using the so-called experts at the universities and the news media to call for the government to undertake various tasks or address certain problems. The cabal would then promote its own people to staff the committees. They would commission a group of its trusted members to perform various studies, which carried with them the prestige of the foundation and whose recommendations always promoted government efforts to intervene to solve various problems. Quite naturally, the problems were promoted, publicized, and magnified to create the need for the government to step in and take the action.

In other words, *the basic strategy was to control both the “supply” and the “demand,”* which is how socialism, Marxism, communism, liberalism – call it what you want – operates. The government is infiltrated to institute the changes, all of which are oriented to build a big welfare state whose function is the total management of all aspects of our lives. The education system is used to brainwash the public into accepting the changes and believing they are for their good. The judicial system is used to remove legal obstacles and to assist in the creation of a police state. The cabal promotes the existence of the problem, the need to take action, and then praises the studies that their members performed and that call for various socialist programs (albeit under different labels) to be implemented.

Because the cabal controls the lion’s share of the intellectual capital and *the means for promoting the cabal’s programs and cabal-generated ideas*, there is no opposition, no contrary opinions that are able to surface and be heard. That is, the cabal controls the marketplace of ideas. And, as the Committee repeatedly stated in its report, conflicting ideas never had a chance. It was “extremely difficult for objective criticism . . . to get into news channels without having first been distorted, slanted, discredited, and at times ridiculed.”³⁵

To understand how well this works, and why, it is essential to understand the power of the foundations. Consider the financial power when the fortunes of such people as Rockefellers, Ford, Morgan, Field, Guggenheim, Carnegie, and so forth, are assembled *tax-free* and answerable only to themselves. The sums of money, not subject to any oversight control, are simply enormous, and in nearly all cases, there were often even greater financial interests behind the Rockefellers and Morgans because of foreign financial interests that had invested influence but remained deep in the shadows; for example, the Rothschild banking interests that had ties to

the Morgan and Rockefeller wealth. Based on one study of the wealth of such people, the wealth the cabal controls or represents can be said to be twenty-five to fifty percent of the world's wealth.³⁶ The money is so great, that you do not even have to spend it to have impact. Just having the money buys influence.

One excellent example of how these people operate, in this case to control public opinion through control of the news media, was reported in the *Congressional Record* of February 9, 1919 as follows: In 1915, financier J. P. Morgan hired twelve men high up in the newspaper world and employed them to select the most influential newspapers in the United States, sufficient to control generally the policy of the daily press. They narrowed the field to 25 papers. Morgan then sent emissaries to buy control of their national and international news sections and put his own editors in charge.³⁷

It is truly impossible to overestimate the power and ruthlessness of these Marxist capitalists. Operating as individuals their power is beyond the comprehension of most mortals. Consider, then, the magnitude of the potential when they act in concert, as an interlocked cabal. The Reece Committee's "Findings of Fact," written with the greatest care and caution, nevertheless tells the story:

The power of the individual large foundation is enormous. It can exercise various forms of patronage which carry with them elements of thought control. It can exert immense influence on educational institutions, upon the educational processes, and upon educators. It is capable of invisible coercion through the power of its purse. It can materially predetermine the development of social and political concepts and courses of action through the process of granting and withholding foundation awards upon a selective basis, and by designing and promulgating projects which propel researchers in selected directions. It can play a powerful part in the determination of academic opinion, and, through this thought leadership, materially influence public opinion.

This power to influence national policy is amplified tremendously when foundations act in concert. There is such a concentration of foundation power in the United States, operating in the social sciences and education. It consists basically of a group of major foundations, representing a gigantic aggregate of capital and income. There is no conclusive evidence that this interlock, this concentration of power, having some of the characteristics of an intellectual cartel, came into being as the result of an over-all, conscious plan. Nevertheless, it exists. It operates in part through certain intermediary organizations supported by the foundations. It has ramifications in almost every phase of research and education, in communications and even in government.

A professional class of administrators of foundation funds has emerged, intent upon creating and maintaining personal prestige and independence of action, and upon preserving its position and emoluments. This informal "guild" . . . has already come to exercise a very extensive, practical control over most research in the social sciences, much of our educational process, and a good part of government administration in these and related fields. The aggregate

thought-control power of this foundation and foundation-supported bureaucracy can hardly be exaggerated.

The far-reaching power of the large foundations and of the interlock, has so influenced the press, the radio, and even the government that it has become extremely difficult for objective criticism of foundations practices to get into news channels without having first been distorted, slanted, discredited, and at times ridiculed.

The concentration of power has tended . . . to promote “moral relativity,” to the detriment of our basic moral, religious, and governmental principles. It has tended to support the concept of “social engineering” that “social scientists” and they alone are capable of guiding us into better ways of living and improved or substituted fundamental principles of action.

