Before reading this you **must** agree to comply with the following rule, otherwise you do not have my permission to read this. - *In fact I both demand and order you to stop reading it.*

If you intend to criticise this work, or comment on it, utilising what is commonly known as the “media”* to do so. (*newspapers, magazines, books, television/news programmes, radio, or any other recognised medium of information providing service to the public, electronic or otherwise.*) Then in order to do so with my permission, you must have read this entire work from start to finish before doing so. Failure to comply with this demand will automatically activate certain parts of my notice of intent and perhaps even fee schedule, (in saying that, my notice of intent activates as soon as you publish anything concerning me or this work regardless of whether you have read the entire work or not). If you feel that you may carry out an action as defined above, then you do not have permission to read this work. If you still choose to continue reading, then you do so at the risk of accruing financial and legal penalties for both yourself, and potentially even your employer. You may also lose some of your rights if you fail to comply. Journalists especially - You have been duly warned.

To the rest of the world: - Hello, my given name is martin, and I´m very pleased to meet you.

I am trying to do something a little bit different with this. This work is an attempt at quite a few things my friend, and none of them are easily attainable goals, in fact, as far as I can understand things, no one has ever tried to do anything like this on this scale before.

Here are a few examples of what I hope to achieve by the end of this series of “books”:

I will present a grand unified theory (G.U.T) that explains the Universe and all it contains, I will do so by utilising thousands pages of information and solid facts to prove my theory, I will even attempt to do so in such a way that it makes the whole theory seem rather simple to visualise (As a true G.U.T should be), - but only by the time you get to the last page.

I will make ANYONE (no matter how smart they thought they were beforehand) see the whole world in a completely different manner, but only if they read this entire work, start to finish.

I will also hazard a decent guess at the true meaning of life. - But only if you get to the end.

All I ask in return is that you do read all of this, and with an open mind. - Now I realise that it is quite an ask, - but think about it, imagine it´s just a series of Hairy Snotter or some of Dan Brown´s stuff, (except you WILL actually learn something meaningful by reading my books!) - Even if it is “Don´t ever read another 6000+ page book again!” - Sorry, just my sense of humour thinking too good a chance to let pass by. - My point is this: Most of you will quite happily read a long series of books, (e.g. Harry Potter) so this size of work is not beyond your capabilities. Why not spend your time reading something meaningful for a change, instead of just pointless drivel? - All I ask from you is for some serious commitment and a willingness to learn. Though I must say: - If you´re one of those people who is 100% sure that they already know how the world works then this will be a total waste of your time.

So, can you commit to a long term relationship? And, are you willing to learn new things?

Are you the type of person who only starts things with a clear intention of finishing them? Because that´s what it takes to finish this, - So ask yourself, are you sure you´re up to it?

The reason I ask is because if you are not, then please don´t even waste another second of your time, or mine for that matter by reading this. And if you consider yourself to be one of the “smart ones” in that you already know how everything works, then as I always say - You can´t teach someone who knows everything, anything. So do me a favour and just Fuck Off!
This is the second part of this work

You must have read the first part of this before continuing any further

Failure to do so will automatically negate some of your rights

FEE SCHEDULE

If any person, any organisation, or any corporation, that I have no interest in conversing with tries to engage in any form of contract with my person, whether written, verbal or otherwise concerning this work, they will conform to my fee schedule as set out below.

1. If I have to enter in any form of correspondence whatsoever with any of the parties mentioned in the paragraph above, (or any other entity that has not been included that I feel this applies to), then I will require payment of £199 per talk, letter, phonecall, or email, for this correspondence. This is to cover my legal fee as you are forcing me into replying to your offers of contract. If this correspondence is to be with any corporation owned by the public, a Sovereign, a State, a sovereign state, a nation, a trillionaire or billionaire, a FTSE 100 company, a Dow Jones company, a Nasdaq Company or any other privately owned or publicly traded company, any corporation, any NGO, any Trust, any Foundation, or any Governmental agency, including but not limited to any and all legal entities that have not been included here. Then this fee rises 100 fold to £19900 per talk, letter, phonecall, or email. This applies to all and any of their agents as well.

2. If because of this work, any legal entity, any person, any thing, or any corporation, for whatever reason, requires or requests me to go to a court of any form, my fee will be £99999 per day. - But that's only applicable if I choose to make a special appearance.

3. All services requiring the assistance of the Capitus Diminutia Maxima title attributed to my living soul will pay £10,000,000 (Ten Million Pounds Sterling) at my request. This fee can be levied at any time, entirely at my discretion, and is totally non-negotiable.

All of my Natural Law, Common Law, and any other rights, are completely reserved. This notice of intent is presented in more than one part. All are part of one lawful document.

DO NOT ATTEMPT TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT OF ANY NATURE WITH ME OVER ANY THING AFTER THIS POINT, WITHOUT REALISING THE POTENTIAL CONSEQUENCES OF THAT ACTION.

Now dear reader, if you are a normal living being then none of what I just written above will ever be used against you as long as your intentions are honourable, to be honest with most of you, you don't even need to pay much attention to this for now. Later in this work you will come to realise the true significance of it, and when you do you will know that it is a 100% defensive measure that's not a threat to anyone. - You'll have to trust me on that for now.
Notice of Intent Section One Part Two:

Dumbed down word controlled monkey’s who think that keeping up with the Jones’s and not being the stupidest guy or gal in the room is ALL that really matters.

Before we begin I will take the time to reiterate this notice – This work, including but not limited to, the part entitled “Notice of Intent” is all one document in a lawful/legal sense.

ALL of my legal/lawful notice’s given at the beginning of part one still apply to you.

DO NOT READ THIS WITHOUT REFERING TO THE INITIAL DOCUMENT OR YOU’LL HAVE FORFEITTED SOME RIGHTS AND ALSO HAVE AGREED TO SOME LAWFUL AND LEGAL STUFF.

Introduction, Preamble and legal/lawful disclaimer - Pages 1 to 2

Contents - Pages 4 to 5

Chapter Seventeen - Pages 7 to 43

Me welcoming you to this part of my work, and some really useful information on an incredibly interesting, yet for some reason, rather overlooked part of Germany.

Chapter Eighteen - Pages 45 to 143

Psychiatry an Industry of Death. That title says it all really. Take a historical tour with me that chronicles the development of this insane field of “Science”. There's also some extremely pertinent information on sociopaths and psychopaths for you to consider.

Chapter Nineteen - Pages 145 to 208

Psychiatric drugs, psychopathic drugs companies. Here we look at the standard of treatment administered by these people. We also look at their aims for the young and old.

Chapter Twenty - Pages 210 to 274

An overview of some of Mind Control's major milestones, and also a brief section on a “great” British institution that you've maybe never heard of: - The Tavistock Institute.

Chapter Twenty One - Pages 276 to 307

Transcript of The Napa Valley Sentinel series on Mind Control.

Chapter Twenty Two - Pages 309 to 350

Some shocking information on The False Memory Syndrome Foundation (FMSF), also, just what are Disassociative Identity Disorder (DID) and Multiple Personality Disorder (MPD)?

Chapter Twenty Three - Pages 352 to 419

Excerpts from Dave McGowan’s “Programmed to Kill”. Here (again) my favourite author demonstrates to you quite clearly “the powers that be” created serial killing to keep you fearful. (And also to find something for their assassin’s to do while they're not at “work”.)

Chapter Twenty Four - Pages 421 to 472

Jonestown and Dunblane. Here we find out that this total control of the mind of another not only works on individuals, it also works on large groups of people, even on whole countries.
Chapter Twenty Five - Pages 474 to 552

In this chapter we cover the control of the media and how Mind Control came into the home through good old TV and the newspaper's. (Hopefully in the process you'll also have the brains work out why you haven't already been hearing about any of the things I talk of).

Chapter Twenty Six - Pages 554 to 584

Think twice before you complain about your kid not doing the washing up...Because if your kid is just like any other, then your child is probably in their bedroom right now training to be a ruthless assassin on their Playstation or Xbox.

Chapter Twenty Seven - Pages 586 to 596

A short introduction (that re-introduces an old “friend”), and an equally short yet succinct chronology detailing the systematic implementation of compulsory education in the USA.

Chapter Twenty Eight - Pages 598 to 651

The “Foundation's” of our modern day education system part 1.

Chapter Twenty Nine - Pages 653 to 675

The “Foundation's” of our modern day education system part 2.

Chapter Thirty - Pages 677 to 740

The proof of the deliberate dumbing down of society using education. - This chapter begins with an exam a 13/14 year old child had to pass a century ago to get into high school. NOT ONE OF YOU WILL BE ABLE TO PASS IT TODAY (AND THAT INCLUDES YOUR KIDS' TEACHER'S, THEIR TEACHER'S, AND PROBABLY MOST UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR'S TOO!)

Chapter Thirty One - Pages 742 to 781

To end the work I briefly touch upon a subject that was brought up in Chapter Nineteen that conveniently provides a perfect segue to the next part of the work. - Genetic Heritability.

Just click on any of the links above to go straight to that chapter.

I would like at this juncture to make the following known: If anyone should ever (for some obscure reason) think that this work was any good at all. I feel it is only fair that you should know at this point who it is that both you and I should really thank for making it that way...A geganormous thanks goes to John Taylor Gatto, (The master Educator concerning our education, and Teacher on what teaching truly is. - And from what I can gather from what I've both seen and read of his work, also an always chirpy, genuine, all round nice guy), Dave McGowan (as ever), and also to Alex Constantine, for their well researched and truly tremendous work. Thanks for caring and for making this easier for me guys. An especially big shout also has to go out to my two ever present and adorable, lesbocarpet-munchers. My spag--bol and Breaking Bad loving, puffbuddy-wei sister's: Ashcat and Cara (Big Thanks my two wee Angel's both for all the great company and also for giving me some hope with regards to the next generation! X), wee A-Ball ('n Des) also deservedly get a shout too, just for all that decent chat 'n positivity. X (Deal wi’ it Des! Woop-Woop Disko-pixie!) Special shout out to Conrad ‘n Charlie, my two wee motivator's. - Their equally infectious laugh's alone, make this all worthwhile. As ever a, big shout also goes out to my dearest and oldest friend Bud who always assists me with the editing, and finally a big thanks also has to go to my wee toy, green space-monkey-jesus (Praise Him Baaaay!). This book is also dedicated to him/her/hermaphro' for providing for all my spiritual needs and general all round welfare while I've been compiling this. - He jived for my skins. - M.P.K. 03 Nov 2011.

Updated Mar 2013. Back in Greenock giving this a final edit and tune up. Here goes...
Chapter Seventeen

I'm sorry to say my friend, but I genuinely hope that the first instalment of this work was a bit of an eye watering experience for you. (And unless you're either thick, stupid, or one of today's apathetic, generation X, post-ironic, phased by pure nada, automaton's, or just one of those annoyingly pig-headed know-it-all types who thinks I'm talking bull (simply because the guy on the 6 o’clock news hasn't told you any of this) it fucking well should have been!)

It was compiled with the aim of capturing your attention, and to also open (or if required poke) your eyes. I have just spent nearly 900 pages showing you, (at times in great detail), that we have all been greatly manipulated for purposes that are entirely detrimental to our entire species, now I'm going to spend this part of the work showing you exactly how it is being done. (Including once again laying bare for your perusal all the utterly preposterous and downright whacky “Science” that stands behind this nonsense).

“You may well recall my having a slight dig at science right back at the beginning of this work, (and continuously ever since). The reason for this is quite simple: Science and many of its “experts” are being used constantly to manipuolate us in a whole multitude of ways.

The physics part during my introduction has also (hopefully) pointed out this second fact to you too: They (the experts) don't know everything. - (And as you are about to see in this work, for mere money and platitudes, many of these so called scientist's are quite willing to kill, maim, or otherwise seriously harm their fellow human beings, children included).

Right now I'm not going to waste any further time dwelling on the points raised earlier on in the work because we have much more to cover in this part. - But I will get back to them. The overwhelming theme of this part of the puzzle will be Mind Control. (Or from now on MK for short. (That's where the K for Kontrol came from in my last work incidentally). It's a subject that I've already touched upon many times up to this point in my thesis, and for that reason I will now dedicate a major amount of my time in detailing for you exactly how deep-rooted, powerful, and all pervasive this mental menace is. The public funds alone that have been spent on this field of “science” are astronomical. And then there's the private fund's... If you were to add it all up, to be blunt, it equals... DEEP FUCKING TROUBLE FOR ALL OF US!

We begin this journey by visiting a relatively forgotten region of Germany first of all, then we will then look across what seems like a small spectrum of “science” or “medicine” related subjects; we will be starting with psychiatry/psychology, and then we will move onto the dodgy goings on in the world of psychiatric drugs. Then we delve into Mind Control proper: From its (recently modern) - (as this has been going on for a long time) birth, to its present day perfection, (we will also take some time to look at the “covering up” of the ritual sexual abuse phenomena, because this relates to material that you read in the first part concerning paedophilia. (Do you remember that weirdo Uncle Fester lookalike Aquino? He pops up again.) Then after that, well after that it's time to show you more “science” (often the work of intelligence services or the military) which has been developed, (and had an awful lot of financial aid flung in its direction over the years), all seeking to create, (and this is no exaggeration) full blown, bona-fide, (remote) mind controlled human beings!

Some of the men you will be reading about think that they have succeeded in this goal.

The material available (that is just from the PUBLIC RECORD) on this one subject alone is easily enough to prove my case 20 times over. And for that reason plenty of my proof will of course come direct from the public record. But I must add that, once again, it will also (of course) be a select band of “other's” who will be teaching you plenty during this “my” (so called) “work”. One of those teachers will (once again) be the studious, intelligent and inimitable, Mr Dave McGowan. And trust me, he teaches you much with the sampling I have included of his best work to date: “Programmed to Kill” – (It talks about STATE sponsored serial killer's and it is towards the end of my chapter's concentrating on the development of mind control), I then finish this short group of chapter's by casting a curious eye over the harrowing and unforgettable events that transpired at both Jonestown and in Dunblane.
The education system (you will discover) also has a massive part to play in all of this too, so I will spend some time with you going over where our present day education “system” really came from, what its true purpose is, and I will also show you how it is an institution which causes untold harm to our most precious of resources: - Our children. - I need to point out, that in order for me to do so, Mr John Taylor Gatto is the man being relied upon for the truly extraordinary work that he’s done both with, and also on, “Education” as a whole.

In the process of doing this I will also take the time to show you the many obvious links and common ground that clearly exists between these three seemingly unrelated matters:

The education “system” of the developed world, the rather insane “science” of psychiatry, and the even weirder subject of mind control.

And wouldn’t you know it, it turns out that the exact SAME people who had funded these three field’s (mentioned above) from their birth to the present day, who oddly, weirdly and rather conveniently (for me), had also funded the birth science’s, plus all that other stuff that you learned in the first part like: the abortion pill, feminism, homosexuality, etc.) - Yep, once again it’s those pesky Rockefeller (trust’s) (with the help of other’s in this helping, like Ford and Carnegie) who’ve been blatantly splashing their malevolent cash once again!

As I have said, to start this part of the section off we will cover a region of Germany that had a massive effect on the whole world during the 19” century, and even though you probably won’t agree with me, or you may even think I’m little weird* for saying this, this is the place where your guide on this tour feels that we need to start if you are to ever fully understand the true (modern) roots of this so called “science” of mind control. After that we will also be covering everything from psychiatry and psychology, to mind control in theory, use, and practise, including the military side and also the intelligence service side as well. Then there’s the pharmaceutical and medical angle to all of this too. And as I have already said, we will then look at more of what I feel is Mr Dave McGowan's best piece of work so far, - “Programmed to Kill”. - His enthralling, explosive, and always fascinating piece of work on State crafted serial killer’s, this is before finishing off the large part of this concentrating just on the “science” of MK, by showing you just two examples of exactly how this total control of the lives of others doesn’t just work on individuals, it can also work on large groups. - We’ll do this by looking at Jim Jones and Jonestown first of all, then we will be covering a subject I wanted to go over in part one, but that I ultimately felt you just weren’t ready for back then. It’s only now that we have covered all the ground we have that I can cover the Dunblane massacre. This was a brutal example of MK on a country-wide scale.

We then spend a little time looking at the blatant Mind Control going on through the media. And just to make my point on this matter rather succinctly. The simple fact is this: If any of these media people were actually doing their job, don’t you feel that you would already have been told about virtually all of the things that I have discussed with you up to this point? How many of them have you actually been told about on TV or in the newspaper? The fact that you will have heard almost NOTHING on ALL of the issues I have raised earlier should have demonstrated to you just how much our “news” is both filtered and controlled. When you see for yourself how utterly controlled the media is, then you will understand why.

We will be putting our government supplied education system under the microscope. I feel it is pertinent for me to be both starting and winding up this part of the work by showing you exactly how much of an effect these people have had on education, and on our CHILDREN.

When you are clearly shown the lie on each of these matters, and after being told why you were being lied to in the first place, I’d imagine that many of you will either get rather angry with me, or with my work. (Or if you’re smarter, you might get angry with “them”). If I was you, I wouldn’t waste my time doing either. Instead I’d pour all that frustration and anger into getting myself fully clued up on ALL of this nonsense. I’d then start educating others about it. - Give them this or my other work if you feel it will help them along the way. Feel free. - Your kind, humble, and always considerate (never rude or brash) friend. – Martin K.
"Weird to you, not me. - Remember I'm the annoying, cocky, Jock cunt who has been telling you, (right from page one, of part fucking one, for God's sake), that I knows what I's doing.

Now to begin this part of the work, we will begin at the beginning by taking the logical and necessary step of going right back to the very foundation's of modern day mind control.

You might well think I'd begin with either Psychiatry or Behaviourism, but you'd be wrong.

You might, if you know a little on the matter say Wundt, Freud or Jung, but you'd still be wrong.

It's not a person, or even a science as such, not in my view; it's actually a place...

It's a region in fact, one that pops up quite a lot in the second section of this work, and it's one that many of you will know very little about. But don't fret, that's all about to change...

It's called Prussia - (Cue the anti-climatical music to match that scrunchy look on your face)

Even though it may not be the starting place that you were expecting, trust me, (in my humble opinion), Prussia is the place where a lot of the modern attitudes prevalent in most "First World" countries (in the present day) really came from, like for example: "The State is more important than the people who make it up" - "We all live to serve the State" - "Trust your Government" - "Trust ALL authority" - "Trust the media to find and print the truth" Etc.

Curiously, the “Prussian Model” is one that is being aimed for, and it is one being practised by so many of our governments worldwide today, that there must be something to it.

(Its mantra's are also being preached to us by all of the high priest's of our modern day "educational" institution's - As you are about to find out for yourself.)

This first chapter's significance will perhaps (I feel) only become truly apparent to you when you have read this work for a second time, don't get me wrong, it fits right in with the rest of this part of section one, but it's TRUE significance will probably only become clear when you have read all the section's of this work, or perhaps, only once you've read them twice. –

(In section two, you'll understand a lot clearer what I'm going on about.)

Before I defer to Mr Gatto, please allow me to leave you with these true words of wisdom...

Before you ever bother to look at any science in its application, you should take the time to look at the same science's “Foundation's”. (Especially if the name Rockefeller pops up!)

From the stunning book “Underground History of American Education” by John Taylor Gatto

A very small group of young psychologists around the turn of the century were able to create and market a system for measuring human talent that has permeated American (My note. And also the British too) institutions of learning and influenced such fundamental social concepts as democracy, sanity, justice, welfare, reproductive rights, and economic progress. In creating, owning, and advertising this social technology the testers created themselves as professionals. – Joanne Brown, The Definition of a Profession: The Authority of Metaphor in the History of Intelligence Testing

I have undertaken to get at the facts from the point of view of the business men – citizens of the community who, after all, pay the bills and, therefore, have a right to say what they shall have in their schools. – Charles H. Thurber, from an address at the Annual Meeting of the National Education Association, July 9, 1897

(My note. My whole case proven in a lone quote!!!!)
On approaching the enemy, the marching columns of Prussians wheeled in succession to the right or left, passed along the front of the enemy until the rear company had wheeled. Then the whole together wheeled into line facing the enemy. These movements brought the infantry into two long well-closed lines, parade-ground precision obtained thanks to remorseless drilling. With this movement was bound up a fire-discipline more extraordinary than any perfection of manœuvre. "Pelotonfeuer" was opened at 200 paces from the enemy and continued up to 30 paces when the line fell on with the bayonet. The possibility of this combination of fire and movement was the work of Leopold, who by sheer drill made the soldier a machine capable of delivering (with flintlock muzzle-loading muskets) five volleys a minute. The special Prussian fire-discipline gave an advantage of five shots to two against all opponents. The bayonet attack, if the rolling volleys had done their work, was merely "presenting the cheque for payment," as a German writer put it. – Encyclopaedia Britannica, 11th edition, "Prussia"

The Land of Frankenstein

The particular utopia American believers chose to bring to the schoolhouse was Prussian.

The seed that became American schooling, twentieth-century style, was planted in 1806 when Napoleon's amateur soldiers bested the professional soldiers of Prussia at the battle of Jena. When your business is renting soldiers and employing diplomatic extortion under threat of your soldiery, losing a battle like that is pretty serious. Something had to be done.

The most important immediate reaction to Jena was an immortal speech, the "Address to the German Nation" by the philosopher Fichte—one of the influential documents of modern history leading directly to the first workable compulsion schools in the West.

Other times, other lands talked about schooling, but all failed to deliver. Simple forced training for brief intervals and for narrow purposes was the best that had ever been managed. This time would be different. In no uncertain terms Fichte told Prussia the party was over. Children would have to be disciplined through a new form of universal conditioning. They could no longer be trusted to their parents. Look what Napoleon had done by banishing sentiment in the interests of nationalism. Through forced schooling, everyone would learn that "work makes free," and working for the State, even laying down one's life to its commands, was the greatest freedom of all. (My Note. Dulce Et Decorum Est Pro Patria Mori, the Owen poem, not the idea, perfectly summed it up.) Here in the genius of semantic redefinition1 lay the power to cloud men's minds, a power later packaged and sold by public relations pioneers Edward Bernays and Ivy Lee in the seedtime of American forced schooling.

Prior to Fichte's challenge any number of compulsion-school proclamations had rolled off printing presses here and there, including Martin Luther's plan to tie church and state together this way and, of course, the "Old Deluder Satan" law of 1642 in Massachusetts and its 1645 extension. The problem was these earlier ventures were virtually unenforceable, roundly ignored by those who smelled mischief lurking behind fancy promises of free education. People who wanted their kids schooled had them schooled even then; people who didn't didn't. That was more or less true for most of us right into the twentieth century: as late as 1920, only 32 percent of American kids went past elementary school. If that sounds impossible, consider the practice in Switzerland today where only 23 percent of the student population goes to high school, though Switzerland has the world's highest per capita income in the world.

Prussia was prepared to use bayonets on its own people as readily as it wielded them against others, so it's not all that surprising the human race got its first effective secular compulsion schooling out of Prussia in 1819, the same year Mary Shelley's Frankenstein,
set in the darkness of far-off Germany, was published in England. *Schule* came after more than a decade of deliberations, commissions, testimony, and debate. For a brief, hopeful moment, Humboldt's brilliant arguments for a high-level no-holds-barred, free-swinging, universal, intellectual course of study for all, full of variety, free debate, rich experience, and personalized curricula almost won the day. What a different world we would have today if Humboldt had won the Prussian debate, but the forces backing Baron vom Stein won instead. And that has made all the difference.

The Prussian mind, which carried the day, held a clear idea of what centralised schooling should deliver:

1) **Obedient soldiers to the army**
2) **Obedient workers for mines, factories, and farms**
3) **Well-subordinated civil servants, trained in their function**
4) **Well-subordinated clerks for industry**
5) **Citizens who thought alike on most issues**
6) **National uniformity in thought, word, and deed.**

(My note. Tell me, does this all not sound a just a little tiny bit familiar to you?)

The area of individual volition for commoners was severely foreclosed by Prussian psychological training procedures drawn from the experience of animal husbandry and equestrian training, and also taken from past military experience. (Me. - WTF!)

Much later, in our own time, the techniques of these assorted crafts and sullen arts became "discoveries" in the pedagogical pseudoscience of psychological behaviourism. (My Note. We will be covering this issue in great detail later on in this part of my work.)

Prussian schools delivered everything they promised.

Every important matter could now be confidently worked out in advance by leading families and institutional heads because well-schooled masses would concur with a minimum of opposition.

This tightly schooled consensus in Prussia eventually combined the kaleidoscopic German principalities into a united Germany, after a thousand years as a nation in fragments. What a surprise the world would soon get from this successful experiment in national centralization!

Under Prussian state socialism private industry surged, vaulting resource-poor Prussia up among world leaders. Military success remained Prussia's touchstone. Even before the school law went into full effect as an enhancer of state priorities, the army corps under Blücher was the principal reason for Napoleon's defeat at Waterloo, its superb discipline allowing for a surprisingly successful return to combat after what seemed to be a crushing defeat at the Little Corporal's hands just days before.3 Unschooled, the Prussians were awesome; conditioned in the classroom promised to make them even more formidable.

The immense prestige earned from this triumph reverberated through an America not so lucky in its own recent fortunes of war, a country humiliated by a shabby showing against the British in the War of 1812. Even thirty years after Waterloo, so highly was Prussia regarded in America and Britain, the English-speaking adversaries selected the Prussian king to arbitrate our northwest border with Canada. Hence the Pennsylvania town "King of
Prussia." Thirty-three years after Prussia made state schooling work, we borrowed the structure, style, and intention of those Germans for our own first compulsion schools. Traditional American school purpose—piety, good manners, basic intellectual tools, self-reliance, etc.—was scrapped to make way for something different.

Our historical destination of personal independence gave way slowly to Prussian-purpose schooling, not because the American way lost in any competition of ideas, but because for the new commercial and manufacturing hierarchs, such a course made better economic sense.

This private advance toward nationalized schooling in America was partially organized, although little has ever been written about it; Orestes Brownson's journal identifies a covert national apparatus (to which Brownson briefly belonged) already in place in the decade after the War of 1812, one whose stated purpose was to "Germanize" America, beginning in those troubled neighbourhoods where the urban poor huddled, and where disorganized new immigrants made easy targets, according to Brownson. Enmity on the part of old-stock middle-class and working-class populations toward newer immigrants gave these unfortunates no appeal against the school sentence to which Massachusetts assigned them. They were in for a complete makeover, like it or not. Much of the story, as it was being written by 1844, lies just under the surface of Mann's florid prose in his Seventh Annual Report to the Boston School Committee. On a visit to Prussia the year before, he had been much impressed (so he said) with the ease by which Prussian calculations could determine precisely how many thinkers, problem-solvers, and working stiffs the State would require over the coming decade, then how it offered the precise categories of training required to develop the percentages of human resource needed. All this was much fairer to Mann than England's repulsive episcopal system—schooling based on social class; Prussia, he thought, was republican in the desirable, manly, Roman sense. Massachusetts must take the same direction.

1Machiavelli had clearly identified this as a necessary strategy of state in 1532, and even explored its choreography.

2For an ironic reflection on the success of Prussian educational ideals, take a look at Martin Van Creveld's Fighting Power (Greenwood Press, 1982). Creveld, the world's finest military historian, undertakes to explain why German armies in 1914–1918 and 1939–1945, although heavily outnumbered in the major battles of both wars, consistently inflicted 30 percent more casualties than they suffered, whether they were winning or losing, on defence or on offense, no matter who they fought. They were better led, we might suspect, but the actual training of those field commanders comes as a shock. While American officer selection was right out of Frederick Taylor, complete with psychological dossiers and standardized tests, German officer training emphasized individual apprenticeships, week-long field evaluations, extended discursive written evaluations by senior officers who personally knew the candidates. The surprise is, while German state management was rigid and regulated with its common citizens, it was liberal and adventurous with its elites. After WWII, and particularly after Vietnam, American elite military practice began to follow this German model. Ironically enough, America's elite private boarding schools like Groton had followed the Prussian lead from their inception as well as the British models of Eton and Harrow. German elite war doctrine cut straight to the heart of the difference between the truly educated and the merely schooled. For the German High Command war was seen as an art, a creative activity, grounded in science. War made the highest demands on an officer's entire personality and the role of the individual in Germany was decisive. American emphasis, on the other hand, was doctrinal, fixated on cookbook rules. The U.S. officer's manual said: "Doctrines of combat operation are neither numerous nor complex. Knowledge of these doctrines provides a firm basis for action in a particular situation." This reliance on automatic procedure rather than on creative individual decisions got a lot of Americans killed by the book. The irony, of course, was that American, British, and French officers got
the same lockstep conditioning in dependence that German foot soldiers did. There are some obvious lessons here which can be applied directly to public schooling.

3Napoleon assumed the Prussians were retreating in the direction of the Rhine after a defeat, but in truth they were only executing a feint. The French were about to overrun Wellington when Blücher's "Death's Head Hussars," driven beyond human endurance by their officers, reached the battlefield at a decisive moment. Not pausing to rest, the Prussians immediately went into battle, taking the French in the rear and right wing. Napoleon toppled, and Prussian discipline became the focus of world attention.

The Long Reach Of The Teutonic Knights (My note. Much more on these guys in section two)

In 1876, before setting off from America to Germany to study, William H. Welch, an ambitious young Bostonian, told his sister: "If by absorbing German lore I can get a little start of a few thousand rivals and thereby reduce my competition to a few hundred more or less it is a good point to tally." Welch did go off to Germany for the coveted Ph.D., a degree which at the time had its actual existence in any practical sense only there, and in due course his ambition was satisfied. Welch became first dean of Johns Hopkins Medical School and, later, chief advisor to the (My note Shockeronie!) Rockefeller Foundation on medical projects. Welch was one of thousands who found the German Ph.D. a blessing without parallel in late-nineteenth-century America. German Ph.D.'s ruled the academic scene by then.

Prussia itself was a curious place, not an ordinary country unless you consider ordinary a land which by 1776 required women to register each onset of their monthly menses (My Note. Their period!) with the police.

North America had been interested in Prussian developments since long before the American Revolution, its social controls being a favourite subject of discussion among Ben Franklin's exclusive private discussion group, the Junta. When the phony Prussian baron Von Steuben directed bayonet drills for the colonial army, interest rose even higher. Prussia was a place to watch, an experimental state totally synthetic like our own, having been assembled out of lands conquered in the last crusade. For a full century Prussia acted as our mirror, showing elite America what we might become with discipline. (Good slaves?)

In 1839, thirteen years before the first successful school compulsion law was passed in the United States, a perpetual critic of Boston Whig (Mann's own party) leadership charged that proposals to erect German-style teacher seminaries in this country were a thinly disguised attack on local and popular autonomy. The critic Brownson allowed that state regulation of teaching licenses was a necessary preliminary only if school were intended to serve as a psychological control mechanism for the state and as a screen for a controlled economy. If that was the game truly afoot, said Brownson, it should be reckoned an act of treason. "Where the whole tendency of education is to create obedience," Brownson said, "all teachers must be pliant tools of government. Such a system of education is not inconsistent with the theory of Prussian society but the thing is wholly inadmissible here." He further argued that "according to our theory the people are wiser than the government. Here the people do not look to the government for light, for instruction, but the government looks to the people. The people give law to the government." He concluded that "to entrust government with the power of determining education which our children shall receive is entrusting our servant with the power of the master. The fundamental difference between the United States and Prussia has been overlooked by the board of education and its supporters."3

This same notion of German influence on American institutions occurred recently to a historian from Georgetown, Dr. Carroll Quigley. Quigley's analysis of elements in German character which were exported to us occurs in his book Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Time. Quigley traced what he called "the German thirst for the cosiness of a
totalitarian way of life" to the breakup of German tribes in the great migrations fifteen hundred years ago. When pagan Germany finally transferred its loyalty to the even better totalitarian system of Diocletian in post-Constantine Rome, that system was soon shattered, too, a second tragic loss of security for the Germans. According to Quigley, they refused to accept this loss. For the next one thousand years, Germans made every effort to reconstruct the universal system, from Charlemagne's Holy Roman Empire right up to the aftermath of Jena in 1806. During that thousand-year interval, other nations of the West developed individual liberty as the ultimate centre of society and its principal philosophical reality. But while Germany was dragged along in the same process, it was never convinced that individual sovereignty was the right way to organize society. Germans, said Quigley, wanted freedom from the need to make decisions, the negative freedom that comes from a universal totalitarian structure which gives security and meaning to life. The German is most at home in military, ecclesiastical, or educational organizations, ill at ease with equality, democracy, individualism, or freedom. This was the spirit that gave the West forced schooling in the early nineteenth century, so spare a little patience while I tell you about Prussia and Prussianized Germany whose original mission was expressly religious but in time became something else.

During the thirteenth century, the Order of Teutonic Knights set about creating a new state of their own. After fifty turbulent years of combat, the Order successfully Christianized Prussia by the efficient method of exterminating the entire native population and replacing it with Germans.

By 1281, the Order's hold on lands once owned by the heathen Slavs was secure. Then something of vital importance to the future occurred—the system of administration selected to be set up over these territories was not one patterned on the customary European model of dispersed authority, but instead was built on the logic of Saracen centralized administration, an Asiatic form first described by crusaders returned from the Holy Land.

For an example of these modes of administration in conflict, we have Herodotus' account of the Persian attempt to force the pass at Thermopylae—Persia with its huge bureaucratically subordinated army arrayed against self-directed Leonidas and his three hundred Spartans. This romantic image of personal initiative, however misleading, in conflict with a highly trained and specialized military bureaucracy, was passed down to sixty generations of citizens in Western lands as an inspiration and model. Now Prussia had established an Asiatic beachhead on the northern fringe of Europe, one guided by a different inspiration.

Between the thirteenth and nineteenth centuries, the Order of Teutonic Knights evolved by gradual stages into a highly efficient, secular civil service. In 1525, Albert of Brandenberg declared Prussia a secular kingdom. By the eighteenth century, under Frederick the Great, Prussia had become a major European power in spite of its striking material disadvantages. From 1740 onwards, it was feared throughout Europe for its large, well-equipped, and deadly standing army, comprising a formulaic 1 percent of the population. After centuries of debate, the 1 percent formula became the lot of the United States military, too, a gift of Prussian strategist von Clausewitz to America. By 1740, the mature Prussian state-structure was almost complete. During the reigns of Frederick I and his son Frederick II, Frederick the Great, the modern absolute state was fashioned there by means of immense sacrifices imposed on the citizenry to sustain permanent mobilization.

The historian Thomas Macauley wrote of Prussia during these years: "The King carried on warfare as no European power ever had, he governed his own kingdom as he would govern a besieged town, not caring to what extent private property was destroyed or civil life suspended. The coin was debased, civil functionaries unpaid, but as long as means for destroying life remained, Frederick was determined to fight to the last." Goethe said Frederick "saw Prussia as a concept, the root cause of a process of abstraction consisting of norms, attitudes and characteristics which acquired a life of their own. It was a unique process, supra-individual, an attitude depersonalized, motivated only by the individual's duty
to the State.” Today it’s easy for us to recognize Frederick as a systems theorist of genius, one with a real country to practice upon.

Under Frederick William II, Frederick the Great’s nephew and successor, from the end of the eighteenth century on into the nineteenth, Prussian citizens were deprived of all rights and privileges. Every existence was comprehensively subordinated to the purposes of the State, and in exchange the State agreed to act as a good father, giving food, work, and wages suited to the people’s capacity, welfare for the poor and elderly, and universal schooling for children. The early nineteenth century saw Prussian state socialism arrive full-blown as the most dynamic force in world affairs, a powerful rival to industrial capitalism, with antagonisms sensed but not yet clearly identified. It was the moment of schooling, never to surrender its grip on the throat of society once achieved.

1Franklin’s great-grandson, Alexander Dallas Bache became the leading American proponent of Prussianism in 1839. After a European school inspection tour lasting several years, his Report on Education in Europe, promoted heavily by Quakers, devoted hundreds of pages to glowing description of Pestalozzian method and to the German gymnasium.

2Brownson is the main figure in Christopher Lasch’s bravura study of Progressivism, The True and Only Heaven, being offered there as the best fruit of American democratic orchards, a man who, having seemingly tried every major scheme of meaning the new nation had to offer, settled on trusting ordinary people as the best course into the future.

3In Opposition to Centralization (1839).

4Quigley holds the distinction of being the only college professor ever to be publicly honoured by a major party presidential candidate, Bill Clinton, in his formal acceptance speech for the presidential nomination (My note. More on this later too.)

The Prussian Reform Movement

The devastating defeat by Napoleon at Jena triggered the so-called Prussian Reform Movement, a transformation which replaced cabinet rule (by appointees of the national leader) with rule by permanent civil servants and permanent government bureaus. Ask yourself which form of governance responds better to public opinion and you will realize what a radical chapter in European affairs was opened.

The familiar three-tier system of education emerged in the Napoleonic era, one private tier, and two government ones. At the top, one-half of 1 percent of the students attended Akademienschulen, where, as future policy makers, they learned to think strategically, contextually, in wholes; they learned complex processes, and useful knowledge, studied history, wrote copiously, argued often, read deeply, and mastered tasks of command.

The next level, Realsschulen, was intended mostly as a manufactory for the professional proletariat of engineers, architects, doctors, lawyers, career civil servants, and such other assistants as policy thinkers at times would require. From 5 to 7.5 percent of all students attended these "real schools," learning in a superficial fashion how to think in context, but mostly learning how to manage materials, men, and situations— to be problem solvers. This group would also staff the various policing functions of the state, bringing order to the domain.

Finally, at the bottom of the pile, a group between 92 and 94 percent of the population attended "people's schools" where they learned obedience, cooperation and correct attitudes, along with rudiments of literacy and official state myths of history.

(My note. – The three paragraphs above ladies and gentleman are the education system of the whole “developed” world described to an absolute tee. - Which model of robot are you?)
This universal system of compulsion schooling was up and running by 1819, and soon became the eighth wonder of the world, promising for a brief time—in spite of its exclusionary layered structure—liberal education for all. But this early dream was soon abandoned. This particular utopia had a different target than human equality; it aimed instead for frictionless efficiency. From its inception Volkschulen, the people's place, heavily discounted reading; reading produced dissatisfaction, it was thought. The Bell-school remedy was called for: a standard of virtual illiteracy formally taught under state church auspices. Reading offered too many windows onto better lives, too much familiarity with better ways of thinking. It was a gift unwise to share with those permanently consigned to low station.

Heinrich Pestalozzi, an odd Swiss-German school reformer, was producing at this time a non-literary, experience-based pedagogy, strong in music and industrial arts, which was attracting much favourable attention in Prussia. Here seemed a way to keep the poor happy without arousing in them hopes of dramatically changing the social order. Pestalozzi claimed ability to mould the poor "to accept all the efforts peculiar to their class." He offered them love in place of ambition. By employing psychological means in the training of the young, class warfare might be avoided.

A curiously prophetic note for the future development of scientific school teaching was that Pestalozzi himself could barely read. Not that he was a dummy; those talents simply weren't important in his work. He reckoned his own semiliteracy an advantage in dealing with children destined not to find employment requiring much verbal fluency.

Seventeen agents of the Prussian government acted as Pestalozzi's assistants in Switzerland, bringing insights about the Swiss style of schooling home to northern Germany. While Pestalozzi's raggedy schools lurched clumsily from year to year, a nobleman, von Fellenberg, refined and systematized the Swiss reformer's disorderly notes, hammering the funky ensemble into clarified plans for a worldwide system of industrial education for the masses. As early as 1808, this non-academic formulation was introduced into the United States under Joseph Neef, formerly a teacher at Pestalozzi's school. Neef, with important Quaker patronage, became the principal schoolmaster for Robert Owen's pioneering work-utopia at New Harmony, Indiana. Neef's efforts there provided high-powered conversational fodder to the fashionable Unitarian drawing rooms of Boston in the decades before compulsory legislation was passed. And when it did pass, all credit for the political victory belonged to those Unitarians. Neef's influence resonated across the United States after the collapse of New Harmony, through lectures given by Robert Owen's son (later a congressman, then referee of J.P. Morgan's legal contretemps with the U.S. Army3), and through speeches and intrigues by that magnificent nineteenth-century female dynamo Scottish émigré Fanny Wright, who demanded the end of family life and its replacement by communitarian schooling. The tapestry of school origins is one of paths crossing and recrossing, and more apparent coincidences than seem likely.

Together, Owen and Wright created the successful Workingman's Party of Philadelphia, which seized political control of that city in 1829. The party incorporated strong compulsion schooling proposals as part of its political platform. Its idea to place working-class children under the philosophical discipline of highly skilled craftsmen—men comparable socially to the yeomanry of pre-enclosure England—would have attracted favourable commentary in Philadelphia where banker Nicholas Biddle was locked in struggle for control of the nation's currency with working-class hero Andrew Jackson. Biddle's defeat by Jackson quickly moved abstract discussions of a possible social technology to control working class children from the airy realms of social hypothesis to policy discussions about immediate reality. In that instant of maximum tension between an embryonic financial capitalism and a populist republic struggling to emerge, the Prussian system of pedagogy came to seem perfectly sensible to men of means and ambition.
I've exaggerated the neatness of this tripartite division in order to make clear its functional logic. The system as it actually grew in those days without an electronic technology of centralization was more whimsical than I've indicated, dependent partially on local tradition and resistance, partially on the ebb and flow of fortunes among different participants in the transformation. In some places, the "academy" portion didn't occur in a separate institution, but as a division inside the Realsschulen, something like today's "gifted and talented honours" programs as compared to the common garden variety "gifted and talented" pony shows.

Pestalozzi's strangeness comes through in almost all the standard biographical sketches of him, despite universal efforts to emphasize his saintliness. In a recent study, Anthony Sutton claims Pestalozzi was also director of a secret lodge of "illuminated" Freemasonry—with the code name "Alfred." If true, the Swiss "educator" was even stranger than I sensed initially.

During the Civil War, Morgan sold back to the army its own defective rifles (which had been auctioned as scrap) at a 1,300 percent profit. After a number of soldiers were killed and maimed, young Morgan found himself temporarily in hot water. Thanks to Owen his penalty was the return of about half his profit!

Travellers' Reports

Information about Prussian schooling was brought to America by a series of travellers' reports published in the early nineteenth century. First was the report of John Griscom, whose book A Year in Europe (1819) highly praised the new Prussian schools. Griscom was read and admired by Thomas Jefferson and leading Americans whose intellectual patronage drew admirers into the net. Pestalozzi came into the centre of focus at about the same time through the letters of William Woodbridge to The American Journal of Education, letters which examined this strange man and his "humane" methods through friendly eyes. Another important chapter in this school build-up came from Henry Dwight, whose Travels in North Germany (1825) praised the new quasi-religious teacher seminaries in Prussia where prospective teachers were screened for correct attitudes toward the State.

The most influential report, however, was French philosopher Victor Cousin's to the French government in 1831. This account by Cousin, France's Minister of Education, explained the administrative organization of Prussian education in depth, dwelling at length on the system of people's schools and its far-reaching implications for the economy and social order. Cousin's essay applauded Prussia for discovering ways to contain the danger of a frightening new social phenomenon, the industrial proletariat. So convincing was his presentation that within two years of its publication, French national schooling was drastically reorganized to meet Prussian Volksschulen standards. French children could be stupefied as easily as German ones.

Across the Atlantic, a similar revolution took place in the brand new state of Michigan. Mimicking Prussian organization, heavily Germanic Michigan established the very first State Superintendancy of Education. With a state minister and state control entering all aspects of schooling, the only missing ingredient was compulsion legislation. On Cousin's heels came yet another influential report praising Prussian discipline and Prussian results, this time by the bearer of a prominent American name, the famous Calvin Stowe whose wife Harriet Beecher Stowe, conscience of the abolition movement, was author of its sacred text, Uncle Tom's Cabin. Stowe's report to the Ohio legislature attesting to Prussian superiority was widely distributed across the country, the Ohio group mailing out ten thousand copies and the legislatures of Massachusetts, Michigan, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, and Virginia each reprinting and distributing the document.

The third major testimonial to Prussian schooling came in the form of Horace Mann's Seventh Report to the Boston School Committee in 1843. Mann's Sixth Report, as noted
earlier, had been a paean to phrenology, the science of reading head bumps, which Mann argued was the only proper basis for curriculum design. The Seventh Report ranked Prussia first of all nations in schooling, England last. Pestalozzi's psychologically grounded form of pedagogy was specifically singled out for praise in each of the three influential reports I've recited, as was the resolutely non-intellectual subject matter of Prussian Volksschulen. Also praised were mild Pestalozzian discipline, grouping by age, multiple layers of supervision, and selective training for teachers. Wrote Mann, "There are many things there which we should do well to imitate."3

Mann's Report strongly recommended radical changes in reading instruction from the traditional alphabet system, which had made America literate, to Prussia's hieroglyphic-style technique. In a surprising way, this brought Mann's Report to general public attention because a group of Boston schoolmasters attacked his conclusions about the efficacy of the new reading method and a lively newspaper debate followed. Throughout nineteenth-century Prussia, its new form of education seemed to make that warlike nation prosper materially and militarily. While German science, philosophy, and military success seduced the whole world, thousands of prominent young Americans made the pilgrimage to Germany to study in its network of research universities, places where teaching and learning were always subordinate to investigations done on behalf of business and the state. Returning home with the coveted German Ph.D., those so degreed became university presidents and department heads, took over private industrial research bureaus, government offices, and the administrative professions. The men they subsequently hired for responsibility were those who found it morally agreeable to offer obeisance to the Prussian outlook, too; in this leveraged fashion the gradual takeover of American mental life managed itself.

For a century here, Germany seemed at the centre of everything civilized; nothing was so esoteric or commonplace it couldn't benefit from the application of German scientific procedure. Hegel, of Berlin University, even proposed historicism—history was a scientific subject, displaying a progressive linear movement toward some mysterious end. Elsewhere, Herbart and Fechner were applying mathematical principles to learning, Müller and Helmholtz were grafting physiology to behaviour in anticipation of the psychologised classroom, Fritsch and Hitzig were applying electrical stimulation to the brain to determine the relationship of brain functions to behaviour, and Germany itself was approaching its epiphany of unification under Bismarck.

When the spirit of Prussian pelotonfeuer crushed France in the lightning war of 1871, the world's attention focused intently on this hypnotic, utopian place. What could be seen to happen there was an impressive demonstration that endless production flowed from a Baconian liaison between government, the academic mind, and industry. Credit for Prussian success was widely attributed to its form of schooling. What lay far from casual view was the religious vision of a completely systematic universe which animated this Frankenstienian nation.

1Of the legendary Dwight family which bankrolled Horace Mann's forced schooling operation. Dwight was a distant ancestor of Dwight D. Eisenhower.

2This happened under the direction of William Pierce, a man as strange in his own way as Pestalozzi. Pierce had been a Unitarian minister around Rochester, New York, until he was forced to flee across the Great Lakes to escape personal harm during the anti-Masonic furore just before the first Jackson election. Pierce was accused of concealing a lodge of Illuminati behind the facade of his church. When his critics arrived with the tar and feathers, the great educator-to-be had already flown the coop to Michigan, his tools of illumination safely in his kit and a sneer of superior virtue on his noble lip. Some say a local lady of easy virtue betrayed the vigilante party to Pierce in exchange for a few pieces of Socinian silver, but I cannot confirm this reliably. How he came to be welcomed so warmly in Michigan and honoured with such a high position might be worth investigating.
The fact is Mann arrived in Prussia after the schools had closed for the summer, so that he never actually saw one in operation. This did nothing to dampen his enthusiasm, nor did he find it necessary to enlighten his readers to this interesting fact. I'll mention this again up ahead.

Finding Work For Intellectuals

The little North German state of Prussia had been described as "an army with a country," "a perpetually armed camp," "a gigantic penal institution." Even the built environment in Prussia was closely regimented: streets were made to run straight, town buildings and traffic were state-approved and regulated. Attempts were made to cleanse society of irregular elements like beggars, vagrants, and Gypsies, all this intended to turn Prussian society into "a huge human automaton" in the words of Hans Rosenberg. It was a state where scientific farming alternated with military drilling and with state-ordered meaningless tasks intended for no purpose but to subject the entire community to the experience of collective discipline—like fire drills in a modern junior high school or enforced silence during the interval between class periods. Prussia had become a comprehensive administrative utopia. It was Sparta reborn.

Administrative utopias spring out of the psychological emptiness which happens where firmly established communities are nonexistent and what social cohesion there is is weak and undependable. Utopias lurch into being when utopia happens best where there is no other social and political life around which seems attractive or even safe. The dream of state power refashioning countryside and people is powerful, especially compelling in times of insecurity where local leadership is inadequate to create a satisfying social order, as must have seemed the case in the waning decades of the nineteenth century. In particular, the growing intellectual classes began to resent their bondage to wealthy patrons, their lack of any truly meaningful function, their seeming overeducation for what responsibilities were available, their feelings of superfluousness. The larger national production grew on wheels and belts of steam power. The more it produced unprecedented surpluses, the greater became the number of intellectuals condemned to a parasitic role, and the more certain it became that some utopian experiment must come along to make work for these idle hands.

In such a climate it could not have seemed out of line to the new army of homeless men whose work was only endless thinking, to reorganize the entire world and to believe such a thing not impossible to attain. It was only a short step before associations of intellectuals began to consider it their duty to reorganize the world. It was then the clamour for universal forced schooling became strong. Such a need coincided with a corresponding need on the part of business to train the population as consumers rather than independent producers. In the last third of the nineteenth century, a loud call for popular education arose from princes of industry, from comfortable clergy, professional humanists and academic scientists, those who saw schooling as an instrument to achieve state and corporate purposes. Prior to 1870, the only countries where everybody was literate were Prussia, its tiny adjacent neighbour states in Nordic Scandinavia, and the United States. Despite all projects of the Enlightenment, of Napoleon, of the parliaments of England and Belgium and of revolutionaries like Cavour, the vast majority of Europeans could neither read nor write. It was not, of course, because they were stupid but because circumstances of their lives and cultures made literacy a luxury, sometimes even impossible.

Steam and coal provided the necessary funds for establishing and maintaining great national systems of elementary schooling. Another influence was the progressivism of the liberal impulse, never more evident than in the presence of truly unprecedented abundance. Yes, it was true that to create that abundance it became necessary to uproot millions from their traditional habitats and habits, but one's conscience could be saved by saying that popular schooling would offer, in time, compensations for the proletariat. In any case, no one doubted Francois Guizot's epigram: "The opening of every schoolhouse closes a jail."
For the enlightened classes, popular education after Prussia became a sacred cause, one meriting crusading zeal. In 1868, Hungary announced compulsion schooling; in 1869, Austria; in 1872, the famous Prussian system was nationalized to all the Germanies; 1874, Switzerland; 1877, Italy; 1878, Holland; 1879, Belgium. Between 1878 and 1882, it became France's turn. School was made compulsory for British children in 1880. No serious voice except Tolstoy's questioned what was happening, and that Russian nobleman-novelist-mystic was easily ignored. Best known to the modern reader for War and Peace, Tolstoy is equally penetrating in The Kingdom of God Is Within You, in which he viewed such problems through the lens of Christianity. The school movement was strongest in Western and Northern Europe, the ancient lands of the Protestant Reformation, much weaker in Catholic Central and Southern Europe, virtually nonexistent at first in the Orthodox East. Enthusiasm for schooling is closely correlated with a nation's intensity in mechanical industry, and that closely correlated with its natural heritage of coal. One result passed over too quickly in historical accounts of school beginnings is the provision for a quasi-military non-commissioned officer corps of teachers, and a staff-grade corps of administrators to oversee the mobilized children. One consequence unexpected by middle classes (though perhaps not so unexpected to intellectual elites) was a striking increase in gullibility among well-schooled masses.

Jacques Ellul is the most compelling analyst of this awful phenomenon, in his canonical essay Propaganda. He fingers schooling as an unparalleled propaganda instrument; if a schoolbook prints it and a teacher affirms it, who is so bold as to demur?

The Technology Of Subjection

Administrative utopias are a peculiar kind of dreaming by those in power, driven by an urge to arrange the lives of others, organizing them for production, combat, or detention. The operating principles of administrative utopia are hierarchy, discipline, regimentation, strict order, rational planning, a geometrical environment, a production line, a cellblock, and a form of welfarism. Government schools and some private schools pass such parameters with flying colours. In one sense, administrative utopias are laboratories for exploring the technology of subjection and as such belong to a precise subdivision of pornographic art: total surveillance and total control of the helpless. The aim and mode of administrative utopia is to bestow order and assistance on an unwilling population: to provide its clothing and food. To schedule it. In a masterpiece of cosmic misjudgement, the phrenologist George Combe wrote Horace Mann on November 14, 1843:

The Prussian and Saxon governments by means of their schools and their just laws and rational public administration are doing a good deal to bring their people into a rational and moral condition. It is pretty obvious to thinking men that a few years more of this cultivation will lead to the development of free institutions in Germany.

Earlier that year, on May 21, 1843, Mann had written to Combe: "I want to find out what are the results, as well as the workings of the famous Prussian system." Just three years earlier, with the election of Marcus Morton as governor of Massachusetts, a serious challenge had been presented to Mann and to his Board of Education and the air of Prussianism surrounding it and its manufacturer/politician friends. A House committee was directed to look into the new Board of Education and its plan to undertake a teachers college with $10,000 put up by industrialist Edmund Dwight. Four days after its assignment, the majority reported out a bill to kill the board!

Discontinue the Normal School experiment, it said, and give Dwight his money back: If then the Board has any actual power, it is a dangerous power, touching directly upon the rights and duties of the Legislature; if it has no power, why continue its existence at an annual expense to the commonwealth?
But the House committee did more; it warned explicitly that this board, dominated by a Unitarian majority of 7–5 (although Unitarians comprised less than 1 percent of the state), really wanted to install a Prussian system of education in Massachusetts, to put "a monopoly of power in a few hands, contrary in every respect to the true spirit of our democratical institutions." The vote of the House on this was the single greatest victory of Mann's political career, one for which he and his wealthy friends called in every favour they were owed. The result was 245 votes to continue, 182 votes to discontinue, and so the House voted to overturn the recommendations of its own committee. A 32-vote swing might have given us a much different twentieth century than the one we saw.

Although Mann's own letters and diaries are replete with attacks on orthodox religionists as enemies of government schooling, an examination of the positive vote reveals that from the outset the orthodox churches were among Mann's staunchest allies. Mann had general support from Congregational, Presbyterian, and Baptist clergymen. At this early stage they were completely unaware of the doom secular schooling would spell out for their denominations. They had been seduced into believing school was a necessary insurance policy to deal with incoming waves of Catholic immigration from Ireland and Germany, the cheap labour army which as early as 1830 had been talked about in business circles and eagerly anticipated as an answer to America's production problems.

The reason Germany, and not England, provided the original model for America's essay into compulsion schooling may be that Mann, while in Britain, had had a shocking experience in English class snobbery which left him reeling. Boston Common, he wrote, with its rows of mottled sycamore trees, gravel walks, and frog ponds was downright embarrassing compared with any number of stately English private grounds furnished with stag and deer, fine arboreums of botanical specimens from faraway lands, marble floors better than the table tops at home, portraits, tapestries, giant gold-frame mirrors. The ballroom in the Bulfinch house in Boston would be a butler's pantry in England, he wrote. When Mann visited Stafford House of the Duke of Cumberland, he went into culture shock:

Convicts on treadmills provide the energy to pump water for fountains. I have seen equipages, palaces, and the regalia of royalty side by side with beggary, squalidness, and degradation in which the very features of humanity were almost lost in those of the brute.

For this great distinction between the stratified orders of society, Mann held the Anglican church to blame. "Give me America with all its rawness and want. We have aristocracy enough at home and here I trace its foundations." Shocked from his English experience, Mann virtually willed that Prussian schools would provide him with answers, says his biographer Jonathan Messerli.

Mann arrived in Prussia when its schools were closed for vacation. He toured empty classrooms, spoke with authorities, interviewed vacationing schoolmasters, and read piles of dusty official reports. Yet from this nonexperience he claimed to come away with a strong sense of the professional competence of Prussian teachers!

All "admirably qualified and full of animation!" His wife Mary, of the famous Peabodys, wrote home: "We have not seen a teacher with a book in his hand in all Prussia; no, not one!" (emphasis added)

This wasn't surprising, for they hardly saw teachers at all.

Equally impressive, he wrote, was the wonderful obedience of children; these German kinder had "innate respect for superior years." The German teacher corps? "The finest collection of men I have ever seen—full of intelligence, dignity, benevolence, kindness and bearing...." Never, says Mann, did he witness "an instance of harshness and severity. All is kind, encouraging, animating, sympathizing." On the basis of imagining this miraculous vision of exactly the Prussia he wanted to see, Mann made a special plea for changes in the teaching
of reading. He criticized the standard American practice of beginning with the alphabet and moving to syllables, urging his readers to consider the superior merit of teaching entire words from the beginning. "I am satisfied," he said, "our greatest error in teaching lies in beginning with the alphabet."

The heart of Mann's most famous Report to the Boston School Committee, the legendary Seventh, rings a familiar theme in American affairs. It seems even then we were falling behind! This time, behind the Prussians in education. In order to catch up, it was mandatory to create a professional corps of teachers and a systematic curriculum, just as the Prussians had. Mann fervently implored the board to accept his prescription...while there was still time! The note of hysteria is a drum roll sounding throughout Mann's entire career; together with the vilification of his opponents, it constitutes much of Mann's spiritual signature.

That fall, the Association of Masters of the Boston Public Schools published its 150-page rebuttal of Mann's Report. It attacked the normal schools proposal as a vehicle for propaganda for Mann's "hot bed theories, in which the projectors have disregarded experience and observation." It belittled his advocacy of phrenology and charged Mann with attempting to excite the prejudices of the ignorant. Its second attack was against the teacher-centred nonbook presentations of Prussian classrooms, insisting the psychological result of these was to break student potential "for forming the habit of independent and individual effort." The third attack was against the "word method" in teaching reading, and in defence of the traditional alphabet method. Lastly, it attacked Mann's belief that interest was a better motivator to learning than discipline: "Duty should come first and pleasure should grow out of the discharge of it." Thus was framed a profound conflict between the old world of the Puritans and the new psychological strategy of the Germans.

The German/American Reichsbank

Sixty years later, amid a well-coordinated attempt on the part of industrialists and financiers to transfer power over money and interest rates from elected representatives of the American people to a "Federal Reserve" of centralized private banking interests, George Reynolds, president of the American Bankers Association, rose before an audience on September 13, 1909, to declare himself flatly in favour of a central bank modelled after the German Reichsbank. As he spoke, the schools of the United States were being forcibly rebuilt on Prussian lines.

On September 14, 1909, in Boston, the president of the United States, William Howard Taft, instructed the country that it should "take up seriously" the problem of establishing a centralized bank on the German model. As The Wall Street Journal put it, an important step in the education of Americans would soon be taken to translate the "realm of theory" into "practical politics," in pedagogy as well as finance. Dramatic, symbolic evidence of what was working deep in the bowels of the school institution surfaced in 1935. At the University of Chicago's experimental high school, the head of the Social Science department, Howard C. Hill, published an inspirational textbook, The Life and Work of the Citizen. It is decorated throughout with the fasces, symbol of the Fascist movement, an emblem binding government and corporation together as one entity. Mussolini had landed in America. The fasces are strange hybridized images, one might almost say Americanized. The bundle of sticks wrapped around a two-headed axe, the classic Italian Fascist image, has been decisively altered. Now the sticks are wrapped around a sword. They appear on the spine of this high school text, on the decorative page introducing Part One, again on a similar page for Part Two, and are repeated on Part Three and Part Four as well. There are also fierce, military eagles hovering above those pages. The strangest decoration of all faces the title page, a weird interlock of hands and wrists which, with only a few slight alterations of its structural members, would be a living swastika.1 The legend announces it as representing the "united strength" of Law, Order, Science, and the Trades. Where the strength of America had been traditionally located in our First Amendment guarantee of argument, now the
Prussian connection was shifting the focus of attention in school to cooperation, with both working and professional classes sandwiched between the watchful eye of Law and Order. Prussia had entrenched itself deep into the bowels of American institutional schooling. Interestingly enough, several versions of this book exist—although no indication that this is so appears on the copyright page. In one of these versions the familiar totalitarian symbols are much more pronounced than in the others.

...By 1776 the theocratic utopia toward which such a principle moves, was well established in the Britain of the German Georges, as well as in the three North German states of Prussia, Saxony, and Hanover. Together with England, all three were to play an important role in twentieth-century forced schooling in America...

Chapter nine

On the night of June 9, 1834, a group of prominent men "chiefly engaged in commerce" gathered privately in a Boston drawing room to discuss a scheme of universal schooling. Secretary of this meeting was William Ellery Channing, Horace Mann's own minister as well as an international figure and the leading Unitarian of his day. The location of the meeting house is not entered in the minutes nor are the names of the assembly's participants apart from Channing. Even though the literacy rate in Massachusetts was 98 percent, and in neighbouring Connecticut, 99.8 percent, the assembled businessmen agreed the present system of schooling allowed too much to depend upon chance. It encouraged more entrepreneurial exuberance than the social system could bear. – The minutes of this meeting are Appleton Papers collection, Massachusetts Historical Society

Frederick W. Taylor

The first man on record to perceive how much additional production could be extracted from close regulation of labour was Frederick Winslow Taylor, son of a wealthy Philadelphia lawyer. "What I demand of the worker," Taylor said, "is not to produce any longer by his own initiative, but to execute punctiliously the orders given down to their minutest details."

The Taylors, a prominent Quaker family from Germantown, Pennsylvania, had taken Freddy to Europe for three years from 1869 to 1872, where he was attending an aristocratic German academy when von Moltke's Prussian blitzkrieg culminated in the French disaster at Sedan and a German Empire was finally proclaimed, ending a thousand years of disunion. Prussian schooling was the widely credited forge which made those miracles possible. The jubilation which spread through Germany underlined a presumably fatal difference between political systems which disciplined with ruthless efficiency, like Prussia's socialist paradise, and those devoted to whimsy and luxury, like France's. The lesson wasn't lost on little Fred.

Near the conclusion of his Principles of Scientific Management 1 (1911), published thirty-nine years later, Taylor summarized the new managerial discipline as follows:

A regimen of science, not rule of thumb.

An emphasis on harmony, not the discord of competition.

An insistence on cooperation, not individualism.

A fixation on maximum output.

The development of each man to his greatest productivity.

Taylor's biographers, Wrege and Greenwood, wrote:
He left us a great legacy. Frederick Taylor advanced a total system of management, one which he built from pieces taken from numerous others whom he rarely would credit. His genius lies in being a missionary.

After Taylor's death in 1915, the Frederick W. Taylor Cooperators were formed to project his Scientific Management movement into the future. Frank Copley called Taylor "a man whose heart was aflame with missionary zeal." Much about this Quaker-turned-Unitarian, who married into an Arbella-descended Puritan family before finally becoming an Episcopalian, bears decisively on the shape schooling took in this country. Wrege and Greenwood describe him as: "often arrogant, somewhat caustic, and inflexible in how his system should be implemented....Taylor was cerebral; like a machine he was polished and he was also intellectual....Taylor's brilliant reasoning was marred when he attempted to articulate it, for his delivery was often demeaning, even derogatory at times."

Frank Gilbreth's2 Motion Study says:

It is the never ceasing marvel concerning this man that age cannot wither nor custom stale his work. After many a weary day's study the investigator awakes from a dream of greatness to find he has only worked out a new proof for a problem Taylor has already solved. Time study, the instruction card, functional foremanship, the differential rate piece method of compensation, and numerous other scientifically derived methods of decreasing costs and increasing output and wages—these are by no means his only contributions to standardizing the trades.

To fully grasp the effect of Taylor's industrial evangelism on American national schooling, you need to listen to him play teacher in his own words to Schmidt at Bethlehem Steel in the 1890s:

Now Schmidt, you are a first-class pig-iron handler and know your business well. You have been handling at a rate of twelve and a half tons per day. I have given considerable study to handling pig-iron, and feel you could handle forty-seven tons of pig-iron per day if you really tried instead of twelve and a half tons.

Skeptical but willing, Schmidt started to work, and all day long, and at regular intervals, was told by the men who stood over him with a watch, "now pick up a pig and walk. Now sit down and rest. Now walk—rest," etc. He worked when he was told to work, and rested when he was told to rest, and at half past five in the afternoon had his forty-seven tons loaded on the car.

The incident described above is, incidentally, a fabrication. There was no Schmidt except in Taylor's mind, just as there was no close observation of Prussian schools by Mann. Below, he testifies before Congress in 1912:

There is a right way of forcing the shovel into materials and many wrong ways. Now, the way to shovel refractory stuff is to press the forearm hard against the upper part of the right leg just below the thigh, like this, take the end of the shovel in your right hand and when you push the shovel into the pile, instead of using the muscular effort of the arms, which is tiresome, throw the weight of your body on the shovel like this; that pushes your shovel in the pile with hardly any exertion and without tiring the arms in the least.

Harlow Person called Taylor's approach to the simplest tasks of working life "a meaningful and fundamental break with the past." Scientific management, or Taylorism, had four characteristics designed to make the worker "an interchangeable part of an interchangeable machine making interchangeable parts."

Since each quickly found its analogue in scientific schooling, let me show them to you:3

1) A mechanically controlled work pace;
2) The repetition of simple motions;

3) Tools and technique selected for the worker;

4) Only superficial attention is asked from the worker, just enough to keep up with the moving line. The connection of all to school procedure is apparent.

"In the past," Taylor wrote, "Man has been first. In the future the system must be first." It was not sufficient to have physical movements standardized; the standardized worker "must be happy in his work," too, therefore his thought processes also must be standardized.4

Scientific management was applied wholesale in American industry in the decade after 1910. It spread quickly to schools.

In the preface to the classic study on the effects of scientific management on schooling in America, *Education and the Cult of Efficiency*,5 Raymond Callahan explains that when he set out to write, his intent was to explore the origin and development of business values in educational administration, an occurrence he tracks to about 1900.

Callahan wanted to know why school administrators had adopted business practices and management parameters of assessment when "Education is not a business. The school is not a factory."

Could the inappropriate procedure be explained simply by a familiar process in which ideas and values flow from high-status groups to those of lesser distinction? As Callahan put it, "It does not take profound knowledge of American education to know that educators are, and have been, a relatively low-status, low-power group." But the degree of intellectual domination shocked him:

What was unexpected was the extent, not only of the power of business-industrial groups, but of the strength of the business ideology...and the extreme weakness and vulnerability of school administrators. I had expected more professional autonomy and I was completely unprepared for the extent and degree of capitulation by administrators to whatever demands were made upon them. I was surprised and then dismayed to learn how many decisions they made or were forced to make, not on educational grounds, but as a means of appeasing their critics in order to maintain their positions in the school. [emphasis added]

1The actual term "scientific management" was created by famous lawyer Louis Brandeis in 1910 for the Interstate Commerce Commission rate hearings. Brandeis understood thoroughly how a clever phrase could control public imagination.

2Gilbreth, the man who made the term "industrial engineering" familiar to the public, was a devotee of Taylorism. His daughter wrote a best seller about the Gilbreth home, *Cheaper By The Dozen*, in which her father's penchant for refining work processes is recalled. Behind his back, Taylor ran Gilbreth down as a "fakir."

3List adapted from Melvin Kranzberg and Joseph Gies, *By the Sweat of Thy Brow*.

4Taylor was no garden-variety fanatic. He won the national doubles tennis title in 1881 with a racket of his own design, and pioneered slip-on shoes (to save time, of course). Being happy in your work was the demand of Bellamy and other leading socialist thinkers, otherwise you would have to be "adjusted" (hence the expression "well-adjusted"). Taylor concurred.

5Callahan's analysis why schoolmen are always vulnerable is somewhat innocent and ivory tower, and his recommendation for reform—to effectively protect their revenue stream from
criticism on the part of the public—is simply tragic; but his gathering of data is matchless and his judgment throughout in small matters and large is consistently illuminating.

The Adoption Of Business Organization By Schools

In 1903, *The Atlantic Monthly* called for adoption of business organization by schools and William C. Bagley identified the ideal teacher as one who would rigidly "hew to the line." Bagley's ideal school was a place strictly reduced to rigid routine; he repeatedly stressed in his writing a need for "unquestioned obedience."

Before 1900, school boards were large, clumsy organizations, with a seat available to represent every interest (they often had thirty to fifty members). A great transformation was engineered in the first decade of the twentieth century, however, and after 1910 they were dominated by businessmen, lawyers, real estate men, and politicians.

Business pressure extended from the kindergarten rung of the new school ladder all the way into the German-inspired teacher training schools. *The Atlantic Monthly* approved what it had earlier asked for, saying in 1910, "Our universities are beginning to run as business colleges."

Successful industrial leaders were featured regularly in the press, holding forth on their success but seldom attributing it to book learning or scholarship. Carnegie, self-educated in libraries, appears in his writings and public appearances as the leading school critic of the day; echoing Carnegie, the governor of Michigan welcomed an NEA convention to Detroit with his injunction: "The demand of the age is for practical education." The State Superintendent of Public Instruction in Michigan followed the governor:

The character of our education must change with the oncoming of the years of this highly practical age. We have educated the mind to think and trained the vocal organs to express the thought, and we have forgotten the fact that in four times out of five the practical man expresses his thought by the hand rather than by mere words.

Something was cooking. The message was clear: academic education had become a strange kind of national emergency, just as had been prophesied by the Department of Education's *Circular of Information* in 1871 and 1872. Twenty years later Francis Parker praised the elite Committee of Ten under Harvard president Charles Eliot for rejecting "tracking," the practice of school class assignment based upon future social destination. The committee had come down squarely for common schools, an ideal that Parker said was "worth all the pains necessary to produce the report. The conclusion is that there should be no such thing as class education." Parker had noticed the start of an attempt to provide common people with only partial education. He was relieved it had been turned back. Or so he thought.

The pronouncements of the Committee of Ten turned out to be the last gasp of the common school notion apart from Fourth of July rhetoric. The common school was being buried by the determination of new tycoon-class businessmen to see the demise of an older democratic-republican order and its dangerous libertarian ideals. If "educators," as they were self-consciously beginning to refer to themselves, had any misunderstanding of what was expected by 1910, NEA meetings of that year were specifically designed to clear them up. Attendees were told the business community had judged their work to date to be "theoretical, visionary, and impractical":

All over the country our courses are being attacked and the demand for revision is along the line of fitting mathematical teaching to the needs of the masses.

In 1909, Leonard Ayres charged in *Laggards in Our Schools* that although these institutions were filled with "retarded children," school programs were, alas, "fitted...to the unusually
bright one." Ayres invented means for measuring the efficiency of school systems by computing the dropout/holdover rate—a game still in evidence today.

This was begging the question with a vengeance but no challenge to this assessment was ever raised.

Taylor's system of management efficiency was being formally taught at Harvard and Dartmouth by 1910. In the next year, 219 articles on the subject appeared in magazines, hundreds more followed: by 1917 a bibliography of 550 school management-science references was available from a Boston publisher. As the steel core of school reform, scientific management enjoyed national recognition. It was the main topic at the 1913 convention of the Department of Superintendence. Paul Hanus, professor of education at Harvard, launched a series of books for the World Book Company under the title School Efficiency Series, and famous muckraker J.M. Rice published his own Scientific Management in Education in 1913, showing local "ward" schooling an arena of low-lives and grifters.

Frederick Taylor's influence was not limited to America; it soon circled the globe. Principles of Scientific Management spread the efficiency mania over Europe, Japan, and China. A letter to the editor of The Nation in 1911 gives the flavour of what was happening:

I am tired of scientific management, so-called. I have heard of it from scientific managers, from university presidents, from casual acquaintances in railway trains; I have read of it in the daily papers, the weekly paper, the ten-cent magazine, and in the Outlook. I have only missed its treatment by Theodore Roosevelt; but that is probably because I cannot keep up with his writings. For 15 years I have been a subscriber to a magazine dealing with engineering matters, feeling it incumbent on me to keep in touch but the touch has become a pressure, the pressure a crushing strain, until the mass of articles on shop practice and scientific management threatened to crush all thought out of my brain, and I stopped my subscription.

In an article from Izvestia dated April 1918, Lenin urged the system upon Russians. His jargon-enriched Classroom Management (1907) was reprinted thirty times in the next 20 years as a teacher training text. Bagley's metaphors drawn from big business can fairly be said to have controlled the pedagogical imagination for the entire twentieth century.

The Ford System And The Kronstadt Commune

"An anti-intellectual, a hater of individuals," is the way Richard Stites characterizes Taylor in Revolutionary Dreams, his book on the utopian beginning of the Soviet Era. Says Stites, "His system is the basis for virtually every twisted dystopia in our century, from death under the Gas Bell in Zamiatin's We for the unspeakable crime of deviance, to the maintenance of a fictitious state-operated underground in Orwell's 1984 in order to draw deviants into disclosing who they are."

Oddly enough, an actual scheme of dissident entrapment was the brainchild of J.P. Morgan, his unique contribution to the Cecil Rhodes–inspired "Round Table" group. Morgan contended that revolution could be subverted permanently by infiltrating the underground and subsidizing it. In this way the thinking of the opposition could be known as it developed and fatally compromised. Corporate, government, and foundation cash grants to subversives might be one way to derail the train of insurrection that Hegelian theory predicted would arise against every ruling class.

As this practice matured, the insights of Fabian socialism were stirred into the mix; gradually a socialist levelling through practices pioneered in Bismarck's Prussia came to be seen as the most efficient control system for the masses. For the rest, an invigorating system of laissez-faire market competition would keep the advanced breeding stock on its toes.
A large portion of the intellectual Left jumped on Taylor's bandwagon, even as labour universally opposed it. Lenin himself was an aggressive advocate:

The war taught us much, not only that people suffered, but especially the fact that those who have the best technology, organization, discipline and the best machines emerge on top; it is this the war has taught us. It is essential to learn that without machines, without discipline, it is impossible to live in modern society. It is necessary to master the highest technology or be crushed.

But even in Russia, workers resisted Taylorish methods. The rebellion of the Kronstadt Commune in 1921 charged that Bolsheviks were "planning to introduce the sweat labour system of Taylor." They were right.

Taylor distilled the essence of Bismarck's Prussian school training under whose regimen he had witnessed firsthand the defeat of France in 1871. His American syntheses of these disciplines made him the direct inspiration for Henry Ford and "Fordism." Between 1895 and 1915, Ford radically transformed factory procedure, relying on Taylorized management and a mass production assembly line marked by precision, continuity, coordination, speed, and standardization. Ford wrote two extraordinary essays in the 1920s, "The Meaning of Time," and "Machinery, The New Messiah," in which he equated planning, timing, precision, and the rest of the scientific management catalogue with the great moral meaning of life:

A clean factory, clean tools, accurate gauges, and precise methods of manufacture produce a smooth working efficient machine [just as] clean thinking, clean living, and square dealing make for a decent home life.

By the 1920s, the reality of the Ford system paralleled the rules of a Prussian infantry regiment. Both were places where workers were held under close surveillance, kept silent, and punished for small infractions. Ford was unmoved by labour complaints. Men were disposable cogs in his machine. "A great business is really too big to be human," he commented in 1929. Fordism and Taylorism swept the Soviet Union as they had swept the United States and Western Europe. By the 1920s the words fordizatsiya and teilorizatsiya, both appellations describing good work habits, were common across Russia.

The National Press Attack On Academic Schooling

In May of 1911, the first salvo of a sustained national press attack on the academic ambitions of public schooling was fired. For the previous ten years the idea of school as an oasis of mental development built around a common, high-level curriculum had been steadily undermined by the rise of educational psychology and its empty-child/elastic-child hypotheses. Psychology was a business from the first, an aggressive business lobbying for jobs and school contracts. But resistance of parents, community groups, and students themselves to the new psychologised schooling was formidable.

As the summer of 1911 approached, the influential Educational Review gave educators something grim to muse upon as they prepared to clean out their desks: "Must definite reforms with measurable results be foresworn," it asked, "that an antiquated school system may grind out useless produce?" The magazine demanded quantifiable proof of school's contributions to society—or education should have its budget cut. The article, titled "An Economic Measure of School Efficiency," charged that "The advocate of pure water or clean streets shows by how much the death rate will be altered with each proposed addition to his share of the budget—only a teacher is without such figures." An editorial in Ladies Home Journal reported that dissatisfaction with schools was increasing, claiming "On every hand signs are evident of a widely growing distrust of the effectiveness of the present educational system..." In Providence, the school board was criticized by the local press for declaring a holiday on the Monday preceding Decoration Day to allow a four-day vacation. "This cost the public $5,000 in loss of possible returns on the money invested," readers were informed.
Suddenly school critics were everywhere. A major assault was mounted in two popular journals, *Saturday Evening Post* and *Ladies Home Journal*, with millions each in circulation, both read by leaders of the middle classes. The Post sounded the anti-intellectual theme this way:

"Miltonized, Chaucerized, Vergilized, Shillered, physicked and chemicaled, the high school ....should be of no use in the world–particularly the business world."

Three heavy punches in succession came from *Ladies Home Journal*: "The case of Seventeen Million Children–Is Our Public-School System Providing an Utter Failure?" This declaration would seem difficult to top, but the second article did just that: "Is the Public School a Failure? It Is: The Most Momentous Failure in Our American Life Today." And a third, written by the principal of a New York City high school, went even further. Entitled "The Danger of Running a Fool Factory," it made this point: that education is "permeated with errors and hypocrisy,"

While the Dean of Columbia Teachers College, James E. Russell added that "If school cannot be made to drop its mental development obsession the whole system should be abolished."

The Fabian Spirit (My Note. I cover the Fabian Society again at the beginning of book three)

To speak of scientific management in school and society without crediting the influence of the Fabians would do great disservice to truth, but the nature of Fabianism is so complex it raises questions this essay cannot answer. To deal with the Fabians in a brief compass as I'm going to do is to deal necessarily in simplifications in order to see a little how this charming group of scholars, writers, heirs, heiresses, scientists, philosophers, bombazines, gazebos, trust-fund babies, and successful men and women of affairs became the most potent force in the creation of the modern welfare state, distributors of its characteristically dumbed-down version of schooling. Yet pointing only to this often frivolous organization's eccentricity would be to disrespect the incredible accomplishments of Beatrice Webb and her associates, and their decisive effort on schooling. Mrs. Webb is the only woman ever deemed worthy of burial in Westminster Abbey.

What nineteenth-century Transcendentalists and Muggletonians hoped to be in reordering the triumvirate of society, school, and family, twentieth-century Fabians actually were. Although far from the only potent organization working behind the scenes to radically reshape domestic and international life, it would not be too far out of line to call the twentieth century the Fabian century. One thing is certain: the direction of modern schooling for the bottom 90 percent of our society has followed a largely Fabian design–and the puzzling security and prestige enjoyed at the moment by those who speak of "globalism" and "multiculturalism" are a direct result of heed paid earlier to Fabian prophecies that a welfare state, followed by an intense focus on internationalism, would be the mechanism elevating corporate society over political society, and a necessary precursor to utopia. Fabian theory is the *Das Kapital* of financial capitalism.

Fabianism always floated above simplistic politics, seeking to preempt both sides. The British Labour Party and its post-WWII welfare state are Fabianism made visible. This is well understood; not so easily comprehended are signs of an aristocratic temper–like this little anti-meritocratic Fabian gem found in a report of the British College of Surgeons:

Medicine would lose immeasurably if the proportion of such students [from upper-class and upper-middle-class homes] were to be reduced in favour of precocious children who qualify for subsidies [i.e., scholarship students].

Even though meritocracy is their reliable cover, social stratification was always the Fabian's real trump suit.
Entitlements are another Fabian insertion into the social fabric, even though the idea antedates them, of course.

To realize the tremendous task Fabians originally assigned themselves (a significant part of which was given to schooling to perform), we need to reflect again on Darwin's shattering books, *The Origin of Species* (1859) and *The Descent of Man* (1871), each arguing in its own way that far from being blank slates, children are written upon indelibly by their race of origin, some "favoured" in Darwin's language, some not. A powerful public relations initiative of recent years has attempted to separate Darwin from "social Darwinism," but it cannot be done because Darwin himself is the prototypical social Darwinist. Both books taken together issued a license for liberal upper classes to justify forced schooling. From an evolutionary perspective, schools are the indoctrination phase of a gigantic breeding experiment. Working-class fantasies of "self-improvement" were dismissed from the start as sentimentality that evolutionary theory had no place for.

What Darwin accomplished with his books was a freeing of discussion from the narrow straitjacket it had worn when society was considered a matter of internal associations and relationships. Darwin made it possible to consider political affairs as a prime instrument of social evolution. Here was a pivotal moment in Western thought, a changing of the guard in which secular purpose replaced religious purpose, long before trashed by the Enlightenment.

For the poor, the working classes, and middle classes in the American sense, this change in outlook, lauded by the most influential minds of the nineteenth century, was a catastrophe of titanic proportions, especially for government schoolchildren. Children could no longer simply be parents' darlings. Many were (biologically) a racial menace. The rest had to be thought of as soldiers in genetic combat, the moral equivalent of war. For all but a relative handful of favoured families, aspiration was off the board as a scientific proposition.

For governments, children could no longer be considered individuals but were regarded as categories, rungs on a biological ladder. Evolutionary science pronounced the majority useless mouths waiting for nature to dispense with entirely. Nature (as expressed through her human agents) was to be understood not as cruel or oppressive but beautifully, functionally purposeful—a neo-pagan perspective to be reflected in the organization and administration of schools.

Three distinct and conflicting tendencies competed in the nineteenth-century theory of society: first was the empirical tendency stemming from John Locke and David Hume which led to that outlook on the study of society we call pragmatism, and eventually to behaviouristic psychology; the second line descended from Immanuel Kant, Hegel, Savigny, and others and led to the organic theory of the modern state, the preferred metaphor of Fabians (and many later systems theorists); the third outlook comes to us out of Rousseau, Diderot, d'Alembert, Bentham, the Mills, and leads almost directly to the utilitarian state of Marxist socialism. Each of these postures was savagely assailed over time by the development of academic Darwinism. After Darwin, utopia as a human-friendly place dies an agonizing death. The last conception of utopia after Darwin which isn't some kind of hellish nightmare is William Morris' *News from Nowhere*.

With only niggling reservations, the Fabian brain trust had no difficulty employing force to shape recalcitrant individuals, groups, and organizations. Force in the absence of divine injunctions is a tool to be employed unsentimentally. Fabian George Bernard Shaw established the principle wittily in 1920 when he said that under a Fabian future government:

You would not be allowed to be poor. You would be forcibly fed, clothed, lodged, taught, and employed whether you like it or not. If it were discovered that you have not character and
industry, you might possibly be executed in a kindly manner. - The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism

Fabianism came into existence around the year 1884, taking its name from Roman general Fabius Cunctator8 who preserved the Roman state by defeating Hannibal, chipping away at Hannibal's patience and will to win by avoiding combat. Darwin was the weird holy man Fabians adored, the man who gave them their principle, a theory inspirationally equal to god-theory, around which a new organization of society could be justified.

Society, after Darwin, was incontrovertibly about good breeding. That was the only true goal it had, or scientifically could have. Before Darwin, the view of historical development which fit best with Anglo/American tradition was a conception of individual rights independent of any theory of reciprocal obligations to the State; the duty of leaders was to Society, not to Government, a crucial distinction in perfect harmony with the teachings of Reformation Christianity, which extended to all believers a conception of individual duty, individual responsibility, and a free will right to decide for oneself beyond any claims of states. John Calvin proclaimed in his Institutes that through natural law, the judgment of conscience alone was able to distinguish between justice and injustice. It's hard for secular minds to face, but the powerful freedoms of the West, unmatched by any other society at any other time, are rooted deeply in a religion so radical, so demanding it revolts the modern temper. For Protestant Christians, salvation was uniquely a matter between God and the individual. The mind of northern Europe had for centuries been fixed on the task of winning liberties for the individual against the State. Notable individual freedoms were taken from the State beginning symbolically at Runnymede9 in 1215. By 1859, six and a half centuries later, in the Age of Darwin, individual rights were everywhere in the Anglo-Saxon world understood to transcend theories of obligation to the State. Herbert Spencer embodies this attitude, albeit ambiguously. For Spencer, Darwinian evolution promised rights only to the strong. It is well to keep in mind that his brief for liberty masks a rigorously exclusionary philosophy, particularly when he sounds most like Thomas Paine. The first and second amendments of our own constitution illustrate just how far this freedom process could carry. Say what you please before God and Man; protect yourself with a gun if need be from government interference.

Spencer was the reigning British philosopher from 1870 to 1900. In the Westminster Review of January 1860, he wrote: "The welfare of citizens cannot rightly be sacrificed to some supposed benefit of the State, the State is to be maintained solely for the benefit of citizens.10 The corporate life in society must be subservient to the lives of its parts, instead of the lives of the parts being subservient to the corporate life." Spencer had an even greater vogue in America, influencing every intellectual from Walt Whitman to John Dewey and becoming the darling of corporate business. Early in 1882 a grand dinner was held in his honour by the great and powerful who gathered to hear scientific proof of Anglo-Saxon fitness for rule–and a brief for moral relativism. This dinner and its implications set the standard for twentieth-century management, including the management of schooling. A clear appraisal of the fateful meal and its resonance is given in E. Digby Baltzell's The Protestant Establishment, a well-bred look at the resurgence of the Anglican outlook in America.

This attitude constituted a violent contradiction of German strong-state, state-as-first-parent doctrine which held that interests of the individual as individual are without significance. But derogation of individual rights was entirely consistent with Darwinian science. The German authoritarian preference received an invigorating restorative with Darwin's advent. Natural selection, the operational principle of Darwinism, was held to reach individuals only indirectly—through the action of society. Hence society becomes a natural subject for regulation and intervention by the State.

To illustrate how reverberant a drum the innocent-sounding locution "natural selection"11 can really be, translated into social practice, try to imagine how denial of black dignities
and rights and the corresponding degradation of black family relationships in America because of this denial, might well be reckoned an evolutionarily positive course, in Darwinian terms. By discouraging Negro breeding, eventually the numbers of this most disfavoured race would diminish. The state not only had a vested interest in becoming an active agent of evolution, it could not help but become one, willy-nilly. Fabians set out to write a sensible evolutionary agenda when they entered the political arena. Once this biopolitical connection is recognized, the past, present, and future of this seemingly bumbling movement takes on a formidable coherence. Under the dottiness, lovability, intelligence, high social position, and genuine goodness of some of their works, the system held out as humanitarian by Fabians is grotesquely deceptive; in reality, Fabian compassion masks a real aloofness to humanity. It is purely an intellectual project in scientific management.

Thomas Davidson's *History of Education* seen through this lens transmutes in front of our eyes from the harmlessly addled excursion into romantic futurism it seems to be into a manual of frightening strategic goals and tactical methods. Fabians emerged in the first years of the twentieth century as great champions of social efficiency in the name of the evolutionary destiny of the race. This infused a powerful secular theology into the movement, allowing its members to revel privately in an ennobling destiny. The Fabian program spread quickly through the best colleges and universities under many different names, multiplying its de facto membership among young men and women blissfully unaware of their induction. They were only being modern. H.G. Wells called it "the open conspiracy" in an essay bearing the same title, and worth your time to track down.

As the movement developed, Fabians became aristocratic friends of other social-efficiency vanguards like Taylorism or allies of the Methodist social gospel crowd of liberal Christian religionists busy substituting Works for Faith in one of the most noteworthy religious reversals of all time. Especially, they became friends and advisors of industrialists and financiers, travellers in the same direction. This cross-fertilization occurred naturally, not out of petty motives of profit, but because by Fabian lights evolution had progressed furthest among the international business and banking classes!

These laughing gentry were impressively effective at whatever they turned their hands to because they understood principles of social leverage. Kitty Muggeridge writes:

*If you want to pinpoint the moment in time when the very first foundation of the Welfare State was laid, a reasonable date to choose would be the last fortnight of November in 1905 when Beatrice Webb was appointed to the Royal Commission on the Poor Law, and she convinced her protégé, Albert Beveridge, to join a committee for dealing with employment.*

*During Mrs. Webb's tenure on the Royal Commission, she laid down the first blueprint of cradle-to-grave social security to eradicate poverty "without toppling the whole social structure." She lived to see Beveridge promulgate her major ideas in the historic *Beveridge Report*, from which they were brought to life in post-WWII Britain and the United States.*

*Fabian practitioners developed Hegelian principles which they co-taught alongside Morgan bankers and other important financial allies over the first half of the twentieth century. One insightful Hegelianism was that to push ideas efficiently it was necessary first to co-opt both political Left and political Right. Adversarial politics—competition—was a loser's game. By infiltrating all major media, by continual low-intensity propaganda, by massive changes in group orientations (accomplished through principles developed in the psychological-warfare bureaus of the military), and with the ability, using government intelligence agents and press contacts, to induce a succession of crises, they accomplished that astonishing feat.*

*In the British sense, middle classes are a buffer protecting elites from the poor; our own statistical income-based designation leads to a more eclectic composition, and to somewhat less predictability of attitudes and values. The origins are disputed but it was an offshoot of Thomas Davidson's utopian group in New York, "The Fellowship of the New Life"—an
American export to Britain, not the other way around. The reader should be warned I use
the term "Fabian" more indiscriminately with less concern for actual affiliation through the
rest of the book than I do here. Fabianism was a *zeitgeist* as well as a literal association,
and thousands of twentieth-century influentials have been Fabians who might be
uncomfortable around its flesh and blood adherents, or who would be puzzled by the label.

9The spelling preferred by baronial descendants of the actual event. See Chapter Twelve.

10Contrast this with John F. Kennedy's "Ask not what your country can do for you but what
you can do for your country" Inaugural of 1960 which measured the distance we had
retreated since the Civil War. It's useful to remember, however, that Spencer reserved these
feelings only for the Elect.

11In 1900, Sidney Sherwood of Johns Hopkins University joined a host of prominent
organizations and men like Andrew Carnegie in declaring the emergence of the corporate
system as the highest stage in evolution. Sherwood suggested the modern corporation's
historic task was to sort out "genius," to get rid of "the weak." This elimination is "the real
function of the trust," and the formation of monopoly control is "natural selection of the
highest order." Try to imagine how this outlook played out in corporate schooling.

12The most dramatic example of abandoning competition and replacing it with cooperation
was the breath-taking monopolization of first the nation's, then the world's oil supply by
Standard Oil under the personal direction of John D. Rockefeller Sr. Rockefeller despised
the competitive marketplace, as did his fellow titans of finance and industry, J.P. Morgan
and Andrew Carnegie. Rockefeller's negotiating team was instructed to accommodate any
company willing to enter his cartel, to destroy any that resisted.

The Open Conspiracy

When I speak of Fabianism, or of any particular Fabians, actual or virtual like Kurt Lewin,
onece head of Britain's Psychological Warfare Bureau, or R.D. Laing, once staff psychologist
at the Tavistock Institute, I have no interest in mounting a polemic against this particular
conceit of the comfortable intelligentsia. Fabian strategy and tactics have been openly
announced and discussed with clarity for nearly a century, whether identified as Fabian or
not. Nothing illegal about it. I do think it a tragedy, however, that government school
children are left in the dark about the existence of influential groups with complex social
agendas aimed at their lives.

I've neglected to tell you so far about the role *stress* plays in Fabian evolutionary theory.
Just as Hegel taught that history moves faster toward its conclusion by way of warfare, so
evolutionary socialists were taught by Hegel to see *struggle* as the precipitant of
evolutionary improvement for the species, a necessary purifier eliminating the weak from
the breeding sweepstakes. Society evolves slowly toward "social efficiency" all by itself;
society under stress, however, evolves much faster! Thus the deliberate creation of crisis is
an important tool of evolutionary socialists. Does that help you underst

The London School of Economics is a Fabian creation. Mick Jagger spent time there; so did
John F. Kennedy. Once elitist, the *Economist*, now a worldwide pop-intellectual publication,
is Fabian, as is *The New Statesman* and Ruskin Labour College of Oxford. The legendary
Royal Institute of International Affairs and the Tavistock Institute for Human Relations,
premier mind-bending institutions of the world, are Fabian. Theodor Adorno, an important
if barely visible avatar of the therapeutic state, and a one-time eminence at Tavistock,
travelled the Fabian road as well. (My Note. Can you see things pulling together here?)
You needn't carry a card or even have heard the name Fabian to follow the wolf-in-sheep's-clothing flag.

Fabianism is mainly a value-system with progressive objectives. Its social club aspect isn't for coalminers, farmers, or steam-fitters. We've all been exposed to many details of the Fabian program without realizing it. In the United States, some organizations heavily influenced by Fabianism are the Ford Foundation, the Russell Sage Foundation, the Stanford Research Institute, the Carnegie Endowments, the Aspen Institute, the Wharton School, and RAND. And this short list is illustrative, not complete. Tavistock underwrites or has intimate relations with thirty research institutions in the United States, all which at one time or another have taken a player's hand in the shaping of American schooling.

Once again, you need to remember we aren't conspiracy hunting but tracking an idea, like microchipping an eel to see what holes it swims into in case we want to catch it later on. H.G. Wells, best known of all early Fabians, once wrote of the Fabian project:

The political world of the Open Conspiracy must weaken, efface, incorporate and supersede existing governments....The character of the Open Conspiracy will then be plainly displayed. It will be a world religion. This large, loose assimilatory mass of groups and societies will definitely and obviously attempt to swallow up the entire population of the world and become a new human community....The immediate task before all people, a planned World State, is appearing at a thousand points of light [but]...generations of propaganda and education may have to precede it. (emphasis added)

Zbigniew Brzezinski wrote his famous signature book "Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technocratic Era" in 1970, a piece reeking with Fabianisms: dislike of direct popular power, relentless advocacy of the right and duty of evolutionarily advanced nations to administer less developed parts of the world, revulsion at populist demands for "selfish self-government" (homeschooling would be a prime example), and stress on collectivism. Brzezinski said in the book:

It will soon be possible to assert almost continuous control over every citizen and to maintain up-to-date files containing even the most personal details about health and personal behaviour of every citizen, in addition to the more customary data. These files will be subject to instantaneous retrieval by the authorities.

Power will gravitate into the hands of those who control information.

In his essay, Brzezinski called common people, "an increasingly purposeless mass." And, of course, if the army of children collected in mass schooling is really "purposeless," what argument says it should exist at all?

13The government-created crisis, masquerading as an unexpected external provocation, is elementary Hegelian strategy. If you want to take Texas and California from Mexico, first shoot a few Americans while the press disinforms the nation that Mexican depredations against our nationals have to be stopped; if you want Cuba as a satrapy, blow up an American battleship and pin it on the Cubans. By this strategy, a nation which has decided to suspend its democratic traditions with a period of martial law (under which permanent social reordering would occur) might arrange a series of "terrorist" attacks upon itself which would justify the transformation as a defence of general public safety.

14In the "world peace" phenomenon so necessary to establish a unitary world order lies a real danger, according to evolutionists, of species deterioration caused by inadvertent preservation of inferior genes which would otherwise be killed or starved. Hence the urgency of insulating superior breeding stock from pollution through various strategies of social segregation. Among these, forced classification through schooling has been by far the most important.
An Everlasting Faith

Fabianism was a principal force and inspiration behind all major school legislation of the first half of the twentieth century. And it will doubtless continue to be in the twenty-first. It will help us understand Fabian influence to look at the first Fabian-authored consideration of public schooling, the most talked-about education book of 1900, Thomas Davidson's peculiar and fantastic History of Education.

The Dictionary of American Biography describes Davidson as a naturalized Scot, American since 1867, and a follower of William Torrey Harris, federal Commissioner of Education—the most influential Hegelian in North America. Davidson was also the first president of the Fabian Society in England, a fact not thought worthy of preservation in the biographical dictionary, but otherwise easy enough to confirm. This news is also absent from Pelling's America and The British Left, although Davidson is credited there with "usurping" the Fabians.

In his important monograph "Education in the Forming of American Society," Bernard Bailyn, as you'll recall, said anyone bold enough to venture a history of American schooling would have to explain the sharp disjunction separating these local institutions as they existed from 1620 to 1890 from the massification which followed afterwards. In presenting his case, Bailyn had cause to compare "two notable books" on the subject which both appeared in 1900. One was Davidson's, the other Edward Eggleston's.

Eggleston's Transit of Civilization Bailyn calls "a remarkably imaginative effort to analyze the original investment from which has developed Anglo-Saxon culture in America by probing the complex states of knowing and thinking, of feeling and passion of the seventeenth century colonists." The opening words of Eggleston's book, said Bailyn, make clear the central position of education in early America. Bailyn calls Transit "one of the subllest and most original books ever written on the subject" and "a seminal work," but he notes how quickly it was "laid aside by American intelligentsia as an oddity, irrelevant to the interests of the group then firmly shaping the historical study of American education."

For that group, the book of books was Davidson's History of Education. William James called its author a "knave-errant of the intellectual life," an "exuberant polymath." Bailyn agrees that Davidson's "was a remarkable book":

Davidson starts with "The Rise of Intelligence" when "man first rose above the brute." Then he trots briskly through "ancient Turanian," Semitic, and Aryan education, picks up speed on "civic education" in Judaea, Greece, and Rome, gallops swiftly across Hellenistic, Alexandrian, Patristic, and Muslim education; leaps magnificently over the thorny barriers of scholasticism, the medieval universities, Renaissance, Reformation, and Counter-Reformation, and then plunges wildly through the remaining five centuries in sixty-four pages flat.

It was less the frantic scope than the purpose of this strange philosophical essay that distinguished it in the eyes of an influential group of writers. Its purpose was to dignify a newly self-conscious profession called Education. Its argument, a heady distillation of conclusions from Social Darwinism, claimed that modern education was a cosmic force leading mankind to full realization of itself. Davidson's preface puts the intellectual core of Fabianism on centre stage:

My endeavour has been to present education as the last and highest form of evolution.... By placing education in relation to the whole process of evolution, as its highest form, I have hoped to impart to it a dignity which it could hardly otherwise receive or claim...when it is recognized to be the highest phase of the world-process. "World process" here is an echo of Kant and Hegel, and for the teacher to be the chief agent in that process, both it and he assumes a very different aspect.
Here is the intellectual and emotional antecedent of "creation spirituality," Pierre Teilhard de Chardin's assertion that evolution has become a spiritual inevitability in our time. Suddenly mere schooling found itself elevated from its petty, despised position on the periphery of the known universe into an intimate involvement in the cosmic destiny of man, a master key too important to be left to parents.

By 1906, Paul Monroe of Teachers College could write in his *Text-book in the History of Education* that knowledge of the "purpose of education" was to supply the teacher with "fundamentals of an everlasting faith as broad as human nature and as deep as the life of the race."

This *History of Education*, according to Bailyn, "came to be taught as an introductory course, a form of initiation, in every normal school, department of education, and teachers college in the country":

The story had to be got straight. And so a few of the more imaginative of that energetic and able group of men concerned with mapping overall progress of "scientific" education, though not otherwise historians, took over the management of the historical work in education. With great virtuosity they drew up what became the patristic literature of a powerful academic ecclesia.

The official history of education: grew in almost total isolation from the major influences and shaping minds of twentieth-century historiography; and its isolation proved to be self-intensifying; the more parochial the subject became, the less capable it was of attracting the kinds of scholars who could give it broad relevance and bring it back into the public domain. It soon displayed the exaggeration of weakness and extravagance of emphasis that are the typical results of sustained inbreeding.

These "educational missionaries" spoke of schools as if they were monasteries. By limiting the idea of education to formal school instruction, the public gradually lost sight of what the real thing was. The questions these specialists disputed were as irrelevant to real people as the disputes of medieval divines; there was about their writing condescension for public concerns, for them "the whole range of education had become an instrument of deliberate social purpose." (emphasis added) After 1910, divergence between what various publics expected would happen, in government schools and what the rapidly expanding school establishment intended to make happen opened a deep gulf between home and school, ordinary citizen and policymaker.

Regulating Lives Like Machinery

The real explanation for this sudden gulf between NEA policies in 1893 and 1911 had nothing to do with intervening feedback from teachers, principals, or superintendents about what schools needed; rather, it signalled titanic forces gathering outside the closed universe of schooling with the intention of altering this nation's economy, politics, social relationships, future direction, and eventually the terms of its national existence, using schools as instruments in the work.

Schoolmen were never invited to the policy table at which momentous decisions were made. When Ellwood P. Cubberley began tentatively to raise his voice in protest against radical changes being forced upon schools (in his history of education), particularly the sudden enforcement of compulsory attendance laws which brought amazing disruption into the heretofore well-mannered school world, he quickly pulled back without naming the community leaders—as he called them—who gave the actual orders. This evidence of impotence documents the pedagogue status of even the most elevated titans of schooling like Cubberley. You can find this reference and others like it in *Public Education in the United States.*
Scientific management was about to merge with systematic schooling in the United States; it preferred to steal in silently on little cat's feet, but nobody ever questioned the right of businessmen to impose a business philosophy to tamper with children's lives. On the cantilever principle of interlocking directorates pioneered by Morgan interests, scientific school management flowed into other institutional domains of American life, too. According to Taylor, application of mechanical power to production could be generalized into every arena of national life, even to the pulpit, certainly to schools. This would bring about a realization that people's lives could be regulated very much like machinery, without sentiment. Any expenditure of time and energy demanded rationalization, whether first-grader or coalminer, behaviour should be mathematically accounted for following the new statistical procedures of Galton and Karl Pearson.

The scientific management movement was backed by many international bankers and industrialists. In 1905, the vice president of the National City Bank of New York, Frank Vanderlip, made his way to the speaker's podium at the National Education Association's annual convention to say:  

I am firmly convinced the economic success of Germany can be encompassed in a single word—schoolmaster. From the economic point of view the school system of Germany stands unparalleled.

German schools were psychologically managed, ours must be, too. People of substance stood, they thought, on the verge of an ultimate secret. How to write upon the empty slates of empty children's minds in the dawning era of scientific management. What they would write there was a program to make dwarf and fractional human beings, people crippled by implanted urges and habits beyond their understanding, men and women who cry out to be managed.

The Gary Plan

Frederick Taylor's gospel of efficiency demanded complete and intensive use of industrial plant facilities. From 1903 onwards, strenuous efforts were made to achieve full utilization of space by forcing year-round school on society. Callahan suggests it was "the children of America, who would have been unwilling victims of this scheme, who played a decisive role in beating the original effort to effect this back."

But east of Chicago, in the synthetic U.S. Steel company town of Gary, Indiana, Superintendent William A. Wirt, a former student of John Dewey's at the University of Chicago, was busy testing a radical school innovation called the Gary Plan soon to be sprung on the national scene. Wirt had supposedly invented a new organizational scheme in which school subjects were departmentalized; this required movement of students from room to room on a regular basis so that all building spaces were in constant use. Bells would ring and just as with Pavlov's salivating dog, children would shift out of their seats and lurch toward yet another class.

In this way children could be exposed to many nonacademic socialization experiences and much scientifically engineered physical activity, and it would be a bonus value from the same investment, a curriculum apart from so-called basic subjects which by this time were being looked upon as an actual menace to long-range social goals.

Wirt called his system the "work-study-play" school, but outside of Gary it was referred to simply as "the Gary Plan." Its noteworthy economical feature, rigorously scheduling a student body twice as large as before into the same space and time, earned it the informal name "platoon school."

While the prototype was being established and tested on children of the new industrial proletariat in Gary, the plan itself was merchandised from newsstand, pulpit, and lecture
circuit, lauded in administrative circles, and soundly praised by first pedagogical couple John and Evelyn Dewey in their 1915 book, *Schools of Tomorrow*. The first inkling Gary might be a deliberate stepchild of the scientific management movement occurred in a February 1911 article by Wirt for *The American School Board Journal*, "Scientific Management of School Plants." But a more thorough and forceful exposition of its provenance was presented in the *Elementary School Teacher* by John Franklin Bobbit in a 1912 piece titled "Elimination of Waste in Education."

Bobbit said Gary schools were the work of businessmen who understood scientific management. Teaching was slated to become a specialized scientific calling conducted by pre-approved agents of the central business office.

Classroom teachers would teach the same thing over and over to groups of travelling children; special subject teachers would deliver their special subjects to classes rotating through the building on a precision time schedule.

Early in 1914, the Federal Bureau of Education, then located in the Interior Department, strongly endorsed Wirt's system. This led to one of the most dramatic and least-known events in twentieth-century school history. In New York City, a spontaneous rebellion occurred on the part of the students and parents against extension of the Gary Plan to their own city. While the revolt had only short-lived effects, it highlights the demoralization of private life occasioned by passing methods of industry off as education.

Bobbit said Gary schools were the work of businessmen who understood scientific management. Teaching was slated to become a specialized scientific calling conducted by pre-approved agents of the central business office.

Classroom teachers would teach the same thing over and over to groups of travelling children; special subject teachers would deliver their special subjects to classes rotating through the building on a precision time schedule.

Early in 1914, the Federal Bureau of Education, then located in the Interior Department, strongly endorsed Wirt's system. This led to one of the most dramatic and least-known events in twentieth-century school history. In New York City, a spontaneous rebellion occurred on the part of the students and parents against extension of the Gary Plan to their own city. While the revolt had only short-lived effects, it highlights the demoralization of private life occasioned by passing methods of industry off as education.

15Bobbit was the influential schoolman who reorganized the Los Angeles school curriculum, replacing formal history with "Social Studies." Of the Bobbitized set of educational objectives, the five most important were 1) Social intercommunication 2) Maintenance of physical efficiency 3) Efficient citizenship 4) General social contacts and relationships 5) Leisure occupations. My own favourite is "efficient citizenship," which bears rolling around on the point of one's bayonet as the bill is presented for payment.

The Jewish Student Riots

Less than three weeks before the mayoral election of 1917, rioting broke out at PS 171, an elementary school on Madison Avenue near 103rd Street in New York City which had adopted the Gary Plan. About a thousand demonstrators smashed windows, menaced passersby, shouted threats, and made school operation impossible.

Over the next few days newspapers downplayed the riot, marginalizing the rioters as "street corner agitators" from Harlem and the Upper East Side, but they were nothing of the sort, being mainly immigrant parents. Demonstrations and rioting spread to other Gary Plan schools, including high schools where student volunteers were available to join parents on the picket line.

At one place, five thousand children marched. For ten days trouble continued, breaking out in first one place then another. Thousands of mothers milled around schools in Yorkville, a German immigrant section, and in East Harlem, complaining angrily that their children had been put on "half-rations" of education. They meant that mental exercise had been removed from the centre of things. Riots flared out into Williamsburg and Brownsville in the borough of Brooklyn; schools were stoned, police car tires slashed by demonstrators. Schools on the Lower East Side and in the Bronx reported trouble also.

The most notable aspect of this rioting was its source in what today would be the bottom of the bell-curve masses...and they were complaining that school was too easy! What could have possessed recently arrived immigrants to defy their betters? Whatever it was, it poisoned the promising political career of mayoral incumbent, John Purroy Mitchel, a well-connected, aristocratic young progressive who had been seriously mentioned as presidential timber. Although Teddy Roosevelt personally campaigned for him, Mitchel lost
by a two-to-one margin when election day arrived shortly after the riots were over, the disruptions widely credited with bringing Mitchel down. In all, three hundred students were arrested, almost all Jewish. I identify their ethnicity because today we don't usually expect Jewish kids to get arrested in bulk.

To understand what was happening requires us to meet an entity calling itself the Public Education Association. If we pierce its associational veil, we find that it is made up of bankers, society ladies, corporation lawyers and, in general, people with private fortunes or access to private fortunes. The PEA announced in 1911 an "urgent need" to transform public schools into child welfare agencies. (emphasis added) Shortly afterward, Mitchel, a member of the PEA, was elected mayor of New York. Superintendent Wirt in Gary was promptly contacted and offered the New York superintendency. He agreed, and the first Gary schools opened in New York City in March 1915.

Bear in mind there was no public debate, no warning of this radical step. Just seventy-five days after the Gary trial began, the financial arm of New York City government declared it a total success, authorizing conversion of twelve more schools. (The original trial had only been for two.) This was done in June at the end of the school year when public attention was notoriously low. Then in September of 1915, after a net one hundred days of trial, Comptroller Prendergast issued a formal report recommending extension of the Gary Plan into all schools of New York City! He further recommended lengthening the school day and the school year.

At the very time this astonishing surprise was being prepared for the children of New York City in 1915, a series of highly laudatory articles sprouted like zits all over the periodical press calling the Gary Plan the answer to our nation's school prayers. One characteristic piece read, "School must fill the vacuum of the home, school must be life itself as once the old household was a life itself." (emphasis added)

Like Rommel's Panzer columns, true believers were on the move. At the same time press agents were skilfully manipulating the press, officers of the Rockefeller Foundation, a body which supported the Gary Plan wholeheartedly, were appointed without fanfare as members of the New York City Board of Education, compliments of Mayor Mitchel.

Immediately after Prendergast's report appeared calling for total Gary-ization of public schooling, a book written by a prominent young protégé of John Dewey directed national attention to the Gary miracle "where children learn to play and prepare for vocations as well as to study abstractions." Titled The Gary Schools, its author, Randolph Bourne, was among the most beloved columnists for The New Republic in the days when that magazine, product of J.P. Morgan banker Willard Straight's personal patronage, took some of its editorial instruction directly from the tables of power in America.

In light of what happened in 1917, you might find it interesting to have your librarian scare up a copy of Bourne's Gary Schools so you can study how a well-orchestrated national propaganda campaign can colonize your mind.

Even as Bourne's book was being read, determined opposition was forming. In 1917, in spite of grassroots protest, the elite Public Education Association urged the opening of forty-eight more Gary schools (there were by that time thirty-two in operation). Whoever was running the timetable on this thing had apparently tired of gradualism and was preparing to step from the shadows and open the engine full throttle. A letter from the PEA director (New York Times, 27 June, 1917) urged that more Gary schools must be opened. An earlier letter by director Nudd struck an even more hysterical note: "The situation is acute, no further delay." This Hegelian manufactured crisis was used to thaw Board of Estimate recalcitrance, which body voted sufficient funds to extend the Gary scheme through the New York City school system.
School riots followed hard on the heels of that vote. European immigrants, especially Jews from Germany (where collectivist thinking in the West had been perfected), knew exactly what the scientific Gary Plan would mean to their children. They weren't buying. In the fallout from these disturbances, socialite Mitchel was thrown out of office in the next election. The Gary schools themselves were dissolved by incoming Mayor Hylan who called them "a scheme" of the Rockefeller Foundation: "a system by which Rockefellers and their allies hope to educate coming generations in the 'doctrine of contentment,' another name for social servitude."

The Rockefeller Report

The Gary tale is a model of how managed school machinery can be geared up in secret without public debate to deliver a product parents don't want. Part One of the Gary story is the lesson we learned from the impromptu opinion poll of Gary schooling taken by housewives and immigrant children, a poll whose results translated into riots. Having only their native wit and past experience to guide them, these immigrant parents concluded that Gary schools were caste schools. Not what they expected from America. They turned to the only weapon at their disposal—disruption—and it worked. They shrewdly recognized that boys in elite schools wouldn't tolerate the dumbing down their own were being asked to accept. They knew this would close doors of opportunity, not open them.

Some individual comments from parents and principals about Gary are worth preserving: "too much play and time-wasting," "they spend all day listening to the phonograph and dancing," "they change class every forty minutes, my daughter has to wear her coat constantly to keep it from being stolen," "the cult of the easy," "a step backwards in human development," "focusing on the group instead of the individual." One principal predicted if the plan were kept, retardation would multiply as a result of minimal contact between teachers and students. And so it has.

Part Two of the Gary story is the official Rockefeller report condemning Gary, circulated at Rockefeller headquarters in 1916, but not issued until 1918. Why this report was suppressed for two years we can only guess. You'll recall Mayor Hylan's charge that the Rockefeller Foundation moved heaven and earth to force its Gary Plan on an unwitting and unwilling citizenry, using money, position, and influence to such an extent that a New York State Senate Resolution of 1916 accused the foundation of moving to gain complete control of the New York City Board of Education. Keep in mind that Rockefeller people were active in 1915, 1916, and 1917, lobbying to impose a Gary destiny on the public schools of New York City even after its own house analyst pointed to the intellectual damage these places caused.

The 1916 analytical report leapfrogged New York City to examine the original schools as they functioned back in Gary, Indiana. Written by Abraham Flexner,16 it stated flatly that Gary schools were a total failure, "offering insubstantial programs and a general atmosphere which habituated students to inferior performance." Flexner's analysis was a massive repudiation of John Dewey's shallow Schools of Tomorrow hype for Gary.

Now we come to the mystery. After this bad idea crashed in New York City in 1917, the critical Rockefeller report held in house since 1916 was issued in 1918 to embarrass critics who had claimed the whole mess was the idea of the Rockefeller project officers. So we know in retrospect that the Rockefeller Foundation was aware of serious shortcomings before it used its political muscle to impose Gary on New York. Had the Flexner report been offered in a timely fashion before the riots, it would have spelled doom for the Gary Plan. Why it wasn't has never been explained.

The third and final part of the Gary story comes straight out of Weird Tales. In all existing accounts of the Gary drama, none mentions the end of Superintendent Wirt's career after his New York defeat. Only Diane Ravitch (in The Great School Wars) even bothers to track
Wirt back home to Gary, where he resumed the superintendency and became, she tells us, a "very conservative schoolman" in his later years. Ah, what Ravitch missed!

The full facts are engrossing: seventeen years after Wirt left New York City, a government publication printed the next significant chapter of the Wirt story. Its title: *Hearings, House Select Committee to Investigate Certain Statements of Dr. William Wirt, 73rd Congress, 2nd Session, April 10 and 17, 1934*. It seems that Dr. Wirt, while in Washington to attend a school administrators meeting in 1933, had been invited to an elite private dinner party at the home of a high Roosevelt administration official. The dinner was attended by well-placed members of the new government, including A.A. Berle, a famous "inner circle" brain-truster. There, Wirt heard that the Depression was being artificially prolonged by credit rigging, until little people and businessmen were shaken enough to agree to a plan where government must dominate business and commerce in the future!

All this he testified to before Congress. The transformation was to make government the source of long-term capital loans. Control of business would follow. Wirt testified he was told Roosevelt was only a puppet; that his hosts had made propaganda a science, that they could make newspapers and magazines beg for mercy by taking away much of their advertising; that provided they were subservient, leaders of business and labour would be silenced by offers of government contracts for materials and services; that colleges and schools would be kept in line by promises of federal aid until such time as they were under safe control; and that farmers would be managed by letting key operators "get their hands in the public trough."

In the yellow journalism outburst following Wirt's disclosure, Berle admitted everything. But he said they were just pulling Wirt's leg! Pulling the leg of the one-time nationally acclaimed saviour of public education. *Time* magazine, *The New York Times*, and other major media ridiculed Wirt, effectively silencing him.

Of Wirt's earlier New York foray into the engineering of young people, New York City mayor Hylan was quoted vividly in *The New York Times* of March 27, 1922:

> The real menace to our republic is this invisible government which like a giant octopus sprawls its slimy length over city, state and nation.... It has seized in its tentacles our executive officers, our legislative bodies, our schools, our courts, our newspapers, and every agency created for the public protection.... To depart from mere generalizations, let me say that at the head of this octopus are the Rockefeller Standard Oil interests.