The concentration has shown a distinct tendency to favor political opinions to the left. These foundations engage extensively in political activity, not in the form of direct support of political candidates or political parties, but in the conscious promotion of carefully calculated political concepts.³⁸

The efforts of the cabal to consciously promote socialist or leftist policies and positions is prominently in evidence throughout the Reece Committee’s investigation of the cabal’s operation. With rare, and likely calculated, exception, everything they promote is heavily slanted to the left. There is no indication of any interest in objectivity or in a search for the “truth.” Not only does this characterize the intellectual elitists, the liberal social scientists, and the foundation administrators, but also the prestigious men and women who are given large salaries, fancy offices, and obviously the greatest prestige to head the foundations.

Given the enormous power and influence of the foundations and, it follows, their intermediaries and people they support, it becomes clear how the liberal or socialist world view has come to dominate the social sciences and the media. People holding alternative points of view never “get a chance to carry the ball,” as one academic explained the situation to the Reece Committee. It is not that the ideas of the left “won out” or rose to the top because of their superiority. They were put in position by the simple expedient of silencing the opposition. As explained above, the cabal controls the market of ideas – and *does so ruthlessly*.

As the Reece Committee counsel, Rene Wormser, wrote “The true problem is not whether Socialists or extreme ‘liberals’ are respectable and entitled to their views but rather that their opponents have been discriminated against in the allotment of funds by major foundations.”³⁹ Nor is it simply a case of spending *their* money as *they* see fit. The foundations were established with tax-free money, and, as explained by the Reece Committee, ninety cents out of every dollar spent were, in effect, the American tax payers dollars that were being spent and utilized to wage war on those very taxpayers and their beliefs. As numerous commentators have recognized over the years, this is *the modus operandi* of the left.

How the American School System Was Captured

Recognizing the importance of the school system to a nation’s thinking and attitudes, seizing control of America’s system of public education and using that system to promote leftist social change was one of the pillars of the interlock’s strategy.

An excellent case study of the manner in which the brainwashing is approached is Columbia Teachers College at Columbia University. The Teachers College (TC) had only received its permanent charter as a teachers college in 1892, yet a short twenty years later, in 1912, it was the 11th largest university in the United States and boasted the 4th largest graduate school. Moreover, most of the growth occurred after 1902, which was the time it began receiving a massive infusion of funds from Rockefeller's General Education Board. Other large contributors to Columbia were the Carnegie, Ford, and Guggenheim Foundations.

Columbia was where "progressive education" was born and the center from which the ideas were marketed. Progressive education is the tap root of today's American education system. To gain an appreciation of the ideas and opinions that constitute the bedrock of progressive education, consider the follow sampling of the writings of several of Columbia's more prominent professors and administrators, John Dewey, Harold Rugg, Edward Lee Thorndike, James McKeen Cattell, and George S. Counts – all prominent men of the cabal.

Harold Rugg: Through the schools of the world we shall disseminate a new conception of government - one that will embrace all of the collective activities of men; one that will postulate the need for scientific control and operation of economic activities in the interests of all people.

Harold Rugg: A new public mind is to be created. How? Only by creating tens of millions of new individual minds and welding them into a new social mind. Old stereotypes must be broken up and new "climates of opinion" formed in the neighborhoods of America.

John Dewey: The first great step as far as subject-matter and method are concerned, is to make sure of an educational system that informs students about the present state of society in a way that enables them to understand the conditions and forces at work. If only this result can be accomplished, students will be ready to take their own active part in aggressive participation in bringing about a new social order.

George Counts: That the teachers should deliberately reach for power and then make the most of their conquest is my firm conviction. 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.

George Counts: Every Progressive School will use whatever power it may possess in opposing and checking the forces of social conservatism and reaction . . . ignorance must be replaced by knowledge, competition by cooperation, trust in Providence by careful planning, and private capitalism by some form of socialized economy.

John Dewey: From a social standpoint, dependence denotes a power rather than a weakness; it involves interdependence. There is always a danger that increased personal independence will decrease the social capacity of an individual. In making him more self-reliant, it may make him more self-sufficient; it may lead to insensitivity in his relations to others as to develop an

illusion of being really able to stand and act alone – an unnamed form of insanity which is responsible for a large part of the remediable suffering of the world.

George Counts: Historic capitalism, with its deification of the principle of selfishness, its reliance upon the forces of competition, its placing of property above human rights, and its exaltation of the profit motive, will either have to be *displaced altogether, or so radically changed in form and spirit that its identity will be completely lost.*

Edward Thorndike: Education is . . . the art of giving and withholding stimuli with the result of producing or preventing certain responses. . . The aim of the teacher is to produce desirable and prevent undesirable changes in human beings by producing and preventing certain responses.

John Dewey. The primary root of all educative activity is in the instinctive, impulsive attitudes of children, and not in the presentation and application of external material, whether through the ideas of others or through the senses.

John Dewey: The ability to “get along with the group” is the primary measure of a student’s “progress.”

Edward Thorndike: Education. . . to make possible a better adjustment of human nature to its surroundings.

John Dewey: The plea for the predominance of learning to read in early school life because of the great importance attaching to literature seems to be a perversion.

James Cattell: People read by words, little is gained by teaching children sounds and letters. Because they can recognize words rapidly, teach children how to read by showing them words.

Edward Thorndike: The program of the average elementary school is too narrow and academic. . . Artificial exercises, like drills on phonetics, multiplication tables, and formal writing movements, are used to a wasteful degree. Subjects such as arithmetic, language, and history include content that is intrinsically of little value.

These are but a small sampling of the direct statements of the cream of Columbia’s social science and teaching faculty. It is hard to find a problem in today’s American school system whose roots can not be traced back to progressive education, the big tax-free foundations, and the cabal.

To appreciate the full impact of these teachings and understand how thoroughly these ideas of progressive education were worked into the American school system, consider the dominance of Columbia’s Teachers College on American education.

In reviewing the growth of the Teachers College in 1952, historian Lawrence Cremin described its graduates and their influence at mid-century in the most graphic and convincing

manner: 100,000 graduates who held one third of the presidents and deans at teachers schools, occupied twenty percent of the public school teaching positions, and were the superintendents of schools at twenty-five percent of the schools in 168 U.S. cities with populations of 50,000 or more – and that was just Columbia’s direct contribution.⁴⁰

In the conclusion of its investigation into the cabal’s operation to use the American education system to force social change, the Reece Committee had this to say:

The evidence forces the conclusion that the movement which resulted in the use of the school systems to change our social order was basically socialistic in nature. Its purpose was to turn educators into political agitators.⁴¹

Social Change or Covert Revolution?

Turning the American school system into an instrument of social change is only the start of the story. It is absolutely critical that we recognize that these men and women of the cabal were not mere “teachers” as we understand the word. Rather, they were political agitators; that is, social science revolutionaries intent on forcing social change in the Marxist sense of the word: destroy the old order and in its place install a new socialist order. Thus, their strategy left no stone unturned.

As Harold Rugg explained, there were three priority aspects to their plan: “*First and foremost*, the development of a new philosophy of life and education which will be fully appropriate to the new social order; *second*, the building of an adequate plan for the production of a new race of educational workers; *third*, the making of new activities and materials for the curriculum.”

As stated in a pamphlet prepared for the Progressive Education Association under the direction of George Counts,

The progressive minded teachers of the country must unite in a powerful organization militantly devoted to the building of a better social order, in the defense of its members against the ignorance of the masses and the malevolence of the privileged. Such an organization would have to be equipped with the material resources, the talent, the legal talent, and the trained intelligence to wage successful war in the press, the courts, and the legislative chambers of the nation.⁴²

One of many examples of the process is the *Building America* textbooks funded by Rockefeller’s General Education board, and subsequently promoted by the National Education Association. California was the first state to become aware of what was happening. A state commission was established to critically examine the textbooks. The commission severely condemned the books because of the clear intent of the authors to destroy American traditions and promote Marxism. When the commission looked at the people responsible for developing the materials for the book, they found that 113 Communist-front organizations and 50 Communist-front authors were involved in the effort, in addition to many leading socialists such as Beatrice and Sidney Webb.⁴³

As a second example, Carnegie Corporation financed a Commission on Social Studies. Professor Counts of Columbia was the director of research for the resulting 17 volume study, which was billed as an authoritative guide for the revamping of American education.

In its concluding section, the Commission announced the decline of the free enterprise system saying, “Cumulative evidence supports the conclusion that, in the United States as in other countries, the age of individualism and laissez faire in economy and government is closing and that a new age of collectivism is emerging.”⁴⁴

The report then called for a concerted effort to be made by all those involved in education to “help with the business of easing in the new era, the age of collectivism.” Writers of textbooks were “expected to revamp and rewrite their old works in accordance with this frame of reference and new writers in the field of the social sciences will undoubtedly attack the central problem here conceived.”⁴⁵

The completed report was praised in the newspapers, and, of course, by the leaders in the education field. Probably the most honest review of the study was that of British socialist Harold Laski, who wrote, “At bottom, and stripped of its carefully neutral phrases, the report is an educational program for a socialist America.”⁴⁶

A third example of how they work is the Citizens Education Project financed by the Carnegie Corporation and performed by Columbia Teachers College. The project, conducted *in the late 1940s, received over a million dollars!* The idea of the project was to produce an card index file in which books, articles, and films were summarized so that high school teachers could get the gist of each reference without having to read it. Using the index, the teacher could quickly select reading or viewing materials for use in teaching courses on citizenship and American history. Officially, the project stressed its “objective” character. In actuality, it was heavily slanted to the left. The preponderance of references were liberal, leftist or internationalistic. Only a few conservative or nationalist references were included. Moreover, the Reece Committee found that “with surprising consistency, leftist books received adulatory notation while conservative books received *coups de grace* or derogation.” Many examples of were included in the Committee’s report.⁴⁷