Like many of the rest of you, I was conditioned early in adult life to avoid conspiracy talk and conspiracy takers by the universal scorn heaped upon the introduction of such arguments into the discourse. All "responsible" journalistic media, and virtually all of the professoriate allowed public access through those media, respond reflexively, and negatively, it seems, to any hint of a dark underside to our national life. With that in mind, what are we to make of Mayor Hylan's outburst or for that matter, the statements of three senators quoted later on this page?

Don't expect me to answer that question for you. But do take a deep breath and make the effort to read Thomas Hobbes' *Leviathan*, written back in the 17th century but easily located in every library of any size in the USA, for some enlightenment in your ruminations.

During the crucial years of the school changeover from academic institution to behavioural modification instrument, the radical nature of the metamorphosis caught the attention of a few national politicians who spoke out, but could never muster enough strength for effective opposition. In the *Congressional Record* of January 26, 1917, for instance, Senator Chamberlain of Oregon entered these words:
They are moving with military precision all along the line to get control of the education of the children of the land.

Senator Poindexter of Washington followed, saying:

The cult of Rockefeller, the cult of Carnegie...as much to be guarded against in the educational system of this country as a particular religious sect.

And in the same issue, Senator Kenyon of Iowa related:

There are certain colleges that have sought endowments, and the agent of the Rockefeller Foundation or the General Education Board had gone out and examined the curriculum of these colleges and compelled certain changes....It seems to me one of the most dangerous things that can go on in a republic is to have an institution of this power apparently trying to shape and mould the thought of the young people of this country.

Senator Works of California added:

These people...are attempting to get control of the whole educational work of the country. If it interests you, take a look. It's all in the Congressional Record of January 26, 1917.

16A man considered the father of twentieth-century American systematic medicine and a longtime employee of the Rockefeller Foundation.

Prussian education system - From Wikipedia, the free encyclopaedia

The political motivations of the King of Prussia

Seeking to replace the controlling functions of the local aristocracy, the Prussian court attempted to instil social obedience in the citizens through indoctrination. Every individual had to become convinced, in the core of his being, that the King was just, his decisions always right, and the need for obedience paramount.

The schools imposed an official language, to the prejudice of ethnic groups living in Prussia. The purpose of the system was to instil loyalty to the Crown and to train young men for the military and the bureaucracy. As the German philosopher Johann Gottlieb Fichte, a key influence on the system, said, "If you want to influence [the student] at all, you must do more than merely talk to him; you must fashion him, and fashion him in such a way that he simply cannot will otherwise than what you wish him to will." [1]

1 ^ Addresses to the German Nation, 1807. Second Address: 'The General Nature of the New Education'. Chicago and London, The Open Court Publishing Company, 1922, p. 21

So there you have it my friend, Prussia gave us more than a just country name that rhymes with Russia. They produced obedient slaves through their education system and by doing so they in fact gave us our modern concept of the “State”.

It was an idea that had probably not been seen to be acted out with such fervour and on such a scale since the time of Sparta, but it was one embraced wholeheartedly by these German's, and in turn also by the American's and even the Brit's. We all coveted and emulated their education system. (Which is the Hindu caste system as you will soon see).

I will cover the goings on in this region of Germany later on in this work as it is I feel both an area that has been largely glossed over by most of the mainstream recorder's of Western history, and yet at the same time it is also a piece of land, that on many occasions, plays a pivotal and critical role in my tale... An odd anomaly you might think, unless of course that is, you think like me... I have observed that quite often our true history, (or to be more specific the parts of history that REALLY matter) is more often about what has been
purposefully omitted or glossed over in our history books, than about the history that was included. - Religion does the same kinda thing whenever people point out that “their” custom, symbol, or practise in fact belongs to an older culture... They just don’t mention it.

I chose to start with this piece because it neatly encapsulated many of the theme’s covered in this group of chapters. It discussed education which is the key to controlling the mind of a large group of people. It discussed the idea of making the state more important than the people who make it up. And it also discussed psychology which is the subject we will be looking at next. As I said at the beginning of this, you probably won’t realise Prussia’s true significance until you have either read all of this work, or perhaps even only once you have read it for a second time. – In truth it’s a region that has had a less than subtle effect on almost EVERYTHING of importance for over 300 years. But you need to see that for yourself.

Because of the immense scope of the subject of mind control, I will be forced into splitting things down into blocks of a few chapter’s on this, and a few chapter’s on that...

We will begin by covering psychiatry from its birth, the science, (cash), and the minds that were behind it,

Then we will look at psychiatric drugs, pharmaceutical companies, and also psychiatric care in great detail.

Then we’ll begin to truly cover the subject of mind control in earnest. But only once we have a firm grounding in the “science” that is behind this “noble” field of medicine first of all.

I will also at this early juncture in MK proper introduce you to the British centre for this sort of nonsense by switching to the good old UK to tell you a little bit about Tavistock.

I will then return back to the USA to give you a concise history of mind control before also touching upon a few subjects that are related to the first part of this work when we cover such diverse yet interconnected subjects as: ritual abuse, disassociative identity disorder, and the false memory syndrome foundation. All of which are generally linked to paedophilia.

Then we will see what my old chum Mr McGowan has to say on the matter of STATE SPONSORED, CONTROLLED, AND CREATED SERIAL KILLER’S.

I will then wind up this part of the work on MK by showing you some material on Jonestown and Dunblane.

I then switch our focus to a couple of parts of the media (newspaper and TV) and discuss the part that they play in all of this when we cover both project mockingbird, and also what that “box” that you learn all your “facts” from is really doing to your brain.

I will spend some time also showing you that video games are actually training YOUR children to be good soldiers/assassin’s.

Then to finish of our second part of this we’ll look at education and the manipulation of it. I will show you in the clearest possible terms that we have all been severely dumbed down over the last 100 odd years through the state ran school system.

If you were among the small group of people who actually liked part one of my offering on Sex, Drugs, Rock and Kontrol, I feel that this second part should quite probably blow your fucking socks off.

Martin
Chapter Eighteen

Just why are so many of our children, (according to the “experts” of both psychiatry and psychology), seemingly so “unhappy” with modern life? - The science of psychiatry is 100% certain that many of our children are not just unhappy, instead they reckon that they are in fact suffering from some sort of mental illness. - Are they, (as these so called experts are all making out) just unfortunately a little bit mentally “disturbed” and in need of some therapy?

Is it also true that many of these kids are suffering from a chemical imbalance in the brain, and therefore in need of some miracle drugs complimented with expensive counselling?

- Because this is psychiatry’s version of what’s “wrong” with our kids. (And us adults too) - Let’s spend the next few chapters finding out if these “experts” are in fact right...

Most of the following pages (unless indicated otherwise) on this subject were lifted directly from the Citizens Commission on Human Rights video presentation “Psychiatry Industry of Death”. Even though this organisation is somehow connected to the scientology movement (I will discuss this at the end of the chapter), which makes me think that they are only encouraging you to stop being brainwashed by one group of charlatans so that some of the viewers might be open to brainwashing from an equally spurious bunch of snake oil salesmen. (Namely scientology itself, I mean just look at Tom Cruise for proof of their wackiness!). The facts presented by the video are nonetheless astonishing, I recommend you get a hold of this documentary if you can; quite frankly it is talking about a subject that once understood, (it is like everything else I put before you‖, in that it’s truly shocking.

According to the pseudo-science of psychiatry almost everyone on the planet today is mentally ill to some degree. If you are unhappy they say it is a mental illness, if you are overweight once again these people say it is because of a mental illness. Dr Jeffrey Schaider professor of Justice and Law at American University says they believe that EVERYONE is mentally ill. Dr Thomas Szasz a professor and author of “the myth of mental illness” says psychiatry says “smoking is a disease, being overweight is a disease, if you’re too thin it’s a disease, if you’re unhappy it too is just a disease.”

I am now going to show you quite clearly that these nut-case quacks are basing their claims on a fraudulent “science” that is really only about these two things:

1. Social control and 2. Money

Do you know for example that psychiatry itself makes the following startling admissions:

1. Psychiatry does not know what causes mental illness. Dr Margaret Hagen professor of psychology at Boston university tells us quite frankly that in psychiatry and psychology: “There is no reliability of diagnosis and no science, just pseudo science, - pretend science”

2. Psychiatry itself says there is presently no cure for mental illness.

3. Psychiatry admits that mental illness is not a “real” illness at all, as it cannot be tested for, or proven by any medical means presently used by the medical profession. Psychiatrist Ron Leifer freely and candidly admits there is “Not one shred of credible evidence that any respectable scientist would consider valid demonstrating that anything psychiatrists call mental illness are brain diseases or biochemical imbalances, - it’s all fraud.”

4. Psychiatrist Gary Null professor of science at Fairleigh Dickinson University has also admitted that nothing is legitimate in the field of psychiatry, he says “This is one of the most open secrets in all of America, in the psychiatric field, that nothing, NOTHING, is being done that is legitimate and they are billing for it.

5. Psychiatry has cured NO-ONE.
6. According to psychiatry there are presently over 1 Billion people worldwide who need their psychiatric “help” because they are ill.

7. In the last thirty years they have treated over half a Billion people with psychiatric drugs, and currently over 17 million kids are on psychiatric drugs worldwide.

8. In a forty year period (1965-2005) psychiatric treatment in the USA alone has killed more people than ALL the wars that this country has fought in since it was created! (738,000 dead from all wars, compared to 1.1 million deaths from psychiatric treatments). - Source: citizen’s commission on human rights.

Please my friend, please go back and read those eight points as many times as it takes before the following fact really sinks in... - These disgusting, nefarious people are truly nothing but charlatans/witchdoctor’s/snake-oil-salesmen/voodoo priest’s/top-notch-quality-bullshit-peddlers!!

When CCHR (citizens commission for human rights) went to the 2005 American Psychiatric Association (APA) conference they interviewed as many of these experts as they could on the scientific basis for their profession, out of the small number who would talk to the camera the following harrowing statements were made (all by the real top psychiatrists remember)

“Psychiatric illness is not really an illness”

“A cure is something we all look forward to, but have no earthly idea how to accomplish”

“We are not good at causes, we don’t know what causes mental illness”

As the narrator then points out, the above admissions have not stopped psychiatry claiming to be the mental health “experts” or from treating people against their will.

Insurance companies pay out 69 Billion dollars annually for psychiatric reasons, which according to CCHR has doubled the cost of medical insurance premiums.

CCHR then points out this most important fact, in spite of 2 Trillion dollars being spent in this field annually worldwide, psychiatrists cannot point to a single cured patient!

Now we are going to cover the roots and history of this disgusting profession, once again prepare to be shocked.

Dr Lee Coleman, author of “Reign of Error” says “The roots of psychiatry have to do with control, power and alienation from certain groups of people who were uncomfortable to be around. They were locked up in asylums to get them out of the way. The history of psychiatry is related to institutions”

Bethlehem Royal Hospital in London was one of the first examples of a psychiatric institution. Commonly referred to as “bedlam” this institution was nothing more than a warehouse for those labelled as “mad”. Inmates were confined to cages, closets, and animal stalls, they were chained to walls and were quite often flogged. The asylum charged admission for public viewings much like a zoo today.

In the Seventeenth century William Battie, who was president of the Royal College of Physicians, was the first to claim that his institutions could cure people. Battie’s “madhouses” made him one of the richest men in England. Though his treatments were every bit as inhumane as anything practised at bedlam. Not a single patient was cured. Even so his financial success caused a massive boom in the asylum business. There were only a few asylums by the beginning of the 18th century, it wasn’t until people saw the financial opportunity that the asylum sector was truly born, by the 19th century it was big business on both sides of the Atlantic.
This most certainly applies to the practice of psychiatry, whose destructive "cures" and false solutions have wrought devastation on society—time and time again. Psychiatry's developmental track did not advance along scientific lines, but instead followed the money and, as a tool of the state, political tides. This brief timeline chronicles that repeating history covering psychiatry's spread and expansion. We begin with its earliest practitioners, whose brutal treatments and social programs resulted in untold pain and suffering. You will see that in the case of psychiatry, some things never change.

1700s-1800s PSYCHIATRY'S ORIGINS

Early treatments for the insane were indistinguishable from torture. Patients were confined in cages, cellars or animal stalls; chained naked to walls, beaten and lashed. Benjamin Rush, author of the first American psychiatric textbook, taught that terror had a therapeutic effect, advocating bloodletting, brutal restraints, blistering of body parts, partial drownings and early "shock" treatments, such as dropping patients into ice baths.

By the 18th century the state was investing its tax dollars, or pounds, heavily in this field. The owners of these institutions were becoming very wealthy, now the psychiatrists of the time wanted to get in on the serious action.

In order to get involved they needed some seemingly scientific reason for doing so, they found this excuse by inventing what is commonly known as the medical model. By becoming involved with the diagnosis and also the treatment of these poor people they latched onto a cash cow that helped maximise their profits while also presenting a false image of legitimacy, without which they would not have had a profession at all. They had to come up with biological solutions to mental illness; otherwise they would have no reason at all to be involved in this field. They done this by claiming that there were underlying biological reasons, for what was really just emotional problems.

Whatever these quacks done in order to control these poor people was classed as being a treatment, no matter how baseless in science, or cruel it was. Making these people manageable was the only goal.

“A huge part of what psychiatry has done really comes down to torture” — Lee Coleman, psychiatrist. “…mental patients become vulnerable to whatever manipulations psychiatrists decide to call treatment. Many of these so-called treatments have been crude experiments and sometimes they were no less than torture.” Lee Coleman, M.D., psychiatrist, The Reign of Error.

Dr Andrew Scull a professor of sociology and science says that some of these methods were utterly barbaric, the example he cites in the film was a near drowning device, basically it was a coffin that was lowered into a pool of water, after a period of time it would be lifted up and the patient would then be revived, - if possible! He says there were a whole range of these devices being used. He also states that the mortality rates were extremely high too, which comes as no surprise.

Psychiatrists then looked to legitimise these practices by cloaking them in the language of medicine. This re-packaging of their treatments became known as the medical model. They reasoned that, for example, if a manic person was wrapped up in sheets then dumped in ice cold water his mania would dissipate, from this observation they deduced that this dumping them in cold water was releasing the “toxins” that were in their bodies of these people, therefore by doing the process over and over they reckoned that they could expel the harmful bacteria or germs that were causing the illness. They then built their so called medical model around this insane thesis.

They pushed this biological theory a step further when American Doctor Benjamin Rush theorised that insanity was caused by too much blood in the head. He reckoned that by expelling this excess blood by any means possible the insanity would be cured (Bleeding
them, cold water, restraint and even terrorising them, were all legitimate treatments). This was to be the next medical model.

Rush was the most famous and prolific doctor of his era, he was known as the “master bleeder” and would drain blood to “cure” madness. He also invented a device called “the tranquiliser” - which was really just a seat that resembled an electric chair, the patient was restrained at his wrists and ankles and a box was placed over their head, they would then be left in this position for hours at a time.

A CRUEL HISTORY

TORTURE AND TERROR

THE HISTORY OF PSYCHIATRY CONSISTS, NOT OF METHODS OF HEALING, BUT OF BRUTAL PRACTICES THAT NO SELF-RESPECTING MEDICAL PROFESSIONAL WOULD EVER CALL TREATMENT. As author Edward Shorter stated in A History of Psychiatry, psychiatrists have had "a rather poor reputation among their medical colleagues as the dull and the second rate."

Despite massive funding increases over the last 60 years, psychiatrists have failed to define, let alone cure, the causes of mental problems. Norman Sartorius, former president of the World Psychiatric Association, declared, "The time when psychiatrists considered that they could cure the mentally ill is gone. In the future, the mentally ill have to learn to live with their illness." In other words, psychiatry is a complete and utter failure.

Until the mid-1800s, the practice that became known as "psychiatry" was responsible only for the warehousing of the mentally disturbed. Patients were treated like animals, managed through brute force. Cruel physical punishments dominated asylums. Inmates were confined to cages, closets and animal stalls, shackled and flogged. Psychiatrist Lee Coleman, author of Reign of Error, says the roots of psychiatry are based on control and power, "Whatever was done to make this person more manageable would be simply called a treatment. And the sad reality is that many of these so-called treatments were in essence torture."

Through the 1600-1700s, inmates at the infamous 'Bedlam' mental asylum in London were chained, beaten, fed rotten food and subjected to regular bloodlettings. The only beneficiaries of this treatment were the asylum attendants, who made fortunes from their human warehouses and displayed their victims like circus sideshow acts to anyone willing to pay admission.

In 1684 in England, Dr. Thomas Willis authored a text on insanity, claiming: "Discipline, threats, fetters [shackles], and blows are needed ...Truly nothing is more necessary and more effective for the recovery of these people than forcing them to respect and fear intimidation."

Throughout the 1700s and 1800s, patients were chained naked to walls, beaten with rods and lashed into obedience. French asylum director Philippe Pinel abolished the use of chains at Paris' Salpetriere Institution in 1793. In their place, however, he instituted straitjackets and threatened patients who misbehaved with "10 severe lashes."

In 1808, Germany's Johann Christian Reil coined the term "psychiatry." The word literally means "healing the soul" from the Greek "psyche." Yet Reil had already concluded in 1803—without evidence—that mental disturbances were of the brain, not the soul. He advocated punishment, intimidation, loud noises, flogging and opium as treatments, describing them as "non-injurious torture." For a man who suffered "delusion about the purity of the female sex," Reil recommended "a prostitute who will cure his delusions."

Dr. Benjamin Rush, the "father of American psychiatry," published the first American textbook on psychiatry in 1812. Masturbation and too much blood in the brain were considered causes of madness.
Treatment involved cauterizing the spine and genitals or encasing the patient's private parts in plaster to prevent masturbation.

Rush’s recommended treatments included:

Dropping victims into a well, on the basis that "if the patient was nearly drowned and then brought back to life, he would take a fresh start, leaving his disease behind."

Blisttering the ankles to draw blood away from the "overheated head."

Bleeding as much as "four-fifths of the blood in the body" to relieve the "excessive action" in the patient’s brain.

By the 1890s, psychiatrists —seeking to emulate the medical advances of the day—were conducting increasingly bizarre experiments in search of new treatments. They injected patients with extracts from animal sexual organs and glands. Extract of sheep thyroid (the gland that affects growth and energy) was a common treatment that caused fevers, weight loss and a reduction in red blood cell count.

In the 1920s, Austrian professor of psychiatry Julius Wagner-Jauregg injected malaria into his patients, claiming that the resultant fever would help them recover their sanity. Wagner-Jauregg was awarded the 1927 Nobel Prize in Medicine for this work.

The duplicity of the profession is clearly stated in this summation of psychiatric treatment by Rush: "Terror acts powerfully upon the body through the medium of the mind, and should be employed in the cure of madness."

PSYCHIATRIST BENJAMIN RUSH (above) designed the tranquilizer chair (below right) to constrain and keep the victim in a state of discomfort and pain. His invention derived from the "Witch’s Chair," used to extract confessions from accused witches. "It binds and confines every part of the body. By preventing the muscles from acting... the position of the head and feet favours the easy application of cold water or ice to the former and warm water to the latter. Its effects have been truly delightful to me," he stated.

EARLY PSYCHIATRIC TREATMENTS
In addition to the Tranquilizer Chair (1), swinging chairs caused dizziness, nausea, vomiting and haemorrhaging. Dropping blindfolded patients into ice-cold water was an early form of shock treatment.

French psychiatrist Jean-Martin Charcot used an Ovary Compressor to crush the ovaries (2) in an attempt to stop female hysterics and the straitjacket has always been an institutional staple (3). Two hundred years later, the devices are different but the goal is the same — patients are pummelled, restrained or drugged into submission. The violence of physical and chemical restraints, and treatments like electroshock, damage patients physically and mentally, when they don't kill outright.

The word psychology first appeared in the English language in the 17th century and derives from psyche (soul) and ology (study of). As a philosophical subject, it considered the mind and body as separate entities. French philosopher Rene Descartes (1596-1650) reasoned "the mind and body were separate because, if something is taken away from the body (i.e. a foot), nothing is considered to have been lost by the mind." His philosophy known as dualism (dual condition), determined that the mind does not exist in space as ordinary physical substances do; it can think for itself and has purpose and freedom of will. As long as man's problems were those of the "soul," it was the domain of the clergy to address such problems.

Rush’s often lethal procedures were detailed in his 1812 book which was the authoritative text for this profession for the next seventy years! He was so revered, that in 1965 he was enshrined as the father of American psychiatry on the seal of the American Psychiatric Association. Rush also coined the term Negritude, which he said was a condition that all coloured people suffered from, this condition, according to Rush, was much like leprosy and it made Black’s inferior and was thus used as justification for racism and segregation.

There is a long history of scientists studying things that do not exist. In the 19th century, psychologists in the US studied a condition that was causing widespread concern, particularly in the south of the country.

This illness was dubbed drapetomania, and its effects were pernicious and financially damaging. Drapetomania was, you see, the ‘uncontrollable urge of a negro to escape from slavery’. Slaves, as well as suffering from this irrational lunacy, could also be blighted with Dysaesthesia aethiopica, or disobedience. Drapetomania was first diagnosed by a Louisiana doctor called Samuel Cartwright, who managed to get his new disease written up in the New Orleans Medical and Surgical Journal. His preferred cure for this and dysaesthesia was simple: a sound flogging.

How we squirm, now, at this ridiculous example of legitimized racism, but can we be sure that the phenomena we take for granted and argue over today are any more real than drapetomania? What else in the scientific canon might be no more than a cultural artefact, a reflection of the thinking of the times?” - Taken from “10 questions science can’t answer yet” page 21. Dr WM Bevis published a paper in the American Journal of Psychiatry claiming that “The alien ancestors...of this race were savages and cannibals.” So as you can see quite plainly, psychiatry is, and always has been, a tool for racist policies and ideologies. They are just trying to justify these policies by using fake science.

As the 18th century progressed the outright failures of these so called experts in curing madness began to threaten their bottom line forcing them to invent new medical models. Joseph Melling who is the assistant director of the Centre for Medical History said “The cures promised weren’t delivered so by the 1860’s there was a growing mood of pessimism covering Europe and North America, effectively these institutions were growing in numbers but not in effectiveness.”

The 20th century brought more medical models; American psychiatrist Henry Cotton mutilated his patients by removing their body parts! He declared this a breakthrough in
treatment mental illness! Andrew Scull states: “The earliest target was the teeth then the
tonsils and sinuses, but when the patient’s didn’t get better the enthusiasts for this
treatment would start to move down the body saying that obviously these patients have
swallowed these bacteria, so now stomachs need to go, spleens need to go, and eventually
colons need to go.”

As public outcries over these treatments that amounted to torture and maiming escalated,
the psychiatrists would invent new procedures and proclaim them all as the new miracle
cure. Even though, each one was found to be no more effective and no less brutal than the
last.

Professor Thomas Szasz says that “This is more or less the history of psychiatry, - to
damage the patient, this was just a new version of the original model which was to chain
these people up like animals.”

Lee Coleman says “If you’re doing this to somebody because you insist that they are going
to change, and you’re doing this by turning the screw, as you might say, whether it be by
restraint or medication, this is torture. A huge part of what psychiatry has done really
comes down to torture.”

As the 20th century progressed psychiatry would continue to seek legitimacy by transforming
itself into a medical discipline. Instead they have only succeeded in coming out with new
more “efficient” ways of inflicting pain and torture, and this has continued right up until the
present day were they have their most profitable and effective medical model which involves
the mass drugging of humanity. To do this psychiatry had to shatter one of mankind’s most
cherished beliefs, decreeing that people are not what they thought they were, i.e. human.

In 1879 in Leipzig in Germany a scientist called Willhelm Wundt (there is plenty on him in
the next few chapters) studied human behaviour, he declared man’s thoughts, feelings and
emotions were nothing but chemical reactions in the brain. He was frustrated in his efforts
to control behaviour because at this time man commonly believed that he possessed a soul,
Wundt re-defined this belief by announcing that man was just an animal without a soul. He
was now to be trained just like an animal because that was all he was. He was no longer a
thinker, but instead was just a monkey to be taught tricks. Students flocked to Germany
from around the world to learn about this new outlook, men like Friedrich Nietzsche
epitomised the mood of the time with statements like “God is dead... we have killed him.”

In 1879, German psychologist Wilhelm Wundt unveiled “experimental” psychology to his
students at Leipzig University, declaring the study of the soul a “waste of energy” and that
Man was nothing more than an animal. By redefining Man’s problems in “biological” terms,
Wundt and his fellow psychologists and psychiatrists were able to place the treatment of
such problems, and the funding for it, firmly within their own ranks.

Wundt's new "science," in describing Man as an animal that could be manipulated as easily
as a dog could be trained to salivate at the sound of a bell, found great favour with
warmongering governments. His theories fuelled the ambitions of Germany’s "Iron
Chancellor," Otto Von Bismarck, who sought the control of masses to feed his war machine;
those dreams of conquest resulted in the death of millions.

Although the "man-is-an-animal" theory is easily debunked (dogs do not drive cars, horses
will never paint masterpieces and concertos have yet to be performed by an orchestra of
monkeys), psychology and psychiatry adopted Wundt's biological model. Man was declared a
victim of his environment with little conscious control over his thoughts and actions—an
animal to be shaped by his master. However, neither psychology nor psychiatry has ever
been able to scientifically isolate a single biological cause of unwanted behaviour, or to
offer any cure. Ryan Bazler, coauthor of Psychology Debunked, says that with the soul
discarded, "There is no conscience, there is no higher law, no morality in your mind that
governs the way you act. You are just acting based on your impulses. You are acting the way
your brain tells you to act, which intuitively doesn't make sense. We are not slaves to our brains. You know, we don't walk around, 'Oh, my brain wants me to go this way,' you know. 'My brain wants me to go that way.'" Dr. Thomas Szasz, who has authored more than 25 books on psychiatry, states bluntly that the real purpose of psychiatry is "politics and economics. Behaviour control. It is not science. It is not medicine."

WILHELM WUNDT and his students reduced spirituality to biological factors, boasting that they had developed a "science without a soul." One of Wundt's pupils, Emil Kraepelin, a pioneer of psychiatric diagnosis, considered the mentally disturbed "a heavy burden for our nation" and the psychiatrist "the absolute ruler." Kraepelin was an early promoter of the false doctrine that mental disturbances are biologically inherited.

Ivan Pavlov a Russian was intrigued by this thought and began to do experiments, firstly on animals, to see how he could modify their behaviour. He observed that by ringing a bell before feeding a dog, and after conditioning the animal to expect food when they heard this bell, he noticed that merely by ringing the bell without feeding them, that he could still provoke the animal to begin salivating. This became known as Pavlovian conditioning and it was the start of what we would later term as mind-control experimentation. Pavlov then moved onto children, they cut holes in the sides of these kids' faces and inserted cone shaped pieces of metal into their cheeks. They would perform similar experiments to the one with the dog mentioned above, and they would then analyze the contents of these funnels to see if the expected results transpired. The idea that behaviour could be controlled and manipulated in this manner through repetitive behavioural conditioning became known as behaviourism. These people believed children could, and therefore should, be trained like animals.

The most famous of these behaviourists was a psychologist called John Watson who famously said "You must look at these children in the same way as the ox you slaughter"

John B. Watson From Wikipedia, the free encyclopaedia

Born: John Broadus Watson January 9, 1878 Died September 25, 1958 (aged 80)

Occupation: Psychologist, Advertising executive Known for Founding Behaviourism

In 1913, Watson published the article "Psychology as the Behaviourist Views It" — sometimes called "The Behaviourist Manifesto".[1] In this article, Watson outlined the major features of his new philosophy of psychology, called "behaviourism". The first paragraph of the article concisely described Watson's behaviourist position: Psychology as the behaviourist views it is a purely objective experimental branch of natural science. Its theoretical goal is the prediction and control of behaviour. Introspection forms no essential part of its methods, nor is the scientific value of its data dependent upon the readiness with which they lend themselves to interpretation in terms of consciousness. The behaviourist, in
his efforts to get a unitary scheme of animal response, recognizes no dividing line between man and brute. The behaviour of man, with all of its refinement and complexity, forms only a part of the behaviourist's total scheme of investigation. [p. 158] In 1913, Watson viewed Ivan Pavlov's conditioned reflex as primarily a physiological mechanism controlling glandular secretions. He had already rejected Edward L. Thorndike's "Law of Effect" (a precursor to B. F. Skinner's principle of reinforcement) due to what Watson believed were unnecessary subjective elements. It was not until 1916 that Watson would recognize the more general significance of Pavlov's formulation and make it the subject of his presidential address to the American Psychological Association. The article is also notable for its strong defence of the objective scientific status of applied psychology, which at the time was considered to be much inferior to the established structuralist experimental psychology.

With his "behaviourism", Watson put the emphasis on external behaviour of people and their reactions on given situations, rather than the internal, mental state of those people. In his opinion, the analysis of behaviours and reactions was the only objective method to get insight in the human actions. This outlook, combined with the complementary ideas of determinism, evolutionary continuism, and empiricism has contributed to what is now called radical behaviourism. It was this new outlook that Watson claimed would lead psychology into a new era. He claimed that before Wundt there was no psychology, and that after Wundt there was only confusion and anarchy. It was Watson's new behaviourism that would pave the way for further advancements in psychology. Watson's behaviourism rejected the studying of consciousness. He was convinced that it could not be studied, and that past attempts to do so have only been hindering the advancement of psychological theories. He felt that introspection was faulty at best and awarded researchers nothing but more issues. He pushed for psychology to no longer be considered the science of the "mind". Instead, he stated that psychology should focus on the "behaviour" of the individual, not their consciousness. [2]

Give me a dozen healthy infants, well-formed, and my own specified world to bring them up in and I'll guarantee to take any one at random and train him to become any type of specialist I might select - doctor, lawyer, artist, merchant-chief and, yes, even beggar-man and thief, regardless of his talents, penchants, tendencies, abilities, vocations, and race of his ancestors.

One might consider the experiment Watson and his assistant Rosalie Rayner carried out to be one of the most controversial in psychology. In 1920 it has become immortalized in introductory psychology textbooks as the Little Albert experiment. The goal of the experiment was to show how principles of, at the time recently discovered, classical conditioning could be applied to condition fear of a white rat into "Little Albert", an 11-month-old boy. Watson and Rayner conditioned "Little Albert" by clanging an iron rod when a white rat was presented. First, they presented to the boy a white rabbit and observed that he was not afraid of the it. Second, they presented him with a white rabbit and then clanged an iron rod. "Little Albert" responded by crying. This second presentation was repeated several times. Finally, Watson and Rayner presented the white rat by itself and the boy showed fear. This study demonstrated how emotions could become conditioned responses.


Watson`s successor, Harvard psychologist BF Skinner believed all behaviour could be manipulated to fit whatever outcome the behavioural psychiatrist desired, which if you think
about was a nice way of saying brainwashing. He was very famous for these experiments, and the one he is most remembered for was the “Skinner Box”. This was like a playpen, except that everything was controlled inside it like the lighting, sounds and temperature.

Skinner famously put his own child into this miniature prison cell for just short of ONE YEAR, his child had to give a conditioned response to certain stimulae on demand. This tells me everything I would need to know on this subject, and this man. He believed children could be trained like rats in a maze, or monkeys in a cage, this belief could only be put into practise after they had already decided that children were merely animals, as no human being could do this to another human, especially a child, under normal circumstances, it took the belief that we were beasts before this could transpire.

Now a not too short article on Skinner I thought still well worthy of inclusion.

I wrote this review of B. F. Skinner's book Beyond Freedom and Dignity in 1971, when the book first came out, to vent my anger at Skinner's monumental stupidity. The review was never published, nor did I try to get it published, but Walter Grinder distributed a few copies of it to his students at Rutgers University. I made some minor editorial changes from the typescript draft as I entered it into my computer 31 years later, but I left most of my original words unchanged because I still agree with my younger self.

Beyond Freedom and Dignity and Reason by Roy Halliday

B. F. Skinner, a professor of psychology at Harvard, is recognized as the most influential behavioural scientist alive. In his new book he presents the case for the further development of behaviourism, which he depicts as the only valid science of human behaviour. He characterizes all other social sciences as methodologically pre-scientific.

The title of this provocative book, Beyond Freedom and Dignity, is a slap in the face to libertarians, and each page of it stuns the reader with more unsettling ideas.

Skinner writes about "the literature of freedom," which includes John Stuart Mill's essay "On Liberty" and other writings opposed to tyranny and despotism. This literature, says Skinner, was useful in its day but is now obsolete. We know now that regimentation is a bad way to run a society. Diversity is important, and any society without it is poorly designed. The literature of freedom was helpful in getting people to realize this fact, but, says Skinner, this literature fosters other ideas that act as barriers to further advances in the technology of controlling human behaviour. These barriers are individual autonomy, free will, volition, and consciousness itself. All of these concepts are supposed to have been fostered and made popular by the literature of freedom, and all of them, according to B. F. Skinner, are myths.

A few quotations from his book should convince the reader that I do not misrepresent Skinner. He rules out independent consciousness: (My Note. Remember my intro?)

Without the help of a verbal community all behaviour would be unconscious. Consciousness is a social product. It is not only not the special field of autonomous man, it is not within the range of a solitary man. (192)

He doesn't forget memory:

The environment is often said to be stored in the form of memories: to recall something we search for a copy of it, which can then be seen as the original was seen. As far as we know, however, there are no copies of the environment in the individual at any time, even when a thing is present and being observed. (196-197)

He tosses out autonomy, abstraction, and association:
Rather than suppose that it is therefore autonomous man who discriminates, generalizes, forms concepts, or abstractions, recalls or remembers, and associates, we can put matters in good order simply by noting that these terms do not refer to forms of behaviour. (194)

Skinner believes the "literature of freedom" attributes these imaginary qualities to man in order to set him apart from other animals and to stifle the advance of behaviourism. If man is unique because he possesses the attributes of consciousness, autonomy, volition, and free will, then man is the only animal whose behaviour cannot be fully controlled by the technology to be developed by behaviourists. For this reason Skinner feels that the "literature of freedom" is the greatest obstruction to the advance of behaviourism.

To man qua man we readily say good riddance. Only by dispossessing him can we turn to the real causes of human behaviour. Only then can we turn from the inferred to the observed, from the miraculous to the natural, from the inaccessible to the manipulable. (200-201)

Behaviourist Jargon

Skinner's writing is difficult to understand. His style suffers from his attempt to eliminate all words that suggest people act because of ideas. He writes of positive and negative reinforcers instead of likes and dislikes. He translates English into the jargon of behaviourism, which is an attempt to eliminate all words that suggest conscious, purposeful, motivation of human behaviour. He explains:

We change the relative strengths of responses by differential reinforcement of alternative courses of action; we do not change something called a preference. We change the probability of an act by changing a condition of deprivation or aversive stimulation; we do not change a need. We reinforce behaviour in particular ways; we do not give a person a purpose or an intention. We change behaviour toward something, not an attitude toward it. We sample and change verbal behaviour, not opinions. (94-95)

Despite all his effort, Skinner does not succeed in translating the entire book. It would be completely incomprehensible if he did. Fortunately, he lapses into lucidity every once in a while, and invariably, it is because he sneaks in some introspective knowledge to explain behaviour and make it understandable.

The most interesting part of his chapter on dignity is his discussion of the role dignity plays in motivating human action. It is a strange topic for a behaviourist to discuss because, as a behaviourist, Skinner has no means of knowing about the subjective experience of pride or dignity. Pride, dignity, and admiration cannot be measured or observed by behaviourists. We have introspective knowledge of their existence only. Skinner smuggles introspective knowledge into the discussion to explain many kinds of human action. If he didn't, the book would be unintelligible.

Behaviourists cannot contribute significantly to our understanding of human behaviour without deviating from their own epistemology. Behaviourism denies that there is any such thing as human nature as a legitimate scientific concern. It denies that people act because they have ideas, values, and plans. It is no wonder that the jargon of behaviourism is hard to understand. By denying the existence of introspective knowledge and reason, it denies understanding itself.

Control by Behaviourists

The word control often implies purpose, but this is not what Skinner means to imply when he says that behaviour is always controlled. He means that behaviour is always determined by causes that are either genetic or environmental. Freedom (lack of control) is an impossible notion. But Skinner goes beyond this to assert that the individual plays no part in controlling his own actions.
The fundamental mistake made by all those who choose weak methods of control is to assume that the balance of control is left to the individual, when in fact it is left to other conditions. (99)

Skinner wants to replace existing control of human behaviour with "scientific" control; that is, external control by 'cultural designers' based on the findings of the behaviourists. Since freedom is imaginary anyway, Skinner says there would be no loss of freedom if the behaviourists gained control, and mankind would benefit by submitting to "scientific" controls administered by trained experts. The alternative is to continue to be controlled by a haphazard environment made up of unplanned controls. [Notice that (1) Skinner gives a reason for submitting to control by behaviourists, even though he claims to believe that people don’t do things for conscious reasons, and notice that (2) control by behaviourists would be for the purpose of making our collective life better, even though people, including behaviourists, do not act for such imaginary things as purposes.]

In order to change existing controls one would have to change either existing hereditary traits or existing environmental controls. We cannot change heredity, but Skinner believes environmental factors are more important anyway, so he proposes controlling us by changing our cultural environment.

Skinner wants to design a culture that will survive. So he proclaims survival of the culture to be the only value needed for testing the scientific control of our cultural environment. This standard makes all the sticky questions that people might raise about the causes of human behaviour insignificant.

Just as we do not need to explain the origin of a genetic mutation in order to account for its effect in natural selection, so we do not need to explain the origin of a cultural practice in order to account for its contribution to the survival of a culture. (136)

The cultural designers (ruling class) are a paradox of Skinnerism because they are alleged to have the ability to control the behaviour of everyone in society but they do not have the ability to control their own behaviour. If you ask how he can attribute the design of a culture to a behavioural scientist and not also attribute the design of the scientist’s own life to him, Skinner answers:

He is indeed controlled by his environment, but we must remember it is an environment largely of his own making. The evolution of a culture is a gigantic exercise in self-control. (215)

So, cultures can control themselves, but people can’t. An individual apparently has no self, but a culture has. This is the thinking of a collectivist. Skinner sees no contradiction here. The only problem he recognizes is the need to control the controllers:

The great problem is to arrange effective counter control and hence to bring some important consequences to bear on the behaviour of the controller. (171)

This problem will be solved by the scientific approach itself. The thing being controlled determines the design of the controlling forces. The cultural designers, being true scientists, will be responsive to the reactions of their human guinea pigs and will modify their methods of control accordingly. Furthermore, the controllers will have to live under the controls of their own design. Skinner tries to make it sound like the controlled can more easily control the controllers than the controllers can control the controlled. He assumes that the controllers will be pure behaviourists who will be guided exclusively by the principles he sets forth, but he does not explain how this could be guaranteed, even if we agreed that it would be desirable.

Designing a culture is like designing an experiment, contingencies are arranged and effects noted. (153)
How is it possible to conceive of an experiment without reference to the purpose of the experiment? What is an experiment if not the testing of a hypothesis—an idea? If men do not possess the capability to implement ideas—to act purposefully—as Skinner supposes, then there can be no such thing as an experiment! The concept of an experiment becomes meaningless without the prior concepts of hypotheses, purposes, and proof.

It is unfortunate for libertarians that the issue raised by Skinner that attracts the most attention is the one where his argument is strongest; namely, the issue of free will. This is an emotional issue for many people. It provokes bitter debate. Let us first examine some of the other issues raised by Skinner and then come back to this one, which I contend is not as crucial as is commonly thought. For a change, let us attack Skinner where he is weakest—as a scientist.

**Behaviourism as Trivial History**

Behaviourism, by denying the significant role played by mental categories, cannot go beyond the study of independent, unrelated, trivial events. It views cultures as sets of unrelated practices and it views practices as purposeless activities. All that Skinner can do without departing from the behaviourist view of human action is to compile meaningless facts about purposeless behaviour driven by contingencies of which no one is conscious. Ludwig von Mises, the founder of praxeology (the science of purposeful human action), saw through the behaviourist ideology when he wrote about its founder (Watson):

> Only by deceiving itself could behaviourism reach the point where it would be in a position to say anything about action. If, true to its resolve, behaviourism were completely to renounce the attempt to grasp meaning, it could not even succeed in singling out what it declares to be the subject matter of its research from all that the senses observe of human and animal behaviour. It would not succeed in marking off its function from that of physiology. Physiology, Watson maintains, is concerned in particular with the behaviour of the parts of the animal. Yet surely neither the reaction of the body to an infection not the phenomena of growth and age are to be classified as "behaviour of the parts." If, on the other hand, one chooses to regard a movement of a hand as an instance of behaviour on the part of the "whole animal," one can, of course, do so only on the view that in this movement something becomes operative that cannot be attributed to any particular part of the body. This something, however, can be nothing else than "meaning" or that which begets "meaning."

**Behaviourism cannot even define itself consistently. This is a poor beginning for an ideology that characterizes itself as a science.**

**The Fallacy of Scientism**

Because ideas cannot be measured, observed, or experimented with by the methods of the physical sciences, Skinner says the assertion that they exist is unscientific. And if ideas are not scientific neither is any explanation of human action that is based on the assumption that people have ideas and act because of ideas.

The physical sciences began by dispelling anthropomorphic explanations of physical phenomena. To attribute purpose, consciousness, volition, and other human characteristics to the inanimate and subhuman came to be regarded by scientists as superstitious nonsense.

Scientists regarded the subjects of their investigations as objects governed exclusively by discoverable laws of nature, completely determined in all their actions by their inherent physical characteristics and by external forces. The purpose of scientific investigations was to discover the physical properties and the natural laws governing objects.

The method devised by scientists for this purpose was controlled observation. By carefully changing only one variable at a time, observing the results, and repeating the process and
getting the same results each time, scientists could infer natural laws. This method led to
great successes in fields such as physics and chemistry. Since the time of Saint-Simon this
scientific method has come to be regarded, more and more, as the only truly scientific
method.

This method, whether it is called empiricism or scientism, when applied to the social
sciences is not only objectionable for its violations of human freedom and dignity, it is
incorrect, illogical, and unscientific. It does not take into account the fundamental facts
about human nature that differentiate the social sciences from the physical sciences.

In their attempt to be scientific and to abolish superstitious anthropomorphism, empiricists
have gone too far. They have gone from declaring it unscientific to ascribe human
characteristics to inanimate objects to declaring it unscientific to ascribe human
characteristics to humans! Excluding anthropomorphism from the social sciences is the
fallacy of scientism.

By assuming that knowledge is limited to what is measurable and observable, Skinner
unwittingly rules out all the logical sciences. Mathematical proofs, for example, are not
based on empirical evidence, but on logical deductions from axioms. In fact, logic itself is
based on "unscientific" axioms that are self-evident to us only through introspection. The
logical and mathematical relationships underlying the theories of behaviourism and all the
empirical science are a priori categories of the human mind. They are only know to us
through introspection. In a review of Jacques Monad's *Chance and Necessity* Gunther Stent
observed:

Certainly the most basic law projected by man into nature is causality, or the belief that the
events he observes in the outer world resemble his own conscious acts in their being
connected as cause and effect, rather than occurring haphazardly ... Indeed, even the most
elementary dimensions in terms of which scientists attempt to describe the very events that
causality is supposed to connect, such as time, space, mass, and temperature, are nothing
more than projections into nature of man's own physiology and anatomy.

By denying the importance of introspective knowledge, Skinner denies any basis for the
physical sciences and denies the significance of behaviourism.

Human Practices

Most people would agree that new practices arise because individuals have values, get
ideas, make plans to achieve their values, try them, and adopt the plans that seem to work.
This is a praxeological explanation of new practices. Skinner, however, does not think it is
an explanation at all. To his way of thinking, attributing human action to unmeasurable
ideas, values, plans, and purposes is a supernatural explanation like calling God the first
cause and claiming thereby to have explained existence. All that it accomplishes, he feels, is
the satisfaction of the curiosity of superficial thinkers. Truly inquisitive people will still
wonder what caused the ideas or what caused God.

Inquisitive people will demand an explanation of the explanation ad infinitum, regardless of
what is being explained and regardless of whether the explanation is a praxeological,
behaviourist, or supernatural one. Praxeological explanations, unlike supernatural
explanations, do not pretend to deal with final causes. Skinner goes too far when he says,

If our understanding of contingencies of reinforcement is not yet sufficient to explain all
kinds of thinking, we must remember that the appeal to the mind explains nothing at all.
(195)

On the contrary, it explains the private internal experiences that we all know are most real.
The external world is more abstract than the internal one. And praxeology, because it
recognizes the significance of the internal world, is more fundamental than behaviourism
for understanding human action. What does understanding mean if not a mental state? The
fact that we cannot observe or measure other people’s thoughts only means they cannot be scientifically studied by the limited tools of the empirical sciences. It does not follow that logical analysis of values and intentions is not of the utmost importance. Mankind would not have survived this long if the average man did not have a better understanding of human nature than the average behaviourist.

Skinner is wrong to imply that purposes, values, and ideas, which praxeology assumes underlie human action, are supernatural categories. Ideas, values, memory, reasoning, and purposes are directly experienced by all men. They are not supernatural. They are facts that are part of general human experience, unlike the gods who manifest themselves to only a select few. We can be more sure of the existence of ideas that we experience directly than we can be of the existence of the external world, which we merely surmise from the data supplied by our senses. All experience is subjective, including experience of external events. Empirical observation presupposes consciousness. So ideas, values, consciousness, memory, reasoning, and other activities of the mind that we know directly are just as fit subjects for natural science as the more abstract objects studied by the empirical sciences.

It is hardly scientific to rule out the unique knowledge, values, memories, and experiences of the individual acting man from the chain of causes that results in his behaviour. Studying human behaviour without recognizing the significance of ideas and purposes is like studying the behaviour of an automobile without considering the possibility that there might be a driver inside. What praxeology postulates is a driver in the driver's seat, not a ghost in the machine.

How does Skinner explain the emergence of a new practice? Well, since intent is ruled out for being a prescientific explanation, the only alternative is accident. To put it in the enlightening and "scientific" language of behaviourism, a new practice arises when controlling contingencies, excluding ideas, cause a person to behave in a way that produces a reinforcing result (one which the controlling contingencies, by accident, cause repetition of). Then, because the controlling contingencies, unintentionally, produce a reinforcing result in one case, the controlling contingencies cause other people to duplicate the behaviour for no reason. Now isn't that as clear as can be? Does it sound like an explanation or a restatement of the question? How is this behaviourist explanation any meatier than simply saying that new practices arise somehow?

My negative reaction to Skinner's analysis of human behaviour is not due so much to his disparagement of human freedom and dignity as it is due to his assault on the things I am most certain of, namely, consciousness, values, volitions, and emotions. By denying the importance of these things Skinner is denying the most fundamental human experiences. His behavioural science, whatever else it may be, is not a study of human life or human action.

Skinner is the master of the self-refuting argument. He denies that ideas play a role in human action, then he explains that it is because of unscientific ideas people have about their freedom and dignity that they show disrespect for his behaviourist theories.

Free Will

Skinner's best point is his attack on the godlike man whose actions are entirely self-caused or uncaused. But even to argue against free will Skinner has to deviate from his behaviourist epistemology and conger up the mental category of causality, which logically precedes empirical inquiry. Empirical science does not prove the law of causality, it assumes it. Historical evidence may suggest antecedent causes of human action, but historical evidence cannot disprove free will. The disproof of free will comes from the a priori idea of causality. It is impossible for us to understand an event happening without a cause. The concept of free will postulates and event, a man willing something, that is not caused by any preceding contingencies. This contradicts the law of causality and is therefore unnatural and unscientific. Skinner does not present the argument this way. He
not only denies the existence of free will, he relegated volition itself to the realm of the supernatural or prescientific.

Some of the confusion about free will may be semantic. Many people equate volition with freedom of the will as though the two terms were synonymous. Volition and will are the same, but neither volition nor will means the same thing as the term free will. No one can convincingly deny the existence of volition as a human trait because we are directly aware of our own volitions. A volition is a conscious decision and resolution to act. It is a part in the chain of causality leading to an action that we take. It is the part that takes place in our conscious mind, so it is the part that seems most significant to us. Free will, however, is the notion that our volitions are spontaneous and uncaused rather than determined by our character, experiences, and circumstances. It is this kind of will that determinists deny. Determinists hold that nothing occurs spontaneously; nothing is uncaused. Human volitions are not exceptions to this law. A man’s will, at any particular time, is an event that needs to be explained like any other—in terms of causes.

Proponents of free will, on the other hand, deny that free will is inconsistent with the law of causality. Instead, they say that free will means man’s will is self-caused rather than externally caused or spontaneous.

But what does "self-caused" mean? If it means merely that the immediate cause for a man willing something is not only external contingencies but also the previously determined personality of the man, then self-causation and the law of causality are not contradictory. However, this is not what the free will proponents mean to suggest. Instead, when they say a man’s will is self-caused, they imply that his self, his personality, is self-caused and is not ultimately determined by external contingencies.

Determinists reply that self-causation is only a proximate explanation of volition, not a final one. A volition is a finite thing that has not existed since the beginning of the universe, so it cannot be its own first cause. One of the causes of a man’s current volition may be a previous one. But then the origin of that previous volition needs to be explained, and so on, until we reach a point in the chain of events where the cause of his volition submerges to the unconscious level. But even unconscious or subconscious events are not exempt from the law of causality. Although we do not sufficiently understand them, we know the origin of subconscious events must in principle be explainable in terms of a mixture of prior mental states and the environment at the time, the origin of which, in turn, needs to be explained. Even if all his mental states were direct results of his first thoughts, we must recognize that his first thoughts must have been determined by his heredity and environment inside his mother’s womb and they could not have been willful acts on his part.

It is unfortunate that the issue of free will is regarded by Skinner and his critics as the crucial issue. Contrary to the prevailing opinion, it does not follow that if we don’t have free will we don’t have volitions at all. The fact that our volitions are determined means that they exist not that they don’t exist! It should be easier to dismiss the claim that we make choices if we conceive of volitions as free and uncaused than if we think of them as arising naturally from our past history and current circumstances. Skinner, like so many others on both sides of the issue, overlooks the possibility of determined volitions causing human action.

Proponents of free will often point to the failure of determinists to predict the future as proof that we have free will. Predicting the future is not impossible in principle, it is only impossible in practice. This does not disprove causality, it only disproves the omniscience of predictors. Causality is not a hypothesis the needs to be tested empirically. It is an a priori category of the mind that we must possess before we can formulate a hypothesis about anything.

Nonetheless there as some fairly obvious correlations that free will proponents prefer to ignore because they imply external causes for many important human choices. If our choices are not determined by our genetics and our history and our environment, then the
same proportion of people from all groups should be making the same major life decisions and the fact that there is a disproportionate number of young black men in American prisons or the fact that there is a disproportionate number of Hindus in India is simply an amazing coincidence.

If the only alternative to Skinner's behaviourism required a belief in free will, behaviourism, as stupid as it is, would have to be regarded as the only scientific approach to human action. Fortunately, Ludwig von Mises, the great libertarian social scientist did not base his analysis of human action on the unscientific and unnatural premise of free will.

Physical Sciences, Logical Sciences, and Methodological Dualism

The obvious truth is that reason, man's most characteristic feature, is also a biological phenomenon. It is neither more nor less natural than any other feature of the species homo sapiens, for instance, the upright gait or the hairless skin.

The mind can be regarded as a subset of the physical world, or the physical world can be regarded as a subset of the mental world. Philosophical problems arise about the interrelationships between mind and body when neither is regarded as a subset of the other (dualism). It is not necessary to solve the age-old problem of how the mind and body interrelate before we proceed with praxeology, economics, psychology, or any other science dealing with purposeful human action or with other non-empirical subjects such as mathematics. We can let philosophers continue to work on the mind-body problem while we proceed to develop sciences that study both of these aspects of reality. All we need to do is recognize that both the outside physical world and the inner life of the mind that we experience directly are both real, that our minds direct our purposeful actions in the physical world, and that different epistemological approaches (methodological dualism) are required for the logical sciences and the physical sciences.

Skinner makes the mistake of accepting materialism (which is unproved) and rejecting methodological dualism (which has been shown to be very fruitful). He rejects the obvious fact that ideas can cause actions and adopts epiphenomenalism instead. Epiphenomenalism assumes that mind and body both function in accordance with physical laws and that a byproduct of this functioning in humans is consciousness. Physical laws determine the experience of consciousness like the speed of a car determines the reading on the speedometer, but consciousness no more determines the actions of man than the speedometer determines the speed of a car. Skinner offers no proof of this counterintuitive philosophy, he simply assumes it is true.

Epiphenomenalists like Skinner leave themselves open to ridicule when they assert that consistent materialism denies any role for ideas in the chain of events. What materialists should say instead is that ideas are one of the forms of physical reality and as such they are able to interact with other forms of physical reality and with each other. This allows materialists to acknowledge the reality of ideas and the reality of the role ideas play in the world. By conceding that ideas are physically real, materialists can grant that ideas have physical effects, indeed they must have physical effects.

The feeling that we make decisions is not a deception. Materialists should say that when a person makes a decision his choice is the result of the values (ideas that have physical reality) that he has acquired (somewhere in his brain), knowledge (more ideas that have physical reality) he possesses (somewhere in his brain), and the other circumstances in which he finds himself. Then materialists should recognize that people's decisions reflect the logic of their values and can be scientifically analyzed best by using logic rather than by empirical methods that as yet have not been able to capture, measure, or explain ideas in a meaningful way. There is no need for us to restrict psychology to the fruitless empirical approach of behaviourism.

Tokens versus Punishment
Skinner is opposed to punishment on the grounds that it is not as effective a means of controlling people as are positive reinforcements such as money, power, prestige, and dignity. He regards punishment as an anachronistic practice fostered by the "literature of freedom." I also oppose punishment, but I don't blame this age-old practice on the relatively recent "literature of freedom," and I think it is contradictory for Skinner to assert that no practices are cause by ideas and then to blame the "literature of freedom" for propagating the idea of punishment.

Skinner's technique of controlling people by giving them rewards for good behaviour rather than punishment for bad behaviour is being practiced in mental hospitals in New York in the form of a token system. The patients are paid tokens for work they do and for social behaviour deemed desirable by the psychologists in charge. The inmates can redeem their tokens for commodities, services, and privileges.

Dr. Nathan Arzin of Anna State Hospital in southern Illinois, one of the pioneers of this approach, can go into a ward of severely retarded, incontinent individuals and toilet train them in three days. He does not reason with them (they have IQs of 25) nor does he in any way operate on their emotions. He just works on their behaviour. This approach may well be the most practical way to supervise idiots. If verbal communication is impossible, then perhaps the best way to get people to behave the way you want them to is to train them the way an animal trainer would. To an outsider, this seems a more humane form of control than using strait jackets or electric shock treatments.

The token system for treating the mentally deficient is sometimes compared to the way the free market economy induces people to work. The tokens are like a worker's paycheck, but there is a crucial difference. Ninety percent of the people in mental institutions are there involuntarily. As Dr. Thomas Szasz has written, "In my opinion 'treatment,' in a free society, can only be that intervention to which a person submits voluntarily. If he's incarcerated in a hospital that's punishment, no matter what his benefactors may care to call it." That is the difference between freedom and slavery; between treatment and punishment. If Skinner proposes to treat people who are not volunteers, he is not really against punishment.

Political Freedom and Behaviourism

The difference between freedom in the political sense and freedom in the metaphysical sense is crucial. To be metaphysically free means to be free from the constraints of the laws of nature and to not have your actions be determined or even limited by anything other than your own will. To be politically free means to not be coerced by force or threats of force from other people. Metaphysical freedom is inconsistent with the laws of nature and can only be experienced by a supernatural being. Political freedom is possible for human beings.

When a man takes purposeful action it is the result of his conscious decision, his will, and it reflects his values and ideas at the time. To change a man's deliberate actions you must change his conscious will. His conscious will obeys certain laws and can be changed only in accordance with those laws. To get a person to change his mind you must either (1) persuade him to change or rearrange the priority of his values, (2) convince him that his plan for achieving his values is incorrect, (3) bribe him by offering him something more valuable to him than the value he is currently pursuing, or (4) coerce him by force or by threatening to prevent him from attaining something more valuable to him than the value he is currently pursuing. The first method requires the use of moral or aesthetic reasoning. The second uses economic or praxeological reasoning. The third uses economic incentives such as money or goods or services. The fourth uses violence or threats or political power.

If behaviourism is to be regarded as a science, it must be value free and devoid of ethical or aesthetic presumptions. So it cannot use the first method. And since behaviourism denies that people make plans and act on those plans, behaviourism cannot use the second
method. Consequently, unless behaviourists can bribe us, their only hope for getting us to behave as they would like is to gain political power.

In this age of bureaucracy the individual is coercively prohibited from many activities, and the possibilities for behaviourists getting authority to experimentation on us are greater than in the earlier days of our republic.

Skinner's emphasis on external contingencies makes sense in cases where coercion is used to train people to behave in a prescribed way. It makes less and less sense the more political freedom an individual subject is allowed.

Although he is nominally opposed to coercion because of its inefficiency, Skinner is not in favour of political freedom or individual rights.

Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are basic rights. But they are rights of the individual and were listed as such at a time when the literature of freedom and dignity were concerned with the aggrandizement of the individual. They have only a minor bearing on the survival of a culture. (p. 180)

That depends, of course, on whether the culture is individualistic or collectivist. Skinner is a collectivist.

Whether or not the literature of freedom has anything to say about scientific methodology as such, it most definitely is opposed to totalitarian control of society by technocrats with collectivist ideas. In this respect the literature of freedom is opposed to Skinner and his brand of science, and Skinner is correct in identifying the literature of freedom as a major obstacle he needs to overcome.

In his excellent critique of Beyond Freedom and Dignity Noam Chomsky concentrates his criticism on the prematurely of Skinner's claim that there is a behaviourist technology than can effectively control us and on the unlikelihood that there ever will be such a technology because of the arbitrary limitations that behaviourism imposes on its own research. Chomsky does not dispute the argument that if we assume that 'what a person wills is fully determined by his genetic endowment and history of 'reinforcement,' we should therefore make use of the best behavioural technology to shape and control behaviour in the common interest.' Indeed, Chomsky attempts to argue that there is not enough scientific evidence to justify the hypothesis of determinism, as though determinism requires empirical proof.

Skinner contends, and the libertarian Chomsky sees logic in it, that if we cannot be free anyway, we might as well submit to "scientific control" instead of haphazard control by an unplanned environment. This argument confuses metaphysical freedom and political freedom. Metaphysical determinism does not preclude political freedom. Political freedom might be possible. No one has proven that political freedom is impossible and there is historical evidence to support the possibility of liberty. If political freedom were impossible for some reason it still doesn't follow that we should allow B. F. Skinner to control our lives. Only if political freedom is impossible and if Skinner's animal-trainer approach could make our lives better, then we might take Skinner's proposal seriously. And if we had bacon we could have bacon and eggs if we had eggs.

The irrationality of Skinner's argument can be seen more clearly if we translate it like this: "Since it is impossible for you not to want the things you want, why don't you do as I say?"

The sheer idiocy of this argument is even clearer when put to a libertarian this way: "Since you can't help wanting political freedom, respect for your rights as an individual, and not being told what to do, why don't you let me control your life?"

Moral Responsibility and Determinism

Perhaps the reason libertarians like Noam Chomsky believe that metaphysical free will is crucial is that they base their political philosophy on their moral philosophy and they see no
way to reconcile moral responsibility with determinism. I see a conflict between spontaneous actions and moral responsibility, but not between determinism and moral responsibility.

The person who has moral responsibility for an act is the person who made the final decision to perform the act. It does not matter what motivates his decision, the actor is inescapably responsible for his deliberate acts. The fact that an individual’s will is determined by the combined factors of his genetics, his unique lifetime of experiences, and his present situation does not make him less responsible, it merely explains why he chose to do what he did. An individual’s decision to act is a true reflection of his character. The individual is the last specific cause that we can identify in the chain of events that results in his actions. An individual cannot relinquish his responsibility or share it with an authority figure. His actions tell us what kind of moral values he possesses. We can use this knowledge to judge his character against our own moral standards.

We can judge a man’s character more confidently by what he does than by what he says. We infer his true beliefs, his true priorities and values, from his actions. We cannot know with certainty what controlling forces in his past history caused him to adopt his values and order them the way he did, but we do know that his actions reflect his priorities, and we can judge him accordingly.

Sometimes people claim that a man is not morally responsible for his actions when there are extenuating circumstances, such as when another man has a gun in his back. The fact is, he is still responsible for his deliberate actions even under duress, because we can still conclude something about his moral character from observing what he chooses to do. If he commits a crime under duress, we cannot conclude that he places no value on right behaviour, but we can conclude that he places a higher value on his own life.

Accidental, spontaneous, reflexive, or unconscious actions convey almost no information about the moral values held by the actor. These are the kinds of actions for which the individual as a moral agent is not responsible.

Not only is determinism compatible with fixing credit for demonstrating virtue and fixing blame for demonstrating the lack of virtue, determinism also explains why moral responsibility is associated with purposeful behaviour rather than all behaviour. According to determinism, purposeful behaviour reflects the preestablished personality and moral character of the acting man. Under the alternative view, if man had metaphysical free will his actions would not be the result of his preestablished character. Instead his actions would be spontaneous and unpredictable, and they would tell us nothing about his moral character. Indeed moral character and moral responsibility are incompatible with metaphysical freedom.

Conclusion

Skinner hopes to refute in advance all criticism by calling his libertarian critics neurotic or psychotic and then accusing them of name-calling:

A literature of freedom may inspire a sufficiently fanatical opposition to controlling practices to generate a neurotic if not a psychotic response. There are signs of emotional instability in those who have been deeply affected by the literature. We have no better indication of the plight of the traditional libertarian than the bitterness with which he discusses the possibility of a science and technology of behaviour and their use in the intentional design of a culture. Name-calling is common. (p. 165)

Being a libertarian and, therefore, fanatic, neurotic (if not psychotic), unstable, and emotional, I can be excused if I resort to bitter name-calling. We can’t all be as dispassionate and open-minded as Skinner about his plans to control our lives.
Although he takes the correct side on determinism, Skinner is wrong in nearly all of his other conclusions. He is wrong when he says consciousness, memory, volition, and reason are unscientific and can safely be ignored. He is wrong in his belief that behaviourism is more than a trivial science. He is ignorant of the truly important scientific achievements of the Austrian School of economics. He is ignorant of the philosophical assumptions underlying his own narrow field of animal training. He has less than an average child’s understanding of human nature. He is naive in his political prescriptions. He confuses political freedom with metaphysical freedom. He is prone to collectivist fallacies. He is a poor excuse for a scientist or human benefactor. It is a sad commentary on the state of American culture that someone as stupid and confused as Skinner can gain a following.

To return to the CCHR article: $19 Billion dollars of US tax dollars has been spent on this behaviour modification “science” by the US government since 1948. If you were smart, you would want to know exactly how was this money spent, and more importantly, why was it done.

The video then goes onto eugenics which has always been closely linked with psychiatry, I won’t cover this again as I cover eugenics in great detail later on, what I will point out was that the Nazi extermination programme was ran by psychiatrists, Jovan Raskovic who organised the Serbian side of the ethnic cleansing programme in the Bosnian crisis was a psychiatrist, his compatriot Radovan Karadzic who helped him organise this ethnic cleansing programme during the recent war, he was also a psychiatrist. Osama’s right hand man Ayman Al-Zawahiri - (who is also credited as being the brains of the operation, though you’ll find out the brains behind Al-Qaeda actually live in London and New York) - Zawahiri is a psychologist, - enough said, many psychiatrists like genocide.

As you might have gathered by now it appears that this field of medicine is behind racism, eugenics, mind control and state sponsored torture. Not bad for something which has also cured nobody!

"The science of improving the stock [will] give more suitable races or strains of blood a better chance of prevailing speedily over the less suitable...." Francis Galton English psychologist, inventor of eugenics - (My Note. He’s covered in book three)

In 1883, Francis Galton, English psychologist and half cousin of Charles Darwin, invented the term eugenics (meaning good stock). Galton supported Darwin's theory that Man had evolved from classes of lower animals. He promoted the breeding of better human stock and discouraged the reproduction of those he considered less desirable. The progression from Wundt's "man-is-an-animal" theory to the breeding doctrines of eugenics was a natural one.

Soon, British psychologists like Herbert Spencer were widely promoting the pseudoscience of eugenics. In 1870, Spencer claimed that selective breeding of the fittest would bring about a superior race, and that the unfit should be allowed to die out. He recommended that natural selection be allowed to take its course, stating for example, that the government should do nothing to save the poor, the weak or the unfit. Spencer claimed that aiding the children of the poor was a serious crime against society because it would "disadvantage the offspring of the worthy." He called this "evolutionary psychology." He opposed enacting laws to mandate safety standards for housing, cleanwater systems, effective sewage systems, and mine and factory regulations because they represented an "artificial preservation of those least able to take care of themselves."
EUGENICS IN THE UNITED STATES

In the early 1900s, to build support for sterilizing minorities and the "unfit," the American Eugenics Society awarded medals (above left) at county fairs for the best-bred families. Sterilization of those deemed "unfit" by psychiatry continued into the 1970s.

The United States was not immune to the eugenics ideology. In 1896, Connecticut enacted a law prohibiting the "insane" from marrying. Other states followed, threatening the mentally ill with a $1,000 fine and five years in prison if they wed. Charles Davenport, who studied British psychological eugenics, argued that if a society had to choose between allowing "mental defectives" to procreate or executing them, the latter was preferable.

By the 1920s, eugenic sterilization was practiced in two dozen states. In 1921, the Second International Congress on Eugenics in New York declared that science should "enlighten government in the prevention of the spread and multiplication of worthless members of society."

During the 1930s, United States immigration policies were guided by eugenics theories, and many peoples of Italian and Eastern European descent were turned away. And to a large extent, as in Germany, anti-Semitism was fuelled by advocates of the eugenics fallacy. As late as 1974, women on welfare were twice as likely as other women to be sterilized; 25% of Native American women had been sterilized and a decline in fertility was most pronounced among African Americans and Mexican-Americans.

EUGENICS TODAY

Eugenic ideology is still prevalent throughout psychologists' utterances and writings. American psychologist Richard Herrnstein's 1994 book, The Bell Curve, (pictured above) labelled African Americans and Hispanics "genetically disabled," claimed they were intellectually inferior due to heredity and asserted that neither education nor training could change this.

In 1971 psychiatrist Dr. Louis Jolyon "Jolly" West, a legendary figure in CIA mind control circles operating out of UCLA continued the legacy of racism that is synonymous with the field of psychiatry. He hatched an aversion therapy "experiment" that he called "violence centres". This government sponsored scheme involved implanting electrodes in the brains of (only) African American and Hispanic "patients" (who were all prison inmates I think).
These implants shocked the men if they displayed any violent tendencies. If this didn’t achieve the desired results then the individuals were chemically castrated! When West’s racist policy created a public outrage the plan was quickly shelved.

Let’s take a quick detour to look at similar institution that did get off the ground.

The Judge Rotenberg Educational Centre

The Judge Rotenberg Educational Centre (JRC, formerly known as the Behaviour Research Institute) is a facility for special needs students that operates in Canton, Massachusetts, providing applied behaviour analysis and educational services to children and adults with severe developmental disabilities and emotional or behaviour disorders, as well as providing respite care to their primary caregivers. The Centre is one of very few that makes extensive use of aversives, including electric shock and withholding of food, in its treatment and behavioural interventions.

In April 2012, a lawsuit against the JRC resulted in the release of a graphic videotape showing a boy being shocked and restrained repeatedly over several hours.

History

The Centre was founded as the Behaviour Research Institute in 1971 by Matthew L. Israel, a psychologist who trained with B. F. Skinner. In 1994 the centre changed its name to the Judge Rotenberg Educational Centre "to honour the memory of the judge [who] helped to preserve [the] program from extinction at the hands of state licensing officials in the 1980's." It has 900 employees and annual revenues exceeding $56 million, charging $220,000 a year for each student.

The Judge Rotenberg Centre treatment goals include a near-zero rejection/expulsion policy, active treatment with a behavioural approach directed exclusively towards normalization, frequent use of behavioural rewards and punishment, video monitoring of staff and the option to use aversives, the most controversial of which is the use of electric shocks. The final item provoked considerable controversy and led to calls from several disability rights groups to call for human protection from Aversion therapy approaches.

In 2011 facilities licensed by the DDS (Department of Developmental Services) in Massachusetts, including but not limited to the Judge Rotenberg Centre, were banned from subjecting new admissions to severe behavioural interventions including electric shock, long-term restraint, or aversives that pose risk for psychological harm.

Use of aversives

The Centre makes use of aversives as part of their intensive, 24/7 behaviour modification program. Until the late 1980s, aversion therapy was administered in the form of spanking with a spatula, pinching the feet, and forced inhaling of ammonia.

The Centre administers 2-second electric skin shocks to residents using a Graduated Electronic Decelerator (GED), which was invented to administer the skin-shocks by remote control through electrodes worn against the skin. Most often, the shocks are initiated manually by the staff. Automatic punishment is also used by forcing the patient to sit down on a cushion; if they stand up, they are automatically shocked. To address high-risk, low-frequency behaviours, a "Behaviour Rehearsal Lesson" has been planned: The person is restrained and forcibly told to misbehave: if the student pulls away, he is shocked; if he follows the order to engage in the risky behaviour, he is shocked even more. Reduction of food is also used as punishment: up to three-quarters of the daily required calories can be withheld from the patients if staff members judge that they are misbehaving.
The centre stated on its website that electrical shock aversives are only employed after positive behavioural interventions have not been proven to help with violent, self-injurious behaviours and the GED is used with only 42% of residents of school age. In 2011 facilities licensed by the DDS (Department of Developmental Services) in Massachusetts, including but not limited to the Judge Rotenberg Centre, were banned from subjecting new admissions to severe behavioural interventions including electric shock, long-term restraint, or aversives that pose risk for psychological harm.

Controversy

Risks of electric shock

Concerns into the treatment regime prompted investigation by New York City Council and an independent report was commissioned which was highly critical of both processes and oversight at the facility. The report mentioned a dependence on punishment, almost to the total exclusion of positive reinforcement, medication or psychological therapy. This dependence is also evident in the lack of effort to switch gradually to other treatment as the condition of the patients improves. Social interaction, academic instruction and respect for the patients dignity were all found insufficient. The report also found substantial risks of malnourishment and side effects of the repeated punishments — both physical (burns) and psychological (fear, PTSD, aggression). The qualifications of the personnel were judged insufficient; indeed, most of the staff have only completed high school. Some of the electrical shocking devices used are not cleared by the FDA.

In December 2007, the Centre was found by the Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care to have been abusive towards residents, failing to protect their health, after two residents were shocked using a GED on the behest of a former student, posing as a staff member via telephone. Video surveillance revealed that one resident was restrained on a 4-point board despite the fact the individual was not approved for this type of physical restraint. In response, the Centre has claimed to have instituted several reforms, including re-training current staff, appointing new supervisors, regularly reviewing video recordings of staff and supposedly instituting random spot checks of staff behaviour, new call screening procedures and the suspension or cancellation of certain punishments (including the GED for certain residential units). The Centre also had its operations reviewed until December 2008, with specific attention being paid to the use of GED to ensure they were only used for extremely dangerous and self-destructive behaviour, and also supposedly had to show the treatments reduce those behaviours.

A video tape documenting a compilation of the footage related to abuse investigations was destroyed by the school after being reviewed by several investigators, despite being requested to keep the tape by an investigator with the Disabled Persons Protection Commission. In November 2011, the JRC was legally prohibited from using aversives under new regulations adopted by the Massachusetts Department of Developmental Services.

Parents of difficult children have been both highly supportive and critical of the centre’s practices; the centre has been both praised for allowing residents and parents to live together, while others have sued the school based on their use of aversives.

Characterization of shocks as torture

On April 29, 2010, the American human rights organization Mental Disability Rights International filed a request with the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Torture, Manfred Nowak, stating they believed the residents were being subjected to human rights abuses due to their use of aversives. On May 11, Special Rapporteur Nowak sent what he described as "an urgent appeal to the U.S. government asking them to investigate," according to ABC Nightline.

The JRC replied to a news story on the appeal, calling it "nothing more than a regurgitation of the outdated, false and unproven accusations that have been made against JRC". The JRC
stated that their treatments were often the last form of treatment for severely affected individuals, and that the treatments free them from "restraint, drugs, self-abuse, and all the severe pain it was causing them, through the use of safe, effective and far less intrusive behavioural treatment". The reply also stated that the evidence cited in the MDRI request grossly misstated information found on the JRC website, misquoted statements made by former students to only show the interventions used while ignoring statements by students that the treatments were effective and permitted them to live better lives and that "It would be torture to not treat these students and allow them to be chemically restrained and warehoused for the rest of their lives."[11]

U.N. Special Rapporteur on Torture Manfred Nowak stated: "This is torture. Of course here they might say, but this is for a good purpose because it is for medical treatment. But even for a good purpose – because the same is to get from a terrorist information about a future attack, is a good purpose. To get from a criminal a confession is a good purpose. ...You cannot balance this. The prohibition of torture is absolute."[15]

Destruction of videotapes

In May 2011, Matthew Israel was charged with misleading a grand jury over the school's destruction of tapes of episodes of students being shocked, as well as being an accessory after the fact. Israel resigned his position at the JRC in a deferred prosecution plea deal with the Massachusetts State Attorney General's office.[16] The JRC is currently administered by a court-appointed monitor.[17] In 2011 facilities licensed by the DDS (Department of Developmental Services) in Massachusetts, including but not limited to the Judge Rotenberg Centre, were banned from subjecting new admissions to severe behavioural interventions including electric shock, long-term restraint, or aversives that pose risk for psychological harm.[18]

Andre McCollins lawsuit and videotape

In April of 2012 Andre McCollins sued the JRC with the charge of having shocked him excessively and caused permanent damage.[21] During the trial a videotape of the incident was shown and aired by Fox News.[22] The video showed McCollins being held face down and shocked repeatedly for several hours after refusing to remove his coat.[23] During the shocks he is seen screaming uncontrollably, and when taken to a hospital three days later by his mother was diagnosed with acute stress response caused by the shocks.[24] On cross-examination, an expert witness for the defence admitted that the shocks had been unsuccessful in accomplishing any treatment goal whatsoever.[25] The JRC had successfully kept the video sealed until April 2012.[26]

McCollins' mother testified that he was catatonic three days after the episode.[27] An expert witness for the prosecution stated that the ordeal permanently traumatized McCollins and was a "gross deviation from accepted standards".[28] The unveiling of the video has led to widespread condemnation of the use of shocks and the JRC, with calls from Massachusetts Governor Deval Patrick and others to ban such use of shocks outright.[29]

2. ^ UN Calls Shock Treatment at Mass. School 'Torture' p.1


16. *"Founder Forced To Leave Controversial Special Needs School" (html).*

17. *Rotenberg founder set to face charges, The Boston Globe, 26 May 2011*


Brief CV for Louis Jolyon West (remember this for the FMSF chapter later on)

People he is credited with “treating”: Jack Ruby (killed Lee Harvey Oswald the “Lone Nut” who supposedly killed John F Kennedy) January 7, 1999, Reuters: "After examining [Jack] Ruby, the killer of President Kennedy's assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald, West concluded Ruby was suffering from major mental illness precipitated by the stress of (his) trial. Charles Manson (No explanation needed), Tim McVeigh (The “Lone Nut who supposedly carried out the Oklahoma bombing. - The bombing of the federal building in Oklahoma City which results in the death of 168 people), Sirhan-Sirhan (The “Lone Nut” who supposedly killed Robert Kennedy), Patty Hearst (Kidnapped by a CIA ran cult, was forced to rob banks with them), and David Koresh (The “Lone Nut” who formed a cult, which culminated in 76 deaths as a result of the government siege on the Branch Davidians compound in Waco Texas).

Member of the Scientific Advisory Board of the FMS Foundation (as reported in the FMS Foundation Newsletter, Vol. 4, No. 8, September 1, 1995).

Dr. Colin Ross, who received many FOIA documents pertaining to US government mind control research said he: "Started off as a Top Secret official for the Air Force who interviewed the American pilots who came back from Korea having been captured and brainwashed by the Communist Chinese. Joly West and Margaret Singer worked for Air Force Intelligence talking to those downed American pilots who were actually DDNOS level Manchurian Candidates.

Director the Cult Awareness Network... funded under MKULTRA to study the psychobiology of dissociation.

He will probably go down in history as the only person to kill an elephant at Oklahoma City Zoo with LSD - (it is now reckoned it was actually a tranquiliser that he administered too which probably finished the poor elephant off).

Joly West was the expert witness in the trial for Patty Hearst. Who were the expert witnesses called to explain to the jury that Patty Hearst was actually a victim of coercive persuasion, mind control and brainwashing? Joly West, Margaret Singer, Robert Lifton and Martin Orne.

Joly West was Head of the UCLA Violence Project which was approved by Ronald Reagan when he was Governor of California, then shut down by public protest. It was spearheaded by a number of people including some people who were very interested in the history of CIA military mind control, and have written books about it. - Reference the UCLA Violence Project [Joly was a] CIA and military contractor, and an expert on multiple personality and other things... he actually mentions multiple personality in his CIA proposal. He tried to set up this UCLA violence centre that was going to be funded by Ronald Reagan and Frank Irvine from the Harvard brain electrode implant team was going to come. One of the things that was going to be done at the UCLA violence project and also at Vacaville State Prison under a separate administrative structure, but which got shut down by public protest, was that they were going to implant brain electrodes in violent sex offenders...

Louis Jolyon West from Wikipedia, the free encyclopaedia

In Hallucinations: Behaviour, Experience, and Theory, West and Ronald K. Siegel explain how drug prohibition can be used for selective social control:

“The role of drugs in the exercise of political control is also coming under increasing discussion. Control can be through prohibition or supply. The total or even partial prohibition of drugs gives the government considerable leverage for other types of control. An example would be the selective application of drug laws against selected components of the population such as members of certain minority groups or political organizations” (5)

- Remember this (West) man, that we just heard about, as he will be a major figure in the chapter's that follow this one. He is a right piece of work. - Now to return to the article.

Fuelling the Fires of Racism

"The difference between White and Black intelligence seems to be lowest during childhood, because Blacks (like women) suffer developmental retardation after puberty." —Fritz Lenz, Professor of Nazi Racial Hygiene.

"WHIPPIN THE DEVIL OUT OF THEM"

This picture above was the recommended treatment for a mental disorder tailed Drapetomania (from drapetes, a runaway slave, and mania, meaning crazy), which was a slave's "unnatural" urge to run away.

Psychiatry and psychology used eugenics to provide the "scientific" justification for racism, apartheid and the assault of ethnic groups. They invented tests to falsely identify the less suitable, the unfit and the undesirable, providing governments with a full range of psychiatric solutions—from enforced sterilization to involuntary incarceration and genocide.

In the early 1900s, British psychologist Cyril Burt, considered "the father of educational testing" and knighted for his contributions to the field, fabricated evidence to demonstrate that certain classes and races were inferior. It was later established that Burt falsified data, invented the assistants he said collected it and wrote reports under their names to substantiate his claims. In the U.S., such tests were used to segregate black students and deny them the educational resources available to whites.

By 1922, American eugenicist Paul Popenoe had added his racist theory that intelligence was determined by blood: "It is established that the intelligence of a 'coloured man' depends to a marked degree on the amount of white blood he has."

In 1923, J.T. Dunston, psychiatrist and South Africa's first Commissioner of Mental Hygiene claimed that natives were mentally inferior to whites because "Their dancing, of which they are very fond, presents no delicate motions—an important psychological point which should be carefully studied."

In 1926, America's Carnegie Institute reported that Native American Indians were "lacking in academic ability, industrious to a very limited degree and capable of taking little training." If they did well at manual labour, the report said, it was "the result of years of persistent supervision by the white landlords."

Margaret Sanger (covered in bk. 1), a member of both the American and English Eugenics Societies and founder of Planned Parenthood, promoted sterilization as a solution to the "inferior" problem. In 1939 she called for Blacks and other minorities to be sterilized but
cautioned: "We do not want word to go out that we want to exterminate the Negro population, and the minister is the man who can straighten out that idea if it occurs to any of their rebellious members."

In the 1950s Lewis Terman, a president of the American Psychological Association, claimed that Mexicans, Native Americans and African Americans should never be allowed to have children because of their "low intelligence," writing that it "is very common among Spanish-Indian and Mexican families and also among Negroes. Their dullness seems to be racial, or at least inherent in the family stocks from which they come. Children in this group should be segregated in special classes."

As late as 1972, American psychologist Henry Garret supported segregation, calling it a "unique institution, and in many ways worked quite well." In 1994, psychologist Richard Herrnstein advocated selective breeding to prevent human "residue" from being born.

Next we will cover what was hailed by psychiatry as its next “miracle” cure – brain damage.

Beginning in the 1920’s a new set of procedures was embraced by these sick bastards, and it all basically worked by causing intentional damage to the brain.

Manfred Sakel was a psychiatrist who felt that it was a matter of bad brain cells causing mental illness. He reasoned that these “bad” brain cells should be destroyed to cure insanity. How he could tell good cells from bad I don’t know, regardless of this point his ideas were duly taken on board as the next medical model, - the next miracle cure. He used insulin to accomplish this feat, which induced violent seizures and comas. Some of these seizures could make you convulse so hard that it was possible to break your own back in the process. Severe spinal cord injuries resulted in 40% of the cases treated in this manner. Hospitals built insulin wards and this “coma” therapy became big business.

Not to be outdone, Ladislaus Von Meduna a psychiatrist from Hungary believed he could drive out mental illness by inducing seizures with a drug called metrazol. He noticed that none of his epileptic patients had mental illness, and that none of his mentally ill patients had epilepsy, the theory was that schizophrenia and epilepsy couldn’t co-exist in the same brain, therefore if epilepsy was chemically induced it would drive out the schizophrenia. There was no scientific basis for this crackpot theory whatsoever. Metrazol was fast acting and relatively easy to administer which made it very lucrative for psychiatrists as they could chemically shock 50 patients into a vegetative state in a single morning. By 1939 this was so popular that it was used by psychiatrists and staff in over 70% of American hospitals. It was just as popular in many other countries around the “civilised” world.

Using brain damage as therapy became so popular that a similar medical model was introduced, this time using electricity instead of drugs, electro-shock therapy was to be the next miracle cure that these evil filthy scum decided was good for us.

The story behind this next miracle cure began in a Roman slaughterhouse in 1938.

Two Italian psychiatrists named Ugo Cerletti and Lucio Bini observed that before slaughtering the pigs two electrodes (that were just wires running out of the wall sockets) were applied to the pig’s head, this current shocked the pigs but didn’t kill them, they noticed that this made the animals more docile. This encouraged them to try and induce convulsions using only electricity. When used on humans this would cause people spines to snap, bones to break and even teeth to fly out, seeing as it was so utterly destructive to human beings it was rapidly adopted by the psychiatric community, and in fact is still heavily in use today.

Having sold brain damage as a cure, these cunts devised even more ruthless and barbaric ways to utilise this way of treating patients.
Egaz Moniz was a Portuguese neurologist who drilled straight through the skull of his patients and would inject pure alcohol directly into the frontal lobes, this became known as a lobotomy.

Dr Walter J Freeman would become the most infamous practitioner of lobotomies, he discovered he could do it faster than Moniz, and without drilling through the skull. (How he “discovered” this exactly, I would love to know, wouldn’t you?)

What Freeman done was this, he would merely lift the eyelid, and then by using something that was no more than an ice-pick, he would insert it under the orbital bone and start hammering this shard of steel directly into the frontal lobe. He would rake it this way and that, basically he was just bludgeoning someone’s brain to pieces with a sharpened screwdriver, and get this, ALL OF THIS WAS DONE WITH NO ANAESTHETIC!

Freeman would travel around the United States in his “lobotomobile” (which looked just like a giant VW camper van) and he would ask people if they wanted a lobotomy! He would carry out this butchery live on stage! Or even worse, he could even perform this “therapy” right there in the back of his van! They were quite often given to him as referrals by local physicians, and they would also just come straight to him, without even consulting a GP. Now trust me, unless you actually see the pictures of this procedure being performed by this man, and until you see the picture of his smiling face, waving from the seat of this lobotomobile, then you don’t get the sheer morbidity and utter callousness of this creature and his procedure. For that reason I recommend that you try and download a copy of this to watch for yourself, but realise that by saying that in no way do I subscribe to any scientology nonsense, and I don’t even know this loony fringe’s connection to the organisation who made this film, I merely saw their name in the credits and feel it pertinent to point this fact out. It is the points raised in this documentary which interested me, not who made it, or who may be associated with them.

By the time his surgical privileges were revoked, and that was because his last patient actually died on the “operating” table, Freeman performed or supervised over 3500 of these lobotomies, this was despite the fact, by his own admission, that 25% of his unlucky patients were left in a vegetative state by this horrible therapy.

Over 1 million of these vile procedures were carried out during the 40’s 50’s and early 60’s before the medical “establishment” experts came to the conclusion that this was a destructive treatment!

Even though the animals performing these experiments were shown to be helping no-one, and were actually harming most of the people who were used as guinea pigs, they kept on coming out with new miracle treatments that were always as barbaric and utterly groundless in science as the last one, yet we always bought the rhetoric about these experts knowing what they were talking about. Quite clearly you can see for yourself they were making it up as they went along and NONE of this was in any way scientific. This was simply another priesthood who knew something that you simpletons couldn’t understand, you were to trust the experts again, only these ones can electrocute you, stick screwdrivers into your brain, drown you while your locked in a coffin, or drug you into becoming a zombie!

AND YOU STILL CALL THEM EXPERTS, THEY DON’T EVEN KNOW WHAT ACTUALLY CAUSES MENTAL ILLNESS, YET YOU STILL CALL THEM EXPERTS IN THE FIELD, AND YOU STILL LET THEM CHARGE YOU A FORTUNE FOR THEIR BULLSHIT. WORSE STILL THEY HAVE CURED NO-ONE.

AND IN FACT THEY THE EXPERTS ARE, AFTER 300 YEARS OF PSYCHIATRY, STILL LOOKING FOR A SINGLE CURE FOR ANY OF THEIR IMAGINARY CONDITIONS, A CURE THAT THEY THEMSELVES ADMIT IS NOT FORTHCOMING.
BUT YOU STILL LET THEM HAVE MORE POWER OVER YOU THAN ALMOST ANYONE ELSE IN SOCIETY. I ACTUALLY THINK THEIR RIGHT YOU KNOW, YOU IDIOTS PERHAPS, ALL DO NEED HELP.

Psychiatrists still tout the benefits of lobotomy today and collect over $31 million annually for mincing your brain. And usually you’re wide awake while it happens.

BRUTAL TREATMENTS

THE RISE OF HARMFUL THERAPY

BY THE LATE 1920s, THE PSYCHIATRIC PROFESSION, ENVIous OF THE ADVANCES IN EVERY OTHER FIELD OF MEDICINE, was desperate for any measure that would justify its existence and enable it to share in the broader legitimacy of physical science. The result was a succession of savage physical treatments designed to assault the brain.

As Elliot S. Valenstein, Ph.D. observed, "Physical treatments...helped psychiatrists gain respectability... But the fact remained: to the patient, psychiatry's offered 'help' was torture in the guise of treatment."

ASSAULTING THE BRAIN

Hearing of operations that rendered monkeys docile and malleable, Egas Moniz conducted his own psychosurgery—on troublesome patients. His fellow psychiatrists lauded his work and he was even awarded the Nobel Prize in 1949. But his victims viewed matters in an entirely different light. In 1939, Moniz was shot five times and paralyzed by one of his leucotomized patients. In 1955, another patient attacked him, this time fatally.

"About 25% of lobotomized patients could be considered as adjusting at the level of a domestic invalid or household pet. Walter Freeman, psychosurgeon, 1936

In 1888, Swiss asylum superintendent Gottlieb Burckhardt became the first known psychosurgeon when he removed brain tissue from six patients. Although one died and others contracted epilepsy, paralysis and aphasia (loss of ability to use or understand words), Burckhardt was pleased with his newly subdued charges and reported the results in glowing terms at the Berlin Medical Conference of 1890.

But 1935 marked the true birth of psychosurgery. Egas Moniz, a professor of neurology in Lisbon, Portugal, observed an experiment in which the frontal lobes of two chimpanzees were removed, leaving the animals docile and vacant.

Moniz wasted no time in conducting the same operation on his own mental patients and pronounced the procedure a stunning success. A 12-year follow-up study, however, revealed that Moniz’s patients suffered relapses, seizures and death.

On September 14, 1936, American psychiatrist Walter Freeman hammered an ice pick through the eye socket of a patient and into the frontal lobes of the brain. Slashing the instrument from side to side, Freeman destroyed wide sections of tissue.

Following Moniz's lead, Freeman described his lobotomy as "mercy killing of the psyche" and widely promoted it.

At the height of his fame, Freeman toured cities in a camper van he called a "lobotomobile," publicly lobotomizing patients for the press corps and curious onlookers.
OPERATION "ICE PICK"

Psychiatrist Walter Freeman, above, performed thousands of lobotomies. Freeman would lift one eyelid, insert the point of the ice pick and drive it through the back of the orbital cavity with a hammer blow. With the pick now lodged in the patient's brain, he would slash the point from left to right, severing tissue, withdraw the pick and repeat on the other side.

Above: In 1961, Freeman lobotomized young Howard Dully, age 12, shown here in photos from Freeman's own files—before, during and after the operation.

The psychiatric community successfully convinced state governments that psychosurgery could reduce their mental health budgets. The superintendent at Delaware State Hospital, for example, was so taken in by the propaganda that he hoped to reduce the number of mental patients by 60%; the combined total of anticipated deaths and discharges would provide a savings of $351,000.

By the time "Operation Ice Pick" ended in the 1960s, an estimated 113,000 people, 40,000 of them Americans, had been lobotomized; with the death rate ranging from 10-20 percent, at least 22,000 of those were fatalities. In spite of the multitudes of victims whose lives have been completely destroyed by psychosurgery, psychiatrists have never been forced to stop the butchery.

Today, instead of ice picks, psychiatrists use a scalpel or electrode implants to destroy healthy portions of the brain, crippling patients.
TODAY More than 100 psychosurgery operations were recently performed on teenage drug addicts at the St. Petersburg Institute in Russia. One of those operated on was Alexander Lusikian (above), who successfully sued the Institute after receiving this brutal operation.

ECT A MONSTROUS THERAPY

First used in 1938 by Ugo Cerletti, psychiatrists still cannot explain how the ECT procedure is supposed to work, nor can they justify its extensive harm. Documented studies show that ECT creates irreversible brain damage, often causes permanent loss of memory and may result in death.

Electroconvulsive therapy (ECT, or electroshock) was first introduced in 1938 by psychiatrist Ugo Cerletti. As chairman of the Department of Mental and Neurological Diseases at the University of Rome, Cerletti had been conducting experiments to induce convulsions. Shocking dogs with electrodes affixed to the anus and mouth was not working; half the animals had died. But then he visited a local slaughterhouse to watch butchers use electricity to stun pigs with electrodes applied to the head, before slitting their throats.

Inspired, Cerletti soon arranged for his first human subject, administering electroshock to a local jailhouse prisoner; the man screamed in response: "Not another one! It's deadly!" Cerletti simply increased the voltage. German psychiatrist Lothar Kalinowsky, who witnessed this first ECT procedure as a student of Cerletti, went on to become one of its most vigorous proponents. He developed his own ECT machine and introduced the method to France, Holland, England, and later, the United States. Of ECT's effects, he stated: "All intellectual functions, grasp [understanding] as well as memory and critical faculty [mental power] are impaired." As up to 40% of ECT patients suffered bone fractures from the convulsions induced by the electric shock, psychiatrists eventually introduced muscle paralysers and anaesthesia. These did not, however, reduce the impact of the shock on the brain. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration reports the following ECT effects: miscarriage, severe memory loss, seizures, tremors and dementia. The 2003 U.S. Mental Health Foundation ECT Fact Sheet reports that ECT causes brain damage, memory loss and disorientation.

Ask a psychiatrist how electroshock "works" and he is likely to say that he does not know; he is not an "expert" on electricity. Instead, he will commonly provide you a theory—for example, that ECT:

"Is a destructive process that somehow makes for improvement."

"Yields a beneficial vegetative effect."

"Yields the unconscious experience of dying and resurrection."

"Gives rise to the identification of the physician to the mother."

"Yields fear, which in turn causes remission (recovery)."
Imagine a heart surgeon claiming not to know how the heart works or why a coronary bypass operation should be performed, stating that there are dozens of theories, but no scientific fact. Yet, a psychiatrist knows he is in just such a position as he straps down a patient for modern shock treatment: searing the brain with 180 to 480 volts of electricity.

Two million people a year are subjected to ECT worldwide. An estimated 10,000 die as a result. In the U.S. alone, the 660,000 electroshocks administered annually—for about $12 worth of electricity—earns the psychiatric industry $5 billion.

Two-thirds of ECT victims are women. Fifty percent are elderly. And solely because U.S. Medicare (government health insurance) takes effect at age 65, statistics show that 65-year-olds receive 360% more electroshock than 64-year-olds—"treatment" driven by a profit motive.

And despite legislated consent procedures, psychiatrists ensure that the dangers and ramifications of this destructive "therapy" are never fully explained to patients or their families.

Today, as in the past, ECT procedure is no more scientific or therapeutic than being hit by a bolt of lightning. Despite legislative bans and laws limiting its practice, its lack of science and its high risk of harm, it remains in use simply because the psychiatric industry finds it lucrative.

**ELECTROSHOCK-THE MASSIVE MONEY MAKER**

ECT remains a big business, administered to 2 million people each year internationally—killing 10,000 of them. But the profitability of the procedure ensures its place in psychiatry's arsenal. For $12 worth of electricity, ECT nets the psychiatric industry $5 billion in the U.S. alone.
LOSING HEMINGWAY

Nobel Prize-winning author Ernest Hemingway, ill with diabetes, was persuaded into admitting himself to a psychiatric institution and given more than 20 electroshock treatments. Later he told a friend, "What is the sense of ruining my head and erasing my memory, which is my capital, and putting me out of business. It was a brilliant cure but we lost the patient." In July 1961, days after being released from the Mayo psychiatric clinic, Hemingway committed suicide.

So, in the wake of lobotomies tarnished reputation psychiatrists were quick to push electro-shock therapy back into the spotlight. Dr John Friedberg, a neurologist says that they just renamed it electro-convulsive therapy and gave the patient drugs to paralyse them and sedate them during the procedure. This wasn’t really for your benefit, rather it was a cosmetic change to make the people administering this torture feel less inhuman while carrying out their evil trade, they didn’t like the sound of your screams, and were made to feel uncomfortable with patients writhing in agony. This made it easier on the witnesses not the patient, yet it was widely touted as being new and improved.

How Electroshock "Works"

1. The patient is injected with an anaesthetic to block out pain and a muscle relaxant to shut down muscular activity and prevent spinal fractures.
2. Electrodes are placed on the temples bilaterally (from one side of the brain to the other) or unilaterally (front to back on one side of the brain).
3. A rubber gag is placed in the mouth to keep teeth from breaking or patients from biting their tongues.
4. Between 180 and 480 volts of electricity are sent searing through the brain.
5. To meet the brain’s demand for oxygen, blood flow to the brain can increase as much as 400%. Blood pressure can increase 200%. Under normal conditions, the brain uses a blood-brain barrier to keep itself healthy against harmful toxins and foreign substances. With electroshock, harmful substances “leak” from blood vessels into the brain tissue, causing swelling. Nerve cells die. Cellular activity is altered. The physiology of the brain is altered.
6. The results are memory loss, confusion, loss of space and time orientation and even death.
7. Most patients are given a total of 6 to 12 shocks, one a day, three times a week.

Ask the foremost psychiatrists and they have no explanation to justify why or how their “treatment” works. It is literally as scientific as sticking one’s head in a light socket. Do it often enough and you will become disoriented, confused, lose your memory or even die. Same result as ECT—but it will cost you a lot less.

Dr Robert Morgan, a psychologist and author added that, every ten years or so first of all there is a blanket denial that the treatment is harmful, then they admit the procedure is in fact harmful, then they make a few cosmetic changes and herald this slight variation on the original method which was admitted to be dangerous as being safe new and improved, this is done without there ever being any competent research to back this claim up.
The same energy used to power industrial machinery is used during this treatment.

2/3 of electro-shock therapies are given to women according to CCHR, and this can be for trivial matters like PMT.

CCHR then states that “Half of electro-shock victims are also elderly. Once they become eligible for US government health care at age 65, the use of this treatment increases 360% compared to those aged 64.” They also add that this procedure has killed 40000 people and left countless thousands of others in a vegetative state. It has cost around $12 for all the electricity used for electro-shock over the years, yet in the US alone, psychiatrists have raked in over $5 Billion for doing so.

Talk to the victims of psychiatry and they'll tell you they weren't “treated”, they were tortured. The History of Shock Treatment, a book produced by psychiatric survivors, says:

“First off, we will call things by their real names: treatment forced upon another against his will is torture. It's not drug treatment, it's drug torture; it's not shock treatment, it's shock torture; it's not psychosurgery, it's psycho torture. Barbarism in the name of benevolence is still barbarism.”

Another psychiatric survivor group, the International Association Against Psychiatric Assault, contains the following in its statutes:

“We declare as forms of torture all psychiatric persecution, psychiatric incarceration and psychiatrically forced bodily acts and intrusions, such as treatment with drugs, electroshock, psychosurgery, four point restraint and others. These have been consistently defined as torture by persons from all around the world and through the whole existence of coercive psychiatry....”

The next medical model and miracle cure to be conceived by these twisted parasites would make even those profit margins look paltry, it would also open the door to making every man women and child a patient for life.

By the early 1950’s the drug thorazine was claimed to be the next wonder treatment of the psychiatric field, this drug was originally designed to destroy parasites in pigs but was also found to hinder brain function and cause what would be termed a “chemical lobotomy” in human brains in much the same way as shoving an ice-pick into your eye socket. It was to be widely used by psychiatrists from that time on, as it was regarded as faster, cheaper and more “efficient than previous therapies. It was to be another old treatment in a new disguise.

Dr Winfrid Overholser President of the American Psychiatric Association said “With the advent of these new tranquiliser drugs it would be not too much to say that we are at the advent of an entirely new era in the treatment of mental illness.”

Canadian psychiatrist Heinz Lehmenn said “It was a little pill that performed the function of psycho-surgery but without the mess.”

“Thorazine would be the product that would project psychiatry into mainstream medicine, the magic bullet. If you had to come for an hours counselling there was only so many people that a psychiatrist could see and therefore only so much that they could charge for that, but instead if a psychiatrist only had to talk to you for a few minutes and then prescribe a pill then this much better use of a psychiatrists time in monetary terms.” says Robert Whitaker author of “Mad in America”

What these fuckers didn´t tell the public was that it was soon discovered that as well as the normal side effects of this sort of treatment, like paralysis and death, this drug also caused another condition called Tardive Dyskinesia. This caused unstoppable tremors and was a crippling neurological disease that made the recipients have uncontrolled muscle jerking.
and twitching, in many cases for the rest of their lives. Whitaker adds that it was noticed that this happened in the early 50’s, but it would be a full twenty years before doctors would start warning their patients about this blatant brain damage being caused by thorazine.

Smith-Kline would see a 3600% return on its investment in the first year alone, while the side effects would be totally ignored by the same firm. This was the start of what would be termed “Big Pharma’s” (meaning big pharmaceutical companies) foray into the world of psychiatric medicine, it would also be the beginning of the world wide movement to chemically-zombifie all of us. (My Note. - At least in this manner. You will read about fluoride which was and is being used for the same purpose later on in book 3)

Creating a Drugged Society

By the early 1950s, psychiatrists had discovered the next "miracle cure"—one that swelled psychiatric coffers and altered the face, but never the intent, of institutional psychiatry. Developed originally as a synthetic dye, French psychiatrist Jean Delay discovered Thorazine, which had a profound effect on patients. Marketed as an "antipsychotic," the drug severely hindered brain function, creating an effect psychiatrists enthusiastically described as "a chemical lobotomy."

The release of Thorazine coincided with new developments that would change the way psychiatrists did business forever—new legislation that made drug dispensing dependent on a doctor's prescription. As a result, big drug companies began to woo doctors and whereas, prior to 1951, the American Medical Association had acted as a watchdog of the pharmaceutical industry, with the injection of drug company cash, the AMA dropped its critical stance and joined the drug marketing gold rush.

As a result, within eight months of Thorazine's release, psychiatrists had administered it to an estimated two million patients in the U.S. A full three-quarters of these were outside institutions. Psychiatrists and pharmaceutical firms were hard at work creating lifelong customers for their drugs, and conning society into enforcing the administration of their "medications." The use of these substances continued to spread beyond the confines of psychiatry and into general medicine where they began to be prescribed for everyday maladies. By the mid 1960s, 48% of American adults had taken a psychotropic drug, reaping billions of dollars for the psychiatric and drug industries.

In 1967, psychiatrists and medical doctors met in Puerto Rico to develop their plan for "Psychotropic Drugs in the Year 2000: Use by Normal Humans." The conference report stated: 'Those of us who work in this field see a developing potential for nearly a total control of human emotional status, mental functioning and will to act. These human phenomena can be started, stopped or eliminated by the use of various types of chemical substances.'

The meeting proposed chemicals that could help a person remember or forget a pleasant or unpleasant experience, replace punishment, prolong or shorten memory, prolong childhood or shorten adolescence, regulate sexual responses, induce or prevent learning, and improve married life by bringing to one's mate "the feeling of fresh wonder that often characterizes the initial or early experiences." Attendees also debated whether lithium, a highly toxic psychiatric drug, could be put in the public water supply.

A staggering range of addictive psychiatric drugs followed, increasingly prescribed for the general population. And with more and more billions of dollars at stake, the psychiatric-pharmaceutical industry bombarded society with advertisements, media articles and talk shows, fraudulently pitching the benefits of psychiatric drugs. Finally, perfectly normal people became the target for psychiatric drug marketing.

WORLDWIDE DRUG BUSINESS
The incestuous relationship between psychiatry and the pharmaceutical industry leads to more than $4.5 billion in drug marketing in the U.S. per year. Stimulant sales for "ADHD" and antidepressants soared after the FDA approved "direct to consumer" marketing of drugs (above) in print and on TV in 1997. Through drugs, psychiatrists extended their influence beyond hospitals and mental institutions into broad society. This drug trade is now a lucrative worldwide enterprise generating $76 billion a year in sales.

All the while, in an ever-increasing incestuous relationship, psychiatrists continued to invent mental diseases for which drug companies would supply a drug to prescribe.

Today, consumption of these drugs has become so widespread that more than 150 million people worldwide have taken Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitor (SSRI) antidepressants. These drugs are so widely prescribed that the pharmaceuticals travel through the sewage network and end up being recycled into the water system. Scientists have discovered traces of one widely used antidepressant in England and U.S. drinking water.

GOVERNMENT WARNINGS

Growing evidence of the dangers of psychiatric drugs has finally begun to spread into the public domain, and drug regulatory agencies in Europe, the U.S. and other nations are being forced to act.

In 2004, the FDA ordered "black box" labelling for antidepressants to warn that they can cause suicide in children and adolescents. Within eight months, the FDA began warning of the risk of suicide for adults taking antidepressants. England, Japan, Australia and Canada also issued warnings.

In 2005, Europe's Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use issued the strongest warning that antidepressants can cause suicidal behaviour, hostility, aggression, anger and mood instability in children and adolescents. Hallucinations, psychotic, violent and aggressive behaviour and suicide are now FDA acknowledged risks of stimulant drugs. Next, the FDA warned that antipsychotic drugs may cause death in the elderly, while for the general public there is a risk of diabetes.

And in 2006, an FDA advisory panel and Australian drug regulatory agency documents showed that stimulants could also cause strokes, heart attacks and death with the FDA revealing 45 child deaths from antidepressant drugs.

A HISTORY OF DUBIOUS DRUG APPROVALS
The admission that a previously profitable "miracle" drug was faulty or harmful is only made when its patent [sole right to manufacture] has expired or is about to—and a new drug is being ushered in. Witness these earlier drug claims and how they fared:

1954

CLAIM: Thorazine was supposed to free patients from institutions and save governments money.

FACT: Thorazine causes irreversible damage to the nervous system and, together with similar anti-psychotic drugs, has killed 100,000 Americans. It also causes heart irregularities, heat stroke, impotence, obesity, blood disorders and seizures.

1955

CLAIM: Ritalin has long been touted as safe for use on children.

FACT: By 1971, Ritalin and other stimulants were scheduled in the same abuse category as morphine, cocaine and opium. More potent than cocaine, it causes stunted growth, weight loss and psychosis. Suicide is a major complication during withdrawal. It can also cause strokes and cardiac arrest.

1958

CLAIM: Tricyclic antidepressants were said to be "wonder drugs" for dulling depression and faster acting with fewer side-effects than earlier drugs.

FACT: These antidepressants frequently cause sedation, drowsiness, difficulties in thinking, a deadening effect, headaches and weight gain. In children, they can cause partial paralysis of the bladder.

1987

CLAIM: The first SSRI antidepressant (Prozac) was marketed as safe and virtually side-effect free. By 2004, another nine SSRIs were in use.

FACT: These drugs cause anxiety, agitation, insomnia, bizarre dreams, sexual dysfunction, confusion, suicidal thoughts, hostility and violent behaviour. Suicide is also a serious risk during withdrawal.

1990s

CLAIM: New antipsychotic drugs were hailed as breakthrough treatments, with fewer side-effects than Thorazine.

FACT: The drugs cause leaking breasts, liver and kidney problems, life-threatening diabetes, respiratory arrest and heart attacks.

2002-2005

CLAIM: The antipsychotic drug Abilify was marketed as safe and effective, with fewer side effects than other antipsychotics.

FACT: The drug causes diabetes and a potentially fatal heart-rhythm irregularity.
Some of the worst human rights atrocities in the world are committed inside psychiatric institutions funded by government appropriations totalling billions of dollars.

Instead of receiving comfort and proper care, patients are detained against their will, restrained, drugged, sexually abused, beaten, denied medical care, experimented upon and locked up in isolation.

Between 1950 and 1963, as many as 1,600 patients died each year at St. Elizabeth's State Psychiatric Hospital in Washington, D.C. While many bodies were simply buried in unmarked graves, thousands more of these deaths went unrecorded while the bodies were kept for experiments: 15,000 brain specimens, including 1,400 preserved, intact brains were stored in a federal government warehouse. Concealed among the case histories in the brain collection was a file on an 8-year old boy subjected to a lobotomy.

In the 1990s, Italy's psychiatric asylums were exposed for forcing patients to live in conditions resembling those of concentration camps. Thousands were locked naked in filthy rooms. Staff were pocketing the government funds allocated for patient care. Similar conditions have been found in Russia. In Mexico, patients have been incarcerated in psychiatric facilities for as long as 30 years. In one Mexican institution, 110 patients were left in the care of a single nurse. Patients were found naked, huddled together for warmth in 45-degree temperatures or walking barefoot on floors covered with urine and faeces.

Harvard psychiatrist Kenneth Clark reported that patients in American institutions are often provoked in order to justify placing them in restraints, for which higher insurance reimbursements accrue—at least $1,000 a day. This can reap as much as $18 million in additional income each year for all such facilities combined. In addition, psychiatric staffs often resort to violent restraint procedures that can be fatal; however, those responsible are rarely criminally charged. Expert testimony given in a 2002 California Senate Research Office report stated, "The attempt to impose 'treatment' by force is always counterproductive —creating humiliation, resentment and resistance to further treatment...." The Pennsylvania Office of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services reported that seclusion and restraint "do not alleviate human suffering or psychiatric symptoms, do not alter behaviour and have frequently resulted in patient and staff injury, emotional trauma and patient death."
Psychiatric restraint procedures, and for that matter all psychiatric procedures, constitute assault and battery in every respect except two: they are lawful—and profitable.

COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH FAILURE...

In 1963, the United States psychiatric research body, National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), under psychiatrist Robert Felix, implemented a community health program that relied heavily on the use of mind-altering psychiatric drugs. Spawning an international trend, it sent drugged patients onto the streets, homeless and incapable. After huge financial investment—$47 billion spent on Community Mental Health between 1969 and 1994 alone—the program is clearly an abject failure.

Today, spending on Community Mental Health Centres (CMHC) has increased more than one hundred times faster than the increase in number of people using CMHC clinics (see graph above). The clinics have become little more than legalized drug dealerships for the homeless.

BEDLAM AROUND THE WORLD

Inhuman and degrading conditions exist in psychiatric institutions in countries around the world, including Italy, Hungary, Russia and Mexico. No matter how rich or poor the country, psychiatrists have found ways to exploit governments and abuse patients. Patients in Czech and Hungarian institutions were imprisoned in caged beds (below). CCHR, human rights groups and the European Parliament brought joint pressure to outlaw the practice and in 2004 Hungary and the Czech Republic banned the use of caged beds.

CREATING SOCIAL CHAOS

BETRAYAL OF THE PUBLIC'S TRUST

PSYCHIATRISTS HAVE SET THEMSELVES UP AS "EXPERTS" over the field of mental health, and through the decades have built up a monopoly of government support. Unfortunately, their mandate has carried with it no accountability. Put an incompetent engineer in an engine room and the engine will soon break down. That is what has happened to society. If we care about the quality of life for ourselves, our children and the future, we must realize that we will not escape from today's social chaos until psychiatry's coercive and destructive influence is eliminated.

Usurping the legal system
"Our legal system has been told that clinical psychology is a scientific discipline... that is truly unbelievable." —Margaret Hagan Ph. D. Author of Whores of the Court

Soaring crime rates, overcrowded prisons, courtrooms clogged with repeat offenders and the erosion of justice—these situations exemplify the destructive influence of psychiatry's agenda. According to Dr. Thomas Szasz, the introduction of psychiatric concepts into the administration of the criminal law—the insanity plea and verdict, mental incompetence defence, and so forth—corrupt the law and victimize the individual on whose behalf they are supposedly employed.

The first recorded use of the insanity defence was in 1843. Englishman Daniel McNaughton shot and killed the British Prime Minister's secretary. The court acquitted McNaughton by reason of insanity and he was placed in a mental institution for the rest of his life.

In 1924, Nathan Leopold and Richard Loeb, two young Americans from affluent families, were charged with the senseless killing of a younger companion. Prominent psychiatrists, including APA president William Alanson White, testified that the young men's murderous behaviour was the "product of impulses contrary to their conscious ideals that could override the reason and judgment and obliterate the sense of right and wrong." The court adopted the defence of "irresistible impulse" without questioning the theory's complete absence of scientific validation.

SELLING JUSTICE DOWN THE RIVER

Judge David Bazelon (above) of the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C., advanced psychiatry's infiltration of our courts. In 1954, he ruled that 23-yearold Monte Durham, with a long criminal and psychiatric background, was not guilty by reason of insanity. The decision established psychiatry solidly within the court systems and set a precedent for the rest of the world.

The U.S. Supreme Court's landmark Monte Durham decision of 1954 further entrenched psychiatry in the courts, setting an international precedent. Durham, age 23, had a long criminal and psychiatric history and was convicted of housebreaking. But Judge David Bazelon of the U.S. Court of Appeals—himself undergoing psychotherapy—ruled: "An accused is not criminally responsible if his unlawful act was the product of a mental disease or defect."

At the time, psychiatrist Karl Menninger declared that the decision was "more revolutionary in its total effect" than the Supreme Court decision on ending the segregation of African Americans from whites. He was right. It shattered the founding principle of our justice system—that each individual is responsible and accountable for his own actions.

Since psychiatrists appointed themselves as experts on criminal behaviour and became part and parcel of our court system, drug abuse violation rates for under 18-year-olds in the
U.S. alone has increased by more than 2,900%, while the rate of violent crime has worsened by over 147%. More than $20 billion is spent each year on psychiatric practice and treatment in the prisons and judicial system, yet the recidivism rate exceeds 60%. Although incapable of predicting violent behaviour or of rehabilitating criminals, psychiatrists continue to testify in court on behalf of the highest bidder—with billings ranging from $3,600 to $25,000 for each court appearance in the U.S. They continue to assert that offenders are not responsible for their acts but are instead victims of fictitious mental disorders.

**USING CRIMINALITY**

Psychologists and psychiatrists are also paid to transform criminal behaviour into diseases. Psychiatric evidence in court is usually based on the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. Here are samples of a few of the invented disorders contained in this manual and how they have been used in court by paid psychiatric witnesses. The numbers in the parentheses represent the billing code numbers:

**Telephone scatalogia (302.90):** Richard Berendzen was forced to resign his presidency of American University after being arrested for making obscene phone calls. A psychiatrist argued that Berendzen suffered from this perverted sexual behaviour disease.

**Sleepwalking disorder (307.46):** This disorder was used successfully in defence of a Canadian man charged with the murder of his wife’s parents, after he drove 15 miles across Toronto in the middle of the night to commit the act.

**Somatoform disorder (330.81):** A university professor was ordered to pay $1,500 per month to his adult daughter whom had been diagnosed with somatoform, a disorder which supposedly makes a person focus on their physical disability.

In 1967 in San Juan Porto Rico all the world’s top psychiatrists would meet to determine the best way to maximise this new medical model and they were looking far into the future.

Psychiatrist Nathan Kline wrote this in the final report of the conference:

“The present breadth of drug use may be almost trivial when we compare it to the possible number of chemical substances that will be available for the control of selective aspects of man’s life in the year 2000.”

Dr Kline spearheaded a movement flooding psychiatric wonder drugs everywhere over the global marketplace, and it was backed by a massive publicity machine spending hundreds of millions of dollars in advertising. Psychiatry had become a worldwide industry of legalised drug pushers.

By 1970 the American Psychiatric association was so dependent on big pharma’s backing that 30% of its annual budget came from the pharmaceutical companies advertising of these miracle cures in their official journals.

**Dr Fred Baughman a neurologist states that the majority of national institute of mental health, and national institute of health scientists are receiving more on the side from big pharma than they make as salaries for their job.”**

You cannot fail to agree that this money would buy an awful lot of influence. And if Dr Baughman is correct, then they have the majority of scientists in this profession saying whatever they tell them to say, ponder on that fact when you ask yourself how could these so called objective and consummate professionals let this happen.

With so much money to be made, all the psychiatrists needed was a scientific theory to justify this method of treatment, their solution;
An official report stating that all depressions were associated with a “chemical imbalance” in the brain, and that this imbalance obviously requiring drugs to correct.

There is NO TEST to show this so called imbalance in people, no matter what condition it is supposed to be, this means it is all solely left up to the “expert” psychiatrists discretion to determine both the nature of this imbalance and also how to treat it. And once again you swallowed it hook, line and sinker – they simply invented a theory to fit round a marketing idea that would make them all very wealthy, it was not an answer that came along to a question that had been being asked beforehand. The drugs were there already they just needed an excuse to use them. It was no coincidence this report magically appeared.

Dr Bob Johnson the author of “Unsafe at any dose” states that “This was for the benefit of the psychiatrists the imbalance has to be there so that the psychiatrist can treat it.”

The "Chemical Imbalance" Hoax

From cradle to the grave, we are bombarded with information pushing us towards a chemical “fix.” But let’s take a closer look at some very important aspects of this new psychoactive, drug-centred philosophy.