Another excellent example is the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, which appeared to be funded by the Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Russell Sage Foundations. It was developed as a basic reference work for social scientists. What the Reece Committee found in its examination of this work was that: “Communists and pro-Communists were permitted to write articles on subjects in which their slant could be heavily applied, *and it was*. . . .What is amazingly characteristic of the *Encyclopedia* is the extent to which articles on ‘left’ subjects have been assigned to leftists; in the case of subjects to the ‘right’, leftists again have been selected to describe and expound them.”⁴⁸

The director of research for the Reece Committee was Norman Dodd. In one of his reports⁴⁹ to the Committee detailing their research, he described how the interlock of social science educational and professional organizations worked. The development and production of material was the work of organizations engaged in research, such as the Social Science Research Council, National Research Council, and universities. The demand for the product was the work of organizations such as the National Education Association and the American Council on Education. The work was then promoted by the Progressive Education Association, the American Historical Association, the League for Industrial Democracy, and so forth. The funding and overall patronage was provided by the major foundations. The entire group was interlocked through people and finances and operated as a single-minded cabal.

As the Reece Committee concluded,

There many not have been a (legal) “conspiracy” to change our social and governmental system, but a mass of evidence demonstrates that the most influential formulators of educational thought strenuously attempted to suborn

our schools and that heavy contributions form the tax-exempt foundations provided them with effective sounding-boards for their subverting doctrines.⁵⁰

Rene Wormser, the general counsel for the Reece Commission, phrases this in much more direct manner:

In the United States we have had two violent revolutions: that which freed us from England and that which sought to divide us. I suggest we are now in the Third American Revolution, none the less serious because it is bloodless. . . This new revolution is a reform movement gone wrong. It has become an attempt to institute the paternal state in which individual liberty is to be subordinated and forgotten in a misapplication of the theory of the greatest good for the greatest number [socialist slogan].⁵¹

He wrote these words in 1953. In reviewing them five years later, he wrote, “My statement may not have been entirely accurate. Instead of saying we *are* in the Third Revolution, I might better have said that it is *nearly finished*; that all that can be hoped for is a counterrevolution.”⁵² Were he to rewrite it today, he might now recognize that the reform movement did not lead to a revolution; rather, it was from the beginning the intent of the leaders of the cabal to conduct a conscious *revolution* whose objective was the triumph of socialism in America.

Impact of the Cabal in Other Areas

The impact of the cabal on education and American nationalism/patriotism are just two of many examples of the impact the cabal has had on our lives. The swath of destruction wrought by cabal mental conditioning and policy formulation has touched all aspects of our lives. Consider briefly, for example, the efforts of the cabal in two other areas that have led to massive problems: immigration and the war on illicit drug use.

In his book on immigration, William Hawkins shows how leftists, Marxists, and anti-Americans in the immigration lobby were supported and encouraged by the Ford Foundation. Ford was present at the very beginning of the immigration movement and devoted immense sums to assist its legal, educational, and policy-influencing activities. At every step, the recipients of Ford largess were determined to have been partisans of the far left.

Their preeminent victory came in 1965 with the passage of the Immigration Act that abolished the national origins standards that had previously governed the flow of immigrants. The far left then worked to exploit the Act. The Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF) was established with grants of \$2.2 million from the Ford Foundation in 1968, and another \$5.5 million in 1983 through 1988. MALDEF’s legal work was handled by the radical-left National Lawyers Guild.⁵³

Ford Foundation also sponsored ideas that have negatively influenced America's efforts to combat illegal drug use. Within a year after President Nixon first declared war on drugs, Ford sponsored an in-depth study of the drug abuse problem. The study was undertaken by two Washington lawyers who with the stroke of a pen, dismissed the policy painstakingly formulated over a half century earlier that had successfully rolled back and then controlled cocaine addiction. The new policy sponsored by the Ford Foundation was one of tolerance and understanding. Neither the availability of these drugs nor the temptation to abuse them could be eliminated, they argued in blind ignorance of historical fact. Therefore, “the fundamental objective of a modern drug-abuse program must be to help the public learn to understand these drugs and how to cope with their use in the context of everyday life.”