Psychiatrists claim that a person “needs” a drug to combat their “chemical imbalance” in the brain which is causing a person’s “mental disorder”. However, the concept that a brain-based, chemical imbalance underlies mental illness is false. While popularized by heavy public marketing, it is simply psychiatric wishful thinking. As with all of psychiatry's disease models, it has been thoroughly discredited by researchers.

Diabetes is a biochemical imbalance. However, as Harvard psychiatrist Joseph Glenmullen states, “the definitive test and biochemical imbalance is a high blood sugar balance level. Treatment in severe cases is insulin injections, which restore sugar balance. The symptoms clear and retest shows the blood sugar is normal. Nothing like a sodium imbalance or blood sugar imbalance exists for depression or any other psychiatric syndrome.”

In 1996, psychiatrist David Kaiser said, “...modern psychiatry has yet to convincingly prove the genetic/biologic cause of any single mental illness...Patients [have] been diagnosed with 'chemical imbalances' despite the fact that no test exists to support such a claim, and...there is no real conception of what a correct chemical balance would look like.”

Today's brain imagery photos, said to prove mental illnesses are physical diseases, are deeply flawed. Indeed, prescribed psychotropic drugs most likely cause the changes seen in the brain. Steven Hyman, director of the National Institute of Mental Health, admits that indiscriminate use of such brain scans produce “pretty but inconsequential pictures of the brain.”

Elliot Valenstein, Ph.D., author of Blaming the Brain, is unequivocal: “[T]here are no tests available for assessing the chemical status of a living person's brain.” No “biochemical, anatomical, or functional signs have been found that reliably distinguish the brains of mental patients.”

According to Valenstein, “The theories are held on to not only because there is nothing else to take their place, but also because they are useful in promoting drug treatment.”

The theories they peddled could not mask the growing numbers of terrifying side effects that were being observed in patients who took the drugs to correct these fantasy imbalances. Suicide and severe violent outbursts were noted to be common behaviour in patients who took these drugs although the drug companies always strenuously denied this. It took massive public support and much medical evidence presented by doctors themselves to convince the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to eventually convene a hearing on the matter. This meeting happened in 1991, the supposedly unbiased and impartial hearings were conducted entirely by psychiatrists, the majority of which had ties to the very
companies being investigated. Psychiatrist Daniel Casey stated that he could find no credible evidence to support the theory that these drugs were in any way related to the instances of violent and often lethal behaviour, or the countless numbers of suicides that occurred among those who took these drugs like Prozac etc. What the public was unaware of was that this man was a paid consultant for 9 drug companies!

Bonnie Lietch of the Prozac Survivors Support Group stated “500 deaths, 33 murder cases, and 20000 known adverse side effects, would anybody like to tell me why this drug is still on the market?”

Robert Whitaker explains exactly why it is still available; “Is there an unholy alliance between the pharmaceutical companies, the psychiatric profession and the FDA? The answer is yes.”

This became all too apparent in 1997 when the pharmaceutical companies convinced the FDA to allow them to advertise directly to the public. With psychiatrists providing the medical endorsement for this, the sales of psychiatric drugs sky-rocketed by two and a half times in only three years.

When the number of suicides and violent outbursts shot through the roof because of this, the public outcry eventually forced the FDA to order the labelling of these drugs with warnings about the increased risks of suicidal behaviour and violent mood swings. By this time they had been selling these drugs to the public en masse for thirteen years, all they did was appear with new wonder drugs making the same promises as the ones they had failed to keep at every stage in this chapter, once again you chose to trust the experts.

CCHR then states that over 8% of the world’s population has taken psychiatric drugs, backed up by fake science and approved by regulatory authorities who are bought and paid for. Their harmful medications gross over $27 Billion dollars a year.

Psychiatrists demand the absolute right to determine what is best for the so called mentally ill, after all the mentally ill are crazy, and are therefore unable to evaluate their own treatment. To enforce their control over society and to keep their institutions full, the psychiatric field uses something called involuntary commitment, commonly called being sectioned here in the UK.

Jeffrey Schaler says “When you go to a real doctor you always have the absolute right to refuse treatment, so there is no such thing as involuntary treatment in any other field of real medicine, only psychiatrists believe that people must be treated against their will.”

In 1956 psychiatrist Winfred Overholser presented a plan to the US congress intended to take involuntary commitment to a whole new level, the plan was to purchase a million acres of Alaskan wilderness that was to house a massive asylum that was “To provide for the hospitalisation and care of the mentally ill...and for other purposes.” They were also pushing to have the involuntary commitment regulations amended so that it would require nothing more than a simple nod and the stroke of a psychiatrist’s pen to have any American shipped off to this establishment. The bill sailed through the house of representatives, it was only when the public got wind of this plan and became enraged about it, some dubbing it “Siberia USA” that something was done about it. The bill was struck in the senate.

Involuntary commitment might not have reached the massive scale that these psychiatrists were aiming for, but on the small scale it still provided the most effective and profitable way for these cunts to keep their institutions well populated.

From Mr Schaler again, “They have committed no crime, the victim has no trial, and is sent directly to a mental hospital which is really just a prison.”
Thomas Szasz says “How many people go to an insane asylum and say lock me up? Doctors don’t do this to anyone, only psychiatrists lock you up.”

Once someone is committed they are restrained and drugged, the more this person objects to this the more it is seen as an indication that they need to be treated in this way, it is a horrible and truly frightening catch 22.

Lawrence Priddy an attorney says “Involuntary commitment occurs with people only because they have health insurance, this is clearly evident in the fact that how quickly they are released once their insurance runs out.”

Involuntary commitment is a form of slavery in that these people are classed as property and they have absolutely no rights, the fact that people are also getting paid for doing this makes it even more alarming.

EVERY MINUTE OF EVERY DAY SOMEONE IS INVOLUNTARILY COMMITTED!

Psychiatry has the worst record of fraud and abuse of any medical discipline, Gary Null stated that “It wouldn’t be hard for a psychiatrist to fraudulently bill for half a million dollars a year and get away with it, many are doing so.”

Hamilton D. Moore a Las Vegas Attorney stated that “I haven’t deposed every psychiatrist in Las Vegas, but I have done so to about half of them, most of them are a dishonest, deceitful, lying bunch of people.”

It is so common that insurance companies have slang for some of their practices like “the California wave” or the “Hundred dollar handshake” this is where a psychiatrist comes into an institution, he will introduce himself to new admissions or involuntary commitments and say “I will be your doctor while you are with us” for doing this to as many patients as he can get round in that day, he can then bill them for an hour each, which is sent of direct to the insurance company, - hence the hundred dollar handshake.

Gary Null gives a (even I have to admit quite funny) example of the fraudulent and coercive behaviour of this field of medicine with the following example, an advert was placed in a newspaper in Arizona (I think) saying it was a revolutionary health spa that could help people lose weight, once these poor souls went to the establishment they were asked to sign some paperwork. What they didn’t realise was it was in fact a mental institution and these people had voluntarily committed themselves! Once they signed they were held against their will, and couldn’t do anything about it. Imagine that, it’s truly terrifying isn’t it?

They also have no fear in taking their dodgy practises into the court room, it has been clearly documented that they will have a different opinion on the same matter depending on who is paying their bill. Suicide is preventable in one case, then it can’t be stopped in the next, is one example cited by a lawyer who is used to working with these people in the film.

Next you must consider this next startling fact given by the CCHR team:

Psychiatrists only account for 6% of American Physicians yet account for 30% of the sex related crime committed by medical personnel.

Joanne Suder chief attorney at Suder law firm says that “It was happening so often that by the mid 80 ´s medical insurance firms stopped covering this sort of crime in their policies for psychiatrists.”

Gary Null said that in most cases the psychiatrist will get away with this crime.

Considering that this is perpetrated against such vulnerable people and that it is also being done behind closed doors, I think we can all appreciate why this is the case.
Criminal Psychiatrists

The practitioners of this profit motivated industry, psychiatrists and psychologists, have an inordinately high number of criminal convictions as compared to other sectors of the health care profession. Hundreds of billions of dollars are lost each year to psychiatric and psychological insurance fraud around the world. A study of U.S. Medicaid and Medicare insurance payouts reveals psychiatrists have the worst record for fraud of all those in the health care disciplines.

AN EPIDEMIC OF PSYCHIATRIC RAPE

A review of more than 800 convictions of psychiatrists, psychologists and psychotherapists over a six-year period, shows 43% were convicted of fraud, theft and embezzlement; 32% for sex crimes; 7% for patient assault and violent crime; 6% for drug offenses and 6% for manslaughter and murder.

A rare U.S. study of therapist-client sex involving minors, reported that one of 20 clients who had been sexually abused by their therapist was a minor. The female victims' ages ranged from 3 to 17, and from 7 to 16 for the males. The average age was 7 for girls and 12 for boys.

At least 10% of the 650,000 psychiatrists and psychologists worldwide admit to sexually abusing their patients. According to one study, the figure could be as high as 25%—more than 162,000 practitioners. This accounts for more than 250,000 victims, 14% of whom attempted suicide as a consequence of the rape and betrayal.

SEXUAL PREDATORS

A review of medical board actions against physicians disciplined for sex-related offenses found that psychiatry and child psychiatry were significantly overrepresented. The perpetrators here are but the tip of a very large iceberg.

The criminal line-up includes:

Christopher Allison- SEX CRIME English psychiatrist put behind bars for 10 years for the rape and sexual abuse of six patients.

William Cone- SEX CRIME Missouri psychiatrist sentenced to 133 years in prison for deviant sexual assault of two patients. Cone told the women they needed to be "re-parented," which required having sex with him. They also became addicted to the drugs he prescribed. Cone claimed he had a "form of moral insanity brought on by my obsessive preoccupation with work, power and perfection."

Donald Persson- CHILD SEX CRIME Utah psychologist who described himself as a "moral" person when sentenced to 10 years imprisonment for the molestation of a 12-year-old girl.

Alan J. Horowitz- CHILD SEX CRIME New York psychiatrist sentenced to 10 to 20 years in prison for sodomizing three boys, aged 7 to 9, and for sexually abusing a 14-year-old girl. Horowitz defended himself saying that he was a "normal paedophile."

John Orpin- SEX CRIME Canadian psychiatrist convicted of raping and sodomizing female patients during drug hypnosis sessions. Orpin told his patients his penis was a "healing staff" and anal rape was "unconditional love."

Bjarne Skovsager- CHILD SEX CRIME Danish psychologist sentenced to 6 years in prison for numerous sexual abuses, including sodomy and indecent exposure with boys between the ages of 7 and 11.
Kolathur Unni- SEX CRIME London psychiatrist jailed for 18 months for sexually attacking a female patient during a hypnotherapy session. Unni had moved to London after losing his license to practice in New Zealand because of similar incidents.

Now we are going to cover one of their greatest frauds of all.

The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) is published by the American Psychiatric Association and provides diagnostic criteria for mental disorders. It is used in the United States and in varying degrees around the world, by clinicians, researchers, psychiatric drug regulation agencies, health insurance companies, pharmaceutical companies and policy makers.

There have been five revisions since it was first published in 1952, gradually including more disorders, though some have been removed and are no longer considered to be mental disorders. It initially evolved out of systems for collecting census and psychiatric hospital statistics, and from a manual developed by the US Army. The last major revision was the fourth edition (“DSM-IV”), published in 1994, although a "text revision" was produced in 2000. The fifth edition (“DSM-V”) is currently in consultation, planning and preparation, due for publication in May 2012. An early draft will be released for comment in 2009. The mental disorders section of the International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems (ICD) is another commonly-used guide, used more often in some parts of the world. The coding system used in the DSM-IV is designed to correspond with the codes used in the ICD, although not all codes may match at all times because the two publications are not revised synchronously.

The American Psychiatric Associations Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) is psychiatry's billing bible of so-called mental disorders. With the DSM, psychiatry has taken countless aspects of human behaviour and reclassified them as a mental illness simply by adding the term disorder onto them. While even key DSM contributors admit that there is no scientific/medical validity to the disorders, the DSM nonetheless serves as a diagnostic tool, not only for individual treatment, but also for child custody disputes, discrimination cases, court testimony, education and more. As the diagnoses completely lack scientific criteria, anyone can be labelled mentally ill, and subjected to dangerous and life threatening treatments based solely on opinion.

Dr. Thomas Dorman, an internist and member of the Royal College of Physicians of the United Kingdom and Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of Canada, wrote, In short, the whole business of creating psychiatric categories of disease, formalizing them with consensus, and subsequently ascribing diagnostic codes to them, which in turn leads to their use for insurance billing, is nothing but an extended racket furnishing psychiatry a pseudo-scientific aura. The perpetrators are, of course, feeding at the public trough.

Professors Herb Kutchins and Stuart A. Kirk, authors of Making Us Crazy, conclude: The public at large may gain false comfort from a diagnostic psychiatric manual that encourages belief in the illusion that the harshness, brutality and pain in their lives and in their communities can be explained by a psychiatric label and eradicated by a pill. Certainly, there are plenty of problems that we all have and a myriad of peculiar ways that we struggle...to cope with them. But could life be any different? Far too often, the psychiatric bible has been making us crazy when we are just human.

While psychiatrists have managed for years to make it look, feel, and sound convincingly scientific, their diagnoses are being seen for the dangerous frauds that they really are. Far more than just marketing tools or harmless billing codes for treatment, in the hands of psychiatrists these manuals can literally be used to decide the fate of any individual.

There's No Science to DSM
Arrived at by what psychiatrists call “consensus,” which in reality is no more scientific or sophisticated than a vote of insider hands, the DSM-IV contains a record 374 so-called mental disorders.

Perhaps the best example of psychiatry’s scientific pretension in creating and augmenting the DSM is the manner in which new “illnesses” are added to it. Psychiatrists literally vote on what constitutes a mental illness or disorder by raising their hands at a conference. There is no medical evidence presented, no brain scans, blood tests or any other medical criteria needed to establish a disorder in the DSM; it is 100% subjective.

A psychologist attending a DSM hearing noted, “The low level of intellectual effort was shocking. Diagnoses were developed by majority vote on the level we would use to choose a restaurant. You feel like Italian, I feel like Chinese, so let's go to the cafeteria. Then it's typed into a computer.”

It was these same experts remember that would have also “voted” to make paedophilia be no longer classed as deviant or even abnormal behaviour. All it took was a bunch of fuckwits (and no doubt amongst them a fair collection of paedophiles) raising their hands to declare the raping of your children as being a normal sexual practise.

In the absence of objective, scientific evidence, psychiatry has decreed the following to be mental illnesses:

- Phonological Disorder
- Caffeine Related Disorder
- Conduct Disorder
- Mathematics Disorder
- Nicotine Use or Withdrawal Disorder
- Non Compliance With Treatment Disorder
- Separation Anxiety Disorder
- Sibling Rivalry Disorder
- Phase of life problem
- Sexual abuse of a child problem
and the all-encompassing - Unspecified mental disorder

PSEUDOSCIENCE

FRAUDULENT DIAGNOSIS AND JUNK SCIENCE

THE PRINCIPAL REASON FOR THE CREATION OF THE DiAGNOSTIC AND STATISTICAL MANUAL OF MENTAL DISORDERS (DSM) was to provide psychiatry with a system of compensation for insurance billing similar to that used by mainstream medicine.

Unlike real diseases, entries into DSM are merely "disorders" passed by committee. DSM is devoted to the categorization of clusters of symptoms with no known causes and none of the resultant diagnoses are supported by objective scientific evidence.

Despite the DSM's complete lack of scientific credentials, psychiatry in the U.S. alone rakes in over $100 billion a year in funding for "treatment" of DSM-disorders.
"The way to sell drugs is to sell psychiatric mental illness." — Carl Elliot, Bioethicist
University of Minnesota

When the American Psychiatric Association (APA) published the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) in 1952, the book contained only 112 entries. That figure has more than tripled over the past five decades. The disorders listed in today's DSM, and in the mental disorders section of the World Health Organization's International Classification of Diseases (ICD), include "reading disorder," "disruptive behaviour disorder," "disorder of written expression," "mathematics disorder," "caffeine intoxication" and "nicotine withdrawal disorder"; these publications comprise a grab bag of billing items for the mental health industry.

This also accounts for the growth in the numbers of "disorders" contained in DSM; it has been motivated by pure economics.

The first increase took place in 1968, coincident with U.S. government insurance becoming available to the mental health industry. That year the number of disorders in the DSM jumped to 163.

By 1980, DSM-III had added 61 more disorders, for a total of 224.

With the publication of DSM-III-R, in 1987, mental disorders increased to 253. In 1994, this total had risen to 374.
But the money trail goes deeper. A study published in April 2006 by public health researchers from the University of Massachusetts and Tufts University in Boston, has disclosed that every psychiatric expert involved in the development of the mood disorders listed in the DSM-IV had financial ties with drug companies before or after the book was published. This report was the first to officially document the wide-ranging and incestuous monetary relationship between the pharmaceutical companies, psychiatrists and other mental health industry personnel responsible for the manual.

NO SCIENCE

Depicted as diagnostic tools, the DSM and the ICD's "mental disorders" section are not only used to diagnose mental illness and prescribe treatment, but also to resolve child custody battles, discrimination cases based on alleged psychiatric disability, support court testimony, modify education and much more.

Yet there is no science to this diagnostic system and insurance companies estimate that the cost of treatment, for "disorders" that cannot be physically proven, is two times greater than for general medical conditions. In 1995, after more than $6 billion in taxpayer funds had been poured into psychiatric research, psychiatrist Rex Cowdry, Director of the NIMH, admitted: "We do not know the causes [of mental illness]. We don't have the methods of 'curing' these illnesses yet."

Psychiatrist Colin Ross points out: "The way things get into the DSM is not based on blood test or brain scan or physical findings. It's based on descriptions of behaviour. And that's what the whole psychiatry system is."

Canadian psychologist Tana Dineen tells us: "Unlike medical diagnoses that convey a probable cause, appropriate treatment and likely prognosis, the disorders listed in DSM-IV [and ICD-10] are terms arrived at through peer consensus"—literally, a vote by APA committee members.

Dr. Mark Filidei concurs: "There's no science behind it. It's a matter of opinion. If enough doctors think it's a disease, it becomes a disease."

Dr. Thomas Dorman, an internist and member of the Royal College of Physicians of the United Kingdom and Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of Canada, wrote: "In short, the whole business of creating psychiatric categories of 'disease,' formalizing them with consensus and subsequently ascribing diagnostic codes to them, which in turn leads to their use for insurance billing, is nothing but an extended racket furnishing psychiatry a pseudo-scientific aura. The perpetrators are, of course, feeding at the public trough."

A TRADITION OF FALSE DIAGNOSIS

The term "schizophrenia" was coined by Swiss psychiatrist Eugen Bleuler (above left) in 1908, when he arbitrarily labelled symptoms associated with a physical ailment as a "mental disease." Yet, psychiatry to this day continues to conduct arbitrary and unscientific diagnoses, leaving patients languishing in drugged stupors, many of whom are suffering from undiagnosed but treatable physical conditions. Psychiatrist William Menninger (above right), along with his predecessor Emil Kraeplin, is credited as one of the pioneers of mental disorder classification and diagnosis. However, there remains no test to determine the validity of any psychiatric disorder.
Consider the following alarming statistics:

In the United States today, more than 6 million children are taking mind-altering psychiatric drugs for the learning and behavioural disorder, ADHD. Two million children take antidepressant and antipsychotic drugs.

In Australia, the stimulant prescription rate for children increased 34-fold in the past two decades.

In Britain the rate increased 9,200% between 1992 and 2000; in Mexico methylphenidate sales (the generic name for the drug Ritalin) increased 800% between 1993 and 2001.

In Germany methylphenidate sales increased 400% between 1995 and 1999.

Significant increases are also reported in France, Denmark, Sweden and Switzerland.

In 2000, international sales of antipsychotic drugs reached $6 billion. In 2001, antidepressant sales climbed to $12.5 billion. Today, that figure is near $20 billion.

These soaring numbers parallel the increases in the number of mental disorders in the American Psychiatric Associations lucrative insurance billing bible, the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM), and the mental disorders section of the International Classification of Diseases (ICD). Not one of the DSMs long list of disorders is supported by any objective, diagnostic observations or criteria.
As psychiatrist Matthew Dumont commented, the APA provides a 125-word definition of mental disorder, which is supposed to resolve all the issues surrounding the sticky problem of where deviance ends and dysfunction begins. It doesn't.

Because of the DSM, psychiatric drugs are now not only used extensively in our schools, nursing homes, drug rehabilitation centres and prisons, individuals personally rely on them to help them with everything from weight control, self-confidence, mathematical and writing problems, to anxiety, sleeping and upsets. In fact, they have become the panacea for the stresses of modern living. And they come with serious risks. Protect yourself from potentially dangerous psychiatric drugs by becoming well informed.

Masquerading as the science of mental health requires that certain appearances be maintained. It was German psychiatrist Emil Kraepelin who, in the 1800s, first worked on a system of codification of human behaviour, while simultaneously acknowledging that psychiatry had no effective treatments or cures for psychiatric disorders.

Since Kraepelin, the number of psychiatric condemnations of human behaviour has steadily expanded. Today, they are codified in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) and the International Classification of Diseases (ICD), Mental Disorders Section. First published in 1952 with a list of 112 maladies, the 1994 issue of DSM specifies more than 370 disorders.

Today, family physicians and doctors prescribe more antidepressants than psychiatrists.

In 1975, 150,000 American children were drugged for a little known condition labelled as “hyperactivity”. In 1987, APA psychiatrists voted to include ADHD into the DSM and within one year, 500,000 children were suddenly afflicted with it. By 1997, the number of labelled kids had risen to 4.4 million, and estimates today range as high as 6 million. That’s 6 million children who have been prescribed cocaine-like drugs, and for a condition that has never been scientifically proven to exist.

Dr Paula Caplan who is clinical research psychologist at the DeBois Institute at Harvard University says “There is no such thing as mental disorder, a mental disorder is whatever someone says it is, and if the person saying that this or that is a mental disorder has enough power and influence, then other people will agree and say “Oh yes, that is a mental disorder.”
But you can’t have power or influence without credibility, so the psychiatry simply manufactured some.

Dr Margaret Hagen, professor of psychology at Boston University says “It is a grab bag of check-lists for disorders that are published in a book called the DSM, which is the diagnostic and statistical manual, there are actually no statistics in this manual, that just helps to make it sound more scientific.”

Julian Whitaker M.D. says “They create this cluster of disease’s, then they get together and they just vote” “Is this a disease?” “All in favour say aye.”

“It’s marketed as a scientifically based document, now the American Psychiatric Association which publishes the DSM puts in a lot of work to create an aura of scientific precision around the DSM but is not scientifically based.” Says Dr Caplan.

They have voted 374 disorders into existence since the first copy of the manual was printed, and with each new disorder brought into existence they create another revenue stream for themselves and the pharmaceutical industry which pays their wages.

Neill Willner president of consolidated insurance says “If you have 27 disorders that is 27 ways to bill your patients, if you have 374 disorders, that is 374 ways to bill your clients, you could pick anyone off the street and find that everybody would be classed as being mentally ill according to the DSM.”

Dr Caplan says “They use a five digit code for each one, the implication being that 403.11 is scientifically and fundamentally different than 403.12, when in fact nothing could be further from the truth.”

Dr George W. Albee who is the professor emeritus at the University of Vermont says “Adolescent rebellion disorder is an official psychiatric diagnosis, arithmetic learning disorder is an officially recognised psychiatric disorder, general anxiety disorder is a new diagnosis.”

All I can say is thank fuck I am not a kid anymore!

Incredibly enough while presenting the DSM as scientific fact, psychiatrists freely admit its utter lack of science. Psychiatrists questioned at the 2006 APA meeting said things like:

“There are no scientific or diagnostic markers for any mental illness in the DSM.”

“What we are testing for in psychiatry is difficult to say because there is nothing specific.”

“As far as a test which is clinically useful we are not there yet.”

“We don’t have any laboratory tests which can determine whether someone has a mental illness.”

“There is no good biological test to find out whether someone has a psychiatric illness.”

“There is no test or biopsy we can perform right now.”

“There is no specific test to confirm the diagnosis or show any improvement like in blood tests, x-rays or something like that.”

“In my practice there are no tests, I just speak to them, listen then make a decision as to what kind of illness it is.”

These diagnosis will vary as much as the psychiatrists who make them, CCHR used a man who went to several different psychiatrists complaining of the same symptoms, what they
found out was that every doctor gave a different diagnosis, and they all recommended a different course of drugs (I counted something like 18 different drugs being recommended).

The video then returns to the APA meeting were the following statements were given:

“When I give a medicine we don’t know if it is going to work or not.”

“To a certain degree it is trial and error.”

“You never know if it’s the right drug.” - From the former head of the APA.

“How many people have I cured? Well right now there are no cures in psychiatry.”

“I have cured none of my patients.”

“We are always challenged by our lack of knowledge.”

“We don’t know the cause.”

“It would be nice to know the medical reasons, we don’t right now, maybe in the future.”

In 2005, when faced with national media pressure, Dr. Steven Sharfstein, then president of the APA, conceded, "We do not have a clear-cut lab test" to prove the existence of a chemical imbalance. Other experts agree.

Ron Leifer, New York psychiatrist said, "There is no biological imbalance. When people come to me and they say, 'I have a biochemical imbalance,' I say, 'Show me your lab tests.' There are no lab tests.”

"... [M]odern psychiatry has yet to convincingly prove the genetic/biologic cause of any single mental illness... Patients [have] been diagnosed with chemical imbalances' despite the fact that no test exists to support such a claim... there is no real conception of what a correct chemical balance would look like,” says psychiatrist David Kaiser.

Dr Darrell Regier the director of research for the APA said “We do not know the causes of any of the mental disorders at the present time.” This man is also the chairman of the DSM-V taskforce.

Dr Walter Afield medical director at a neuropsychiatric institution said “We have DSM-V coming out soon, it has grown in size ten times since it began, and it labels everybody, basically I could find five disorders that would fit you (the interviewer) or anybody else.”

Psychiatrists are not the only ones who benefit from the DSM, for every psychiatric diagnosis you will find that there is a psychiatric drug. Dr Caplan says that we must pay close attention to the psychiatrists with their DSM and also the pharmaceutical companies, because for every condition the DSM brings into existence, behind them we have a drug company saying “Oh, handy, we have a pill for that.”

In 2006 a study revealed that over 56% of the individuals who were voting these conditions into reality were also tied to at least one big pharmaceutical company.

Psychiatrists and psychologists have used the fake conditions invented by them and published in their phony scientific publication the DSM to label 450 million people worldwide as being mentally ill. That number is the populations of Russia, France, Italy, Germany, Australia, Canada and the UK combined!

$440 Billion is spent annually by our governments on these treatments, and we spend over $29 Billion on psychiatric drugs every year.
That is not the end of this story, these people have attempted to enter into every facet of our daily lives, politics, science, advertising, social work, and perhaps most importantly education.

Beverly Eakman who is the executive director of the National Education Consortium had this to say about their plans for education:

“They have openly admitted that their ultimate goal is social control, it is not to pass on knowledge, and not to give a child something that they can use to get on in the world.”

In 1950 psychiatrists and psychologists from around the world met at the white house to propose a total re-orientation of the public schooling system called the “mid-century white house conference on children and youth”. Ms. Eakman states that “This conference was a landmark one where it was decided that schools could serve their communities better by acting as mental health clinics rather than places of learning.”

Jim Nichols of the voice of freedom stated “In the early sixties psychiatry really started going places in the US, little by little it started creeping into our schools and education system.”

By 1965 their plans were codified in law in the education act of that year. They had been given the green light to start the wholesale drugging and coercion of our most valuable resource, our children.

Beverly Eakman says “A child is labelled as ADD or ADHD as soon they can’t sit still for a 10-15 minute period, or he talks constantly, or ignores the teacher.”

This labelling went into high gear around 1987, in that one year over 500000 children were labelled as ADD or ADHD in the US alone.

By 1994 that number had soared to 4.4 million.

To keep the masses placated about this seeming epidemic of mental health problems, the US government convened a “consensus development conference on ADD/ADHD” in 1998. This was to explain to parents and educators exactly what ADHD was. It is perhaps one of the only light-hearted and even funny parts of this film (if you can lay aside the subject matter for a second). The conference panel chairman David Kupfer M.D. obviously didn’t know the script because he asked any member of the panel to describe to the audience what exactly ADHD was. He then makes the mistake of singling out perhaps the only person he knew from the panel, a man named Mark Vonnegut, (I say I think he knew him because he used his first name). Mark quite frankly looks and sounds flustered and surprised by the question. A clock is shown beside him at the time the question was asked which reads 15:06. It is almost laughable to watch this man for the next five or so minutes, as he waffles like I have never seen a man waffle in my whole life, he is shown quite clearly to be about as knowledgeable on this matter as a goldfish would be when asked about quantum physics. If the panel of “experts” on this matter can’t describe the symptomology and effects of this so called disease, you the general public should be very concerned because you are letting them drug your children with products that cause suicide and have also been taken by almost every kid who has been involved in the spate of US school shootings.

By 1996 the number of kids diagnosed with these conditions had reached 6 million.

Today 20 million children worldwide are labelled as having some form of learning disorder. This diagnosis is often made in the matter of minutes, a psychiatrist will observe a large batch of children at a time, and make his judgement on them merely based on these observations, more often than not this is without even having a conversation with them!

Ritalin has spawned a new class of drug-dealing, and it is happening in playgrounds. People will accuse marijuana, claiming it is a “gateway drug” when in fact, the real gateway drugs
are given to them by their parents. It is commonly known as "kiddie cocaine". How can you expect to calm down a seemingly hyperactive child by giving them coke? School shootings didn't exist until drugs like this and Prozac were forced down the throats of our kids.

Here are just a few examples of the effects of this "medicine" on our children, this is the abbreviated list, the actual list I wanted to use would have taken up over 50 pages!

**12 RECENT SCHOOL/TEEN SHOOTERS UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF PSYCHIATRIC DRUGS**

Resulting in 54 Killed And 105 Wounded

Dekalb, Illinois – February 14, 2008: 27-year-old Steven Kazmierczak shot and killed five people and wounded 16 others before killing himself in a Northern Illinois University auditorium. According to his girlfriend, he had recently been taking Prozac, Xanax and Ambien. Toxicology results showed that he still had trace amount of Xanax in his system.

Omaha, Nebraska – December 5, 2007: 19-year-old Robert Hawkins killed eight people and wounded five before committing suicide in an Omaha mall. Hawkins' friend told CNN that the gunman was on antidepressants, and autopsy results confirmed he was under the influence of the "anti-anxiety" drug Valium.

Jokela, Finland – November 7, 2007: 18-year-old Finnish gunman Pekka-Eric Auvinen had been taking antidepressants before he killed eight people and wounded a dozen more at Jokela High School in southern Finland, then committed suicide.

Cleveland, Ohio – October 10, 2007: 14-year-old Asa Coon stormed through his school with a gun in each hand, shooting and wounding four before taking his own life. Court records show Coon had been placed on the antidepressant Trazodone.

Blacksburg, Virginia – April 16, 2007: The psychiatric drug history of Seung-Hui Cho in the Virginia Tech Massacre was never made public. Initial reports stated that "depression medication" was found among Cho's belongings. But neither his toxicology reports, nor his recent medical history were ever released to find out whether Cho had been in withdrawal from psychiatric medication. (33 were killed and 29 injured, but this was not included in the total of dead and wounded cited above.)

Red Lake, Minnesota – March 2005: 16-year-old Jeff Weise, on Prozac, shot and killed his grandparents, then went to his school on the Red Lake Indian Reservation where he shot dead 7 students and a teacher, and wounded 7 before killing himself.

Greenbush, New York – February 2004: 16-year-old Jon Romano strolled into his high school in east Greenbush and opened fire with a shotgun. Special education teacher Michael Bennett was hit in the leg. Romano had been taking “medication for depression”.

El Cajon, California – March 22, 2001: 18-year-old Jason Hoffman, on the antidepressants Celexa and Effexor, opened fire on his classmates, wounding three students and two teachers at Granite Hills High School.

Williamsport, Pennsylvania – March 7, 2000: 14-year-old Elizabeth Bush was taking the antidepressant Prozac when she shot at fellow students, wounding one.

Columbine, Colorado – April 20, 1999: 18-year-old Eric Harris and his accomplice, Dylan Klebold, killed 12 students and a teacher and wounded 26 others before killing themselves. Harris was on the antidepressant Luvox. Klebold's autopsy reports were never released.
Notus, Idaho – April 16, 1999: 15-year-old Shawn Cooper fired two shotgun rounds in his school, narrowly missing students. He was taking a prescribed SSRI antidepressant and Ritalin.

Springfield, Oregon – May 21, 1998: 15-year-old Kip Kinkel murdered his parents and then proceeded to school where he opened fire on students in the cafeteria, killing two and wounding 22. Kinkel had been taking the antidepressant Prozac.

All of this overshadows the reason that kids go to school in the first place – to receive an education. From 1970 the US has fallen from 9th to 27th in the academic standing tables.

Nearly 20 million kids have been labelled as mentally ill in this time and sales of these drugs have increased by 32 times.

Thomas Szasz says “Children don’t ask to be diagnosed, they don’t want to be called crazy, so you must ask the ancient roman legal question Qui Bono, who benefits, it is the psychiatrists and the pharmaceutical industry and certainly not our kids.”

Psychiatrist Heinz Lehmen says “Psychiatry should go into government, politicians should listen to us, psychiatrists should be in every parliament and should monitor governmental and political activities.”

This is not the ravings of a loose cannon, this is indicative of the true purpose of psychiatry, they have infiltrated our whole society at every level in less than a century. And believe me when I say they are not finished there.

In 1940 a famous British psychiatrist called Colonel JR Rees (This nut job is covered more in subsequent chapters) made the following statement that set the agenda for psychiatry for the next 40 odd years, it was made at the national council for mental hygiene in front of a packed and responsive audience, Colonel Rees was the president of this council:

“WE MUST AIM TO MAKE IT (PSYCHIATRY) PERMEATE EVERY EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITY IN OUR NATIONAL LIFE. PUBLIC LIFE, POLITICS AND INDUSTRY ALL OF THEM SHOULD BE WITHIN OUR SPHERE OF INFLUENCE. WE HAVE MADE A USEFUL ATTACK ON A NUMBER OF PROFESSIONS. THE TWO EASIEST OF THEM NATURALLY ARE THE TEACHING PROFESSION AND THE CHURCH. THE MOST DIFFICULT ARE LAW AND MEDICINE.”

At the US department of the interior in Washington DC in 1945 Rees`s colleague G Brock Chisolm who was the co-founder of the world federation for mental health went further, he explained what the real purpose of psychiatry was and is:

“TO ACHIEVE WORLD GOVERNMENT IT IS NECESSARY TO REMOVE FROM THE MINDS OF MEN THEIR INDIVIDUALISM, LOYALTY TO FAMILY TRADITIONS, NATIONAL PATRIOTISM AND RELIGIOUS DOGMA’S.”

They pushed this agenda by insisting that mental illness was a national threat and pushed forward the following bill which passed through the US senate. HR 4512 The national mental health act. This was the beginning of the massive funding programme which has pushed them into every profession, educational establishment and into our daily life from that time on. In 1946 1 million dollars was allocated to them per year, today they receive around 1.4 billion dollars per year, an increase of 139,000% increase!

Professor Barry Mehler Ph.D. from Ferris State University Stated “When you look at psychiatry and psychology, social control is the overall agenda.”

Teen Screen is a prime example of this agenda, it is a US based programme to screen EVERY SINGLE US kid for mental illness.
Gary Null predicts that upward of 90% of these kids will be diagnosed with some form of mental illness. This he says will produce a whole generation of people who will need treatment for THE REST OF THEIR LIVES (if these evil bastard’s get their way). And the bill will allow them to screen the parents as well.

David Shaffer was behind this programme, he is a consultant for the US department of defence.

Dr Arthur Caplan a professor of medical ethics at the University of Pennsylvania says “The idea of a nationwide screening programme, being ran by the government, is perhaps the scariest thing I have ever heard of.”

We don’t have an epidemic of mental illness, we have an epidemic of psychiatry.

**Government Sponsored Mind Control In America: The Teen Screen Scam**

Dave Hodges The Common Sense Show October 6, 2012

Through the former President, George Bush, and the current President, Barrack Obama, the government has unleashed a modern day version of the mind control police in America by attacking the psychological well-being of America’s school children and veterans by forcibly incarcerating veterans who are not drinking from the globalists’ Kool-Aid.

On the surface, screening the mental health of children for suicidal tendencies is a noble idea worth pursuing. Yet, when the screening is mandated by the President of the United States and is done without the knowledge and consent of the parents of the children being tested, an eyebrow should be raised. When children, under this program can only be medicated with the most expensive psychiatric drugs which contain 2 to 20 times higher suicide rates and are contraindicated for use by children, all of America should begin to dismantle this unholy marriage of the Police State and the pharmaceutical fraudsters that first, former President Bush, and now President Obama, is trying to force down the throats of America’s children and its latest set of victims, American veterans!

There is an ongoing battle for the psychological health and welfare of America’s children and eventually all Americans, under the New Freedoms Commission (NFC), as it is the eventual intent to screen and treat, with mind numbing drug, all Americans for mental illness by using criteria designed to elicit false positives. The relatively new mind control programs have commenced with the intent of compelling the mental health testing of all 52 million school children and the 6.5 million adults who walk through doors of every school in America on any given weekday. Acting under the authority of the NFC, all 50 states are mandated to implement compulsory mental health screening. The screening exams are to be administered in kindergarten, fourth and ninth grade. The screening program requires no parental notification and carries the force of law and this program continues unabated to this day. As is the case with vaccinations, the diagnosis and treatment, under the mind control policies of the Bush and Obama administrations will eventually be universal!

In April of 2002, by Executive Order, President George W. Bush convened a 22 member panel which sought to identify policies that could be implemented by all levels of government which would promote successful mental health treatment for all children and adults.

In July of 2003, the NFC formally recommended that schools were in the best position to commence the screening of all Americans beginning with America’s students and school employees. The NFC implemented their recommendations, in November of 2004, with a $20 million dollar appropriation.

Not all Congressmen agreed with President Bush and his desire to screen the mental health of all American schoolchildren, especially without parental notification, including Congressman Ron Paul. Congressman Paul, R-Texas, is a medical doctor and a member of
the American Association of Physicians and Surgeons (AAPS). Congressman Paul cautions Americans that the most obvious beneficiary of this mental health screening legislation is none other than the omnipresent pharmaceutical industry. The AAPS is also on record as opposing the NFC legislation, which they say will result in mandatory psychological testing of all of America's school children without parental consent as well placing coercive pressure on parents to needlessly medicate their children with dangerous psychotropic drugs. Congressman Ron Paul attempted to withhold funding for the mandatory mental health screenings as well as requiring parental consent prior to any screening through the introduction of an amendment to the Congressional NFC funding bill. Because of the intense lobbying efforts by Big Pharma, Paul's proposed amendment was soundly defeated.

The planned testing of America's school children is being rolled out in two parts. First, a screening process, implemented by TeenScreen, will be used to identify this new group of potential pharmaceutical customers. Secondly, the psychiatric drug-dispensing protocols of Texas Medication Algorithm Project (TMAP) will be utilized to ensure maximum profits by the pharmaceuticals by requiring that the most expensive psychiatric drugs on the market will be prescribed. TMAP attempts to deceive the public by altering the name of the drug dispensing authority in each State. For example, in Illinois, TMAP goes by the name of the Illinois Medication Algorithm Project, or IMAP for short. Same people, same insane policies, slightly different name designed to throw off investigators.

The primary purpose of the NFC and its sole pharmaceutical broker and screener, TeenScreen, is to make certain that only the newest, most expensive drugs are used through adherence to TMAP's standard of practice for treating mental illness in that State. Once TMAP procedures are adopted by a State, all psychiatrists must comply with the prescribed standard of care. For example, the antipsychotic drug, Haldol, whose patent has expired, costs about 8 cents per pill, or about $2.50 per month, while the controversial antipsychotic, Zyprexa, which is still under patent to Eli Lilly, costs $8 per pill or about $250 per month. The more expensive Zyprexa is listed on the algorithm of treatment by TMAP, the far less expensive drug, Haldol, is not. If price gouging the mental health public was the only crime here, we would have fraud and price fixing, not a scandal to the degree that is presently happening. However, this conspiracy goes much deeper and is much more nefarious.

Several researchers, such as Robert Whitaker and David Healy, have published findings which demonstrate that antipsychotic drugs MAY temporarily reduce psychiatric symptoms in the short term. However, the long term benefits of many psychiatric drugs are highly questionable because of the existing evidence linking the newer family of expensive, antipsychotic drugs to a greater likelihood of destroying the mental and physical health of those persons who take them. In particular, this new class of drugs is reputed to be especially dangerous to younger patients. Furthermore, Dr. Whitaker reports that that the death rate of patients on the newer TMAP drugs, the atypical antipsychotic drugs like Eli Lilly's Zyprexa, is double that of patients taking the older, cheaper antipsychotic drugs like Haldol. Healy found that the suicide rate for schizophrenics increased 20 times for patients placed under anti-psychotic medication treatment. Healy states that this is a phenomenon which has risen in correlation to the increased use of the new anti-psychotic medications. Healy's views have received support from the American Hospital Formulary Service Drug Information, which stated that the FDA has determined that antidepressants increase the risk of suicidal ideation and behaviour in children and teenagers. Pity the parent who has read this warning, who subsequently comes home from work to find that their child has become the next statistic in an ever growing number of suicidal behaviours which are associated with many of the new antipsychotic medications courtesy of the TeenScreen program.

Why are these newer and more dangerous drugs continuing to be used despite serious questions as to their efficacy? Perhaps the answer lies in the fact that Ely Lilly had several undeniable ties to the Bush family, where George H. W. Bush was once a member of the
board of directors. A sample of those who have been on the Eli Lilly payroll includes The National Alliance for the Mentally Ill (a recipient of Eli Lilly funding), former President George Herbert Walker Bush (one-time member of the Eli Lilly board of directors), former CEO of Enron, the late Ken Lay (one-time member of the Eli Lilly board of directors), George W. Bush’s former director of Management and Budget, Mitch Daniels (a former Eli Lilly vice president), George W. Bush’s Homeland Security Advisory Council member, Sidney Taurel (CEO of Eli Lilly).

Not surprisingly, Eli Lilly gave $1.6 million dollars in campaign contributions during the 2000 election. Eighty two percent of this money went to Republicans and George W. Bush. The pharmaceutical and health products industry has spent more than $800 million in federal lobbying and campaign donations at the federal and state levels in the past seven years. No other industry has spent more money to sway public policy during this same period. Public health and welfare be damned, and now, in order to increase their market share, the pharmaceuticals are coming after your children.

Under the auspices of George W. Bush, TMAP originated in Texas and has been exported under the umbrella of the NFC to at least 48 States. Under then-Texas Governor Bush, TMAP was allowed to gain virtual control of the diagnostic and treatment protocols for the Texas mental health and prison systems. It is interesting to note that in 1994, Big Pharma did not contribute one dime to Texas politicians. TMAP surfaced in Texas after the 1994 elections and subsequently, during the 1998 campaigns, it made over 250 contributions totalling $152,000 to candidates running for state office. In 2002, it made more than 400 contributions totalling $384,735, and poured tens of millions more money into Texas state universities which are intimately affiliated with TMAP. President Obama, no less a Big Pharma whore, has received almost $500,000 from these drug pushers and this number is growing by the second. Mitt Romney is lap dancing for the pill pushers as he has taken almost $300,000 from Big Pharma. And the beat goes on as Big Pharma buys the politicians and the “Do No Harm” credo of the medical profession takes a backseat.

It also appears that a culture of corruption is following the exportation of TMAP to other States. Consider the case of whistleblower, Allen Jones, a former lead investigator at the Pennsylvania Office of the Inspector General (OIG). The Pennsylvania mental health treatment formulary is presently based on TMAP protocols. As the OIG’s lead investigator, Jones uncovered evidence of payments into an “off-the-record (books) account”. The accounts under Jones investigation were cleverly allocated for “educational grants” which were conveniently funded by Pfizer and Janssen Pharmaceuticals. Payments were made from the account to state employees who developed formulary guidelines, which were consistent with the TMAP algorithm whereby the new antipsychotic medications were the only drugs of choice available in the Pennsylvania formulary of psychiatric treatment. This practice resulted in recommending the far more expensive and newer drugs over older, cheaper drugs with proven track records. Jones’ findings clearly showed that the pharmaceutical company, Janssen, had paid honorariums (i.e., legal bribes) to key state officials who held influence over which drugs would be prescribed in state-run prisons and mental hospitals. Instead of being hailed a hero for valiantly performing his role as a public servant, Jones was subsequently fired and escorted from the grounds of the OIG and told not to return. Even Ray Charles could see that the State of Pennsylvania and several of its key officials knowingly and willing participated in a system of political bribery in partnership with the pharmaceuticals. A whistleblower, a true public servant, was steamrolled out of his job for daring to question both the legality and ethics of key State officials. The NFC school based mental health screening programs were implemented in Pennsylvania the year following Jones dismissal.

TeenScreen, created by Laurie Flynn, arose out of the expressed desire of the NFC to test all American school children. There are several problems with this screening instrument. For example, the screening device has a high rate of false positives. The rigor (e.g., measure of reliability and validity, utilization of genuinely representative population samples used in the
norming process) of the screening mechanics have also been called into question. Additionally, TeenScreen allows for the use of unsupervised nonprofessionals to both administer and interpret the screening instrument. In an effort to cover their malpractice behinds, TeenScreen is careful to state that the program is not a substitute for clinical evaluation. Despite its self-proclaimed message that TeenScreen has a wonderful diagnostic tool from which to predict suicidal behaviour resulting from depression, TeenScreen states that the instrument is not a diagnostic tool. If you had to reread the previous four sentences in order to try to make sense out TeenScreen's, “doublespeak,” you are not alone. Although the diagnostic tool is not heralded as a clinical tool, the schools which use the TeenScreen tool can still label the child as being emotionally disturbed and this label can follow this child for the rest of their life. Further, school-initiated treatment protocols can be triggered as a result of the findings.

TeenScreen tries to entice teens into the trap of screening, from which they may never escape the clutches of the mental health profession, with promises of pizza coupons and movie tickets in exchange for their “willing” participation. Of course parents can take their children to their psychiatrist of choice and perhaps an alternative and less threatening diagnosis will be offered. Yet, if the child is one of the 40 million Americans that do not have medical insurance, how will their parents afford an expensive second opinion in which a real clinical diagnostic instrument would be used? The NFC, TMAP and TeenScreen represents a thinly veiled attempt to prey upon working class people and their children. Many of these children will undoubtedly become a permanent, chemically-dependent prisoner to the TeenScreen/TMAP system because they lack the options of a gaining a qualified second opinion.

TeenScreen's website proclaims that they are not associated with any pharmaceutical industry. This is like saying that bullets are not associated with the use of guns. Pfizer contributed $232,000 to TMAP start up and, under George W. Bush, Texas reciprocated and paid Pfizer $233 million in tax dollars for drugs like Zoloft. Janssen Pharmaceuticals contributed $224,000 to TMAP and received a return of $272 million for Risperdal. The Bush's pharmaceutical golden child, Eli Lilly, won the George W, Bush version of the Texas State pharmaceutical lottery as it only contributed $109,000 and collected over $328 million for Zyprexa. It is clear that the pharmaceutical industry contributed the start up funds for TMAP while receiving a tremendous return on their investment. Screening agent, TeenScreen and the sole medicating agent, TMAP, are implemented in lockstep. Maybe all the people really can be fooled all the time.

In 2002, TeenScreen contracted with the public relations firm of Rabin Strategic Partners to provide each teen in the United States with easy access to this free mental health screening program. Rabin's marketing efforts have proven to be a huge success. Rabin provided TeenScreen with a 10 year marketing strategy. The marketing plan called for an intense public relations plan including lobbying and advertising in order to expand and implement the plan. TeenScreen's use of Rabin's marketing strategy is paying great returns. For example, a 2004 progress report stated, mental health screening programs are now established in 48 states. Further the report added that a total of 19 national groups have approved the screening of our youth's mental health. Disturbingly, Rabin claims a waiting list of 250 additional Kool-Aid drinking communities which have expressed interest in the screening program.

The lobbying efforts have also paid tremendous dividends as there are three related bills pending in Congress and several state governments are working on plans to spread screening programs statewide. This miraculous market penetration has been achieved in only four short years. TeenScreen currently claims a market penetration in 45 states. Big Pharma’s DNA permeates the development of the NFC as they cleverly “cook the books” to establish their legitimacy. Through the creation of the pharma-friendly NFC policy supporting “experts”, they have succeeded in greatly expanding the scope of disease while simultaneously narrowing the treatment parameters to a few set of very expensive drugs
which produce very dangerous side-effects. Finally, the NFC is supporting shoddy screening and diagnosis in an effort to identify an endless reservoir of potential pharmaceutical customers. For example, one of the questions which appear on TeenScreen is:

1) **Have you often felt nervous or uncomfortable when you have been with a group of children or young people - say, like in the lunchroom at school or a party?**

Who has not felt any of these feelings? As a former nationally certified mental health counsellor, and an instructor of research and statistical methods, I am left wondering if I was absent from graduate school the day that these types of feelings were declared to be representative of a mental illness or emotional disturbance? If enough yes answers are given, the child may be referred to an “expert” for treatment (i.e., medication) purposes.

TeenScreen attempts to justify its thinly veiled money making machine program as being based on the fact that “700,000 teens are depressed” with the implication being that these children are at great risk of suicide. I would offer a couple of cautions here before taking TeenScreen’s warnings at face value. To obtain a greater number of depressed patients, one merely has to alter the time frame that is being questioned. For example, if a child loses a pet, and spends 3 weeks mourning their loss, do they really need Zoloft, or will they bounce back without the use of mind-numbing and mind-altering drugs? Secondly, it has long been determined that depression is not the best predictor of suicide. Researchers such as Aaron Beck determined, a very long time ago, that hopelessness is the best predictor of suicide. I fail to see where TeenScreen has taken this well established fact into consideration.

It is indeed ironic that the TeenScreen instrument purports to screen for suicide and the TMAP protocols will be dispensing drugs which have been linked to a higher incidence of suicide by its young users as compared to the earlier generation of antipsychotic medications. This simply means that the pharmaceutical fox is watching the proverbial TeenScreen hen house. Euphemisms aside, the pseudoscience of TeenScreen and TMAP represent unadulterated and evil corporate greed for those who are engaging in system of legal bribery for untold amounts of money at the expense of our children’s autonomy and welfare.

With the high level of reported false positive diagnostic rates and serious questions surrounding the safety of the use of the newer psychotropic medications on developing, young brains, how many children will be chemically destroyed before reaching adulthood? What has happened to parental rights? How many children will not be able to obtain health insurance because the questionable labelling practices of TeenScreen which are allowed under the NFC? Loss of parental rights and constitutional guarantees against the deprivation of life, liberty and pursuit of happiness are not the only threats of this cancer which is just beginning to sweep our country like an out of control tsunami.

If we, as adults, submit to this pharmaceutical greed and treachery, then we get the government we deserve. Unfortunately, our children are not able to make the same informed choice. This country was founded on a spirit of civil disobedience. Thus, the answer seems obvious, refuse to participate in this mental health culture of corruption. If we do not capitulate, what is the government going to do, build a fence around the country and call it jail? We needlessly acquiesce every day to the intrusive demands of government as our bank accounts, emails, phone calls are monitored. “Granny” gets goosed and detained by the TSA at the airport in name of national security, meanwhile, we totally leave our borders open to the very terrorists Bush claims to so desperately fear. Government keeps expanding and the citizens keep retreating. But we are not talking about debits, credits, phone calls and terrorism; we are speaking about the welfare of your child! Ultimately, this system of money-making pseudoscience needs your compliance to work. Look the intimidators in the face and just say NO!

I am not saying that travelling the road of refusal will be easy. Bush and his NFC cronies relied on threats, sanctions and intimidation to impose their agenda on all of us and Obama
has indefinite detention protocols on his side. It seems like we have forgotten that
government is supposed to serve the people, not the other way around. Still, refusing to
comply is our best response. However, I wonder if America has become too fat, lazy and
cowardly to even protect its own children? If you are not willing to fight for your child on
this issue, then you must ask yourself what is your child really worth to you? In amazement,
I have watched this scenario unfold in the Illinois Public Schools, through the passage and
implementation of the Illinois Mental Health Act, where several schools, covering most of
the state, have been implementing TeenScreen and IMAP since 2006. Several Illinois
parents have protested, but all seemingly succumbed to the powers that be. Illinois and the
rest of the nation needs to grow a spine.

It is not just our children that are under attack from the mind control police. Veterans are
being victimized all around the country by the Obama administration who have expanded
this medieval approach to mental health care by recently signing an executive order which
expands suicide prevention treatment to returning veterans. The new program has worked
so well that a former veteran, Brandon Raub, was locked up in a mental health institution
against his will, and was not suicidal. He was locked up for an anti-government rant on his
Facebook page regarding the fact that 9/11 was an inside job. When one considers the
treatment of Raub and other veterans, at the hands of the new mind control police, this
begs the traditional question, with friends like these, who needs enemies?

John Whitehead, lead attorney for the Rutherford Institute, has stated that many veterans
are disappearing for expressing similar views. Does this remind anyone else of the old
Soviet Union when they deemed political dissent as “political schizophrenia” when the
Soviets had the first version of the National Defence Authorization Act and just disappeared
people who disagreed with the government? This may be hard for some to accept, but when
one comes realize that the government has been hijacked by bankers who are using
traditional Soviet style tactics to eradicate the last vestiges of American civil liberties, the
game plan becomes readily apparent.

A drugged up population is a mind controlled population which poses no danger to the
globalist’s plans to depopulate the human herd and the first steps involve keeping as many
people as possible in a zombie state by drugging as many of our children, as possible, out
of their mind. A drugged up veteran population is the first line of defence against a
tyramical takeover of our government. Drugging as many veterans as possible, who do not
espouse the globalists “company line”, is the first step toward stripping America’s first line
of defence against this takeover.

If your child’s school district insists on playing the role of the thought police, then change
schools. If every school in your State is hell bent on biochemically castrating your child’s
brain, then home school your child. If the Department of Education outlaws home schooling,
then be willing to go to jail. News flash: Your children do not belong to the government and
Big Pharma! Your children look to you, their parents, to protect them from evils like the
ones discussed here. I can unequivocally state that TeenScreen and the Big Pharma will
never get their hands on my son. Not now, not ever! Can you say the same for your child?
For the good of your children, sign this petition and then distribute this article to your
family, friends, neighbours, local school board members and your elected representatives.
When TeenScreen and TMAP debut in your community, what will you parents do?

Veterans, America will soon need you to defend the home front from these monsters. In the
near future, when you are deemed to be mentally ill for not embracing totalitarianism, and
they come for you, what will you do?

- And in case you forgot, remember that it is these same psychiatrists who re-classified
paedophilia as NOT being a mental illness. It is these sick bastards who have “normalised”
this disgusting and harrowing practise, the politicians merely rubber-stamped legislation
acting on the advice of these so called “experts”. Let’s now look at the new DSM – 5.
DSM – The ‘Psychiatric Bible’ Responsible for Over Medicating the Population

Mike Barrett Activist Post Thursday, December 29, 2011

If you are a parent then there is a good chance your child has been labelled with some type of disorder, whether it be mental, depressive, or hyperactive.

But even if your child is “lucky” enough to dodge the onslaught of disease labelling, you can be sure that most other children around weren’t as fortunate.

While there are numerous reasons for the influx of disorder-labelling such as additives in the food, toxins in the water, and chemicals in the air, one of the main reasons actually has everything to do with a simple stroke of a pen in a book known as the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, or DSM.

You May Have a New Disorder with the Stroke of a Pen

The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders is the bible of mental health, as far as psychiatrists are concerned. This book possesses the definition of every single disorder known to man, and also every disorder invented by man.

Similar to how lawyers are often thought to have their own language which no normal person would fully understand, this book holds a language of its own to classify people into certain categories. If you are a 296.22, you have experienced a single mild episode of major depressive disorder, while if you are a 301.83 you very close to having personality disorder.

As the decades have gone by, the amount of disorders someone can possibly have has gone up by the hundreds. Most notably, homosexuality was battled for inclusion, describing people as having a “sociopathic personality disturbance.” Later, it was replaced with a disorder called “ego-dystonic homosexuality,” a problem specifically surfacing from a source of distress.

The book is currently on its fourth edition, but the DSM-5’s planned release is coming in May of 2013.

As the DSM editions continue to be released, the criteria for labelling a person for many disorders becomes much lower. Psychiatrists, the pharmaceutical industry and all of their ties love these changes, as medications are prescribed with even less effort on the medical establishment’s part. With a few simple strokes in this book, every single person in the country could soon be labelled as having a disorder, whether caught by medical “professionals” or not.

The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders is Leading to Unnecessary Medication Use

During the 1990s childhood ADD, a disorder ridiculously common today, exploded so much that a 700 percent increase in the use of Ritalin and other stimulants was seen. You may or may not be surprised to know that your child “has ADD” so long as 6 of 9 boxes from a list of symptoms are checked; symptoms like “often does not seem to listen when spoken to directly” or “often fidgets with hands or feet or squirms in seat.”

Two other proposed disorders for the DSM-5 are “mild neurocognitive disorder” in the elderly and “disruptive mood dysregulation disorder” in kids. With the approval of these disorders, there will undoubtedly be a dramatic increase in powerful antipsychotic drug use. These drugs which breed overweight, diabetic children, rose to the top in 2008 with over $14 billion in sales, and have been pushed on millions of children since 2009 alone.
Whether more disorders are added to DSM-5 or not, it is more than expected that criteria be lowered for already existing disorders. No matter the final decision, this book has been helping the pharmaceutical industry for decades, while causing millions of people to suffer from unnecessary medications. The vicious profit-driven cycle brought to you by the pharmaceutical industry only leads you to become dependent on their products, while heavily contributing to the decline of legitimate health practices.

Psychiatry goes insane: Every human emotion now classified as a mental disorder in new psychiatric manual DSM-5

Thursday, December 13, 2012 by Mike Adams (NaturalNews)

The industry of modern psychiatry has officially gone insane. Virtually every emotion experienced by a human being – sadness, grief, anxiety, frustration, impatience, excitement – is now being classified as a "mental disorder" demanding chemical treatment (with prescription medications, of course).

The new, upcoming DSM-5 "psychiatry bible," expected to be released in a few months, has transformed itself from a medical reference manual to a testament to the insanity of the industry itself.

"Mental disorders" named in the DSM-5 include "General Anxiety Disorder" or GAD for short. GAD can be diagnosed in a person who feels a little anxious doing something like, say, talking to a psychiatrist. Thus, the mere act of a psychiatrist engaging in the possibility of making a diagnosis causes the "symptoms" of that diagnosis to magically appear.

This is called quack science and circular reasoning, yet it's indicative of the entire industry of psychiatry which has become such a laughing stock among scientific circles that even science sceptics are starting to turn their backs in disgust. Psychiatry is no more "scientific" than astrology or palm reading, yet its practitioners call themselves "doctors" of psychiatry in order to try to make quackery sound credible.

How modern psychiatry really works

Here's how modern psychiatry really operates: A bunch of self-important, overpaid intellectuals who want to make more money invent a fabricated disease that I'll call "Hoogala Boogala Disorder" or HBD.

By a show of hands, they then vote into existence whatever "symptoms" they wish to associated with Hoogala Boogala Disorder. In this case, the symptoms might be spontaneous singing or wanting to pick your nose from time to time.

They then convince teachers, journalists and government regulators that Hoogala Boogala Disorder is real – and more importantly that millions of children suffer from it! It wouldn't be compassionate not to offer all those children treatment, would it?

Thus begins the call for "treatment" for a completely fabricated disease. From there, it's a cinch to get Big Pharma to fabricate whatever scientific data they need in order to "prove" that speed, amphetamines, pharmaceutical crack or whatever poison they want to sell "reduces the risk of Hoogala Boogala Disorder."

Serious-sounding psychiatrists – who are all laughing their asses off in the back room – then "diagnose" children with Hoogala Boogala Disorder and "prescribe" the prescription drugs that claim to treat it. For this action, these psychiatrists – who are, let's just admit it, dangerous child predators – earn financial kickbacks from Big Pharma.

In order to maximize their kickbacks and Big Pharma freebies, groups of these psychiatrists get together every few years and invent more fictitious disorders, expanding their fictional
tome called the DSM.

The DSM is now larger than ever, and it includes disorders such as "Obedience Defiance Disorder" (ODD), defined as refusing to lick boots and follow false authority. Rapists who feel sexual arousal during their raping activities are given the excuse that they have "Paraphilic coercive disorder" and therefore are not responsible for their actions. (But they will need medication, of course!)

You can also get diagnosed with "Hoarding Disorder" if you happen to stockpile food, water and ammunition, among other things. Yep, being prepared for possible natural disasters now makes you a mental patient in the eyes of modern psychiatry (and the government, too).

Former DSM chairperson apologizes for creating "false epidemics"

Allen Frances chaired the DSM-IV that was released in 1994. He now admits it was a huge mistake that has resulted in the mass overdiagnosis of people who are actually quite normal. The DSM-IV "...inadvertently contributed to three false epidemics -- attention deficit disorder, autism and childhood bipolar disorder," writes Allen in an LA Times opinion piece.

He goes on to say:

The first draft of the next edition of the DSM ... is filled with suggestions that would multiply our mistakes and extend the reach of psychiatry dramatically deeper into the ever-shrinking domain of the normal. This wholesale medical imperialization of normality could potentially create tens of millions of innocent bystanders who would be mislabelled as having a mental disorder. The pharmaceutical industry would have a field day -- despite the lack of solid evidence of any effective treatments for these newly proposed diagnoses.

All these fabricated disorders, of course, result in a ballooning number of false positive. As Allen writes:

The "psychosis risk syndrome" would use the presence of strange thinking to predict who would later have a full-blown psychotic episode. But the prediction would be wrong at least three or four times for every time it is correct -- and many misidentified teenagers would receive medications that can cause enormous weight gain, diabetes and shortened life expectancy.

But that's the whole point of psychiatry: To prescribe drugs to people who don't need them. This is accomplished almost entirely by diagnosing people with disorders that don't exist.

And it culminates in psychiatrists being paid money they never earned (and certainly don't deserve.)

Imagine: An entire industry invented out of nothing! And yes, you do have to imagine it because nothing inside the industry is actually real.

What's "normal" in psychiatry? Being an emotionless zombie

The only way to be "normal" when being observed or "diagnosed" by a psychiatrist -- a process that is entirely subjective and completely devoid of anything resembling actual science -- is to exhibit absolutely no emotions or behaviour whatsoever.

A person in a coma is a "normal" person, according to the DSM, because they don't exhibit any symptoms that might indicate the presence of those God-awful things called emotions or behaviour.
A person in a grave is also "normal" according to psychiatry, mostly because dead people do not qualify for Medicare reimbursement and therefore aren't worth diagnosing or medicating. (But if Medicare did cover deceased patients, then by God you'd see psychiatrists lining up at all the cemeteries to medicate corpses!)

It's all a cruel, complete hoax. Psychiatry should be utterly abolished right now and all children being put on mind-altering drugs should be taken off of them and given good nutrition instead.

When the collapse of America comes and the new society rises up out of it, I am going to push hard for the complete abolition of psychiatric "medicine" if you can even call it that. Virtually the entire industry is run by truly mad, power-hungry maniacs who use their power to victimize children (and adults, too). There is NO place in society for distorted psychiatry based on fabricated disorders. The whole operation needs to be shut down, disbanded and outlawed.

The lost notion of normalcy

Here are some simple truths that need to be reasserted when we abolish the quack science industry of psychiatry:

Normalcy is not achieved through medication. Normalcy is not the absence of a range of emotion. Life necessarily involves emotions, experiences and behaviours which, from time to time, step outside the bounds of the mundane. This does not mean people have a "mental disorder." It only means they are not biological robots.

Nutrition, not medication, is the answer

Nutritional deficiencies, by the way, are the root cause of nearly all "mental illness." Blood sugar imbalances cause brain malfunctions because the brain runs on blood sugar as its primary energy source. Deficiencies in zinc, selenium, chromium, magnesium and other elements cause blood sugar imbalances that result in seemingly "wild" emotions or behaviours.

Nearly everyone who has been diagnosed with a mental disorder in our modern world is actually suffering from nothing more than nutritional imbalances. Too much processed, poisonous junk food and not enough healthy superfood and nutrition. At times, they also have metals poisoning from taking too many vaccines (aluminium and mercury) or eating too much toxic food (mercury in fish, cadmium, arsenic, etc.) Vitamin D deficiency is ridiculously widespread, especially across the UK and Canada where sunlight is more difficult to achieve on a steady basis.

But the reason nutrition is never highlighted as the solution to mental disorders and illness is because the pharmaceutical industry only makes money selling chemical "treatments" for conditions that are given complicated, technical-sounding names to make them seem more real. If food and nutritional supplements can keep your brain healthy -- and believe me, they can! -- then who needs high-priced pharmaceuticals? Who needs high-priced psychiatrists? Who needs drug reps? Pill-pushing doctors? And Obamacare's mandatory health insurance money confiscation programs?

Nobody needs them! This is the simple, self-evident truth of the matter: Our society would be much happier, healthier and more productive tomorrow if the entire pharmaceutical industry and psychiatry industry simply vanished overnight.

With the DSM-5, modern-day psychiatry has made a mockery of itself. What was once viewed as maybe having some basis in science is now widely seen as hilarious quackery.
Psychiatry itself now appears to be completely insane. And that might be the first accurate diagnosis to come out of the entire group.

**End-Run Around Due Process of Law: DSM-5 Defines Millions as "Mentally Ill"**


Reuters 2:07 PM EST February 9, 2012

 Millions of healthy people - including shy or defiant children, grieving relatives and people with fetishes - may be wrongly labelled mentally ill by a new international diagnostic manual, specialists said on Thursday.

In a damning analysis of an upcoming revision of the influential Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM), psychologists, psychiatrists and mental health experts said its new categories and "tick-box" diagnosis systems were at best "silly" and at worst "worrying and dangerous."

Some diagnoses - for conditions like "oppositional defiant disorder" and "apathy syndrome" - risk devaluing the seriousness of mental illness and medicalising behaviours most people would consider normal or just mildly eccentric, the experts said.

At the other end of the spectrum, the new DSM, due out next year, could give medical diagnoses for serial rapists and sex abusers - under labels like "paraphilic coercive disorder" - and may allow offenders to escape prison by providing what could be seen as an excuse for their behaviour, they added.

The DSM is published by the American Psychiatric Association (APA) and has descriptions, symptoms and other criteria for diagnosing mental disorders. It is used internationally and is seen as the diagnostic "bible" for mental health medicine.

More than 11,000 health professionals have already signed a petition (at http://dsm5-reform.com) calling for the development of the fifth edition of the manual to be halted and re-thought.

"The proposed revision to DSM ... will exacerbate the problems that result from trying to fit a medical, diagnostic system to problems that just don't fit nicely into those boxes," said Peter Kinderman, a clinical psychologist and head of Liverpool University's Institute of Psychology at a briefing about widespread concerns over the book in London.

He said the new edition - known as DSM-5 - "will pathologise a wide range of problems which should never be thought of as mental illnesses."

"Many people who are shy, bereaved, eccentric, or have unconventional romantic lives will suddenly find themselves labelled as mentally ill," he said. "It's not humane, it's not scientific, and it won't help decide what help a person needs."

Simon Wessely of the Institute of Psychiatry, King's College London said a look back at history should make health experts ask themselves: "Do we need all these labels?"

He said the 1840 Census of the United States included just one category for mental disorder, but by 1917 the APA was already recognizing 59. That rose to 128 in 1959, to 227 in 1980, and again to around 350 disorders in the latest revisions of DSM in 1994 and 2000.

Allen Frances, Emeritus professor at Duke University and chair of the committee that oversaw the previous DSM revision, said the proposed DSM-5 would "radically and recklessly expand the boundaries of psychiatry" and result in the "medicalisation of normality, individual difference, and criminality."
As an unintended consequence, he said an emailed comment, many millions of people will get inappropriate diagnoses and treatments, and already scarce funds would be wasted on giving drugs to people who don't need them and may be harmed by them.

Nick Craddock of Cardiff University's department of psychological medicine and neurology, who also spoke at the London briefing, cited depression as a key example of where DSMs broad categories were going wrong.

Whereas in previous editions, a person who had recently lost a loved one and was suffering low moods would be seen as experiencing a normal human reaction to bereavement, the new DSM criteria would ignore the death, look only at the symptoms, and class the person as having a depressive illness.

Other examples of diagnoses cited by experts as problematic included "gambling disorder," "internet addiction disorder" and "oppositional defiant disorder" - a condition in which a child "actively refuses to comply with majority's requests" and "performs deliberate actions to annoy others."

"That basically means children who say 'no' to their parents more than a certain number of times," Kinderman said. "On that criteria, many of us would have to say our children are mentally ill."

'Grief is not a mental illness that should be treated with pills': Doctors hit back at creeping medicalisation of life events

- Treatment of grief with antidepressants is 'dangerously simplistic', experts say
- Backlash follows the American Psychiatric Association's reclassification of grief as a mental illness

By Lauren Paxman Last updated at 3:54 PM on 17th February 2012 Daily Mail

Grief is not a mental illness that should be treated with anti-depressants, experts say.

In an unsigned editorial in the influential medical journal The Lancet, experts argue that grief does not require psychiatrists and that 'legitimising' the treatment of grief with antidepressants 'is not only dangerously simplistic, but also flawed.'

The debate follows a decision by the American Psychiatric Association to classify grief as a mental illness in a bid to allow to doctors to be more flexible about how early patients can be treated for depression after the death of a loved one.

The lead editorial states: 'Grief is not an illness; it is more usefully thought of as part of being human and a normal response to the death of a loved one.'

The Lancet's comments follow the APA's decision to add grief reactions to their list of mental illnesses in their fifth edition of the psychiatry 'bible', Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, (DSM-5), which is due out in 2013.

But The Lancet, along with many psychiatrists and psychologists have called for the changes to be halted - saying they would lead to a 'tick box' system that did not consider the wider needs of patients but labelled them as 'mentally ill'.

They agree that in rare cases, bereavement will develop into prolonged grief or major depression that may merit medical treatment. However, they suggested that for the majority of the bereaved, 'doctors would do better to offer time, compassion, remembrance and empathy, than pills.'

The DSM-5 proposal - which has been opposed by The Lancet's editorial writers - would eliminate the so-called 'grief exclusion.'
This 'exclusion' means that anyone who has experienced bereavement cannot be diagnosed as depressed for a certain period of time.

In a previous edition, DSM-III, that period of time was set at one year.

The DSM-IV reduced that period to two months and DSM-5 plans to reduce the period to just two weeks.

Although the proposed changes to the fifth edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5) would not directly affect clinical practice here, where doctors tend to use different international guidelines, experts say it would eventually influence research and thinking in the field.

Defending the change in timeframe, Dr. Kenneth S. Kendler, a member of the DSM-5 Mood Disorder Working Group, said it would allow for an earlier diagnosis but would by no means force it.

Simon Wessely, of the Institute of Psychiatry, King's College, London, said 'We need to be very careful before further broadening the boundaries of illness and disorder.'

'Back in 1840 the Census of the United States included just one category for mental disorder.

'By 1917 the American Psychiatric Association recognised 59, rising to 128 in 1959, 227 in 1980, and 347 in the last revision. Do we really need all these labels? Probably not. And there is a real danger that shyness will become social phobia, bookish kids labelled as Asperger's and so on.'

'Grief is not an illness; it is more usefully thought of as part of being human and a normal response to the death of a loved one'

Whereas people who are bereaved are currently given help where necessary, in future they might find themselves labelled as having a depressive disorder if their symptoms lasted longer than a certain period of time, he added.

Peter Kinderman, Professor of Clinical Psychology and Head of Institute of Psychology, University of Liverpool, said 'It will exacerbate the problems that result from trying to fit a medical, diagnostic, system to problems that just don't fit nicely into those boxes.

'Perhaps most seriously, it will pathologise a wide range of problems which should never be thought of as mental illnesses. Many people who are shy, bereaved, eccentric, or have unconventional romantic lives will suddenly find themselves labelled as 'mentally ill'.

Dr. Arthur Kleinman, a Harvard psychiatrist, social anthropologist and global health expert, says that the main problem is the lack of 'conclusive scientific evidence to show what a normal length of bereavement is.'

According to the Lancet writers, 'it is often not until 6 months, or the first anniversary of the death, that grieving can move into a less intense phase.'

They added that grieving is individual, shaped by age, gender, religious beliefs and the strength of the relationship with the lost loved one.

The secret at the bottom of psychiatry's rabbit hole

by Jon Rappoport February 24, 2013 www.nomorefakenews.com

Nightmares, out-of-control aggressive behaviour, extreme sadness and passivity, confusion, hallucinations, mania, brain damage, suicide, homicide—these are just a few central effects of psychiatric drugs.
Read the staggering statistics reported by Robert Whitaker, the author of Mad in America: Bad Science, Bad Medicine, and the Enduring Mistreatment of the Mentally Ill: “The number of adults, ages 18 to 65, on the federal disability rolls due to mental illness jumped from 1.25 million in 1987 to four million in 2007. Roughly one in every 45 working-age adults is now on government disability due to mental illness.

“This epidemic has now struck our nation’s children, too. The number of children who receive a federal payment because of a severe mental illness rose from 16,200 in 1987 to 561,569 in 2007, a 35-fold increase.”

My exploration started in 1999, as I covered the Columbine school shooting. I was already familiar with the pioneering work of Dr. Peter Breggin and his classic book, Toxic Psychiatry. I knew the drugs were toxic and that some of them could push people into violence.

It emerged that one of the Columbine shooters, Eric Harris, had been on Luvox, a violence-inducing drug, an SSRI antidepressant.

This, of course, was very troubling, because children and adults all over America were taking these antidepressants. And in Dr. Breggin’s book, I saw a summary of a review-study on Ritalin, done in 1986 by Joseph Scarnati. Ritalin, far from being a “soft” drug, was essentially speed, and it carried with it significant dangers.

It could cause hallucinations, aggressive behaviour, and even psychotic breaks. Several million children in America were taking Ritalin.

What I came to call a “Johnny Appleseed spectre” loomed over America. If psychiatrists dispensed enough of these drugs, seeding the population, we would be in for random shootings and killings and suicides on into the indefinite future. And psychiatrists were, in fact, handing out these drugs like candy. No one at the FDA or any enforcement government agency was ringing alarm bells.

In the wake of Columbine, I wrote a white paper, “Why Did they Do It: School Shootings Across America,” for The Truth Seeker. It gained wide online attention. The report mentioned other instances where children, on psychiatric drugs, had committed murder and suicide.

In the ensuing years, I became much more aware of the influence of drug companies in this Johnny Appleseed operation. They had, in fact, struck a deal to rescue the sinking profession of psychiatry. The arrangement was simple and potent: Big Pharma would bankroll psychiatric conferences and education, prop up flagging journals with advertising money, and generally promote the repute of psychiatry, in return for a certain kind of research:

The research would “prove” that all mental disorders were the result of chemical imbalances in the brain, and no amount of talk therapy would resolve these issues. Instead, it would take drugs, which of course would be developed and sold by Pharma.

In order for this scheme to work, the FDA, which certifies all medicines as safe and effective before releasing them for public consumption, would have to play along. That was no problem. The FDA basically serves the pharmaceutical industry.

Roughly five years after Columbine, I (and other investigators) began to see how widespread the research fraud really was. Peter Breggin was already aware of it and had published extensively on the subject.
For example, clinical trials of psychiatric drugs were being done over very brief periods of time; in some cases, the trials were as short as six weeks. This was the case with Xanax. A brief testing period would hide many of the adverse effects of the drugs.

But then I also saw how clinical trials that were failures, that revealed how badly the drugs were performing, could be hidden altogether, as if they'd never happened. The results of these trials weren't published at all. A pharmaceutical company, running a number of studies on a drug, could cherry pick a few studies that looked good and shelve the others.

In 2009, searching the literature and interviewing several psychiatrists off the record, I came to understand that the whole idea of “chemical imbalances in the brain” was a fraud. No one had ever established a normal chemical level of balance. In other words, there was no scientific standard that, by comparison, could show what an “imbalance” was. It was a myth, and it was widely accepted, even by the public.

I began talking to parents. The full force of what was happening, on the ground, was driven home to me. Lives were being derailed and destroyed at an early age. Children were being warped by these drugs. A diagnosis of one psychiatric condition, followed by a drug prescription, often resulted in another diagnosis, and more drugs. The effects were devastating.

The time of childhood, of innocence, was being destroyed. It was all in the service of carving up behaviour into categories of mental disorders and then selling drugs behind those diagnoses.

Children's brains were being twisted.

There was a growing trend to diagnose children at six, at four, or even earlier, with mental conditions—and give them drugs. Papers and books were being written to justify this. The publications were called “breakthroughs.” A whole industry of “bipolar children” was created out of thin air, and the scientific fraud was accepted as holy writ.

This was not just fraud. It was evil. It was remorseless evil, perpetrated by elite academics and researchers. These were people who should have been put in prison for the rest of their lives. But nothing was happening to them. They were praised instead, and celebrated.

Where was the national conscience? Where were the people in the Department of Justice, who should have been serving warrants and making arrests and building court cases?

What I saw was obvious, and it had been in front of my face for more than a decade. The federal government was supporting and certifying psychiatry/psychology as the single science of mental health. This wasn't just a wink and a nod; it was rock solid.

Where in the Constitution was there any basis for that? Nowhere. The very idea, when you isolated it and held it in your hand and looked at it, was preposterous. The federal government has no conceivable right to enable psychiatry in any way.

Yet, it was happening. It was happening to such a degree that nothing was being done to punish the whole profession for destroying countless lives with toxic drugs. Indeed, this was government-approved behaviour.

It still boggles my mind to think about that. Yes, one can offer many excuses and rationalizations, but at the end of it all, that’s what we’re left with: the government is certifying the destruction of millions of lives.

Read Toxic Psychiatry, and Dr. Breggin’s later book, Medication Madness. Read Robert Whitaker’s Mad in America and Anatomy of an Epidemic. That will get you started. You’ll find lucid evidence of the many destructive effects the drugs produce, all the way from mania to motor brain damage.
I thought I had reached the end of the road. What more was there to discover? What more did anyone need to know? No matter which way you sliced it, psychiatric destruction was a government-certified program.

But then, several years ago, I realized I didn’t know how many mental disorders existed. I knew, of course, there was a bible of the psychiatric profession. It is called the DSM, the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. So far, there have been four editions. A fifth is due out in the spring of 2013.

The editions of the DSM are put together by committees of psychiatrists. The DSM, published by the American Psychiatric Association, lists and defines every officially-certified mental disorder. It is used by psychiatrists to bill insurance companies.

So I quickly found out there are 297 mental disorders. This is absurd on the face of it. Reading the descriptions of these disorders, one sees they are menus of behaviours.

I assumed some of these disorders were based on nothing but speculation. They were inventions. Concoctions.

But after a few conversations with psychiatric sources, I saw I had been underestimating the extent of the fraud.

In fact, all 297 mental disorders are arrangements and clusters of behaviours. The DSM committees hold meetings and argue and hash out the composition of the clusters and the accompanying mental-disorder labels.

Then I found an article: Wired Magazine, December 27, 2010, “Inside the Battle to Define Mental Illness,” by Gary Greenberg. It was an interview with a psychiatrist, Dr. Allen Frances.

Frances wasn’t just any psychiatrist. He was a star of stars. He had been in charge of assembling the fourth edition of the bible, the DSM.

In an April 19, 1994, New York Times piece, “Scientist At Work,” Daniel Goleman called Frances, “Perhaps the most powerful psychiatrist in America at the moment…”

Long after the DSM-IV had been put into print, Dr. Frances, talking to Wired’s Greenberg, said the following:

“There is no definition of a mental disorder. It’s bullshit. I mean, you just can’t define it.”

This was on the order of the Pope asserting there was no real reason to believe in God.

After a pause, Dr. Frances remarked, “These concepts [of distinct mental disorders] are virtually impossible to define precisely with bright lines at the borders.”

Frances might have been referring to the fact that his DSM-IV had expanded earlier definitions of ADHD and Bipolar, to permit many more diagnoses, leading to a vast acceleration of drug-dosing with highly powerful and toxic compounds, like Valproate and Lithium.

Finally, at the end of the Wired interview, Frances flew off into a bizarre fantasy:

“Diagnosis [as spelled out in the DSM-IV] is part of the magic...you know those medieval maps? In the places where they didn’t know what was going on, they wrote ‘Dragons live here’...we have a dragon’s world here [with the DSM]. But you wouldn't want to be without the map.”

Frances was basically admitting that the nice neat definitions of mental disorders were a delusion. But to justify it, he called the whole enterprise an exercise in partial map-making.
The Wired interview was explosive, to say the least. The most influential psychiatrist in America was confessing that you couldn’t clearly define mental disorders.

But no, that wasn’t all. There were a few more steps to the bottom of the rabbit hole. They were taken by Dr. Russell Barkley, professor of psychiatry and neurology at the University of Massachusetts Medical Centre.

In an episode of the PBS Frontline series, titled “Does ADHD Exist,” the Frontline interviewer stated: “Sceptics say that there’s no biological marker—that it [ADHD] is the one condition out there where there is no blood test, and that no one knows what causes it.”

Dr. Barkley replied: “That’s tremendously naïve, and it shows a great deal of illiteracy about science and about the mental health professions. A disorder doesn’t have to have a blood test to be valid. If that were the case, all mental disorders would be invalid...There is no lab test for any mental disorder right now in our science. That doesn’t make them invalid.”

First of all, Dr. Barkley’s comments are not unique. I have heard his points echoed by many psychiatrists. It’s time to take this assertion apart, because it is truly staggering.

The “illiteracy about science” belongs to Dr. Barkley. The scientific method requires that when a researcher draws a conclusion, he provides the evidence for it. The burden of proof is on him.

If a committee of psychiatrists says disorder X exists, it must demonstrate that.

Barkely confirms that no mental disorder has a lab test to back up a diagnosis. It doesn’t matter what disorder you pick. Schizophrenia, ADHD, Bipolar, clinical depression. None of them can be tested for.

No blood test, no urine test, no saliva test, no brain scan, no genetic assay.

That is a titanic fact.

And being a fact, it destroys the whole DSM and everything it stands for. It destroys the validity of every one of the 297 official mental disorders.

Science requires that the claim for the existence of a mental disorder must be backed up by hard evidence. Since there is no evidence, and since the burden of proof is on the psychiatric profession, the inevitable inference is clear:

Retract every one of the 297 mental disorders. Erase their names. It’s over. There is no proof any of these disorders exist. They only have the status of fictions. Psychiatry doesn’t have some special dispensation to do “a different brand of science.”

When this was finally made clear to me, I knew I had reached the bottom of the rabbit hole. There were other paths to follow, concerning the issue of conscious intent to do harm to millions of people, but as far the science was concerned, that was it.

Of course, those who are confused by this bottom-line revelation will say that many people are suffering from mental illness. They will say it is obvious.

No, what is obvious is that many people have problems. Many people suffer. Many people are desperate. Many people experience emotional and physical pain. The actual causes for all this can’t be neatly categorized and labelled. To make a meaningful diagnosis or assessment involves much deeper investigation—and also an appreciation of what is front of one’s own eyes.

When it comes to human suffering and emotional distress, we could be talking about causes ranging from severe malnutrition to brain lesions; from environmental poisoning to a history of toxic medical drug and vaccine-use; from extreme poverty and hopelessness to
false arrest; from oxygen deprivation at birth to physical abuse and imminent danger in the immediate household, or in the community; from massive food sensitivities and other allergies to blood-sugar problems; from guilt at having committed crimes to being on the receiving end of political oppression. The list goes on.

This is a partial collection of real causes—instead of the false, non-existent mental disorders, which are excuses to drug people.

The whole profession of psychiatry is an outright fraud and an ongoing crime of the highest order.

At the same time, as long as psychiatrists sit in offices and the drugs are available, and no one is prosecuted and sent to jail for dispensing these “medicines,” adults have the freedom to choose to take the drugs or not. And if some of them say they have benefited, that's also their decision.

But without knowledge and authentic informed consent beforehand, the landscape is rife with danger.

When it comes uninformed or uncaring parents dealing away their children’s lives to psychiatrists, that is an ever-expanding tragic nightmare.

Each day that the profession of psychiatry continues to practice its sophisticated brand of poisonous fakery, and each day that the federal government of the United States continues to back it up and support it and fund it and give it primacy and monopoly, there is an ongoing RICO crime in progress. A crime of gangsters and thugs organized as a mob.

It is as if the Mafia declared its shootings and beatings to be scientifically based. It is exactly like that.

Newsflash to psychiatry: a human being is not a thing

by Jon Rappoport January 31, 2013 www.nomorefakenews.com

The ability to separate components of a machine, to increase the efficiency and power of each component, to link up all the elements in smoother ways; this is one of the hallmarks of the technological society.

And when the current machine is superseded by a new one, the process of improving efficiency starts all over again.

But a human being is not a machine, because consciousness is not a machine.

The rise of what has been called industrial psychology, or scientific management, tries to overcome that “flaw.” This is described well in Scott Noble's film, Human Resources: Social Engineering in the 20th Century (posted at YouTube).

For example, the modern factory assembly line, in which workers did multiple tasks and functioned as skilled artisans, was overthrown in favour of a system in which each worker performed the same severely restricted, specialized task over and over again. A machine making machines.

And not just in America. In Russia, in the early stages of the revolution, worker-owned companies were on the rise. But that development was too conscious, too participatory. Lenin imposed his top-down version of human machines making machines, all in the service of constructing a super-state.

In the same way, the rise of psychology and psychiatry reflect the impulse to treat the mind as a machine. The expanding concoction of so-called mental disorders are arbitrary attempts at categorizing human thought, desire, and behaviour as diseases.
Have you ever tried to solve an arbitrarily cooked-up problem for millions of people? Of course not. Who in his right mind would? Yet this is exactly what the “mental sciences” have accepted as their mission.

Consciousness is not public business. Its dimensions and capabilities are there for every person to explore on his own terms. This is called freedom.

Psychiatry has sought to redefine consciousness solely in terms of brain function. This materialist obsession is also an attempt to gain control of the mind.

In the wake of Sandy Hook, we are seeing the escalation of a social and political bargain: the sacrifice of freedom in return for more invasive “mental health,” which would purportedly reduce the number of mass murders.

Of course, this is a false promise. There is no psychiatric prospect for reducing killings (especially since some of their medicines induce extreme violence.) There is only more diagnosis of mental disorders, followed by drugging with toxic and dangerous chemicals.

This is all based on an unspoken bias against freedom and consciousness, in favour of “evening out” the emotional range and experience of humans. Psychiatrist Peter Breggin rightly characterizes this as drug-induced emotional flatness and anaesthesia.

Worse yet, this layer of flatness can disintegrate, leaving the patient in a synthetically created, out-of-control emotional state.

But psychiatry’s political allies, all too happy to delegate violent-crime prevention to mental-health professionals, are viewing society as a numbers game. For them, averaging out human emotions into an acceptable and harmless range is a preferred overall solution. It’s a system of control.

Therefore, this really isn’t about violent-crime prevention at all. It’s about rendering humans into a state where they react like predictable Things under chemical restraint.

No doubt we’ll soon see a new generation of devices for stimulating brain centres, aimed at inducing pleasure and satisfaction. And the covert agenda will be to render consciousness a servant to the status quo.

The people who own governments and countries look upon this model as a reasonable method for producing “the normal human” who accepts things as they are.

Let’s face it, wherever human beings feel the possibility of liberation, they begin to devise their own communities and workplaces. They innovate. Forms and structures are created so that each person can benefit from the whole.

But top-down, this is viewed as a dangerous development. Leaders, in the camp of monopolists, do everything they can to squelch such movements. Which means they reduce the human being and consciousness to a cipher within a system, thus defeating their nemesis: decentralization.

It has been so since the beginning of time. Somewhere in a cave, prehistoric men and women, striving to survive in a hostile environment, began to think about new social relationships in their extended families—and a few leaders, watching this unwelcome development, decided they had to invent the first false flags (creation of non-existent enemies), in order to declare DEFCON 1 and centralize their control over the group.

From its earliest experiments, forged by Pavlov, Wundt, and other like-minded researchers, psychology has sought to prove that the conditioned-reflex (machine) model of human behaviour was a true reflection of life on planet Earth.
They were given entrance into the club of controllers for precisely that reason: humans as machines was a perfect pseudoscience to build on.

Once you strip away the sophisticated complexities of modern psychiatry, you see the same proposition: the human brain, through chemical intervention, can be modified to produce “better behaviour.”

Progressing from the sheer madness of researchers like Jose Delgado and Ewen Cameron, who believed no human had an inherent right to his own personality, but should be altered to fit the social needs of the State, psychiatry, hand-in-hand with Pharma, has developed kinder, gentler language to describe its mission:

Healing disease; ending suffering; bringing greater happiness.

This decades-long propaganda blitz has benefited psychiatry enormously. Smoothly fitting into programs of its government backers, promoted as the “official word” by major media, the profession has gained a primacy exceeding its most optimistic projections.

In America and many other countries, there now exists Official Mental Science. That most people don’t even notice this fact speaks to the overwhelming success of psychiatry.

Think about that. In what kind of political State do you need an official science of the mind? There is only one explanation for it. The State is a dictatorship.

In a free society, government would never dream of taking sides with one explanation of the human mind. It wouldn’t dare enable that explanation through its law-enforcement officers, court system, and publicly funded psych wards and research grants.

In the US, we have the federal NIMH, the National Institute of Mental Health, a sub-branch of the National Institutes of Health. It operates on an annual budget of $1.5 billion. Wikipedia names NIMH “the largest research organization in the world specializing in mental illness.”

In this obvious puff piece written for NIMH, Wikipedia goes on to state: “For the institution to continue fulfilling this vital public health mission it must further innovative thinking...in the evolving science of brain, behaviour, and experience. In this way, breakthroughs in science can become breakthroughs for all people with mental illnesses...NIMH is particularly known for studies of genetics, neuroscience, and clinical trials of psychiatric medication.”

Official mental science. Backed and enforced by the US government.

In previous articles, I’ve demonstrated that, for all 297 officially certified mental disorders, there are NO physical tests to confirm a diagnosis. None. And on that non-basis, millions of doses of toxic and dangerous drugs are prescribed to Americans every year.

So much for science. But for control? Ah, that's quite a different story. The power to invade and interfere with people's lives is on the upswing.

Government simply says, “We care about you,” and for most people, this is apparently enough to satisfy them that psychiatry is a good thing, an objective thing, a thing worthy of being official and enforced and funded.

In 1906, Ivan Pavlov, the celebrated innovator in what is now called “classical conditioning,” wrote: “Mankind will possess incalculable advantages and extraordinary control over human behaviour, when the scientific investigator will be able to subject his fellow men to the same external analysis he would employ for any natural object...”
Nearly half a century later, one of the most celebrated psychologists of the 20th century, BF Skinner, offered this pithy assessment of humans: “The real question is not whether machines think but whether men do.”

Skinner’s answer to that question was no; instead, humans were driven entirely by a set of their past behaviours that were reinforced positively by others.

In both Pavlov’s and Skinner’s universe, free will was out of the question. It was only a matter of deciding how to condition people.

Modern psychiatry, 40 years ago, formed an overt alliance with pharmaceutical companies, to sell chemically-imposed conditioning as treatment for disease. At least the early behaviourists wore their agenda on their sleeves. These days, it’s all subterfuge and deception.

When all is said and done, brain researchers of the 21st century steadfastly believe that human thought, feeling, desire, and consciousness can be reduced to predetermined signals and chemicals and electronics taking place inside the skull. Therefore, for them, creating changes in those signals is entirely legitimate and ethical: they are merely making over the Unfree Human Thing into a Better Unfree Thing.
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After the Sandy Hook murders, psychology and psychiatry have taken another leap forward in expanding their influence throughout society. “More mental-health services” is the catch-all phrase our leaders use in “solving” these massacres—along with gun control.

But just as grabbing guns won’t reduce the bulk of gun violence in America, the vague mental-health dictum won’t work, either.

This article focuses on psychology, which is a branch of false knowledge different from the false knowledge of psychiatry.

A psychiatrist is a medical doctor who has received special training in diagnosing and prescribing drugs for “mental disorders,” none of which disorders can be confirmed to exist by any test.

A psychologist doesn’t need to be a medical doctor. With an advanced degree and a license, he can do therapy with patients and try to resolve “mental and emotional issues,” for which no diagnostic tests exist.

From the beginning of the history of psychology, it was really a simple trick. Establish a loose category called “mental problem,” pour money and research into solving it, and enrol patients.

This approach has become so pervasive that most people can’t conceive of an alternative. A person is acting strange, he has a problem, and a mental-health practitioner can help him solve it. What else do we need to know?

Well, for starters, we need to know why the category of “mental problem” is necessary. Why should we assume it means anything?

Instead, for example: what about people making an inventory of their own deeply held convictions, followed by a self-assessment, to see how well or badly they’re living up to those convictions?
Why did that approach go out the window?

Because it's based on some sense of responsibility, which is now verboten in a society where “intervening” and “fulfilling needs” are paramount.

If a person can't or won't discover what his most deeply held convictions are, what hope does he have? What problems can he solve that are going to make any great difference?

“Let’s see. I'm living a life I don't want, and that life is throwing problems at me. If I solve the problems, I'll be okay, right?”

Are you kidding?

Academic psychology, if you read its history, its textbooks, its methods, has nothing of value or substance to say about a person’s most profound personal convictions. That’s not on the radar. It never was. What you get is sophisticated babble about mental conditions and unresolved issues.

The existence of these issues and conditions is PROMOTED by psychology. Psychology is a self-fulfilling prophecy: if you assume these conditions actually exist and if you believe they are real, then you can chew on them for ten or 15 years and come up with explanations, answers, and solutions.

Yes, that's right. The human being is a very adaptable creature. If you can insert a primary assumption into his mind, where he accepts it as authentic, he'll begin to cogitate and calculate around it.

Because the assumption was never his to begin with. He bought it. He went for it. He took the bait.

Now if you consider that millions and millions of people are working on this fake reality, having accepted that they suffer from mental problems, what do you get?

You get a society that, more and more, is paralyzed into inaction. You get passivity. You get an overall depletion of energy and power. You get a victim-club mentality.

Freud picked the “Oedipal Complex” out of a hat. The incest fantasy. He made this the foundation of his breakthrough. He sold it. He sold it as the underlying trauma and taboo that was always and forever twisting the minds of every male on Earth. He decided that this fantasy had to be exorcised with years of specialized therapy.

It was a new version of old guilt. Forget about the Garden of Eden and eating forbidden fruit from the tree. The incest wish was the real source of human guilt.

Psychology, from Freud forward, quickly became a prison term from which the inhabitant could be released when the therapist determined basic problems had been defeated.

Freud's opponents and detractors argued for their own version of the correct prison (the basic mental problem). But the whole underlying notion of “a person captured” needed to come under scrutiny, and of course that never happened, as long as psychologists and psychiatrists ruled the roost.

Psychology became a major force that undermined freedom, the Bill of Rights, and the Constitution in America. It asserted or implied that no rights or responsibilities meant anything as long as people were chained to their own problems and issues. This was an argument from Inherent Limitation. It was persuasive.

From the perspective of psychology, only rubes and Neanderthals would claim freedom was a core fact of existence. The more educated classes would realize they had to swim through an undersea jungle of their own mental and emotional restraints, guided by a steady
professional hand, before they could finally emerge and come to experience the meaning of freedom.

So of course that journey became a self-fulfilling prophecy.

There was one catch. Most people, after years of therapy, felt no dramatic difference. This disappointment translated into a deep cynicism about life. It meant more passivity.

Psychology has not only promoted the existence of mental problems, it has stated that these conditions are rock-bottom facts: there is no way to overcome them, short of talk therapy or psychiatric drugs. Psychology argues that it is useless to try to “ignore mental conditions.” That won’t work. It can’t work.

And if the patient agrees, he can go on to manufacture problems without end.

Whereas, the truth is, every so-called mental or emotional condition is a signal. It alerts a person that he is heading the ship away from its destination. He’s experiencing a crisis that has everything to do with the question: WHAT IS MY COURSE IN LIFE?

Finding an answer to that question makes all the difference.

I know somebody is going to write me about how nutrition can solve mental problems. Somebody is going to write and tell me how vaccines, medical drugs, chemtrails, GMOs, dyes and colours in food, etc., create mental problems.

I've written about these factors for years. Understand, however, that, in these cases, what the person is really suffering from is a severe nutritional deficit, or from the toxic overload of the vaccines, drugs, GMOs. To say it’s a mental problem is to misname what is really going on. In the same way, saying a person has an irresistible itch when what he really has is poison ivy is a diversion from the main event.

Psychology says: “Here is the mind. It contains conditions and issues. We can resolve them.”

That's false. That's the illusion. The mind doesn't CONTAIN CONDITIONS or issues.

The conditions-hoax is perfectly paralleled by the disorder-hoax of psychiatry. These are, at the very best, metaphors. At their worst, they're intentional ruses.

Here are ACTUAL rock-bottom conditions: freedom, independence, deep and profound desire, the power and energy to fulfil those desires, a sense of what is right and wrong, the wish to see others succeed brilliantly, community, expressing self, creative power, action in the world.

These are the elements of a philosophy, not psychology. These are elements of life abundant.

These are loci of decision for every conscious person.

And, as it turns out, psychology came late to the party. For millennia, humans have been engaging in philosophy and the exploration of spiritual dimensions.

The assumption of “gross limitation caused by internal problems” is a very recent concoction.

The assumption is simply the result of propaganda bought and sold.

When we delete such nonsense, we can discover the kind of personal truth that rings the bell clearly, if we are up to the task.
The rise of psychology was in part fuelled by the notion that science could resolve human problems. But humans aren’t machines; they aren’t closed systems; they aren’t planets moving in fixed orbits. The analogy doesn’t work. It fails miserably.

Exploring instead, for example, what the ancient alchemists were really up to, and the original teachers of Tibet who employed the techniques of itinerant adepts from India, gives us a startling perspective on the UNLIMITED human being.

These teachers weren’t, in any meaningful sense, psychologists. They were philosophers of action. They were adventurers and explorers. They didn’t sit in offices dealing with the latest symptoms of people suffering from the malaise of a brainwashed society.

They knew there was a Matrix; they knew it was a heavy blanket of illusion; they knew it both corralled the individual and the community; and they knew it could be dispelled. It was their mission to make that happen, and they didn’t stint.

Their was a heraldic enterprise. It surpassed, by light years, stirring sand in a childish playpen of therapy.

That heraldic thread of adventure never dies. It can be stifled at times, but it remains alive under the surface.

Liberating the creative force in a person is the key. Not through some external and removed and remote process. The process involves everything you’ve got.

It goes down to the centre of the Earth and out to the stars, and beyond. When so engaged, the mind cooperates and collaborates with the adventurer. It moves through so-called mental problems like a rocket burning up old paper.

One summer in the 1980s, when I was just starting out as a reporter, I scored a few front-page stories for LA Weekly, because other writers were out of town. I managed to squeeze in one of the weirder features the Weekly had published up to that time: off-the-record interviews with therapists detailing their private fantasies—all of which turned out to be intensely anti-social.

I later learned the “therapy community in town” didn’t appreciate my approach.

Similarly, I expect some psychologists will rankle at this one. But the point is, all these fantasies, of both patient and therapist are outcomes of the creative force in action—nothing less or more—and they should be seen that way.

Instead of assigning fantasy A to mental condition A and fantasy B to condition B, why not just throw all the insanity overboard and acknowledge, finally, that what underlies fantasia is the beginning and end of the answer to what’s bothering people and troubling them and driving them into despair and deep boredom:

Imagination and the creative force are tigers waiting to be let out of their cages so they can invent astonishing Futures.

This would be a truly modern psychology and a thoroughly contemporary reflection of what we all know.

From our deepest wellsprings, we:

INVENT; IMAGINE; CREATE; IMPROVISE; BUILD;

WORK TO MAKE WHAT WE IMAGINE INTO FACT IN THE WORLD.

Exploring the meaning and action of THIS is a worthy undertaking, and it would happily supersede what has absurdly been called psychology. Jon Rappoport
I firmly and genuinely believe that the individuals involved (at the higher levels) with all of this psychobabble nonsense are probably themselves all sociopathic or psychopathic.

Here’s some rather pertinent information on both of these conditions.

Once you've looked at the next few pages remember the lunacy that you've just read previously and ask yourself if these guys are sociopathic or psychopathic?

--

How to spot a sociopath - 10 red flags that could save you from being swept under the influence of a charismatic nut job

Mike Adams, NaturalNews Editor naturalnews.com Originally published June 8 2012

(NaturalNews) One of the more offensive duties of being an investigative journalist is taking out the trash – exposing liars, fraudsters, con artists and scammers for the people they truly are. Each time we investigate a sociopath, we find that they always have a little cult group following of spellbound worshippers who consider that particular sociopath to be a "guru" or "prophet."

Sociopaths are masters at influence and deception. Very little of what they say actually checks out in terms of facts or reality, but they're extremely skilful at making the things they say sound believable, even if they're just making them up out of thin air. Here, I'm going to present quotes and videos of some legendary sociopaths who convinced everyday people to participate in mass suicides. And then I'm going to demonstrate how and why similar sociopaths are operating right now... today.

Why cover this subject? I've seen a lot of people get hoodwinked, scammed or even harmed by sociopaths, and it bewilders me that people are so easily sucked into their destructive influence. I want to share with NaturalNews readers the warning signs of sociopaths so that you can spot them, avoid them, and save yourself the trouble of being unduly influenced by them.

Much of this information is derived from the fascinating book, *The Sociopath Next Door* (http://www.amazon.com/Sociopath-Next-Door-Martha-Stout/dp/0767915828), which says that 4% of the population are sociopaths. The book is a fascinating read.

10 signs for spotting a sociopath
#1) Sociopaths are charming. Sociopaths have high charisma and tend to attract a following just because people want to be around them. They have a "glow" about them that attracts people who typically seek guidance or direction. They often appear to be sexy or have a strong sexual attraction. Not all sexy people are sociopaths, obviously, but watch out for over-the-top sexual appetites and weird fetishes.

#2) Sociopaths are more spontaneous and intense than other people. They tend to do bizarre, sometimes erratic things that most regular people wouldn't do. They are unbound by normal social contracts. Their behaviour often seems irrational or extremely risky.

#3) Sociopaths are incapable of feeling shame, guilt or remorse. Their brains simply lack the circuitry to process such emotions. This allows them to betray people, threaten people or harm people without giving it a second thought. They pursue any action that serves their own self interest even if it seriously harms others. (My Note. The underlined parts above describe the behaviour and ideology of the psychiatrists we've just read about doesn't it?)

#4) Sociopaths invent outrageous lies about their experiences. They wildly exaggerate things to the point of absurdity, but when they describe it to you in a storytelling format, for some reason it sounds believable at the time.

#5) Sociopaths seek to dominate others and "win" at all costs. They hate to lose any argument or fight and will viciously defend their web of lies, even to the point of logical absurdity.

#6) Sociopaths tend to be highly intelligent, but they use their brainpower to deceive others rather than empower them. Their high IQs often makes them dangerous. This is why many of the best-known serial killers who successfully evaded law enforcement were sociopaths.

#7) Sociopaths are incapable of love and are entirely self-serving. They may feign love or compassion in order to get what they want, but they don't actually FEEL love in the way that you or I do.

#8) Sociopaths speak poetically. They are master wordsmiths, able to deliver a running "stream of consciousness" monologue that is both intriguing and hypnotic. They are expert storytellers and even poets. As a great example of this in action, watch this interview of Charles Manson: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=alfGj_55FHI

#9) Sociopaths never apologize. They are never wrong. They never feel guilt. They can never apologize. Even if shown proof that they were wrong, they will refuse to apologize and instead go on the attack.

#10) Sociopaths are delusional and literally believe that what they say becomes truth merely because they say it! Charles Manson, the sociopathic murderer, is famous for saying, "I've never killed anyone! I don't need to kill anyone! I THINK it! I have it HERE! (Pointing to his temple.) I don't need to live in this physical realm..."

Watch Charles Manson saying this at the 3:05 mark of this video: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=alfGj_55FHI

How to dispel illusion and get to the truth

Sociopaths are masters at weaving elaborate fictional explanations to justify their actions. When caught red-handed, they respond with anger and threats, then weave new fabrications to explain away whatever they were caught doing.

A sociopath caught red-handed with a suitcase full of cash he just stole, for example, might declare he had actually rescued the money from being stolen by someone else, and that he
was attempting to find its rightful owner. He’s the hero, see? And yet, in reality, he will simply pocket the money and keep it. If you question him about the money, he will attack you for questioning his honesty.

Sociopaths are masters at presenting themselves as heroes with high morals and philosophy, yet underneath it they are the true criminal minds in society who steal, undermine, deceive, and often incite emotional chaos among entire communities. They are masters at turning one group of people against another group while proclaiming themselves to be the one true saviour. Wherever they go, they create strife, argument and hatred, yet they utterly fail to see their own role in creating it. They are delusional at so many levels that their brains defy logical reasoning. You cannot reason with a sociopath. Attempting to do so only wastes your time and annoys the sociopath.

Tip for exposing sociopaths: Start fact-checking something they claim

One simple method for dispelling sociopathic delusion is to start fact checking their claims. Do any of their claims actually check out? If you start digging, you will usually find an inconsistency. Confront the suspected sociopath with the inconsistency and see what happens: Most sociopaths will become angry or aggressive when their integrity is questioned, whereas a sane person would simply be happy to help clear up any misinformation or misunderstanding.

Beware of fact-checking the sociopath by asking other people under his or her influence. A sociopath will usually have a small group of cult-like followers who not only believe their fictional tales, but who actually internalize those fictions to the point where they rewrite their own memories to be consistent with them. If a guru-style sociopath talks about his "levitation sessions" over and over again, some of his believers will sooner or later start to form false memories in which they imagine seeing him levitate off the floor. So if you ask those people, "Did you actually ever see this person levitate?" They will enthusiastically say, "Yes!" Because in their own minds, that illusion has become something indistinguishable from a vivid memory.

That's why fact-checking a sociopath requires evidence from outside his circle of influence. Does anything he say actually check out in the real world, outside his sphere of direct control? If not, you've probably spotted a sociopath.

Sociopaths never answer facts; they always attack the messenger

Another very valuable red flag to recognize when trying to spot a sociopath is to see how they deal with attacks on their own integrity. If a sociopath is presented with a collection of facts, documents and evidence showing that he lied or deceived, he will refuse to address the evidence and, instead, attack the messenger!

As an investigative journalist who exposes some of the most despicable sociopaths on the planet, I've been attacked on every front imaginable: I'm a secret government agent, they say. Or I'm an alien from planet Zorg. I've heard it all, and while the accusations vary wildly, the pattern is the same: Attack the messenger but refuse to answer the documented allegations.

If you really try to nail a sociopath down to answering a documented allegation, they will quickly turn on you, denounce you, and declare that you too are secretly plotting against them. Anyone who does not fall for the brainwashing of the sociopath is sooner or later kicked out of the circle and then wildly disparaged by the remaining members of the cult.

Inventing bizarre tales

One of the easiest signs to spot is how sociopaths exaggerate things to an irrational absurdity. In the sociopath's world, every explanation is more intense and more heroic-
sounding than the way it really went down. Where a normal person might say, "I vomited last night," a sociopath would say, "I vomited up a 27-foot tapeworm!"

And a truly psychotic sociopath might even add details such as, "And then the tapeworm climbed up the wall and jumped on me and tried to strangle me!"

You might laugh at such an explanation, but I know lots of similar examples that have been believed by irrational cult followers.

Every story the sociopath weaves, often on the spur of the moment, is impossible to either confirm or deny. No one can prove him wrong, since they weren't there, so he can spin whatever details into the story he wants. "After eating this, I had a three-hour ejaculation!"

Or, "The Dalai Lama wanted to anoint me as a spiritual leader, but I declined, telling him that I only needed faith, not any official recognition."

How can anyone disprove such a claim? They can't. So the sociopath relies on these unprovable, unsubstantiated claims to build up a false aura of authority, spirituality or knowledge. This creeps up on followers like a serpent, slithering into their brains and taking hold of their belief systems before they realize what has happened.

As a survivor of the Jim Jones "Jonestown" mass suicide says in a PBS documentary video (see link below), "Everything was plausible [at the time], except in retrospect the whole thing seems bizarre."

That's how sociopaths operate. As they're speaking, they capture your imagination and sound reasonable, even authoritative. But in the clear light of day, what they are actually saying is absurd... even dangerous.

But no matter what fictions are presented by the sociopath, they always present him in the light of a hero -- sometimes even a saint -- who sacrifices his life for the good of others. He often talks of "healing" or "detoxification" or being "cleansed." When he is exposed by truth-tellers, he merely accuses the truth-tellers of being secret undercover agents. When he is accused of sexual assault by one of his own followers (a common occurrence in these circles), he denounces her as an enemy or a spy.

The ultimate destination of a sociopath is to destroy himself and take as many willing victims with him as possible. This is the Jim Jones scenario: Drink the Kool-Aid laced with poison, and thereby prove your worth to your entire cult group.

A common theme of poison, sainthood, redemption

Interestingly, many sociopaths do indeed centre their actions around a bizarre food or drink theme, often demanding their members eat or drink poisonous or highly offensive substances that no rational person would otherwise consume. The Heaven's Gate cult, for example, was led by a classic sociopath named Marshall Applewhite. He managed to convince 38 followers to kill themselves by eating applesauce laced with phenobarbital.

Watch the fascinating video of Applewhite here and ask yourself: Would you follow this man to your own grave? (Other people did!) http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AqSZhwu1Rwo

Notice how Applewhite speaks with authority, clarity and some level of charisma. Notice the intensity of his eyes? This is another common trait among sociopaths (including Manson, above). Remember, this man gained such influence over his followers that they voluntarily killed themselves in order to maintain his approval!

On March 19–20, 1997, Marshall Applewhite taped himself speaking of mass suicide and asserted "it was the only way to evacuate this Earth." The Heaven's Gate group was against suicide but they believed they had no choice but to leave Earth as quickly as possible. After claiming that a space craft was trailing the comet Hale-Bopp, Applewhite convinced 38 followers to commit suicide so that their souls could board the supposed craft. Applewhite believed that after their deaths, a UFO would take their souls to another "level of existence above human," which Applewhite described as being both physical and spiritual. This and other UFO-related beliefs held by the group have led some observers to characterize the group as a type of UFO religion. In October 1996, the group purchased alien abduction insurance to cover up to 50 members at a cost of $10,000.

The cult rented a 9,200-sq.-ft. mansion, located at 18241 Colina Norte (later changed to Paseo Victoria), in a gated community of upscale homes in the San Diego-area community of Rancho Santa Fe, California from Sam Koutchesfahani, paying $7,000 per month in cash. The thirty-eight Heaven's Gate members, plus group leader Applewhite, were found dead in the home on March 26, 1997. In the heat of the California spring, many of the bodies had begun to decompose by the time they were discovered. The corpses underwent autopsies, where cyanide and arsenic were found. The bodies were later cremated.

The suicide was accomplished by ingestion of phenobarbital mixed with applesauce or pudding, washed down with vodka. Additionally, plastic bags were secured around their heads after ingesting the mix to induce asphyxiation. Authorities found the dead lying neatly in their own bunk beds, faces and torsos covered by a square, purple cloth. Each member carried a five-dollar bill and three quarters in their pockets. All 39 were dressed in identical black and white Nike Decades athletic shoes, and armband patches reading "Heaven's Gate Away Team" (one of many instances of the group's use of the Star Trek fictional universe's nomenclature). The adherents, between the ages of 26 and 72, are believed to have died in three groups over three successive days, with remaining participants cleaning up after each prior group's death.

This episode speaks directly to the mind-altering power of sociopaths. Their delusions can be so convincing that followers will even kill themselves in order to stay in alignment with the expectations of the group. I know of a fringe health sociopath operating right now who has killed several of his own followers, but of course he always blames them for their own deaths. It's never his fault, you see.

Sadly, even when one sociopath kills himself (and takes a few of his followers with him), there is always another sociopath waiting to take his place, seeking power, influence, and sometimes fame. It is common for sociopaths to strongly desire to be on television shows or to desperately seek out opportunities for short-term fame, often from engaging in bizarre acts or staging strange events. This is one of the ways in which they recruit followers to join their cult.

Jim Jones and drinking the Kool-Aid

The most horrifying master of sociopathic delusion was, of course, Jim Jones who convinced 900+ people to kill themselves by drinking poisoned Kool-Aid.

And people loved him for it! They felt inspired, excited, healed and guided. Jim Jones was their saviour, their prophet. They believed his every word, and they paid for their foolish belief with their lives.

Watch this powerful PBD documentary video about Jonestown: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D7ixGfipSWk

As Jim Jones proved, people can be easily swept up into an irrational belief in a guru or prophet who quite literally plans to murder them. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jonestown)
This is the other dominant factor we see in dangerous sociopaths: An odd obsession with dead things, rotting things, putrid things... things that would cause a normal, mentally balanced person to shrink away in horror. Jim Jones, for example, was fascinated with death and would reportedly murder small animals and then hold funerals for them.

Jones was a master at invoking spiritual concepts and presenting himself as spiritually evolved. This is another common theme among sociopaths, and you see it among Applewhite, Manson, Jones and even present-day sociopaths who are operating in America right now.

Historically, perhaps the best example of a delusional sociopath was none other than Adolf Hitler. He showed all the classic signs: A brilliant orator, a congenital liar, a complete lack of compassion for others, a dominant, aggressive personality, and the invoking of spirituality to justify his actions. The Nazi Swastika symbol, in fact, is a derivation of the Flower of Life symbol derived from sacred geometry. (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1KMxmJVtp2Y)

The modern sociopath: A threat to us all

Sociopaths aren't just a relic of history; I see their kind operating today, in 2012. A surprising number of people continue to fall for the delusional (but convincing) web of lies spun by wordsmithing sociopaths who may operate in almost any area of society: Science and physics, New Age circles, fringe health, self improvement and even "pop" spiritual development.

People from all walks of life allow themselves to be fooled by these sociopaths, buying into their false narratives, toxic products and destructive behavioural patterns, all driven into their heads through a complex web of social engineering, linguistics and emotional influence. Most people are completely unaware they have been mesmerized into these cult groups, just like the Jonestown people were completely unaware... or the Heaven's Gate crowd.

There are people today, right now, who are zealous members of fringe cults that advocate drinking toxic metals dissolved in sulphuric acid, eating rotten meat festering with deadly bacteria, playing with poisonous snakes or even dehydrating yourself in a sweat lodge to the point where you suffer hallucinations that are then interpreted as "spiritual guidance."

These cults are operating right here in America, and they are led by sociopaths who follow in the footsteps of monsters like Jim Jones and Marshall Applewhite. Some of today's cult followers will pay for their misplaced faith with their lives. Others will eventually come to their senses and wonder how they could have been so completely blinded by a false prophet.