This Ford Foundation philosophy has dominated the drug abuse efforts since 1972. Its principal effect has been to encourage drug use by presumably educating children on drugs, which is another way of saying how to use them safely. It may not be entirely accidental that this policy played right into the hands of the people and organizations whose objective was to move as many drugs as possible into the United States. The Immigration Act of 1965 and MALDEF also assisted the foreign interests behind the drug trade whose strategy was to train Hispanics in drug trafficking and then infiltrate them into the United States to build distribution networks targeted mainly at the inner-cities. Those most critical in this operation were the Mexicans, Jamaicans, Haitians, and Cubans.⁵⁴

Ford next helped the Drug Abuse Council get started with a \$7.5 million grant. Three other big-money foundations – Carnegie, Kaiser, and Commonwealth foundations – added an additional \$2.5 million. When the Council started in 1972, no one with any experience in the field of drug dependence was appointed to the board of directors. The president of the Council, Dr. Thomas Bryant, was selected by the Ford Foundation, and in 1973, Bryant joined the National Organization for the Repeal of Marijuana Laws (NORMAL). The Council, using moneys from the Foundation, then supported NORMAL, whose first objective was the legalization of marijuana.⁵⁵

Similar efforts by the leftist intellectuals supported by the big-money foundations to corrupt our legal system, undermine the Constitution, destroy criminal justice, expand the welfare system, and promote cultural diversity (i.e. destruction of Western culture), encourage open sexuality and the destruction of morality, promote so-called free trade and supranational institutions, and so forth can be documented with equal clarity and conviction. That is, the Reece Committee only dealt with the tip of a very large iceberg.

The Interlock's Self-Defense Mechanisms

To the Left, freedom of speech means the freedom for them to be heard coupled with the freedom to shout down the opposition. That is, while espousing all the traditional freedoms when it benefits them, their true philosophy is one in keeping with their elitist, totalitarian world view; namely, never give the opposition any quarter.

The Reece Committee's finding in this respect is worth careful consideration because of what it implicitly tells us about the moral principles of the Interlock in operation:

The far-reaching power of the large foundations and of the interlock, has so influenced the press, the radio, and even the government that it has become extremely difficult for objective criticism of foundation practices to get into news channels without having first been distorted, slanted, discredited, and at times ridiculed. Nothing short of an unhampered Congressional investigation could hope to bring out the vital facts; and the pressure against Congressional investigation has been almost incredible. As indicated by their arrogance in dealing with this committee, the major foundations and their associated intermediary organizations have entrenched themselves behind a totality of power which presumes to place them beyond serious criticism and attack.⁵⁶

David Horowitz, one of the former editors of the Left's magazine *Ramparts*, expressed the attitude of the Left with characteristic insight when he wrote: "Belief in the kingdom of socialist heaven is the faith that transforms vice into virtue, lies into truth, evil into good. . . . For the Left, the facts were not what mattered. What mattered was the revolutionary Idea."⁵⁷ Words such as fairness and objectivity simply do not exist in the minds of the Left.

The manner in which the interlock attacked the Reece Committee and, ultimately, presided over its demise is an excellent example of the manner in which the interlock operates. The Committee found itself under attack from the beginning. First, Congressman Wayne Hays was appointed to the committee by Sam Rayburn for one purpose, "to break-up the investigation."⁵⁸ He also acknowledged that the White House had been in contact with him and had requested that he cooperate in killing the Committee.⁵⁹

The Committee had experienced difficulties with funding. The House Committee on Administration that appropriates money had repeatedly cut back on funds, which greatly inhibited the investigation. Mid-way into the investigation, Congressman Hays was appointed to the Administration Committee and given authority over the Reece Committee appropriation funds. He further held up funds, and required the dismissal of two very key members of the research staff before he would support even a portion of Congressman Reece's request for funds. Ultimately, the suppression of funds were used to kill the Committee and its investigative efforts.

During the hearings, Congressman Hayes repeatedly badgered Committee witnesses. In effect, he brought an end to the hearings by simply making them impossible for the witnesses. In one case, he interrupted the witness 246 times during a total time of 185 minutes.⁶⁰

Character assassination was conducted on a massive scale. Congressman Reece himself was attacked in the press, especially those newspapers whose editors also sat on the boards of major foundations. Witnesses who testified were also attacked in the newspapers and liberal magazines. The Committee staff itself was also attacked. One of the better examples of the blatant exercise of power was the creation of the Fund for the Republic, which was created by the Rockefeller Foundation with a grant of \$15,000,000. As the Committee determined, the Fund had been created specifically to investigate Congressional Investigations.⁶¹ The propaganda operations it proceeded to finance are themselves an excellent example of the manner in which the cabal spreads its deadly poison.⁶²

The above examples are only a sampling of the cabal's tactics employed to kill and discredit the Reece Committee investigation. Additionally, it is important to add that the chief investigator, Norman Dodd, was warned that if he proceeded with the investigation, he would be killed. A second effort to either intimidate or coop him was performed by the Washington representative of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Herman Edelsberg. Edelsberg met with Dodd to learn who on the Committee had decided to question the ADL. Dodd told him it was his decision, not Chairman Reece's decision, and Edelsberg asked, "How do we dispose of you?"⁶³

Carry Over into the Present Day

As indicated earlier, what has been happening to America is no secret. The people, the mechanisms, the strategy, and the money behind the destruction are described again and again, and nothing happens. Following publication of the Reece Committee's final report, it disappeared quietly down the memory hole, rarely to be heard of again.