Seven rules for personal empowerment (without joining a cult)

The most shocking realization to take home from all this is that people who live under the spell of a sociopath almost never realize it until after the spell has been broken. Just as the worshippers of Jim Jones believed his organization to be based in love, life and light, people today who worship sociopathic, charismatic leaders usually have no idea they have already surrendered their will to someone who does not have their best interests at heart.

This is why, here at NaturalNews, I have always taught people the following authentic principles of responsibility and power:

#1) Think for yourself. Be sceptical of everything. Most people, corporations, governments and institutions are lying to you. There is much good in the world, but there is far more selfishness and greed which is falsely presented as that which is good.

#2) Follow your inner truth, not some external guru. Any guru who demands your
obedience is a false prophet. A real teacher is one who empowers you and sets you free to explore your life experience with complete freedom tempered by a code of morals and personal responsibility.

#3) Serve in the protection of life, with or without a church or spiritual group. You can protect life every day in your own garden. Resist the seduction of profit and power that comes from serving darkness (i.e. working for Big Pharma). Seek to protect life, which is sacred and precious.

#4) Value all living things, including animals and plants. You are their shepherd. Protect the diversity of life and the integrity of the continuation of life. (For example, resist GMO and plant only non-hybrid seeds.)

#5) Live an authentic life. Practice what you teach. Walk your talk. Do not speak with one face and then secretly act out another. Spiritual strength comes from spiritual authenticity, and even if the world isn't aware of what you do when no one is looking, God and the universe most certainly are. Karma counts.

#6) Defend the innocent. Stand your ground against bullies. Resist tyranny. Promote freedom, liberty and justice. Help others when you can, and seek to empower others with the skills and knowledge they can use to support themselves rather than creating dependency.

#7) Tell the truth. It is powerful... perhaps the most powerful thing in the universe. The truth unfailingly outshines lies and deceptions. And even when the people around you may not see the truth, the greater universe does. By telling the truth, you empower yourself in all areas of your life, and you bring yourself closer to true spiritual understanding.

I try Mike I really do. - Now let's get Mr Thomas Sheridan's view on all of this...

REJECT AND SURVIVE: the Psychopathic Control Grid by Thomas Sheridan

THE REVEAL

If you experienced the following behaviour while in a relationship, or working with this person — then you knew a psychopath:

Invented Personas to Manipulate Others

Psychopaths are a different version of themselves for every person they interact with. They also have ‘group personas’ for family, organisational and workplace interaction.

Highly Unreliable/Broken Promises

Psychopaths will make the most incredibly ambitious plans including you as their right hand man or woman — then, on a whim, discard those plans and move on to some other crusade that excludes you. Targets often alter their own life plans to help the psychopath reach their imaginary goals, resulting in appalling emotional, psychological and financial chaos for the victims when the psychopath moves on.

Idealisation Followed by Cold Rejection

At the height of their idealisation of you, the psychopath will show you obsessive ‘love,’ care and attention. However, once they feel they have you where they want you — or the relationship has ended — if you collapsed in front of them on the street they would simply step over you as if they’d never met you and continue on their way. Outrageous smear campaigns against the discarded targets to falsely portray them as psychologically unstable, self-serving liars or abusers are often undertaken by psychopaths following the ending of a relationship.
Becomes Obsessed with a Hobby, Cause, or Individual and then Loses Interest Instantly

However, as soon as the relationship is established, the downward trajectory from idealisation of their targets and towards the inevitable devaluation and discarding begins in earnest. It may take weeks. It may take months. It often takes years. Nevertheless the psychopath always begins the devaluing of their victims as soon as the relationship is legitimised and is always on the lookout for an 'upgrade'.

Phony Altruism

Buys into either secular and non-secular belief systems to appear superior or enlightened. Will align themselves with 'morally popular' causes to make themselves appear enlightened and with a sense of deep moral wisdom and compassion. But it is always a pose; the psychopath's association with these causes is a veneer to fool others into trusting them. It's always fake; always an agenda.

There is Nothing Real Behind the Persona

Behind the months or years of perfectly-constructed performance by your psychopath is a nothing: a void, a blank, a hunger for something the psychopathic entity can never define. They now see no further benefit in playing this part and have moved on to a new role. It is just business. You are treated to a completely new, cold and emotionless persona. “Who is this stranger?” you will ask yourself over and over again. It is so bewildering.

The Sudden Goodbye

Then the psychopath finds an upgrade, changes their persona, will often change their look, fashions and even change the subject when they suspect others are figuring them out and you begin asking questions. "Hey, never mind that, it is lovely weather we are having!" Stated in a chipper and almost giddy manner (with an obvious underlying glibness). They are repressing the internal excitement at having pulled a fast one on you. The psychopath is literally filled with an adrenalin rush which lights up their whole facial expression with a gigantic self-satisfied grin — while the people the psychopath has stabbed in the back are expected to "get a life FFS..." The psychopath then mocks, ridicules and back stabs the people whom they "loved" only days prior and are now left in a state of chaos and confusion. Along with more glib statements as if "everything is OK". Following this, the psychopath generally goes into hiding for a short while from their former target(s) and emerges with a new life, relationship, in another country/region in a completely whole new persona and a new mask of manipulation and social sanity. This was the new persona which the psychopath had been clandestinely crafting behind the scenes.

It is essentially an internal psychotic rampage hidden behind platitudes of "time to move on" and other superficial pontifications to hide that this is a completely deranged predator working their new "target" while dehumanising and discarding the ones whom they have no further requirement for. This is what leaves people in such shock — until they start to realise what they were in fact dealing with all along. A psychopath. Then your former "beloved", hero, social activist, revolutionary, celebrity, cult-of-personality (persona) moves on as if the previous persona never existed — but it is always their undoing as they assume they are smarter than the people whom they have manipulated and fooled into their cult-of-personality. Which is why they always insult and mock the ones who supported, championed and loved them the most — as the psychopath walks away.

Psychopathy personality traits

From whaleto.com

Hervery M. Cleckley from the book Mask of Sanity (1941):
Superficial charm and average intelligence.
Absence of delusions and other signs of irrational thinking.
Absence of nervousness or neurotic manifestations.
Unreliability.
Untruthfulness and insincerity.
Lack of remorse or shame.
Antisocial behaviour without apparent compunction.
Poor judgement and failure to learn from experience.
Pathological egocentricity and incapacity to love.
General poverty in major affective reactions.
Specific loss of insight.
Unresponsiveness in general interpersonal relations.
Fantastic and uninviting behaviour with drink, and sometimes without.
Suicide threats rarely carried out.
Sex life impersonal, trivial, and poorly integrated.
Failure to follow any life plan.

Robert Hare Ph.D (1991 “The Hare Psychopathy Checklist – Revised”):

Displaying glibness and superficial charm
Being in constant need of stimulation and prone to excessive boredom
Acting in a conning or manipulative way
Showing shallow emotional responses
Relying on others for financial support (parasitic lifestyle)
Acting out promiscuous sexual behaviour
Lacking realistic long term goals
Behaving irresponsibly
Avoiding long term relationships
Feeling a grandiose sense of self worth
Lying repeatedly without remorse
Lacking any remorse or guilt
Lacking empathy for others
Having poor behavioural controls
Displaying behavioural problems early on in life
Behaving impulsively
Failing to accept responsibility for actions
Delinquency as a juvenile
Displaying signs criminal diversity

Thomas Sheridan [2010] Psychopathic Traits by Thomas Sheridan

Primary 'Absolute' Psychopathic Traits

Absolutely no remorse
Mysterious past, you don't know where they came from. You can never get to their past.
Invented personas, no personality.
Invoking pity
High level of testosterone

Secondary 'Relative' Psychopathic Traits

Sexual promiscuity/Asexuality/One night stands
Narcissism/boastfulness a sense of being born for a special purpose.
History of brief or failed relationships ending badly which are always the fault of the other party - wants to/or does get engaged/married on impulse.
Waking up in a pool of sweat even in cold weather.
Migraine headaches
Falling asleep instantly and/or waking up instantly
Idealisation followed by cold rejection
Eyes dead and lifeless, then racing frantically from side-to-side with a "win" or scam.
Needing, at most, 4-5 hours sleep a night.
Constantly looking and acting busy for no apparent reason.
Highly unreliable/broken promises.
Constantly trying to correct others' opinions (arrogant pseudo-sceptic/debunker)
Righteous indignation/condescending/always right - never wrong
Crocodile tears and unconvincing emotional responses, superficial laughter.
Extreme and obvious flattery - emulating/Sycophantic.
Claims to be the only person who really relates to you
Obsessed with the latest pharmaceuticals/hypochondriac.
Has no real creative talent (can only copy – can't innovate or be original)
Phoney altruism
Gifts designed to “buy you” or to mould you in a certain way (their taste in clothes, pop psychology books)
Little or no interest in parenting (even if they have children, while claiming to adore them)
Easily bored
Becomes obsessed with a hobby or causes/individuals and then loses interest instantly.
Feels they are entitled to the best of everything and expects to be indulged.
Exploits parents, the elderly or handicapped (money, free rent, getting into wills, legal help)
Claims to have a special relationship with God or fakes being religious
Parasitic lifestyle/slacker/highly-strung “genius”/middle-aged student who never graduates
Expelled/’flunks out’ from educational institutions and then blames the entire institution and not themselves.

The male traits are (apart from the classic mention in other posts pertaining to both psychopathic genders) can include a ring finger is longer than an index finger, a receding hair line, heavy growth of facial and body hair, acne, and high cheekbones with a low brow ridge. ...That Bundy photo is spot on. He looked the twin of an investment manager I once worked with who got done for cocaine dealing in the company he worked for. I used actually enjoy hanging out with him as he was a lot of fun. But it was just because he liked me for some reason. I think because I was a good guitar player and I gave him tips now and again. But he could have been Bundy's twin brother. Be interesting to see images of bundy's hands to see if the ring finger is longer than the index. Bet it is. As for the hair, depends on your age. If you are young and healthy with the high testosterone it will be shooting out of your head as the overall metabolism will be very high. Same with body hair. The female psychopaths I knew from my music days had very thick and dense pubic hair but as they go into their 30's a lot of them needed hair extension on their heads as it began to grow slowly. Which I suspect why a lot of them were Goth chicks so they could justify long extensions. But a lot of them do start to go bald in their mid 30's. Just on their heads. [2011] Female Psychopaths - Smear Campaigns, Bullying, Flattery, Lovebombing, High Testosterone and Self Pity by Thomas Sheridan

Is the Root of Evil the Psychopathic Mind?

Randall Clifford Activist Post Wednesday, May 30, 2012

As such a useful tool of exchange, money is not inherently evil. Money can be a springboard to such evil as bailout-begging banks too monstrous to fail gambling with taxpayer wealth—you know, private profits, public risk. Casino financialization with taxpayers as a backstop. The $700 billion TARP bailout actually being a $23.7 trillion bailout. But the root of all evil is the human brain.

New research has exposed, shall we say, the root of the problem. Pathocracy is its flower.

Definition: pathocracy (n). A system of government created by a small pathological minority that takes control over a society of normal people (from Political Ponerology: A Science on the Nature of Evil Adjusted for Political Purposes, by Andrew Lobaczewski).
A small minority of people are born psychopaths; they inherit a genetic deviance linked to certain structural abnormalities of their social brain.

The physical dynamic that exposes psychopaths is a reduction of gray matter in the anterior rostral prefrontal cortex and temporal poles. Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is able to image this deviation fundamental to psychopathy. Potential benefits to humanity are immense; imagine something like a TSA screening (without the bureaucracy, groping and humiliation) to keep psychopaths from boarding the flight to power.

Psychopaths enjoy a perverse advantage over normal people in ascending pyramids of power. Unfettered by conscience, empathy, morality...some might say, without the weight of a soul, psychopaths readily rise to the top in a society turned upside down by pathocracy. Lying, cheating, stealing, backstabbing—without remorse, psychopaths can claw for power in ways that make a person with conscience recoil.

It's not so much that power corrupts as that the corrupt seek power.

Politics and investment banking are prime waters for psychopaths to school. If people enjoying great power over others were screened for social-brain deviations with an MRI scan, and the psychopaths were weeded out, renaissance might occupy Capitol Hill and Wall Street. Judging from our current state of politics and financialization, there certainly would be many vacancies to fill in such a furthering of the humane.

It truly is right in our hands, an opportunity we may never see again.

But...possessing the means of physically detecting psychopathy and correcting the blight of psychopathic “leadership” may be irrelevant in the face of pathocracy fully entrenched. Psychopaths in power would never volunteer to have their social-brain deviations revealed, would never allow legislation regarding a brain MRI as a prerequisite to holding any elective office.

Perhaps it's true, "where there's a will, there's a way". Technology offers us the way—the key to identifying the human brain's physical roots of psychopathy. The question becomes whether or not the American public has the will to force holders of great power over others, and seekers of such power, to bare their soul...or lack thereof.

Legislation requiring some “newfangled, junk-science” brain scan for leaders could only be forced from below. But our influence down here in the 99.99% is withering toward nothing but voting for a red psychopath, or a blue one, in elections controlled by unlimited corporate cash, and fraud.

And there’s: “Either with us, or against us”. Criminalization of dissent is plodding toward any questioning of entrenched pathocracy becoming “domestic terrorism”.

A most insidious aspect of psychopathy: It’s in the genes. Not only can moneypower be passed on through progeny, so can genes for psychopathy. The elite are shameless in pronouncing their gigadeath plans (95% reduction of human population) with such as Agenda 21, Georgia Guidestones, Denver airport...though they are elusive about how billions of humans will be eliminated....

When human population is reduced to 500,000,000, will the elite in absolute control be psychopaths across the board?

Perhaps an easy way to consider our potential is a simple MRI scan: Imagine...Dick Cheney was screened from ultimately becoming, for eight years, the de facto president of the greatest military power Earth has ever suffered. Imagine that 9/11 never happened.

Rand Clifford's latest novel, Priest Lake Cathedral has been released by StarChief Press
Are The Inmates Running the Asylum?

We've extensively documented that sociopaths in D.C. and on Wall Street caused the financial crisis.

But we didn’t realize how many people are sociopaths.

Psychologist Martha Stout – who – clinical instructor in psychiatry at Harvard Medical School for 25 years – estimates in her book The Sociopath Next Door that as many as 4% of the population are conscienceless sociopaths who have no empathy or affectionate feelings for humans or animals.

4% might not sound like much.

But – using the U.S. as an example, that means that 12 million Americans are sociopaths.

Because sociopaths are ruthless and will squash their rivals and burn institutions to the ground in order to reach their goals – but great at pretending that they care about people – they are incredibly destructive.

Sociopaths would have been discovered very quickly in a small group. But in huge societies like our's, they can rise to positions of power and influence.

Unless we learn to spot “wolves in sheep’s clothing”, we will continue to fall prey to their scams.

Note: Other mental health experts put the percentage of sociopaths at 1-3% of the population, which is 3-9 million Americans.

One last question for the psychobabblists:

Would We Have Drugged Up Einstein? How Anti-Authoritarianism Is Deemed a Mental Health Problem

We are increasingly marketing drugs that essentially "cure" anti-authoritarians.

February 20, 2012 AlterNet

In my career as a psychologist, I have talked with hundreds of people previously diagnosed by other professionals with oppositional defiant disorder, attention deficit hyperactive disorder, anxiety disorder and other psychiatric illnesses, and I am struck by 1) how many of those diagnosed are essentially anti-authoritarians; and 2) how those professionals who have diagnosed them are not.

Anti-authoritarians question whether an authority is a legitimate one before taking that authority seriously. Evaluating the legitimacy of authorities includes assessing whether or not authorities actually know what they are talking about, are honest, and care about those people who are respecting their authority. And when anti-authoritarians assess an authority to be illegitimate, they challenge and resist that authority—sometimes aggressively and sometimes passive-aggressively, sometimes wisely and sometimes not.

Some activists lament how few anti-authoritarians there appear to be in the United States. One reason could be that many natural anti-authoritarians are now psychopathologized and medicated before they achieve political consciousness of society’s most oppressive authorities.
Why Mental Health Professionals Diagnose Anti-Authoritarians with Mental Illness

Gaining acceptance into graduate school or medical school and achieving a PhD or MD and becoming a psychologist or psychiatrist means jumping through many hoops, all of which require much behavioural and attentional compliance with authorities, even those authorities one lacks respect for. The selection and socialization of mental health professionals tends to breed out many anti-authoritarians. Degrees and credentials are primarily badges of compliance. Those with extended schooling have lived for many years in a world where one routinely conforms to the demands of authorities. Thus for many MDs and PhDs, people different from them who reject this attentional and behavioural compliance appear to be from another world—a diagnosable one.

I have found that most psychologists, psychiatrists and other mental health professionals are not only extraordinarily compliant with authorities but also unaware of the magnitude of their obedience. And it also has become clear to me that the anti-authoritarianism of their patients creates enormous anxiety for these professionals, and their anxiety fuels diagnoses and treatments.

In graduate school, I discovered that all it took to be labelled as having “issues with authority” was not kissing up to a director of clinical training whose personality was a combination of Donald Trump, Newt Gingrich and Howard Cosell. When I was told by some faculty that I had “issues with authority,” I had mixed feelings about being so labelled. On the one hand, I found it amusing, because among the working-class kids I had grown up with, I was considered relatively compliant with authorities. After all, I had done my homework, studied and received good grades. However, while my new “issues with authority” label made me grin because I was now being seen as a “bad boy,” I was also concerned about just what kind of profession I had entered. Specifically, if somebody such as myself was labelled as having “issues with authority,” what were they calling the kids I grew up with who paid attention to many things that they cared about but didn’t care enough about school to comply there? Well, the answer soon became clear.

Mental Illness Diagnoses for Anti-Authoritarians

A 2009 Psychiatric Times article titled “ADHD & ODD: Confronting the Challenges of Disruptive Behaviour” reports that “disruptive disorders,” which include attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and opposition defiant disorder (ODD), are the most common mental health problem of children and teenagers. ADHD is defined by poor attention and distractibility, poor self-control and impulsivity, and hyperactivity. ODD is defined as “a pattern of negativistic, hostile, and defiant behaviour without the more serious violations of the basic rights of others that are seen in conduct disorder”; and ODD symptoms include “often actively defies or refuses to comply with adult requests or rules” and “often argues with adults.”

In the next couple of chapter's we will deal with psychiatric drugs and psychiatric care, but I will also take the time to also look at the latest escapades of these sick twisted individuals.

For example:

Their planning to stop some of us from having children because of what they might do!

Their planning to have kids as young as four forced to take their medication.

But before we get to that though, let’s deal firstly with why the scientologist’s appear to hate psychiatry. I mean it was a scientology related organisation that put the video together that this chapter was based upon, the least we can do is find out why...

To end the chapter we will take a brief detour in order to explain to you exactly why it is that scientology has taken it upon itself to combat the evils of psychiatry. (Pot and kettle anyone?)
The extracts that follow were taken from a radio transcript titled *True World Order*
Broadcast on February 14th 2002 by J. Morgan Duty of CitizenSpokane.com in Association
with PropagandaMatrix.com

Now let’s get into the matter of this Church of Scientology. Because right from the start I
have been asking myself why did they go to the bother of putting this information together?

I know most of you have heard about them because people like Tom Cruise, Kirstie Alley,
and John Travolta are all members and you are probably saying, they seem pretty nice and I
like their movies but they are the Church’s insertions into the image machine and what
better place than the cinema?

They definitely have a different side to them. Just ask a man named Fishman and see what
he and many other “non-conformists” that have tried to escape the group have to say. I met
a woman a few years ago when I was in Amsterdam named Karin. She told me about a raid
on her ISP, XS4all. It seems the Scientologists took exception to the fact that a friend of
hers named Fonss had a copy of the Fishman Affidavit on his website. Since this case was
adjudicated, the papers became public and he thought people should know what the COS
was really about. They showed up one night with a German cop, a Dutch prosecutor, two
thugs, and a couple of city police. They barged in and started to rip the extremely sensitive
and expensive equipment from the racks. Server systems often cost in the hundreds of
thousands of dollars when a company is large. This started the fight because XS4all
contended, and rightfully so, that the contents of Fonss website are of no concern to them
as long as he pays the bill. Karin has a website that is dedicated to exposing the
scientologists and I have mirrored it on citizenspokane.com. When I first looked at the site
several years ago, there were dozens of links, all full of material, documents, testimonials,
and of course, the famous Fishman Affidavit.

Here’s what Karin had to say about them on her front page. Since I first saw this site, most
of the links have disappeared or are no longer hot. The reason is because the COS has
harassed the owners, sued them, had them followed, their homes burglarized, and beaten
by private thugs. However, it no longer serves any purpose as the Affidavit has been copied
and mirrored by the hundreds and all over the world. Here is a synopsis by Karin.

The Church of Scientology (or: CoS; or: Cof$ as their opponents call it) sells its followers
expensive courses, which, if students study them carefully, are supposed to set them free
(‘clear’ them). A former CoS-follower, Fishman, was brought before the court because he
committed several crimes in order to get the money to pay for these courses. Scientology
urged him to get the money any which way he could. They also assigned him to kill
somebody, and failing that, ordered him to commit suicide.

When Fishman had to testify in court, he used parts of Scientology-documents to prove he
had been brainwashed by the Church. These Scientology documents thereby became public
material: anybody could go to the court library and read them. The Church, fearing that its
sacred secrets would be revealed, had some of their people going to the library every day to
lend these documents, thereby preventing other people (read: non-Scientologists) to read
them. Nevertheless, the Fishman Affidavit got copied and has been travelling Internet ever
since.

The funny thing is, when you read the document, you’ll just see a bunch of gibberish. Apart
from the instructions of how to treat non-Scientologists - almost every means is allowed to
silence them; lying is common sense; cheating is part and parcel - there’s just this silly and
badly written science-fiction tale about Xenu who controls all of us people; except (of
course) the few Scientologist who managed to ‘clear’ themselves. Well, L. Ron Hubbard was
a sf-author, but not a very good one (and jeez, I happen to like the genre).
But the real story is that Scientology does not want their followers to know what's in store for them: they forbid everybody to read this material, stating that it would kill those who are not yet ready for it, but probably because people may stop believing Scientology once they've read this lousy s.f. stuff. Also, followers may never know what's in store for them. And of course Scientology asks massive amounts of money for the privilege of reading this.

Scientology does not argue with people who do not agree with them. They prefer to harass, start crazy lawsuits, have people followed by private detectives, and generally intimidate them. (See especially Exhibit B in the Fishman Affidavit: On Control and Lying) Currently, they are waging a war against Internet: trying to remove newsgroups, cancelling messages, raiding providers. Their motto is: 'Never defend, always attack' and they are bent on ruining people who criticize them. (My note: psychiatry)

Scientology has ordered various raids on providers or computer systems from which documents exposing Scientology were available; most notably FactNet, a group of people who are putting together an on-line archive about Scientology.

A couple of months ago Scientology raided my provider, XS4all, telling them to remove the Fishman Affidavit from the homepage of one of their clients, Fonss. XS4all refused to do so, stating that the content of people's homepage is of no concern to them and that they are not responsible. Fonss voluntarily (well, what would you do if you knew the Church was after you?) removed the Fishman Affidavit but provided a link on his page to another place where it could be obtained.

Ever since, the Fishman Affidavit is popping up everywhere. It's a dragon: when you cut one head of, it grows seven new ones.

Contained within the Fishman Affidavit, there are seven other Affidavits that are hair raising accounts of COS attacks and brainwashing.

Here is a brief explanation of their own private policing agencies:

In December 1953, Scientology was first incorporated as a religious body in Camden, New Jersey. Less than 18 months later, the new Church had its first intelligence agency - a remarkably swift evolution considering that the Catholic Church took 1500 years to create its own Inquisition. Since 1955, Scientology has had a highly organised mechanism to gather intelligence and administer "Justice and Punishment" to its perceived foes. This has been achieved through three agencies within the Church of Scientology. The following short essays present a historical view of each and exposes the inner workings of Scientology's secret service as it has developed over the last 40 years.

Intelligence activities on behalf of Scientology were first carried out by the Hubbard Communications Office, the Scientology agency responsible for co-ordinating executive policy. It ran a small but ambitious intelligence system to monitor friends and enemies alike, and to harass perceived opponents. Its methods were outlined in the 10-page Manual Of Justice (marked "Confidential - for HCO personnel only" and still in use), written by Hubbard in 1959. The copyright on this publication expired in the 1980s, so it can freely be downloaded and reproduced.

In 1960-61, the HCO's intelligence section was supplemented by three new innovations: Special Zone Departments, to implement Hubbard's "Special Zone Plan" of infiltration, the Department of Government Affairs, into which the Special Zone Departments were merged after only two months, and which was in turn superseded in March 1961 by the Department of Official Affairs. The purpose of this rapidly-evolving Department was made absolutely plain: "we have here in actuality the equivalent of a Ministry of Propaganda and Security", as Hubbard put it in an HCO Policy Letter of 13 March 1961. Its goal was to bring the government and hostile philosophies or societies into a state of complete compliance with the goals of Scientology. This is done by high level ability to control and in its absence by
low level ability to overwhelm & Introvert such agencies & Control such agencies.

Scientology is the only game on Earth where everybody wins. There is no overt [sin] in bringing good order. [Hubbard, HCO Policy Letter of 15 August 1960, Department of Government Affairs]

But the need for something better became all too visible when, in 1965-66, L. Ron Hubbard was faced by threats from within (defectors setting up their own brands of Scientology) and from without (antagonistic governments and press). The publication in October 1965 of the report by the Australian state of Victoria's official board of inquiry into Scientology was a disaster for Scientology, but one which could hopefully be contained. It was not. On 7 February 1966, Lord Balniel asked the British Minister of Health, "whether he will initiate an inquiry into the scope and practice in this country of so-called Scientology, and the practice of psychology for fee or reward by persons who have no medical or psychological qualifications ... in view of the scathing criticism by an official board of inquiry in Australia into the so-called practice of Scientology, surely the right hon. Gentleman considers that it is in the public interest to hold a similar type of inquiry in this country?"

Hubbard was outraged and clearly very worried that the fire started in Melbourne would spread further (as it did, to Canada, New Zealand and South Africa as well as to Britain and two other Australian states). Ten days after Lord Balniel asked his question, Hubbard established a Public Investigation Section - that is, a section to investigate the public, not to publicly conduct investigations. Its stated purpose was "TO HELP LRH INVESTIGATE PUBLIC MATTERS AND INDIVIDUALS WHICH SEEM TO IMPEDE HUMAN LIBERTY SO THAT SUCH MATTERS MAY BE EXPOSED AND TO FURNISH INTELLIGENCE REQUIRED IN GUIDING THE PROGRESS OF SCIENTOLOGY" [emphasis in original]. Hubbard outlined how this was to be achieved:

The determination of what a project is simple - what agency or group is attacking Scientology? As Scientology stands for freedom, those who don't want freedom tend to attack it. The Section investigates the attacking group's individual members and sees that the results of the investigation get adequate legal action and publicity.

The mechanism employed is very straightforward. We never use the data to threaten to expose. We simply collect it and expose.

Experience with the section will show that very sordid motives lie behind such attacks and that individuals of the attacking groups have a very great deal to hide. Thus the section always has a huge quantity of matters to be discovered and is not likely to run out of cases to investigate, providing only that it does not depart from this formula:

1. Note what public or private group is attacking Scientology.
2. Get a project warrant from the Advisory Council Area or WW to investigate it.
3. Collect as many case histories as possible on the individuals of that group, specializing on those that can be led to criminal prosecution by state or world agencies.
4. See that enough of the data is made available to the state or world agencies to obtain convictions.
5. See that excellent press coverage is given the disclosures over as long a period of time as possible.
6. See that HCO and Scientology are given full credit for protecting human rights and liberty.

[Hubbard, HCO Policy Letter of 17 February 1966, Public Investigation Section]

But the Public Investigation Section met almost immediately with disaster: although one of its tasks was to catalogue "derogatory news stories appearing that week", it soon found itself the subject of press condemnation. Vic Filson, a non-Scientologist private investigator, was recruited to establish an investigation section to target psychiatrists and other enemies, starting with Lord Balniel. He lasted only a week and promptly sold his story to the low-brow tabloid The People.
After this false start, there was really only one thing for Hubbard to do: create his own private intelligence agency, staffed solely by Scientologists and organisationally separate from the Hubbard Communications Office. This he did on 1 March 1966, bestowing on his third wife Mary Sue the grandiose title of "The Guardian".

It should be mentioned that this world-wide organization now brings in approximately 4 million dollars per day. They have extensive real estate holdings which they use to set nomadic brainwashing clinics. There were several arrests in St Petersburg Florida while I was living in Tampa. They were in the news all the time as defectors would get lose and run through the streets half crazed. They kidnapped a couple from their home and were, on one occasion arrested and raided for the murder of a young woman that was allegedly starved to death. Their arrests and court cases, in most instances, are kept very quiet and seem to go unnoticed.

from www.citizenspokane.net

So there you have it, the only reason scientology put together all this information regarding the evils of psychiatry was because some psychiatrists had dared to attack scientology!

Personally I think that both of these institutions are seriously fucked up cults, and in reality it was just a case of badmouthing the "opposition" for credibility and recruitment purposes. Nonetheless the information gathered on psychiatry is mind blowing (pardon the pun).

Everyone knows scientology practitioners are nutcases, not so many of you will have known that most of the psychiatrists were every bit as mad.

Let's begin to unravel this madness by now looking at their “magic” potion's and lotion’s that are quite clearly as dangerous, poisonous and useless as fuck... - Sorry I appear to have been distracted with all that top notch “science” for second, what I meant to say was, let's begin this short series of work on psychiatric drugs and care by getting the low-down on the super-safe, state of the art, psychiatric medicine being produced for our benefit by those greedy yet giving, and huge but never too big to care, pharmaceutical companies...

You'd do well to remember both the man and his word's... Colonel JR Rees made the following statement that set the agenda for psychiatry for the next 40 odd years, it was made at the national council for mental hygiene in front of a packed and responsive audience, Colonel Rees was the president of this council (My Note. More on him later):

"WE MUST AIM TO MAKE IT (PSYCHIATRY) PERMEATE EVERY EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITY IN OUR NATIONAL LIFE. PUBLIC LIFE, POLITICS AND INDUSTRY ALL OF THEM SHOULD BE WITHIN OUR SPHERE OF INFLUENCE. WE HAVE MADE A USEFUL ATTACK ON A NUMBER OF PROFESSIONS. THE TWO EASIEST OF THEM NATURALLY ARE THE TEACHING PROFESSION AND THE CHURCH. THE MOST DIFFICULT ARE LAW AND MEDICINE." - Let's see just how well they've done with making inroads in regards to exercising their control over medicine, and with whose help...
Chapter Nineteen

Now we are going to seriously look at the repercussions of the subjects covered in the last couple of chapters, firstly I would like to present this serious medical paper on the subject, after you read that I have then included some more papers on the matter and (as always) plenty of examples taken from the newspapers that we all read.

Surely even the most sceptical among you must be starting to see that both psychiatry and psychology are two fields of “science” that are having a devastating effect on millions of us all over the world. The thing is, if we don’t do something about it, it will get much worse, of that you can be certain. These people want to take control of our lives, they want to keep us dependant on drugs we don’t need, and they want to milk you for every penny they can.

Anatomy of an Epidemic:

Psychiatric Drugs and the Astonishing Rise of Mental Illness in America
Robert Whitaker Cambridge, MA

Over the past 50 years, there has been an astonishing increase in severe mental illness in the United States. The percentage of Americans disabled by mental illness has increased fivefold since 1955, when Thorazine - remembered today as psychiatry's first “wonder” drug - was introduced into the market. The number of Americans disabled by mental illness has nearly doubled since 1987, when Prozac - the first in a second generation of wonder drugs for mental illness was introduced. There are now nearly 6 million Americans disabled by mental illness, and this number increases by more than 400 people each day. A review of the scientific literature reveals that it is our drug-based paradigm of care that is fuelling this epidemic. The drugs increase the likelihood that a person will become chronically ill, and induce new and more severe psychiatric symptoms in a significant percentage of patients.

The modern era of psychiatry is typically said to date back to 1955, when chlorpromazine, marketed as Thorazine, was introduced into asylum medicine. In 1955, the number of patients in public mental hospitals reached a high-water mark of 558,922 and then began to gradually decline, and historians typically credit this emptying of the state hospitals to chlorpromazine. As Edward Shorter wrote in his 1997 book, A History of Psychiatry, "Chlorpromazine initiated a revolution in psychiatry, comparable to the introduction of penicillin in general medicine" (Shorter, 1997, p. 255). Haldol and other antipsychotic medications were soon brought to market, and then antidepressants and anti-anxiety drugs. Psychiatry now had drugs said to target specific illnesses, much like insulin for diabetes. However, since 1955, when this modern era of psychopharmacology was born, there has been an astonishing rise in the incidence of severe mental illness in this country. Although the number of hospitalized mentally ill may have gone down, every other metric used to measure disabling mental illness in the United States has risen dramatically, so much so that E. Fuller Torrey, in his 2001 book The Invisible Plague, concluded that insanity had risen to the level of an "epidemic" (Torrey, 2001). Since this epidemic has unfolded in lockstep with the ever-increasing use of psychiatric drugs, an obvious question arises: Is our drug-based paradigm of care fuelling this modern-day plague?

THE EPIDEMIC

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services uses "patient care episodes" to estimate the number of people treated each year for mental illness. This metric tracks the number of people treated at psychiatric hospitals, residential facilities for the mentally ill, and ambulatory care facilities. In 1955, the government reported 1,675,352 patient care episodes, or 1,028 episodes per 100,000 population. In 2000, patient-care episodes totalled 10,741,243, or 3,806 per 100,000 population. That is nearly a fourfold per capita increase in 50 years (Table 1).
TABLE 1. Patient-Care Episodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Episodes</th>
<th>Per 100,000 Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1,675,352</td>
<td>1,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>2,636,525</td>
<td>1,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>3,682,454</td>
<td>1,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>4,190,913</td>
<td>2,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>6,857,597</td>
<td>3,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>7,194,038</td>
<td>3,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>7,885,618</td>
<td>3,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>8,620,628</td>
<td>3,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>8,824,701</td>
<td>3,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>9,584,216</td>
<td>3,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>10,549,951</td>
<td>3,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>10,741,243</td>
<td>3,806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, SAMHSA. Mental Health, United States, 2002. Per 100,000 numbers calculated according to U.S. Census.

A second way to assess this epidemic is to look at the number of disabled mentally ill in the country. Up until the 1950s, the number of hospitalized mentally ill provided a rough estimate of this group. Today, the disabled mentally ill typically receive a disability payment either from the Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) program or the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program, and many live in residential shelters or other subsidized living arrangements. Thus, the hospitalized patient of 50 years ago receives either SSDI or SSI today, and this line of evidence reveals that the number of disabled mentally ill has increased nearly six fold since Thorazine was introduced.

In 1955, there were 559,000 people in public mental hospitals, or 3.38 people per 1,000 population. In 2003, there were 5.726 million people who received either an SSDI or SSI payment (or from both programs), and were either disabled by mental illness (SSDI statistics) or diagnosed as mentally ill (SSI statistics). That is a disability rate of 19.69 people per 1,000 population, which is nearly six times what it was in 1955 (Table 2).

TABLE 2. The Disabled Mentally Ill in the United States rate of disabled mentally ill per Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1,000 Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>13.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>19.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The disability rates for 1850 through 1955 are based on the number of hospitalized mentally ill, as cited by E. Fuller Torrey in The Invisible Plague (2001). The disability rates for 1987 and 2003 are based on the number of mentally ill receiving SSI or SSDI payments, as was reported in 2004 by the Social Security Administration.

It is also noteworthy that the number of disabled mentally ill has increased dramatically since 1987, the year Prozac was introduced. Prozac was touted as the first of a second generation of psychiatric medications said to be so much better than the old. Prozac and the other SSRIs replaced the tricyclics, while the atypical antipsychotics (Risperidone, Zyprexa, etc.) replaced Thorazine and the other standard neuroleptics. The combined sales of antidepressants and antipsychotics jumped from around $500 million in 1986 to nearly $20 billion in 2004 (from September 2003 to August 2004), a 40-fold increase.
this period, the number of disabled mentally ill in the United States, as calculated by the SSI and SSDI figures, increased from 3.331 million people to 5.726 million. That is an increase of 149,739 people per year, or 410 people newly disabled by mental illness every day (Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SSDI recipients disabled by mental illness</th>
<th>SSI recipients diagnosed with mental illness</th>
<th>Total SSDI+SSI payments to mentally ill</th>
<th>SSDI’s who also received SSI payments</th>
<th>Total disabled mentally ill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>800,139</td>
<td>2,630,999</td>
<td>3,431,138</td>
<td>100,017</td>
<td>3,331,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,812,021</td>
<td>4,141,418</td>
<td>5,953,439</td>
<td>226,502</td>
<td>5,726,937</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increase= 1,011,882 1,510,419 2,522,301 2,395,816


A BIOLOGICAL CAUSE FOR THE EPIDEMIC

The notion that psychiatric drugs work by balancing brain chemistry was first raised in the early 1960s. Once Thorazine and the standard neuroleptics were shown to block dopamine activity in the brain, researchers hypothesized that schizophrenia was caused by too much of this neurotransmitter. Thus, the neuroleptics-by blocking the dopamine receptors-helped normalize the brain’s dopamine system. Since the tricyclics raised norepinephrine and serotonin levels in the brain, researchers reasoned that depression was caused by low levels of these brain chemicals. Merck, meanwhile, marketed its antianxiety drug Suavitil as a "mood normaliser.” These normalizing claims suggested that the drugs were indeed curative of biological ailments.

However, this hypothesis-that the drugs balanced abnormal brain chemistry-never panned out. Although the public may still be told that the drugs normalize brain chemistry, the truth is that researchers did not find that people with schizophrenia had overactive dopamine systems (prior to being medicated), or that those diagnosed with depression suffered from abnormally low levels of serotonin or norepinephrine. As U.S. Surgeon General David Satcher acknowledged in his 1999 report on mental health, the causes of mental disorders "remain unknown" (Satcher, 1999, p. 102). Yet, scientists have come to understand how the drugs affect the human brain, at least in terms of their immediate mechanisms of action. In 1996, the director of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), neuroscientist Steven Hyman, set forth a paradigm for understanding how all psychiatric drugs work. Antipsychotics, antidepressants, and anti-anxiety drugs, he wrote, "create perturbations in neurotransmitter functions" (Hyman & Nestler, 1996, p. 153). In response, the brain goes through a series of compensatory adaptations. For instance, Prozac and other SSRI antidepressants block the reuptake of serotonin. In order to cope with this hindrance of normal function, the brain tones down its whole serotonergic system. Neurons both release less serotonin and down-regulate (or decrease) their number of serotonin receptors. The density of serotonin receptors in the brain may decrease by 50% or more. As part of this adaptation process, Hyman noted, there are also changes in intracellular signalling pathways and gene expression. After a few weeks, Hyman concluded, the patient's brain is functioning in a manner that is "qualitatively as well as quantitatively different from the normal state" (Hyman & Nestler, 1996, p. 161).

In short, psychiatric drugs induce a pathology. Princeton neuroscientist Barry Jacobs has explicitly made this point about SSRIs. These drugs, he said, alter the level of synaptic transmission beyond the physiologic range achieved under (normal) environmental/biological conditions. Thus, any behavioural or physiologic change produced under these
conditions might more appropriately be considered pathologic, rather than reflective of the normal biological role of serotonin. (Jacobs, 1991, p.22)

Once psychiatric drugs are viewed in this way, it is easy to understand why their widespread use would precipitate an epidemic of mental illness. As E. Fuller Torrey wrote in The Invisible Plague, conditions that "disrupt brain chemistry may cause delusions, hallucinations, disordered thinking, and mood swings-the symptoms of insanity" (Torrey, 2001, p. 315). He noted that infectious agents, tumours, metabolic and toxic disorders, and various diseases could all affect the brain in this manner. What Torrey failed to mention is that psychiatric medications also "disrupt brain chemistry." As a result, their long-term use is bound to be problematic, and that is precisely what the research literature reveals: Their use increases the likelihood that a person will become chronically ill, and they cause a significant percentage of patients to become ill in new and more severe ways.

TURNING PATIENTS CHRONICALLY ILL

Neuroleptics

The study that is still cited today as proving the efficacy of neuroleptics for curbing acute episodes of schizophrenia was a nine-hospital trial of 344 patients conducted by the NIMH in the early 1960s. At the end of 6 weeks, 75% of the drug-treated patients were "much improved" or "very much improved" compared to 23% of the placebo patients. (National Institute of Mental Health Psychopharmacology Services Centre Collaborative Study Group, 1964).

However, 3 years later, the NIMH reported on 1-year outcomes for the patients. Much to their surprise, they found that "patients who received placebo treatment were less likely to be re-hospitalized than those who received any of the three active phenothiazines" (Schooler, Goldberg, Boothe, & Cole, 1967, p. 991). This result raised an unsettling possibility:

While the drugs were effective over the short term, perhaps they made people more biologically vulnerable to psychosis over the long run, and thus the higher rehospitalisation rates at the end of 1 year.

In the wake of that disturbing report, the NIMH conducted two medication-withdrawal studies. In each one, relapse rates rose in correlation with neuroleptic dosage before withdrawal. In the two trials, only 7% of patients who were on placebo relapsed during the following 6 months. Twenty-three percent of the patients on less than 300 mg of chlorpromazine daily relapsed following drug withdrawal; this rate climbed to 54% for those receiving 300-500 mg and to 65% for patients taking more than 500 mg. The researchers concluded:

"Relapse was found to be significantly related to the dose of the tranquilizing medication the patient was receiving before he was put on placebo - the higher the dose, the greater the probability of relapse" (Prien, Levine, & Ssvitalski, 1971,p. 22).

Once again, the results suggested that neuroleptics increased the patients' biological vulnerability to psychosis. Other reports soon deepened this suspicion. Even when patients reliably took their medications, relapse was common, and researchers reported in 1976 that it appeared that relapse during drug administration was greater in severity than when no drugs were given (Gardos & Cole, 1977). A retrospective study by Bockoven also indicated that the drugs were making patients chronically ill. He reported that 45% of patients treated at Boston Psychopathic Hospital in 1947 with a progressive model of care did not relapse in the 5 years following discharge, and that 76% were successfully living in the community at the end of that follow-up period. In contrast, only 31% of patients treated in 1967 with neuroleptics at a community health centre remained relapse free over the next
5 years, and as a group they were much more "socially dependent" - on welfare and needing other forms of support-than those in the 1947 cohort (Bockoven & Solomon, 1975).

With debate over the merits of neuroleptics rising, the NIMH revisited the question of whether newly admitted schizophrenia patients could be successfully treated without drugs. There were three NIMH-funded studies conducted during the 1970s that examined this possibility, and in each instance, the newly admitted patients treated without drugs did better than those treated in a conventional manner. In 1977, Carpenter reported that only 35% of the non-medicated patients in his study relapsed within a year after discharge, compared to 45% of those treated with neuroleptics (Carpenter, McGlashan, & Strauss, 1977). A year later, Rappaport reported that in a trial of 80 young male schizophrenics admitted to a state hospital, only 27% of patients treated without neuroleptics relapsed in the 3 years following discharge, compared to 62% of the medicated group (Rappaport, Hopkins, Hall, Belleza, & Silverman, 1978). The final study came from Mosher, head of schizophrenia research at the NIMH. In 1979, he reported that patients who were treated without neuroleptics in an experimental home staffed by non-professionals had lower relapse rates over a 2-year period than a control group treated with drugs in a hospital. As in the other studies, Mosher reported that the patients treated without drugs were the better functioning group as well (Bola & Mosher, 2003; Mathews, Roper, Mosher, & Mann, 2003).

The three studies all pointed to the same conclusion: 

**Exposure to neuroleptics increased the long-term incidence of relapse.** Carpenter's group defined the conundrum:

There is no question that, once patients are placed on medication, they are less vulnerable to relapse if maintained on neuroleptics. But what if these patients had never been treated with drugs to begin with? We raise the possibility that antipsychotic medication may make some schizophrenic patients more vulnerable to future relapse than would be the case in the natural course of the illness. (Carpenter & McGlashan, 1977, p. 19)

In the late 1970s, two physicians at McGill University in Montreal offered a biological explanation for why this was so (one that fits with the paradigm later outlined by Hyman). The brain responds to neuroleptics—which block 70% to 90% of all D, dopamine receptors in the brain—as though they are a pathological insult. To compensate, dopaminergic brain cells increase the density of their D, receptors by 30% or more. The brain is now "supersensitive" to dopamine, and this neurotransmitter is thought to be a mediator of psychosis. 

The person has become more biologically vulnerable to psychosis and is at particularly high risk of severe relapse should he or she abruptly quit taking the drugs (Chouinard, Jones, & Annable, 1978; Chouinard & Jones, 1980). The two Canadian researchers concluded:

*Neuroleptics can produce a dopamine super sensitivity that leads to both dyskinetic and psychotic symptoms. An implication is that the tendency toward psychotic relapse in a patient who had developed such a super sensitivity is determined by more than just the normal course of the illness.* (Chouiniard, Jones, & Annable, 1978, p. 1410)

Together, the various studies painted a compelling picture of how neuroleptics shifted outcomes away from recovery. Bockoven's retrospective and the other experiments all suggested that with minimal or no exposure to neuroleptics, at least 40% of people who suffered a psychotic break and were diagnosed with schizophrenia would not relapse after leaving the hospital, and perhaps as many as 65% would function fairly well over the long term. However, once first-episode patients were treated with neuroleptics, a different fate awaited them. Their brains would undergo drug-induced changes that would increase their biological vulnerability to psychosis, and this would increase the likelihood that they would become chronically ill (and thus permanently disabled).

That understanding of neuroleptics had been fleshed out by the early 1980s, and since then, other studies have provided additional confirming evidence. Most notably, the World Health Organisation twice compared schizophrenia outcomes in the rich countries of the
world with outcomes in poor countries, and each time the patients in the poor countries—where drug usage was much less—were doing dramatically better at 2-year and 5-year follow-ups. In India, Nigeria and Colombia, where only 16% of patients were maintained continuously on neuroleptics, roughly two-thirds were doing fairly well at the end of the follow-up period and only one third had become chronically ill. In the US and other rich countries, where 61% of the patients were kept on antipsychotic drugs, the ratio of good-to-bad outcomes was almost precisely the reverse. Only about one third had good outcomes, and the remaining two thirds became chronically ill (Jablensky et al. 1992; Leff, Sartorius, Jablensky, Korten, & Ernberg, 1992).

More recently, MRI studies have shown the same link between drug usage and chronic illness. In the mid 1990s, several research teams reported that the drugs cause atrophy of the cerebral cortex and an enlargement of the basal ganglia (Chakos et al 1994; Gur et al 1998; Madsen, Keiding, Karle, Esbjerg, & Hemmingsen, 1998). These were disquieting findings, as they clearly showed that the drugs were causing structural changes in the brain. Then, in 1998, researchers at the University of Pennsylvania reported that the drug-induced enlargement of the basal ganglia was "associated with greater severity of both negative and positive symptoms" (Gur, Ivlaany et al., 1998, p. 1711). In other words, they found that over the long term the drugs cause changes in the brain associated with a worsening of the very symptoms the drugs are supposed to alleviate. The MRI research, in fact, had painted a very convincing picture of a disease process: An outside agent causes an observable change in the size of brain structures, and as this occurs, the patient deteriorates.

**Antidepressants**

The story of antidepressants is a bit subtler, and yet it leads to the same conclusion that these drugs increase chronic illness over time. Even their short-term efficacy, in terms of a benefit greater than placebo, is of a questionable sort.

In the early 1960s, there were two types of antidepressants, monoamine oxidase inhibitors (MAOIs) and tricyclics. However, MAOIs soon fell out of favour because of dangerous side effects and a 1965 finding by the Medical Research Council in the United Kingdom that they were no more effective than placebo (Medical Research Council, 1965). Four years later, the NIMH concluded that there was also reason to doubt the merits of tricyclics. After reviewing the medical literature, NIMH investigators determined that in "well-designed studies, the differences between the effectiveness of antidepressant drugs and placebo are not impressive" (Smith, 1969, p. 19). About 61% of the drug-treated patients improved, versus 46% of the placebo patients, producing a net drug benefit of only 15% (Smith, 1969).

This finding led some investigators to wonder whether the placebo response was the mechanism that was helping people feel better. What the drugs did, several speculated, was amplify the placebo response, and they did so because they produced physical side effects that helped convince patients that they were getting a "magic pill" for depression. To test this hypothesis, investigators conducted at least eight studies in which they compared a tricyclic to an "active" placebo, rather than an inert one. (An active placebo is a chemical that produces an unpleasant side effect of some kind, like dry mouth.) In seven of the eight, there was no difference in outcomes, leading investigators at New York Medical College to conclude "there is practical value in viewing [psychotropics] as mere amplifiers or inhibitors of the placebo effects" (Dinnerstein, Lowenthal, & Blitz, 1966; Thompson, 1982).

With such confusion over the efficacy of tricyclics hanging in the air, the NIMH launched an ambitious long-term study of depression treatments in the early 1980s. Two hundred thirty-nine patients were randomized into four treatment groups—cognitive behaviour therapy, interpersonal therapy, the tricyclic imipramine, and placebo. The results were startling. At
the end of 16 weeks, "there were no significant differences among treatments, including placebo plus clinical management, for the less severely depressed and functionally impaired patients." Only the severely depressed patients fared better on a tricyclic than on placebo. However, at the end of 18 months, even this minimal benefit disappeared. Stay-well rates were best for the cognitive behaviour group (30%) and poorest for the imipramine group (19%) (Elkin, 1990). Moreover, two pharmacology researchers at the State University of New York, Seymour Fisher and Roger Greenberg, concluded that if study dropouts were included in the analysis, then the "results look even worse" (Greenberg & Fisher, 1997, p. 147). Patients treated with an antidepressant were the most likely group to seek treatment following termination of the initial treatment period, they had the highest incidence of relapse, and they "exhibited the fewest weeks of reduced or minimal symptoms during the follow-up period" (Greenberg & Fisher, 1997, p. 147).

Once again, the results led to an unnerving conclusion. Antidepressants were making people chronically ill, just like the antipsychotics were. Other studies deepened this suspicion. In 1985, a U.K. group reported that in a 2-year study comparing drug therapy to cognitive therapy, relapse "was significantly higher in the pharmacotherapy group" (Blackburn, Eunson, & Bishop, 1986, p. 67). In 1994, Italian researcher Giovanni Fava reviewed the outcomes literature and concluded that "long-term use of antidepressants may increase the (patient's) biochemical vulnerability to depression," and thus "worsen the course of affective disorders" (Fava, 1994, p. 127). Fava revisited the issue in 2003. An analysis of 27 studies, he wrote, showed that "whether one treats a depressed patient for 3 months or 3 years, it does not matter when one stops the drugs. A statistical trend suggested that the longer the drug treatment, the higher the likelihood of relapse" (Fava, 2003, p. 124).

Benzodiazepines

This same basic paradox—that a psychiatric drug may curb symptoms over the short term but worsen the long-term course of the disorder—has been found to hold true for benzodiazepines, at least when used to treat panic attacks. In 1988, researchers who led the large Cross-National Collaborative Panic Study, which involved 1,700 patients in 14 countries, reported that at the end of 4 weeks, 82% of the patients treated with Xanax (alprazolam) were "moderately improved" or "better," versus 42% of the placebo patients. However, by the end of 8 weeks, there was no difference between the groups, at least among those who remained in the study (Ballenger et al. 1988). Any benefit with Xanax seemed to last for only a short period. As a follow-up to that study, researchers in Canada and the UK studied benzodiazepine-treated patients over a period of 6 months. They reported that the Xanax patients got better during the first four weeks of treatment, that they did not improve any more in weeks 4 to 8, and that their symptoms began to worsen after that. As patients were weaned from the drugs, a high percentage relapsed, and by the end of 23 weeks, they were worse off than patients treated without drugs on five different outcomes measures (Marks et al. 1993). More bad news of this sort was reported by Pecknold in 1988. He found that as patients were tapered off Xanax they suffered nearly four times as many panic attacks as the nondrug patients, and that 25% of the Xanax patients suffered from rebound anxiety more severe than when they began the study. The Xanax patients were also significantly worse off than nondrug patients on a global assessment scale by the end of the study (Pecknold, Swinson, Kuch, & Lewis, 1988).

Then and Now

Research by David Healy, a prominent U.K. psychiatrist who has written several books on the history of psychopharmacology, shows how this problem of drug-induced chronicity plays out in society as a whole. Healy determined that outcomes for psychiatric patients in North Wales were much better a century ago than they are today, even though patients back then, at their moment of initial treatment, were much sicker. He concluded that today's drug-treated patients spend much more time in hospital beds and are "far more likely to die
from their mental illness than they were in 1896." "Modern treatments," he said, "have setup a revolving door" and appear to be a "leading cause of injury and death" (Healy et al. 2001).

MANUFACTURING MENTAL ILLNESS

It is well known that all of the major classes of psychiatric drugs—antipsychotics, antidepressants, benzodiazepines, and stimulants for ADHD—can trigger new and more severe psychiatric symptoms in a significant percentage of patients. This is the second factor causing a rapid rise in the number of disabled mentally ill in the United States. Moreover, it is easy to see this epidemic-creating factor at work with Prozac and the other SSRIs.

Although serotonin has been publicly touted as the brain's mood molecule, in truth it is a very common chemical in the body, found in the walls of the blood vessels, the gut, blood platelets, and the brain. The serotonin system is also one that could be said to be primitive in kind. Serotonergic neurons are found in the nervous systems of all vertebrates and most invertebrates, and in humans their cell bodies are localized along the midline of the brain stem. From there, their axons spread up into the brain and down into the spinal cord. The first purpose of this neuronal network is thought to be control of respiratory, cardiac, and repetitive motor activity, as opposed to higher cognitive functions.

As one would expect, perturbing this system and to a degree that could be considered pathologic, as Jacobs said—causes a wide range of problems. In Prozac's first 2 years on the market, the FDA's Medwatch program received more adverse-event reports about this new "wonder drug" than it had received for the leading tricyclic in the previous 20 years. Prozac quickly took up the top position as America's most complained about drug, and by 1997, 39,000 adverse-event reports about it had been sent to Medwatch. These reports are thought to represent only 1% of the actual number of such events, suggesting that nearly 4 million people in the US had suffered such problems, which included mania, psychotic depression, nervousness, anxiety, agitation, hostility, hallucinations, memory loss, tremors, impotence, convulsions, insomnia, and nausea. The other SSRIs brought to market caused a similar range of problems, and by 1994, four SSRIs were among the top 20 most complained-about drugs on the FDA's Medwatch list (Moore, 1997).

In terms of helping fuel a rapid rise in the number of disabled mentally ill, the propensity of Prozac and other SSRIs to trigger mania or psychosis is undoubtedly the biggest problem with these drugs. In clinical trials, slightly more than 1% of the Frame patients developed mania, which was three times higher than the rate for patients given a tricyclic (Breggin, 2003). Other studies have found much higher rates of SSRI-induced mania. In 1996, Howland reported that 6% of 184 depressed patients treated with an SSRI suffered manic episodes that were "generally quite severe." A year later, Ebert reported that 8.5% of patients had a severe psychological reaction to Luvox (fluvoxamine) (Breggin). Robert Bourguignon, after surveying doctors in Belgium, estimated that Prozac induced psychotic episodes in 5% to 7% of patients (Bourguignon, 1997). All of this led the American Psychiatric Association to warn that manic or hypomanic episodes are "estimated to occur in 5% to 20% of patients treated with antidepressants" (Breggin).

As Fava has noted, "Antidepressant-induced mania is not simply a temporary and reversible phenomenon, but a complex biochemical mechanism of illness deterioration" (Fava, 2003, p 126).

The best available evidence suggests that this is now happening to well more than 500,000 Americans a year. In 2001, Preda and other Yale researchers reported that 8.1% of all admissions to a psychiatric hospital they studied were due to SSRI-induced mania or psychosis (Preda, MacLean, Mazure, St Bowers, 2001). The federal government reported that there were 10.741 million "patient care episodes" in 2000;
If 8% were SSRI-induced manic or psychotic episodes, that would mean that 860,000 people suffered this type of adverse reaction in 2000.

Thus, the SSRI path to a disabling mental illness can be easily seen. A depressed patient treated with an antidepressant suffers a manic or psychotic episode, at which time his or her diagnosis is changed to bipolar disorder. At that point, the person is prescribed an antipsychotic to go along with the antidepressant, and once on a drug cocktail, the person is well along on the road to permanent disability. Since Prozac was introduced in 1987, the number of disabled mentally ill in the US has risen by 2.4 million people, and given the risk of mania and psychosis with the SSRIs, that increase was to be expected.

CONCLUSION

A century ago, fewer than two people per 1,000 were considered to be "disabled" by mental illness and in need of hospitalisation. By 1955, that number had jumped to 3.38 people per 1,000, and during the past 50 years, a period when psychiatric drugs have been the cornerstone of care, the disability rate has climbed steadily, and has now reached around 20 people per 1,000. (Table 2). As with any epidemic, one would suspect that an outside agent of some type—a virus, a bacterial infection, or an environmental toxin was causing this rise in illness. That is indeed the case here. There is an outside agent fuelling this epidemic of mental illness, only it is to be found in the medicine cabinet. Psychiatric drugs perturb normal neurotransmitter function, and while that perturbation may curb symptoms over a short term, over the long run it increases the likelihood that a person will become chronically ill, or ill with new and more severe symptoms. A review of the scientific literature shows quite clearly that it is our drug-based paradigm of care that is fuelling this modern-day plague.