Because there is no organized drive for change, no patron to shoulder the cause, no change occurs. The system keeps on doing what it is doing, gathers more momentum, spins more webs of deception, and garnishes even greater control over our schools, government, and institutions. And, when you stop to think about it, why should it be any different? Where is the impetus for change to come from? Certainly not from the foundations. Certainly not from a government that has been infiltrated and strongly influenced by the interlock since mid-century. And certainly not from all the liberal social scientists as Etziona-Halevy so clearly determined. Those academics who are not part of the cabal and who have repeatedly voiced their concern about the pseudo-science of their colleagues and the unfair practices of the cabal are only voices in the wilderness

and, more often than not, suddenly find their careers at dead ends. Again, the key question is, where is any significant financial support to challenge the cabal to come from – or leadership insofar as the key positions of power and influence are controlled by the cabal?

There are numerous studies on the destruction taking place in America that have been published in the past few years.⁶⁴ But, little changes. In the schools, the problem is much worse than it was in 1954, and for all the same reasons. Similarly all the other problems have grown worse in concert: crime, corruption, illegal drugs, deficit spending, loss of economic strength, loss of political credibility, and destruction of the Constitution and national sovereignty, to mention just a few. Studies and programs to “fix” the problems, such as the National Crime Bill, or America 2000, or Goals 2000, are destined only to extend the problems *because the same people who are responsible for creating the problem are repeatedly given the task of repairing the damage*. Very rarely is someone with expertise in a problem area who is critical of the ongoing efforts and policies allowed into the inner policy-making circle. Because none of the insiders will admit where the damage comes from, as Etzione-Halevy observed, they are not about to correct the situation.

What needs to be done is really quite simple in principle: Kick the cabal out. The problem is how – insofar as the cabal is still in charge, much more so than it was in 1954. And, the money spent by the big foundations and industry in areas that deal with domestic and foreign policy are, even more than they were in 1954, biased in support of leftist projects.⁶⁵ Congress along with the major political parties are decisively controlled by special interests, the majority of whom have ties back to the cabal or similar interests. Even after the decisive vote against the government in November 1994, the first action taken by the new Republican leadership was to organize support for the GATT, notwithstanding clear objections by the people. Who promoted passage of the GATT? Simple, international finance, big business, and all the socialist/leftist/liberal tax-free foundations and their intermediaries.

It is the American people whose beliefs, values, families, and nation that is under attack. Yet the American people are, for the most part, uninvolved in the struggle. Most Americans are themselves struggling to make ends meet and raise families. The majority are also brainwashed by the media and education system. Even more important, however, they have been willing to allow those in the positions of power and influence, the same people who are responsible for the problems in the first place, assume the responsibility for combating those problems, and hardly no one even raises an eyebrow.

Accordingly, nothing significant changes. Nor is significant change likely until the people whose lives, savings, and children are at risk start challenging what is happening and become involved. This will require the emergence of a new breed of leaders, ones who are more concerned about the future of American than getting re-elected. Unfortunately, this will require an extra measure of determination, knowledge, and courage, because the last thing the cabal wants is the emergence of a leader who is not corrupted or who can not be bought by the special interests. The problem is not a lack of good books and articles that explain what is happening. True, it is often not easy to find them and the few are dominated by those of the left published by the big publishers. However, a more serious problem is how few people read, estimated ten years ago at less than 10 percent of the population, and how most of them just read fiction. Probably the principle positive action over the past twenty years has been the tremendous growth in home school. Unfortunately, however, this is a slow process, one that will attract increasing bureaucratic opposition as it grows. Meanwhile, the government becomes increasingly arrogant and dictatorial, especially over the past six years.

As so cogently noted by Rene Wormser in 1958, “*all that can be hoped for is a counterrevolution.*” This requires three elements: leadership, understanding, and a population that is *informed and involved*.

It is additionally noteworthy that an almost identical conclusion was reached in 1981 by noted philosopher and theologian Francis A. Schaeffer. He too recognized that the only recourse was for the citizenry *to mount a counterrevolution*. However, he noted, with the election of Ronald Reagan, that might not be necessary. Unfortunately, Dr. Schaeffer failed to recognize how fully the cabal controlled the U.S. power apparatus, including most seemingly conservative politicians.⁶⁶

One of the more astute political analysts who has increasingly focused his attention on the corruption of the American political structure is Kevin Phillips. In 1994 he strengthened the call for open revolt. “America’s challenge in the 1990s,” he wrote, “is to mount the political equivalent of a revolution to revitalize its institutions. . . . The 1990s *should* be a revolutionary decade, perhaps the most notable in two hundred years. . . . Serious national revolutions are usually about politics, government, privilege, unresponsiveness, and anger. This is exactly what is simmering – and periodically boiling – in the United States of the 1990s.”⁶⁷ Unfortunately, like Dr. Schaeffer, Kevin Phillips has also neglected to take into account in his analysis the problem posed by the ever-present cabal – especially their control and influence over the media and their growing corruption and (justifiable) arrogance.

The call for revolution (or, more accurately counterrevolution) is increasing being voiced as more and more Americans have come to recognize the disinclination of the American political structure as it currently exists to challenge the cabal and correct the growing evils that are destroying America. This is the real task facing those Americans who want to salvage what is left of their country and heritage and leave their children a better life. As Phillips and others recognize, the problems of welfare, education, crime, drugs, corruption, and so forth are subordinate.

Will that counterrevolution emerge? Will the American people wake up and reclaim their country? At this point in time, the only sensible response is, time will tell.

A number of people had thought the 1990s would be the *critical decade*. People are beginning to open their eyes, but they are not yet awake. But, that is no where adequate to overcome the cabal’s interlock. Never does the cabal itself seem to have been more confident of its own power and ability to triumph than it has been throughout the beginning of this century. At present, the critical question is whether enough people can wake up, get motivated, and take action before it is too late. The odds on this happening are very low, and the socialist/globalist movement knows it, which is why they are so arrogant, as reflected in the movement to create a North American Union without regard for the American people of Congress. We have entered a new era in which *fait accompli* is the order of business.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ Cited in Charles J. Sykes, *A Nation of Victims* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992), pp. 231-232.
- ² U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, *Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Tax-exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, December 16, 1954). Hereinafter cited as *Final Report*
- ³ *Final Report*, p. 17.
- ⁴ See, for example, *Final Report*, p. 45.
- ⁵ See *Final Report*, pp. 30, 81.
- ⁶ *Final Report*, p. 126.
- ⁷ Peter Collier and David Horowitz, *Destructive Generation* (New York: Summit Books, 1989), pp. 245-246.
- ⁸ *Final Report*, p. 116.
- ⁹ Interestingly, it is many of these same private financial interests that collaborated in secrecy to establish the Federal Reserve System, which they then controlled. See G. Edward Griffin, *The Creature from Jekyll Island* (Appleton, WI: American Opinion, 1994).
- ¹⁰ Western support for the Soviet Union is documented in numerous books. See, for example, A. Ralph Epperson, *The Unseen Hand* (Tucson, AZ: Publius Press, 1985); Robert Henry Goldsborough, *Lines of Credit: Ropes of Bondage* (Baltimore, MD: Washington Dateline Publishers, 1989); James Perloff, *The Shadows of Power* (Appleton, WI: Western Islands, 1988); John Stormer, *None Dare Call It Treason ...25 Years Later* (Florissant, MO: Liberty Bell Press, 1990); Antony C. Sutton, *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution* (New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 1974); Joseph Funder, *Red Carpet* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1983).
- ¹¹ *Final Report*, p. 204.
- ¹² *Final Report*, p. 131.
- ¹³ *Final Report*, p. 137.
- ¹⁴ *Final Report*, p. 137.
- ¹⁵ *Final Report*, p. 140.
- ¹⁶ *Destructive Generation*, op. cit., p. 244.
- ¹⁷ *Final Report*, p. 18.
- ¹⁸ *Final Report*, pp. 88-89, italics in original.
- ¹⁹ *Final Report*, p. 149.
- ²⁰ *Final Report*, p. 73.
- ²¹ Paul Kurtz, editor, *Humanist Manifestos I and II* (Buffalo, NY: Prometheus books, 1973).
- ²² *Final Report*, p. 129.
- ²³ *Final Report*, p. 19.
- ²⁴ *Final Report*, p. 168.
- ²⁵ *Final Report*, p. 169.
- ²⁶ *Destructive Generation*, op. cit., p. 173.
- ²⁷ Rene Wormser, *Foundations: Their Power and Influence* (New York: Devin-Adair Company, 1958; reprinted by Covenant House Books, Sevierville TN, 1993), p. 206.
- ²⁸ *Final Report*, p. 170.
- ²⁹ *Final Report*, p. 177.
- ³⁰ *Final Report*, p. 182.
- ³¹ *Final Report*, p. 192.
- ³² *Final Report*, p. 192.
- ³³ *Final Report*, p. 192.
- ³⁴ *Final Report*, p. 56.
- ³⁵ *Final Report*, pp. 17-18.
- ³⁶ The wealth represented by the seven people who met in secret on Jekyll Island in 1910 to plan the Federal Reserve Bank (Aldrich representing Morgan and Rockefeller interests, Andrew, Vanderlip representing Rockefeller and Kuhn, Loeb & Company interests, Davison representing Morgan interests, Norton representing Morgan interests, Strong representing Morgan interests, Warburg representing Warburg, Rothschild, and Kuhn, Loeb & Company interests) was estimated at one-fourth of the world's total wealth. G. Edward Griffin, *The Creature from Jekyll Island* (Appleton, WI: American Opinion, 1994), pp. 5-7. The cabal includes all these and more, for example, the Ford, Carnegie, Rhodes, Milnor, etc billions.
- ³⁷ Congressional Record, House, February 9, 1919, p. 2947-2948.
- ³⁸ *Final Report*, pp. 17-19.

- ³⁹ *Foundations*, op. cit., p. 179.
- ⁴⁰ Paolo Lionni, *The Leipzig Connection* (Sheridan, OR: Heron books, 1993), p. 87.
- ⁴¹ *Final Report*, p. 167.
- ⁴² *Final Report*, p. 151.
- ⁴³ *Final Report*, p. 154-155.
- ⁴⁴ *Final Report*, p. 137.
- ⁴⁵ *Final Report*, p. 140.
- ⁴⁶ *Final Report*, p. 141.
- ⁴⁷ *Final Report*, pp. 120-122.
- ⁴⁸ *Final Report*, pp. 91-93.
- ⁴⁹ Norman Dodd, *Report from Norman Dodd, Director of Research, covering his direction of the Staff of the Special Committee of the House of Representatives to Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations for the six months' period November 1, 1953 -- April 30, 1954*, April 29, 1954.
- ⁵⁰ *Final Report*, p. 146.
- ⁵¹ Rene Wormser, *Foundations* op. cit., p. 173.
- ⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 173.
- ⁵³ Samuel T. Francis in Foreword to William R. Hawkins, *Importing Revolution* (Washington, D.C.: American Immigration Control Foundation, 1994), pp.iii-iv.
- ⁵⁴ Joseph D. Douglass, Jr., *Red Cocaine: The Drugging of America* (Atlanta, GA: Clarion House, 1990).
- ⁵⁵ Gabriel G. Nahas, *Cocaine: The Great White Plague* (Middlebury, VT: Paul S. Eriksson, 1989), pp. 106-111.
- ⁵⁶ *Final Report*, pp. 17-18.
- ⁵⁷ *Destructive Generation*, op. cit., pp. 313-321.
- ⁵⁸ *Lines of Credit: Ropes of Bondage*, op. cit., pp. 32-33.
- ⁵⁹ *Foundations*, op. cit., p. 349.
- ⁶⁰ *Final Report*, p. 224.
- ⁶¹ *Foundations*, op. cit., p. 271-272.
- ⁶² See, for example, *Foundations*, op. cit., pp. 272-281.
- ⁶³ *Lines of Credit: Ropes of Bondage*, op. cit., p. 32.
- ⁶⁴ See, for example: Pette Collier and David Horowitz, *Destructive Generation* (New York: Summit Books, 1989); William J. Gill, *Trade Wars Against America* (New York: Praeger, 1990); Charles J. Sykes, *A Nation of Victims* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992); Samuel L. Blumenfeld, *NEA: Trojan Horse in American Education* (Boise, ID: The Paradigm Company, 1984). Research Publications, P.O. Box 39850, Phoenix AZ 85069, \$9.45; Joseph D. Douglass, *Red Cocaine: The Drugging of America* (Atlanta, GA: Clarion House, 1990). Book, Line and Thinker, P.O. Box 1878, Fort Collins, CO 80522, \$8.95; B. K. Eakman, *Educating for the "New World Order"* (Portland, OR: Halcyon House, 1991). ISBN 0-89420-278-2; Pearl Evans, *Hidden Danger in the Classroom* (Petaluma, CA: Small Helm Press, 1990). Small Helm Press, 622-A Baker Street, Petaluma, CA, 94952, \$9.50; John Taylor Gatto, *Dumbing Us Down* (Philadelphia, PA: New Society Publishers, 1992). New Society Publishers, 4527 Springfield Ave., Philadelphia, PA 19143, \$12.45; G. Edward Griffin, *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve* (Appleton, WI: American Opinion Publishing, Inc., 1994) P.O. Box 8040, Appleton WI 54913-8040, or 1-800 237-7568 \$22.50; Robert Henry Goldsborough, *Lines of Credit: Ropes of Bondage* (Baltimore, MD: Washington Dateline Publishers, 1989). P.O. Box 5687, Baltimore, MD, 21210, \$4.95; Paolo Lionni, *The Leipzig Connection* (Sheridan, OR: Heron Books, 1993). Heron Books, P.O. Box 503, Sheridan, OR 97378, \$4.95; James Perloff, *The Shadows of Power* (Appleton, WI: Western Islands, 1988). Call Western Islands, 414-749-3783; John Stormer, *None Dare Call It Treason ...25 Years Later* (Florissant, MO: Liberty Bell Press, 1990). Liberty Bell Press, P.O. Box 32, Florissant, MO, 63032, \$23.95.
- ⁶⁵ See for example, Marvin Olansky, *Patterns of Corporate Philanthropy* (Washington D.C.: Capital Research Center, 1987).
- ⁶⁶ Francis A. Schaeffer, *A Christian Manifesto* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1981).
- ⁶⁷ Kevin Phillips, *Arrogant Capital* (New York: Little, Brown & Company, 1994), pp. 165-183.