NOTES

1. These data come from the 2003 annual Social Security reports for the SSI and SSDI programs. The figure of 5,726,937 disabled mentally ill is calculated as follows: There were 1,812,021 SSDI recipients who were disabled because of mental illness. There were 4,141,418 SSI recipients diagnosed as mentally ill. However, one out of every eight recipients of SSDI, or 226,502 people, also received an SSI payment. Thus, the number of disabled mentally ill is: 1,812,021 + 4,141,418 - 226,502 = 5,726,937.

2. In 1985, U.S. sales of antidepressants totalled $240 million, and U.S. sales of antipsychotics were $263 million. From September 1, 2003 to August 30, 2004, U.S. sales of antidepressants were $11.2 billion, and U.S. sales of antipsychotics were $8.6 billion. The source for the 1985 figures is Zore, Larson, Lyons, and Beardsley (1991). The 2004 sales figures are from IMS Retail Drug Monitor: 12 months to August 2004.

3. The calculation for the number of disabled mentally ill in 1987 is as follows: There were 800,139 SSDI recipients who were disabled because of mental illness. There were 2,630,999 SSI recipients diagnosed as mentally ill. One out of every eight recipients of SSDI, or 100,017 people, also received an SSI payment. Thus, the number of disabled mentally ill is: 800,139 + 2,630,999 - 100,017 = 3,331,120.
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Tracking the American Epidemic of Mental Illness - Part I

By Evelyn Pringle for opednews.com

Over a twenty year span, starting when Prozac came on the market in 1987, the number of people on government disability due to mental illness went from 1.25 million to more than 4 million today. There has been a 35-fold increase in the number of children disabled by mental illness who receive federal disability payments, rising from 16,200 in 1987, to 561,569 in 2007.


For the book, Whitaker reviewed 50 years of outcomes in the medical literature, for adults with schizophrenia, anxiety, depression, and bipolar illness, and the childhood disorders of ADHD, depression and juvenile bipolar disorder, to see whether medications had altered the long-term course of the disorders and whether drugs could bring on new or more severe psychiatric symptoms.

His intent was to assess whether this paradigm of care increased the risk that a person would become chronically ill, or ill with disabling symptoms, he reports in his "Mad in America" blog, on the Psychology Today website.

"Although we, as a society, believe that psychiatric medications have "revolutionized" the treatment of mental illness, the disability numbers suggest a very different possibility," he wrote in the April 28, 2010, Huffington Post.

On April 29, 2010, Alternet published an interview with Whitaker by Dr Bruce Levine, with the headline question of, "Are Prozac and Other Psychiatric Drugs Causing the Astonishing Rise of Mental Illness in America?"

The "literature is remarkably consistent in the story it tells," Whitaker told Levine. "Although psychiatric medications may be effective over the short term, they increase the likelihood that a person will become chronically ill over the long term."
"In addition, the scientific literature shows that many patients treated for a milder problem will worsen in response to a drug—say have a manic episode after taking an antidepressant—and that can lead to a new and more severe diagnosis like bipolar disorder," he said. "That is a well-documented iatrogenic pathway that is helping to fuel the increase in the disability numbers."

During the interview, Whitaker discusses his research on the increase of juvenile bipolar disorder in the US, as an example of how prescribing psychiatric drugs to children can actually cause mental illness.

"When you research the rise of juvenile bipolar illness in this country, you see that it appears in lockstep with the prescribing of stimulants for ADHD and antidepressants for depression," he reports.

"Prior to the use of those medications, you find that researchers reported that manic-depressive illness, which is what bipolar illness was called at the time, virtually never occurred in prepubertal children," he explains.

"But once psychiatrists started putting "hyperactive" children on Ritalin, they started to see prepubertal children with manic symptoms," he reports.

"Same thing happened when psychiatrists started prescribing antidepressants to children and teenagers," Whitaker says. "A significant percentage had manic or hypomanic reactions to the antidepressants."

"Thus, we see these two iatrogenic pathways to a juvenile bipolar diagnosis documented in the medical literature," he states.

The bipolar kids often end up on cocktails of heavy-duty drugs, including antipsychotics such as Zyprexa, Risperdal, Invega, Seroquel, Abilify and Geodon, which cause a host of physical problems and possible cognitive decline over the long term, he told Levine.

"When you add up all this information, you end up documenting a story of how the lives of hundreds of thousands of children in the United States have been destroyed in this way," Whitaker says.

In fact, he thinks that "the number of children and teenagers that have ended up "bipolar" after being treated with a stimulant or an antidepressant is now well over one million."

"This is a story of harm done on an unimaginable scale," he told Levine.

Levine, an author himself of "Surviving America's Depression Epidemic," describes "Anatomy of an Epidemic," as the "most important book on psychiatric treatment in a generation."

Role of American Psychiatric Association

In 2006, the 38,000 member strong, American Psychiatric Association, received 30% of their funding, or more than $20 million, from the pharmaceutical industry.

This year's attendees at the group's annual meeting last month in New Orleans "had to brave 200 protestors chanting "no drugging kids for money" and "no conflicts of interest" to get into the convention hall," according to Martha Rosenberg's May 30, 2010 report in OpEd News.
"If there were a take home message at the APA meeting about the blizzard of ADHD, bipolar and personality disorders threatening adults and children, it was don't wait," Rosenberg says. "These dangerous conditions, likened to cancer and diabetes, won't go away."

"Thanks to genetic advancements, psychiatric disease risks can now be detected and treated before symptoms surface," said presenters, fostering early treatment paradigms that are pretty Brave New World: People being told they have a disease they can't feel that needs immediate and lifelong treatment at hundreds of dollars a month or their health will suffer," she reports. (My Note I talk about this bullshit “Minority Report” type of Psychiatry later).

"Preemptive psychiatric drugging is likely the most dangerous idea that has come along since lobotomy," warns the prolific anti-drugging activist, Vince Boehm. (I totally agree M).

As far as drugs, there was no star of the show, Rosenberg says. "The Next Big Thing was not a new drug at all but *adjunctive therapy* also known as adding *existing drugs* to *existing* drugs because they don't work right."

"Throwing good drugs after bad, popularized with the antipsychotic Abilify," she explains, "has only been enhanced by a study in the January JAMA that found antidepressants don't work for mild depression at all." (read that a couple of times before moving on. M)

"Antipsychotics are also being "enhanced" by adding drugs to offset weight gain and lethargic side effects," she reports.

"The pharma-con-fraudulence which has taken over psychiatry today is absolutely breathtaking," says Dr Nathaniel Lehrman, former Clinical Director of Kingsboro Psychiatric Centre, Brooklyn NY.

"There is absolutely no rationale for adding antipsychotics to antidepressants in the treatment of depression other than the hope that somehow the patient will feel better when new medication is added when the old is not enough," he reports.

Lehrman can think of no medication "which is really specific for anything in psychiatry."

"The effect of all these medications is largely happenstance," he says. "If something happens to make the patient feel better while taking a particular medication, the latter will be credited."

**Catalog of Mental Disorders**

In January 2010, the APA released a draft for the 5th edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual, or DSM-V, also known as the Billing Bible of psychiatry, with the official definitions of normal and abnormal. Criticisms of the revisions and the task force have been non-stop.

In a March, 2010, analysis in Psychiatric Times, Lisa Cosgrove and Harold Bursztajn reported that approximately 68% of the members of the DSM5 task force had financial ties to the pharmaceutical industry, a 2% increase over the task force members of the DSM4 with such ties.

The draft criteria for "Temper Dysregulation Disorder with Dysphoria," has specifically come under attack as "one of the most dangerous and poorly conceived suggestions for DSM5," by Dr Allen Frances, who was chairman of the DSM-IV Task Force, in his "DSM5 in Distress" blog on the Psychology Today Website.
"Apparently, the Work Group was trying to correct excessive diagnosis of childhood bipolar disorder—but its suggestion is so poorly written that it could not possibly accomplish this goal and instead would it would create a new monster," he advises.

"The "diagnosis" would be very common at every age in the general population and would promote a large expansion in the use of antipsychotic medications, with all of the serious attendant risks," he warns.

"While trying to rescue kids who are now misdiagnosed as bipolar," Frances says, "it will undoubtedly open the door to the misdiagnosis of normal kids who happen to be temperamentally or in difficult family circumstances."

The syndrome was first called "severe mood dysregulation (SMD)," but the Childhood Disorders Work Group decided to rename it "temper dysregulation with dysphoria (TDD)," because (a) the new name is more descriptive; and (b) the name of DSM diagnoses does not typically include a denotation of severity, according to the group's report.

In any event, the prescribing of psychiatric drug cocktails will continue no matter what they end up calling the new disorder. If TDD is a form of BD, "first-line treatment would consist of atypical antipsychotic medication and/or mood stabilizers," the group states in the report. "On the other hand, if TDD is on a continuum with unipolar depressive disorders, anxiety disorders, and ADHD, first-line treatment would consist of serotonergic reuptake inhibitor antidepressants (SSRI's) and stimulants."

In a March 8, 2010 article in Sceptic Magazine, Dr John Sorboro warned that the "folks writing the new DSM-V are even considering a new classification of "prodromal" disorders, which means you may qualify for diagnosis of a mental disorder just based on the hunch of your psychiatrist." (my note - Fucking Scary!)

"Psychiatrists get paid for treating mental illness," he says. "There is a strong motivation for them to look at things they used to attribute to chronic personality, or just life, and see them as psychiatric illness." (A NICE WAY OF SAYING THEY LIE)

"These changes have nothing to do with any real definitive science or specific tests that can effectively demonstrate who has a disorder," Sorbora notes. "It's little more than psychiatry repackaging people with different labels."

"Who gets what label has a lot more to do with politics and the economics of psychiatry than it does with any true understanding of the developmental or biologic underpinnings of specific behaviour let alone whether we choose to see "different" as "disordered," he points out. (my note: a breathtakingly succinct observation).

Sorboro says following the money has led many people to seriously question "the motivations of some of psychiatry's most prolific researchers who shape how people get diagnosed, what disorder label they are given, and what drugs they are prescribed."

He notes Senator Charles Grassley's ongoing investigation to determine the full extent of industry fees paid to psychiatric researchers, and that "some of the biggest names in the business have been accused of misconduct."

The "biggest names in the business," identified by Grassley thus far, include Harvard University's Joseph Biederman, Thomas Spencer and Timothy Wilens; Charles Nemeroff and Zachery Stowe from Emory University; Melissa DelBello at the University of Cincinnati; Alan Schatzberg, the president of the American Psychiatric Association from Stanford University; Martin Keller at Brown University; Karen Wagner and A John Rush from the University of Texas; and Fredrick Goodwin, the former host of a radio show called "Infinite Minds," broadcast for years by National Public Radio.
"Among all the problematic suggestions for DSM5, the proposal for a "Psychosis Risk Syndrome" stands out as the most ill conceived and potentially harmful," according to Dr Frances, in his "DSM5 in Distress" blog on the Psychology Today Website.

"This is a clearly the prescription for an iatrogenic public health disaster," he warns.

"The whole concept of early intervention rests on three fundamental pillars- being able to diagnose the right people and then providing them with a treatment that is effective and safe," he explains. "Psychosis Risk Syndrome" fails badly on all three counts, he warns.

"The false positive rate would be alarming," he says, "70% to 75% in the most careful studies and likely to be much higher once the diagnosis is official, in general use, and becomes a target for drug companies."

"Hundreds of thousands of teenagers and young adults (especially, it turns out, those on Medicaid) would receive the unnecessary prescription of atypical antipsychotic drugs," he warns.

"There is no proof that the atypical antipsychotics prevent psychotic episodes," he says, "but they do most certainly cause large and rapid weight gains (see the recent FDA warning) and are associated with reduced life expectancy--to say nothing about their high cost, other side effects, and stigma."

"Imagine the human tragedies that follow the mislabelling of 70% of children as severely mentally ill, who are then exposed to extremely toxic drugs that induce diabetes, cardiovascular disease, and a host of other severe adverse effects," warned Vera Hassner Sharav, founder and president of the Alliance for Human Research Protection, in a February 10, 2010 Infomail.

Unnecessary Drugging

"We are going to have an epidemic of young adults with yet-to-be-determined neurological problems due to the long term use of psychotropic drugs," warns Washington DC psychiatrist Dr Joseph Tarantolo, Board Chairperson of the International Centre for the Study of Psychiatry and Psychology.

An epidemic is defined as 1% of the population and there will be far more than 1% injured by these drugs, he says.

Every human being is at risk of becoming "psychotic," he states. "It has been said that in the German concentration camps psychosis was 100%.

"Once one agrees that something is universal, one is simply trying to describe the human condition, not make a medical diagnosis," Tarantolo advises.

Dr Stefan Kruszewski, a graduate of Princeton University and Harvard Medical School, has seen many patients who experienced one or more episodes of psychosis from medications, illicit drug withdrawal, acute stress, metabolic conditions, PTSD or other psychiatric diagnoses, "who recovered and did not re-experience problems later in life."

In his extensive clinical experience with psychotic individuals, "recovery after psychosis has been the "norm," not the exception," he says.
"More significantly, and somewhat contrary to the prevailing psychiatric professional view," he notes, "the overwhelming majority of my clients in who I observed this 'norm' did NOT require psychiatric medicines to sustain them."

"And, many of them who were prescribed antipsychotic medications to 'thwart' another psychotic episode fared somewhat worse than those who were not prescribed any combination of antipsychotics and mood stabilizers," he adds.

Dr. Thomas Edward Bratter is president and founder of the John Dewey Academy in Massachusetts, a residential, voluntary, educational-treatment school for gifted but self-destructive adolescents. This drug and medicine-free facility uses compassionate psychotherapy.

Most students arrive at the Academy with multi DSM-IV labels to justify prescribing psychotropic poisons and receiving third party payments, Bratter says, and have been "raped by the pejorative psychiatric cartel."

He calls the "Psychosis Risk Syndrome" criminal because "such a diagnosis ignores the awesome toxic power of a negative self-fulfilling prophesy which maximizes failure by perpetrating the unproven myth of mental illness."

"There needs to be a class action against those who would endorse this movement," he says, and Bratter would gladly testify on behalf of children and adolescents who need to be protected from such a toxic and damaging conspiracy.

Toxicology expert, Dr. Lawrence Plumlee, is president of the Chemical Sensitivities Disorders Association, and editor of, "The Environmental Physician of the American Academy of Environmental Medicine."

The Chemical Sensitivity Disorders Association was established to provide information and support to chemically sensitive people; to disseminate information to physicians, scientists and other interested persons; and to encourage research on chemical sensitivity disorders and minimizing hazards to human health.

Plumlee is concerned about the DSM5 proposal by the Somatic Symptom Disorders Work Group, to change the name of the category "Somatic Symptom Disorders," to "Complex Somatic Symptom Disorder."

"The new draft DSM manual proposes that chronic fatigue syndrome, fibromyalgia, and multiple chemical sensitivity are "somatiform" disorders requiring psychiatric consultation," he says. "It's the same old story of Psychiatry trying to extend its diagnostic labels and drug treatments to new populations."

This is "an effort by psychiatry to psychiatrize physical illnesses and to try to suppress the complaints of these patients by prescribing psychiatric drugs," Plumlee says.

"But experience is showing that the psychiatric procedures and drugs are making patients worse," he advises.

Using psychiatric diagnoses and drugs on diseases of neurotoxicity helps the chemical companies in two ways, he reports. "It fools some people into thinking that poisoned people are crazy, thus getting the poisoners (chemical companies) off the hook," and two, "it sells more chemicals (psychiatric drugs) to treat those who really need detoxification, not more chemicals in their bodies. "
Tax dollars are being used to fuel the American epidemic of mental illness by promoting the preemptive drugging of persons supposedly at risk of developing mental disorders, to the great benefit of the pharmaceutical industry.

In March 2010, the US Department of Health & Human Services Substance Abuse & Mental Health Service Administration Centre for Mental Health Services announced $16.5 million in funding for "Mental Health Transformation Grants," one of SAMHSA's services grant programs.

An evidence-based practice, or EBP, refers to approaches to prevention or treatment that are validated by some form of documented research evidence. As an example of a practice that could be implemented, SAMHSA listed under "Prevention and Wellness: Early Intervention," the "Early Detection and Intervention for the Prevention of Psychosis Program (EDIPPP)," along with a link to its website [http://www.changemymind.org/](http://www.changemymind.org/).

EDIPPP is a national program replicating the "Portland Identification and Early Referral," or "PIER," a treatment research program at the Main Medical Centre, in Portland, Maine.

On a webpage for PIER on the Centre's Website, under "Project Overview," it states: "The goals are to improve outcomes and prevent the onset of the psychotic phase of illnesses like Bipolar Disorder, Major Depression, and Schizophrenia."

"This is the first program in the United States to identify the entire population of at risk young persons and offer them treatment," PIER said in a September 26, 2005 press release.

EDIPPP was funded through a $14.4 million grant for the "National Demonstration of Early Detection, Intervention and Prevention of Psychosis in Adolescents and Young Adults," from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, and is "designed to prevent psychosis in teens and young adults," according to an April 10, 2007, announcement on RWJF's launch of the program.

"The national program is expanding PIER's success during the past seven years in identifying and treating young people experiencing subtle and early symptoms that herald the onset of serious mental illness," a November 2007 report in Behavioural Healthcare, by Dr James Maier, a research psychiatrist with PIER, notes.

EDIPPP works with people between the ages of 12 and 25, with an average age of persons entering the program between 15 and 16.
"Widespread dissemination of this early intervention model throughout the United States offers tremendous hope and optimism for combating some of the most devastating and costly illnesses that can afflict young people and their families," Maier claims.

The RWJF grant set up additional EDIPPP sites in Sacramento, California; Salem, Oregon; Ypsilanti, Michigan; and Glen Oaks, New York. A site in Albuquerque, New Mexico was added in 2008.

RWJF also funds a booklet for professionals, on how to prevent mental illness with early detection titled, "Recognizing and Helping Young People at Risk for Psychosis: A Professional's Guide," which can be downloaded free off the internet.

From the start, PIER has always been primarily funded by RWJF, according to its website. However, on October 13, 2003, Mental Health Weekly reported that the program had received a $3.9 million grant from the National Institute of Mental Health, and a parallel $2 million grant from the Centre for Mental Health Services intended for a related program in early identification of non-psychotic disabilities.

In Portland, young people typically are referred to PIER by high school guidance counsellors, paediatricians, or other clinicians who attended presentations about PIER's work, visited the PIER Website (http://www.preventmentalillness.org), and are familiar with the early warning symptoms that suggest the onset of a psychotic illness, according to the report in Behavioural Healthcare.

Mental Illness According to PIER

In a fact sheet posted to "Dispel the Myths," the PIER website claims that, "Mental disorders are as easy to diagnose as asthma, diabetes, and cancer." (My Note: this is bullshit as you have just read in the last chapter, as is the next statement for the same reasons)

"Treatments are effective 60%-80% of the time, success rates that meet or exceed success rates for cutting edge treatment for heart disease," the sheet states.

"In many cases, PIER does use medications," the Websites says. "We believe that some of the newer medications effectively improve thinking and combat early symptoms."

"Research suggests these medications may have a protective effect against changes in the brain that cause mental illness," it reports.

Under costs, it reads: "For now, services provided by PIER staff are supported by grants. However, if certain medications, medical tests, or neurological assessments are ordered, there will be a charge."

The PIER program was founded in 2000, by Dr William McFarlane, and after 10 years in operation, on May 28, 2010, the ChangeMyMind website listed only two "case studies and impact stories that illustrate the effectiveness of the Early Detection and Intervention for the Prevention of Psychosis Program."

Medicated for Life

Virtually every person entering the PIER program is prescribed antipsychotics, such as Risperdal or Invega, marketed by Johnson & Johnson, the parent company of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. These prescriptions are off-label because antipsychotics are not FDA approved to "prevent" mental illness in any age group.
An August 2008 article, by Charles Schmidt in Discover Magazine, highlighted the PIER program with a byline that stated: "A new mix of therapy and medication may stave off psychosis among teens at risk."

Schmidt discussed the case of Camila (not her real name), who entered the program in September 2001, when she was 14. "Camila and her family stuck with PIER for the four-year treatment program, which ended formally in 2005, and still keep in touch with counsellors there," he reports.

However, "Camila's health still hinges on antipsychotic medication," Schmidt says. "In the summer of 2007 she went off the drugs for a spell and her strange feelings returned."

He notes that her reliance on antipsychotics raises issues. "On the one hand, it shows that the threat of psychosis hasn't really been removed, it's just been held in check."

"What we hope is that the benefits of treatment will be lifelong," McFarlane says in the article. "We don't have any empirical evidence to support that yet, but what we've seen is that young people who still haven't converted to psychosis after about three years of our treatment don't seem to be at much risk."

While he suggests that over time, some patients may be able to go off medications, McFarlane acknowledges that PIER hasn't developed a plan for managing that process, Schmidt reports.

"As to when or if they can go off medication, that's hard to say," he told Schmidt. "I think many of our patients don't feel a need to stop; they certainly don't feel oppressed by it. At a certain point it becomes a personal choice."

A fortune can be made from these life-long antipsychotic customers. In April 2010, the price for one box of Invega, at a middle dose, was $1,373 at DrugStore.com. Risperdal went for $788 per 90 pills. The cost was $1,395 for 100 tablets of Abilify. Seroquel cost $997 per 100. One-hundred capsules of Geodon sold for $918 and Zyprexa cost $1,523 for a hundred 10mg pills.

In 2003, McFarlane told Mental Health Weekly that with about 3% of the population at risk for a serious mental illness, Greater Portland could expect about 75 young people to develop a disorder each year.

RWJF Front Group

The founder of RWJF, Robert Wood Johnson, was chairman of Johnson & Johnson for over 30 years, from 1932 to 1963, as a member of the drug maker's founding family. Throughout the years, the majority of the Foundation's money has come from investments in J&J stock. RWJF's board of trustees has always been stacked with the drug company's executives. For instance, current and past trustees have held positions at J&J such as President, CEO, Vice President, Chairman of the Board, and Treasurer, and have served alongside another family heir on the board, Robert Wood Johnson IV.

RWJF is listed in a Medicaid fraud lawsuit, filed against J&J by whistleblower, Allen Jones, a former federal fraud investigator, and joined by the Texas attorney general, as providing funding for illegal marketing schemes to increase the off-label sales of Risperdal, including funding the development of the "Texas Medication Algorithm Project (TMAP)," which required doctors to prescribe the newest, most expensive antipsychotics, antidepressants, anticonvulsants, and ADHD drugs to patients covered by public programs, like Medicaid and
Medicare, who were diagnosed with mental disorders, and a nearly identical set of child
drugging guidelines known as the "Texas Children's Medication Algorithm Project (CMAP)."

In addition to Risperdal and Invega, J&J also markets the ADHD drug Concerta, and
Topamax, an anticonvulsant.

A May 11, 2005, report by RWJF on the results of the funding of TMAP grants totalling
$2,389,581 to the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Centre at Dallas and a grant of
$353,747 to the Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation, describes the
supposed "Problem," that led to the creation of the TMAP drugging guidelines as:

"In the 1980's and 1990's, as pharmaceutical companies began producing new and more
efficacious medications to treat people with serious mental disorders such as depression,
bipolar disorder, and schizophrenia, the question arose of how to choose the most
appropriate treatment options. Concerns about wide variation in prescribing practices by
physicians and complaints from consumer advocates about the negative consequences of
this variation spurred the creation of evidence-based guidelines and medication treatment
algorithms."

The "Contacts" for the grants listed in the report, were Dr A John Rush, for the University,
and Dr Steven Shon for the state of Texas. Shon was fired in October 2006, after the Texas
attorney general determined that J&J had improperly influenced him to make Risperdal a
preferred drug on TMAP. In 2008, Rush was added to a list of psychiatric academics who
failed to disclose all the payments they received from drug companies, by Senator Charles
Grassley, as part of an investigation conducted on behalf of the US Senate Finance
Committee, which oversees Medicaid and Medicare spending.

As a main component of the off-label marketing schemes, the lawsuits against the
antipsychotic makers allege that the drug companies "seeded" the medical literature with
reports and papers purporting to be written by "experts" when they were actually
ghostwritten with the names of experts attached after the fact. (More on this later - M).

In its report on the TMAP grant results, RWJF boasts that: "More than 50 articles on the
Texas Medication Algorithm Project have appeared in the Journal of Clinical Psychiatry,
Psychiatry Research, Managed Care, Health Services Research, Journal of the American
Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and other peer-reviewed journals."

"Over the next two years, Project Directors Rush and Shon and their colleagues plan to
publish additional articles on other areas of interest," the report said.

On August 18, 2008, a Dallas Morning News headline read: "Conflict of interest fears halt
children's mental health project," in reference to the Children's Medication Algorithm
Project. "A state mental health plan naming the preferred psychiatric drugs for children has
been quietly put on hold over fears drug companies may have given researchers consulting
contracts, speakers fees or other perks to help get their products on the list," the News
wrote.

To date, four of the five atypical makers have settled fraud charges involving the illegal off-
label marketing of antipsychotics, including for use with children. Eli Lilly paid $1.4 billion
for Zyprexa, Bristol-Myers Squibb's fine was $515 million for Abilify, Pfizer paid $301 for
Geodon, and AstraZeneca just forked out $520 million for Seroquel.

But the fines are merely chocked up to the cost of doing business. For instance, although
AstraZeneca paid a whopping $520 million fine, Seroquel had sales of $4.9 billion in 2009,
with more than half coming from the US. Overall, antipsychotics were the top-earning class
of drugs in the US, in both 2008 and 2009, with sales of $14.6 billion in 2009, according
to IMS Health.

J&J is the only atypical maker that has not settled the off-label marketing charges against it
- yet. However, two units of J&J "will pay more than $81 million to resolve criminal and civil
claims over illegal promotion of the epilepsy drug Topamax," according to Bloomberg news on April 29, 2010.

Also, over the past 2 months, J&J's McNeil division has recalled over 40 varieties of child and baby medications after the FDA found massive safety and manufacturing violations at a plant in Fort Washington, Pennsylvania, including formulations of Tylenol, Motrin, Zyrtec and Benadryl. The FDA also found problems with "strength, quality and purity."

The FDA's inspection report notes that J&J received about 46 consumer complaints regarding foreign materials, black or dark specks [in their drugs] from June 2009 to April 2010." J&J had knowledge of problems since May 2009, which means it was allowing children and infants to ingest potentially poisonous drugs for a year before the product recall took place.

Time Magazine as Promoter

On June 22, 2009, the RWJF website posted a link to download the full text of an article in Time Magazine, by John Cloud titled, "Staying Sane May Be Easier Than You Think," who reported: "The most exciting research in mental health today involves not how to treat mental illness but how to prevent it in the first place."

"In fact," Cloud said, "many mental illnesses – even those like schizophrenia that have demonstrable genetic origins – can be stopped or at least contained before they start."

"This isn't wishful thinking but hard science," he claimed. (It's bullshit – M)

The article discussed a report by the National Academics, "an organization of experts who investigate science for the Federal Government," nearly two years in the making, "on how to prevent mental, emotional and behavioural disorders." A quick check found one of the sponsors of the National Academies to be RWJF.

"The report concludes that pre-empting such disorders requires two kinds of interventions," Cloud said, "first, because genes play so important a role in mental illness, we need to ensure that close relatives (particularly children) of those with mental disorders have access to rigorous screening programs."

"Second," he noted, "we must offer treatment to people who have already shown symptoms of illness (say, a tendency to brood and see the world without optimism) but don't meet the diagnostic criteria for a full-scale mental illness (in this case, depression)."

"Some prevention programs even prescribe psychiatric medications, including antipsychotics and antidepressants, to people who aren't technically psychotic or depressed," Time reported.

"This is a big concern," Joseph Rogers, founder of the Philadelphia-based National Mental Health Consumers' Self-Help Clearinghouse told Cloud. "Because, gee, if you miss, you can really do more harm with some of these drugs than good."

"But those who contributed to the National Academies report say preventing the suffering of people with mental illness is worth the risk of some false positives, partly because of the enormous cost of treating mental illness after it's struck," Cloud reported.

The article profiled PIER and McFarlane, who was described as "one of the world's top authorities on preventing mental illness."
According to Time, the "National Institute of Mental Health is funding a trial of McFarlane's work, and while he is still writing up his data for publication, his anecdotal results are promising: most of the kids are so far avoiding a first psychotic episode."

Preemptive Drugging Unsupported

In a 2008 paper titled, Atypical Antipsychotic Agents For the Schizophrenia Prodrome: Not a Clear First Choice," published in the "International Journal of Risk & Safety in Medicine," Dr Stefan Kruszewski, a psychiatrist, and Dr Richard Paczynski, a neurologist, both from Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, explain that, "Pharmacologic intervention at the earliest stages of suspected psychotic illness is an intuitively appealing concept and a logical extension of the current approach to many other diseases of the central nervous system."

"However," they report, "a critical analysis of the results of structured clinical investigations which have explored the use of ATAPs for new-onset psychotic symptoms raises safety concerns and does not support pre-medication in this setting as a preventive strategy."

"Over the past several years," the paper states, "a voice has emerged in the international psychiatric community recommending early prescription of the atypical antipsychotic agents (ATAPs) for adolescents and young adults who appear to show signs consistent with a schizophrenia prodrome. Early use is predicated on the possibility that ATAPs may prevent progression to full-blown psychotic illness in this high-risk population."

"This trend has been encouraged despite a paucity of data which clearly support the effectiveness of these agents for this indication, and despite evidence of adverse side effects including," the authors note.

These circumstances prompted their literature review, "focusing on the five published studies that have explicitly addressed the preventative efficacy of the most widely prescribed ATAPs in structured (i.e., non-anecdotal) clinical settings."

In the summary and conclusion section of the paper, the authors report that the results from the available controlled trials reviewed are in line with several of the conclusions of the naturalistic study by Cornblatt et al. "That is, early prescription of ATAPs to adolescents and young adults seeking medical attention for prodromal psychotic symptoms is associated with high rates of medication non-adherence."

"Additionally," they say, "the introduction of ATAPs was not associated with reduction in the rate of conversion to formal psychosis beyond that explainable by chance and/or the introduction of bias secondary to baseline imbalances, inadequate blinding or even differential psychosocial supports."

"We suggest caution in making any assumptions that justify changes in prescription-writing behaviour when it involves patients who are at high risk for developing long-term psychotic illnesses but have never demonstrated sustained psychosis (psychotic illness by DSM-IV criteria)," Kruszewski and Paczynski advise.

"This would include but is not limited to persons with suspected schizophrenia prodrome," they add.

"Even in the hands of experienced investigators using detailed screening protocols in controlled settings, only one-quarter to one-third of high-risk patients converted to full-blown psychosis," they report.
"Consequently," they warn, "if early use of ATAPs continues as a quasi-standard of care for new-onset psychotic symptoms, a large majority of these often young individuals will be exposed unnecessarily to poorly defined but likely substantial risks, including but not limited to obesity, hyperlipidemia, metabolic syndrome, increased rates of type II diabetes mellitus and extrapyramidal syndromes, both acute and chronic."

"Considerations of safety must come first when the preventative efficacy of these agents remains so poorly defined," they conclude.

(Part III of this series will highlight the Psychiatric Industrial Complex as the driving force behind the American Epidemic of Mental Illness)

Evelyn Pringle

(This series is sponsored by the International Centre for the Study of Psychiatry and Psychology https://icspponline.org/index.html)

I'm sorry, with reference to part three; you'll have to look it up yourself I have to move on.

**Americas Mental Illness Epidemic**

By Gary G. Kohls, MD

8-25-10

Tens of millions of innocent, unsuspecting Americans, who are mired deeply in the mental "health" system, have actually been made crazy by the use of or the withdrawal from commonly-prescribed, brain-altering, brain-disabling, indeed brain-damaging psychiatric drugs that have been, for many decades, cavalierly handed out like candy often in untested and therefore unapproved combinations of drugs - to trusting and unaware patients by equally unaware but well-intentioned physicians who have been under the mesmerizing influence of slick and obscenely profitable psychopharmaceutical drug companies aka, BigPharma.

That is the conclusion of two books by investigative journalist and health science writer Robert Whitaker. His first book, entitled Mad in America: Bad Science, Bad Medicine and the Enduring Mistreatment of the Mentally Ill noted that there has been a 600% increase (since Thorazine was introduced in the US in the mid-1950s) in the total and permanent disabilities of millions of psychiatric drug-takers. This uniquely First World mental ill health epidemic has resulted in the life-long taxpayer-supported disabilities of rapidly increasing numbers of psychiatric patients who are now unable to be happy, productive, taxpaying members of society. Whitaker has done a powerful, albeit unwelcome job of presenting previously hidden, but very convincing evidence to support his thesis, that it is the drugs and not the diagnosis that is causing the epidemic of mental illness disability. Many open-minded physicians and many aware psychiatric patients are now motivated to be wary of any and all synthetic chemicals that can cross the blood/brain barrier because all of them are capable of altering the brain in ways totally unknown to medical science, especially when the patients are taking the drugs long-term.

In Whitaker's second book Anatomy of an Epidemic: Magic Bullets, Psychiatric Drugs, and the Astonishing Rise of Mental Illness in America, he goes much further in advancing this sobering reality. He documents the history of the powerful forces behind the relatively new field of psychopharmacology and its major shaper and beneficiary, BigPharma. Psychiatric drugs, whose developers, marketers and sales-persons are all in the employ of the giant drug companies, are far more dangerous than the drug and psychiatric industries are willing to admit: These drugs, it turns out, are fully capable of disabling permanently - body, brain and spirit.
More evidence to support Whitaker's well-documented claims are laid out in two important new books written by psychiatrist and scholar Grace Jackson. Jackson did a beautiful job of researching and documenting, from the voluminous basic neuroscience research (which is uniformly ignored by the clinical sciences) the unintended and often disastrous consequences of the chronic ingestion of any of the five major classes of psychiatric drugs. Her second and most powerful book: Drug-Induced Dementia: A Perfect Crime, proves beyond a shadow of a doubt, that any of the five classes of drugs that are commonly used in psychiatric patients (antidepressants, antipsychotics, psychostimulants, tranquilizers and anti-seizure/"mood-stabilizer" drugs) have shown microscopic, macroscopic, biochemical, clinical and/or radiological evidence of brain shrinkage and other signs of brain damage, which can result in clinically-diagnosable, permanent dementia, premature death and a variety of other related brain disorders that can mimic mental illnesses. Jackson's first book, Rethinking Psychiatric Drugs: A Guide for Informed Consent was an equally sobering book warning about the many hidden dangers of psychiatric drugs.

This sad truth is that the seemingly knee-jerk prescribing (without very much information being given to patients about the long list of serious long-term adverse effects) of potent and often addicting/dependency-inducing psychiatric drugs has become the standard of care in American psychiatry since the introduction of the so-called anti-schizophrenic "miracle" drug Thorazine in the mid-1950s. (Thorazine was the offending drug that all of Jack Nicholson's fellow patients were coerced into taking at "medication time" in the Academy Award-winning movie "One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest".) Thorazine and all the other "me-too" early antipsychotic drugs are now universally known to have been an iatrogenic (= doctor or other treatment-caused) disaster because of their serious long-term, initially unsuspected, brain-damaging effects that resulted in a number of incurable neurological disorders such as tardive dyskinesia and Parkinson's disease.

Thorazine and all the other knock-off drugs like Prolixin, Mellaril, Navane, etc, are synthetic "tricyclic" chemical compounds similar in molecular structure to the tricyclic "antidepressants" like imipramine and the similarly toxic, obesity-inducing, diabetogenic, "atypical" anti-schizophrenic drugs like Clozaril, Zyprexa and Seroquel.

Thorazine, incidentally, was originally developed in Europe as an industrial dye. That doesn't sound so good although it may not be so unusual in the closely related fields of psychopharmacology and the chemical industry, especially when one considers that Depakote, a popular drug marketed initially as an anti-epilepsy drug but now is being heavily used as a so-called "mood stabilizer". Depakote, known to be a hepatotoxin and renal toxin, was originally developed as an industrial solvent capable of dissolving fat - including, presumably, the fatty tissue in human livers and brains.

Some sympathy and understanding needs to be generated for the various victims of BigPharma's compulsive drive to expand market share and "shareholder value" (share price, dividends and the next quarter's financial report) by whatever means necessary. Both the prescribers and the swallowers of BigPharma's drugs have succumbed to BigPharma's cunning marketing campaigns, the prescribers having been seduced by attractive drug company representatives and their "pens, pizzas and post-it note" freebies in the office, and the patients being brain-washed by the inane and unbelievable (if one has intact critical thinking skills) commercials on TV that quickly gloss over the lethal adverse effects in the fine print while urging the watcher to "ask your doctor" about the latest unaffordable wannabe blockbuster drug.

For a quick overview of these issues, I recommend that everybody with an open mind read a long essay written by Whitaker that persuasively identifies the source of
America's epidemic of mental illness disability (a phenomenon that doesn't exist in Third World nations because costly psych drugs are not prescribed so cavalierly as in the US).

Whitaker and Jackson (among a number of other ground-breaking and whistle-blowing authors who have been essentially black-listed by the mainstream media and mainstream medical journals) have proven to most critically-thinking scientists, alternative practitioners and assorted "psychiatric survivors" that it is the drugs - and not the so-called "disorders" - that are causing our nation's epidemic of mental illness disability. The Whitaker essay, plus other pertinent information about his books can be accessed at www.madinamerica.com A recent interview on Wisconsin Public Radio can be accessed at www.wpr.org (at their radio archives link) and a long interview with Dr. Joseph Mercola can be heard at: http://articles.mercola.com/sites/articles/archive/2010/05/08/robert-whitaker-interview.aspx

After reading and studying all these inconvenient truths, mental health practitioners must consider the medicolegal implications for them, especially if the information is ignored or if the information is dismissed out of hand by practitioners who might be tempted to not take the time to study this new information. Those people who are hearing about this for the first time need to pass the word on to others, especially their prescribing healthcare practitioners who should be equally concerned. This is important because the opinion leaders in the highly influential (for good or ill) psychiatric and medical industries have been marketed into submission without hearing the all the facts (which may have been intentionally hidden from them. If that is the case, they cannot be automatically blamed for proceeding in a practice that someday might represent malpractice. It shouldn't have to be pointed out that is the solemn duty of ethical practitioners who are in positions of authority to fully examine potential malpractice issues and then warn others, especially their patients, of the dangers.

Sadly, it must be admitted that most of the over-worked, double-booked care-givers in medical clinics have not yet heard the news that most if not all of the brain-altering synthetic chemicals known as psychotropic drugs (which are treated as hazardous waste unless they are packaged in a swallowable capsule!) have been marketed as safe and effective - but only for short-term use. The captains of the drug industry know that the psychotropic drugs that they present for the FDA-approval have only been tested in animal trials for days and in clinical trials for 6 weeks. They also know indeed they hope - that patients will be taking their drugs for years (despite no long-term trials proving safety and efficacy) as the only "treatment" for mental ill health. They know that their brain-altering drugs are also dependency-inducing (aka addicting, causing withdrawal symptoms when stopped), neurotoxic and increasingly ineffective (a la "Prozac Poop-out") as time goes by.

The truth is that the people diagnosed as "mentally ill" for life are often simply those unfortunates who find themselves in acute or chronic states of crisis or "overwhelm" due to any number of preventable, curable and treatable (without the use of drugs) bad luck accidents such as poverty, abuse, violence, torture, homelessness, discrimination, underemployment, brain malnutrition, addictions/withdrawal, brain damage from electroshock "therapy" and/or exposure to neurotoxic chemicals in their food, air, water or prescription bottles.

Those labelled as the "mentally ill" are just like us "normals" who have not yet decompensated because of some yet-to-happen, crisis-inducing, overwhelming (however temporary) life situation. And thus we have not yet been given a billable code number (accompanied by the seemingly obligatory - and unaffordable - drug prescription or two signifying we are now chronically mentally ill. Unlabeled, we are likely to remain off prescription drugs but with a label and in "the system", it is hard
to "just say no to drugs."

The victims of hopelessness-generating situations like simple bad luck, bad circumstances, bad company, bad choices, bad government, big business, and a competitive society that generates a few winners but mostly losers. America tolerates, indeed celebrates, punitive and thus fear-inducing social systems resembling in many ways the infamous police state realities of 20th century European totalitarianism, where people who were different or just dissidents were thought to be abnormal and therefore "disappeared" into insane asylums, jails or concentration camps without just cause or competent legal defence. And many of them were and are drugged with disabling psychoactive chemicals against their will.

The truth is that most, if not all, of BigPharma's psychotropic drugs are lethal at some dosage level (the LD50, the lethal dose that kills 50% of lab animals, is calculated before efficacy testing is done), and therefore the drugs must be regarded as dangerous. The chronic use of these drugs is a major cause of cognitive disorders, brain damage, loss of creativity, loss of spirituality, loss of empathy, loss of energy, loss of strength, fatigue and tiredness, permanent disability and a multitude of metabolic adverse effects that can readily sicken the body, brain and soul by causing insomnia or somnolence, increased depression or anxiety, delusions, psychoses, paranoia, mania, etc. So before filling the prescription, it is advisable to read the product insert labelling under WARNINGS, PRECAUTIONS, ADVERSE EFFECTS, CONTRAINDICATIONS, TOXICOLOGY, OVERDOSE and the ever-present BLACK BOX WARNINGS ABOUT SUICIDALITY.

Long-term, high dosage or combination psychotropic drug usage could be regarded as a chemically traumatic brain injury (TBI) or, as drugs like Thorazine were known in the 1950s and 60s, a "chemical lobotomy". That is a useful way to conceptualize this serious issue, because such chemically brain-altered patients are often indistinguishable from those who have suffered a physically traumatic brain injuries or been subjected to ice-pick lobotomies which were popular in the 1940s and 50s - before the drugs came on the market.

America has a mental ill health epidemic on its hands that is grossly misunderstood because it is worsening, not by the supposed disease progression, but because of the neurotoxic, non-curative drugs that are somehow regarded as first-line "treatment."


Dr. Kohls is a family physician who, until his retirement in 2008, practiced holistic mental health care. His patients came to see him asking for help in getting off the psychotropic drugs that they knew were sickening and disabling them. He was successful in helping significant majorities of his patients get off their drugs using a thorough and therefore time-consuming program that was based on psychoeducational psychotherapy, brain nutrient therapy, a drastic change away from the malnourishing and often toxic Standard American Diet (SAD) plus a program of gradual, closely monitored drug withdrawal. Dr. Kohls warns against the abrupt discontinuation of any psychiatric drug because of the common, often serious withdrawal symptoms that can occur with the chronic use of any dependency-inducing psychoactive drug, whether illicit or legal. Close consultation with an aware, informed physician who is hopefully familiar with dealing with drug withdrawal syndromes (starting with the original prescribing physician), who will
read and study the above books and become aware of the previously unknown dangers of these drugs and the nutritional needs of the drug-toxified and nutritionally-depleted brain.

Dr. Kohls is a member of MindFreedom International and the International Centre for the Study of Psychiatry and Psychology. He is the editor of the occasional Preventive Psychiatry E-Newsletter.

Exclusive: Britain's £100bn mental health crisis

Experts demand radical policy rethink, to focus on illness prevention rather than expensive and ineffective treatments

By Nina Lakhani the Independent Sunday, 3 October 2010

Mental illness in England cost the nation more than £100bn last year, highlighting some of the most serious emotional and psychological problems in Europe. More than £21bn was spent on such health treatments as antidepressants and social care such as befriending services, an increase of 75 per cent since 2003.

Experts warned that the figure is likely to rise as government cuts to public services start to have an impact. The statistics, released today by the Centre for Mental Health, show mental health-related sick leave and unemployment cost the economy more than £30bn. The true impact is likely to be much higher, as the costs of underperformance and poor productivity are not included.

The cost of the less tangible, human toll of mental illness is calculated to be £50bn: this figure takes into account the negative impact that conditions such as depression, anxiety, psychoses and bipolar disorder have on quality of life and life expectancy, as well as the costs of providing informal care.

Rates of reported mental illness have remained fairly stable since 2003 when the centre put the cost at £77.4 bn. The new figure – an increase of 36 per cent – takes into account inflation since 2003 and the rising cost of health and social care.

The most recent figures for Scotland and Northern Ireland are £8.6bn and £3bn respectively; there is no calculation for Wales.

The numbers are likely to trouble members of the coalition Government as it struggles to curb an annual deficit of £157bn by slashing departmental budgets. Mental health campaigners insist that all of the money being spent is essential but say it should be diverted towards prevention.

One in four people experiences some kind of mental health problem in the course of a year. Women are more likely to have been treated for a mental health problem than men, but men are three times as likely to die by suicide. About 10 per cent of children have a mental health problem at any one time. The UK has one of the highest rates of self-harm in Europe, at 400 per 100,000 population. About 45,000 people a year are sectioned under the Mental Health Act.

In less extreme cases, some eight million people of working age experience common mental health problems such as depression, anxiety and sleep problems. Cases such as those of Annabelle Davis, 20, from Weymouth, who was prescribed antidepressants for an eating disorder, illustrate the need for early counselling. Denied the right help when she became ill at 15, she has needed a range of interventions including adult intensive psychiatric care.
She is still on powerful drugs, but finally has a counsellor and is struggling to catch up with school.

There is little sign that future cases like Annabelle’s will fare much better. A survey by the charity Rethink, published last week, revealed that a third of GPs, who will soon take over commissioning services, believe mental health care is the most vulnerable under current proposals set out in the NHS White Paper. Two-fifths of GPs surveyed admitted they knew little about specialist services needed by people with psychoses and bipolar affective disorder.

The previous government invested heavily in community mental health services for adults, although services for inpatients, children, young people and the elderly lagged behind. The controversial 2007 Mental Health Act, opposed by this newspaper, has proven costly: 4,000 people were forcibly treated under community treatment orders in the first year – 10 times the number predicted.

But its radical and well-received 10-year New Horizons strategy recognised the urgent need to refocus resources away from only treatment. It outlined sweeping plans to improve the mental health of the nation and reduce rates of illness by making well-being and prevention a priority for local and national services. It has been abandoned by the coalition, which shows no sign of moving away from a treatment approach.

Andy Burnham, shadow Health Secretary, warned against cuts in funding for mental health. He said: "If mental health promotion is not placed front and centre of public health strategy, these costs will continue to rise. The Government needs to explain why it is abandoning New Horizons – a unique strategy that focused on changing attitudes to mental health.

"It enjoyed widespread support, so if the Government is changing direction it must explain why and what will replace it. As the coalition pushes ahead with its cuts, mental health services must not be seen as a soft target."

Dr Andrew McCulloch, chief executive of the Mental Health Foundation, said: "This invaluable new data once again underlines the fact that we need to revolutionise the way that we tackle mental health, to increase the focus on early intervention and preventative measures, rather than just treatment once an individual has reached crisis point. Figures like these show that, in times of fiscal stringency, there are also considerable economic benefits to this approach."

Sophie Corlett, of Britain's largest mental health charity, Mind, said: "You don't have to cut mental health services to put people's mental health at risk. Reducing benefits and pushing people into poverty, job losses, and less investment in community services are just some of the things that can have serious repercussions for our well-being. The recession has seen a greater need for the Government to look after the nation's mental health."

A Department of Health spokesman said yesterday: "The Government recognises that good mental health is as important as good physical health. That is why we are developing a new strategy for mental health, working across government, with local communities, the independent sector and health professionals to create a more personalised service tailored to individual needs. We want patients to be supported into their recovery."

Now let's see how they are aiming for all of us, our young and old included.

**Mental health screening how it will affect your children by Dennis Cuddy m.d.**
The impetus for this book has been the recommendation of President George W. Bush's New Freedom Commission on Mental Health that all Americans, and especially children, receive mental health screenings.

In the past, whenever there was controversial congressional legislation regarding children, it was easy to introduce and pass provisions in the bills requiring parental consent. However, recent attempts by U.S. Rep. Ron Paul to require parental consent for, and prohibit funding of, mental health screenings failed. This leads many to wonder whether there may be a larger agenda at work here, and it is in this new book that this larger agenda, its background, and its future implications, are explored.

In April 2002, President George W. Bush established the New Freedom Commission on Mental Health to conduct a "comprehensive study of the United States mental health service delivery system." Now there are about 27 sites around the country piloting various aspects of the president's New Freedom Initiative, which provides for mental health screening for everyone, and provides for strong antipsychotic and antidepressant drugs as treatment for many mental health problems detected.

Perhaps the most powerful force behind this initiative is the pharmaceutical industry, including Eli Lilly & Co. (which manufactures Prozac) whose top selling drug is the antipsychotic Olanzapine. Is it merely a coincidence that President George H. W. Bush has been on the board of directors of Lilly, that Lilly made over $1 million in contributions to George W. Bush and the Republican Party in the campaign of 2000, and that Lilly's CEO, Sidney Taurel, was appointed by the current President Bush to the Homeland Security Council? In July 1945, Lilly chemist Ervin Kleiderer led a research team to an I. G. Farben pharmaceutical plant in Germany. I. G. Farben had produced Zyklon B gas used in the Nazi prison camps (remember that both the Nazis and Communists used mental health screenings to identify their adversaries). Kleiderer returned to the U.S. with the formula for Dolophine (named in honour of Adolph Hitler), now marketed as methadone. And don't forget that it was Eli Lilly & Co. in 1953 that made up a batch of LSD for the CIA.

According to John Marks in The Search for the "Manchurian Candidate": The CIA and Mind Control (N.Y. Times Books, 1979). Lilly over the years has given a great deal of money to Planned Parenthood and to the Centre for Population Options.

In case you think you will only be affected by the New Freedom Initiative if you have some extreme form of psychosis or neurosis, you need to look at whom the leaders in the field consider mentally disturbed. In B. K. Eakman's "What? Are You Crazy? The Screening of America" (Chronicles, October 2004), she reveals that "in August 2003, the National Institute of Mental Health and the National Science Foundation announced the results of their $1.2 million taxpayer-funded study. It stated, essentially, that traditionalists are mentally disturbed. Scholars from the University of Maryland, California at Berkeley, and Stanford had determined that social conservatives, in particular, suffer from 'mental rigidity,' 'dogmatism,' and 'uncertainty avoidance,' together with associated indicators of mental illness."

The ultimate goal of the power elite, as I have written before, is to have a world government with social control of the populace. In 1919, the American Baptist Publication Society published Samuel Zane Batten's The New World Order, in which he pronounced: "We have vindicated the right of social control. . . . The state must socialize every group. . . . Men must learn to have world patriotism. World patriotism must be a faith." Batten then called for a world federation of nations, and said that men "must see and affirm that above the nation is humanity. Internationalism must first be a religion before it can be a reality and a system."

Because education has been an important vehicle for this movement, a little over a decade after Batten's book was published, the National Education Association's Department of
Superintendence in 1932 published its Tenth Yearbook subtitled Character Education. This document presented their plans to use America's schools to undermine traditional values in pursuit of the goal of world government, and see that "the citizen of the future must be a citizen of the world." (In the companion to this book, I quoted U.S. Secretary of Education Rod Paige on October 3, 2003 as saying that he was proud the U.S. was rejoining UNESCO and educating our children to be "citizens of the world." Since "citizens" of states have to obey the states' laws, supposedly "citizens of the world" will have to obey world law. President Clinton also referred to himself as "a citizen of the world" in a speech in Shanghai on July 1, 1998.)

In the companion to this series on mental health, education, and social control, I referred to the head of the Rockefeller Foundation, Max Mason, on April 11, 1933, stating that their goal was social control, the control of human behaviour. The next year, in a February 1934 "progress report" by one of the Rockefeller Foundation's division heads, one finds the following: "Can we develop so sound and extensive a genetics that we can hope to breed, in the future, superior men?" (See The Circuit Riders: Rockefeller Money and the Rise of Modern Science by Gerald Jones, 1989.) In 1941, the infamous Alfred Kinsey began to receive money for his notorious sex research from Alan Gregg, Rockefeller Foundation medical director, who would also fund the establishment of the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations. The decade of the 1930s with the Great Depression provided a major impetus for the power elite's goal of social control, and in Bronislaw Malinowski's 1937 conference paper, "Culture as a Determinant Behaviour," was mentioned that there was "only one way out" of the current cultural crisis, and that was "the establishment of a scientific control of human affairs." And in that same year, in the July-October 1937 edition of J. L. Moreno's Sociometry, one reads about the federal government Resettlement Administration's "Centreville Project," which was an experiment in assigning housing for families based upon certain characteristics (e.g., whether they were religious) to see how they interrelated. President Franklin D. Roosevelt had told Moreno in Hyde Park one day that he would see how Moreno's sociometric principles could be put to use. Perhaps the "Centreville Project" was one such example.

The ultimate goal of the power elite is a world Socialist government, a synthesis of western Capitalism and eastern Communism. A consultant to the Resettlement Administration during this period of the 1930s was Stuart Chase, who in 1932 had authored A New Deal, boldly proclaiming:

I am not seriously alarmed by the sufferings of the creditor class, the troubles which the church is bound to encounter, the restrictions of certain kinds of freedom which must result, nor even by the bloodshed of the transition period. A better economic order is worth a little bloodshed. . . . Revolution can give what no other road promises to give so directly and forcibly—a new religion. ... It will be materialistic. . . . We need a new religion.

With this kind of attitude, one can only wonder why Chase was not only a consultant to the federal Resettlement Administration, but also to UNESCO in 1949. But then perhaps the answer lies in UNESCO's first director-general's emphasis on eugenics. This first director-general, Fabian Socialist Sir Julian Huxley, also advocated a world government, which was perfectly in line with Milton Eisenhower's comment at the closing session of the first day's conference on UNESCO at Wichita, Kansas, December 12, 1947. There, this brother of President Dwight Eisenhower stated that "one can truly understand UNESCO only if one views it in its historical context [and] reviewed in this way it reveals itself as one more step in our halting, painful, but I think very real progress toward a genuine world government." This quote can be found in a speech by U.S. Rep. Paul W Shafer on March 21, 1952 (later published in his and John Howland Snow's The Turning of the Tides).

An ally of Rep. Shafer in Congress was Rep. John Ashbrook, who would severely criticize UNESCO and on October 10, 1962, introduced HR 10508 which would ban psychological testing of students. As support for his legislation, Rep. Ashbrook quoted from a "moral
value” exam that had been given to students, asking such things as whether spitting on the Bible or spitting on the flag was worse. Students' values were in the process of being changed, as leading educator Theodore Sizer, writing with his wife in Five Lectures . . . on Moral Education, declared in 1970: “Moral autonomy . . . is the 'new morality' toward which we are to guide ourselves and other people. . . . Clearly the strict adherence to a 'code' is out of date.” This was a clear example of the humanist influence that was growing in American education (there are 4 million members of the International Humanist and Ethical Union).

Three years later, the second Humanist Manifesto was written in 1973, and one of its signers was the infamous sexologist Sol Gordon, who referred to himself as "polymorphous perverse." Gordon has been on the board of directors of SIECUS (Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States), has been affiliated with Ortho Pharmaceuticals (a subsidiary of Johnson & Johnson, which is connected with the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation), has produced the infamous Zing Sex Comix, and has called many of those disagreeing with him "Bible Bigots." And in case you think this represents only an isolated extreme example of humanistic attitudes about people who believe in The Holy Bible, look at the following quote from a prize-winning essay by John Dunphy in The Humanist (January-February 1983): "The battle for humankind's future must be waged and won in the public school classroom . . . between the rotting corpse of Christianity . . . and the new faith of humanism. . . . Humanism will emerge triumphant." Psychologically, this was all part of a programming process that would culminate in a "brave new world," and how it would be administered was explained in Roderick Seidenberg's 1964 book, Anatomy of the Future, in which he showed how a master race of “administrators” controls the masses of human beings "by the ever increasing techniques and refined arts of mental coercion" to the level of mindless guinea pigs.

Similarly, Zbigniew Brzezinski in Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technetronic Era (1970) referred to "the ruling elite" and said that "Society would be dominated by an elite . . . [which] would not hesitate to achieve its political ends by using the latest modern techniques for influencing public behaviour and keeping society under close surveillance and control." He also forecast difficult problems in determining the legitimate scope of human control. The possibility of extensive chemical mind control, the danger of loss of individuality... Man is increasingly acquiring the capacity to . . . affect through drugs the extent of [children's] intelligence, and to modify and control their personalities. And he furthered indicated that "in the technetronic society the trend seems to be toward . . . effectively exploiting the latest communication techniques to manipulate emotions and control reason." Mika Brzezinski, one of the people to whom the book was dedicated, is now a correspondent with CBS News. Along the lines of this same concept that our planet needs to be managed, in 1971 New Age networker Donald Keys co-founded Planetary Citizens (which, in addition to Global Education Associates and others, wants to "redesign education"), and in a later (November 11, 1984) symposium, "Toward a Global Society," stated: "We're at a stage now of pulling it all together. It's a new religion called 'networking.' . . . When it comes to running a world or taking people into a New Age, . . . don't anyone think for a moment that you can run a planet without a head... This planet has to be managed." And Keys is not without influence, as he has been a speechwriter for U.N. Secretary-General U Thant as well as for foreign ministers and ambassadors. In this capacity, he has been responsible for starting many trends at the U.N. Keys has also been with Lucis Trust (formerly Lucifer Publishing), on the board of directors of United World Federalists, and a member of the advisory council of the London Institute of Psychosynthesis. An apparent volunteer for managing people, future governor of California Arnold Schwarzenegger, six years after Keys' 1984 statement, said: "My relationship to power and authority is that I'm all for it. . . . People need somebody to watch over them. . . . Ninety-five percent of the people of the world need to be told what to do and how to behave" (U.S. News & World Report, November 26, 1990).
In order to "manage" people, the power elite logically would have to know what we are doing. In that regard, when I was a senior associate with the U.S. Department of Education, one of my jobs was to monitor the federally funded Centre for the Social Organization of Schools (CSOS) at Johns Hopkins University. And on December 30, 1985, I wrote a memo to Chester Finn, the head of my division, warning that the CSOS was asking students whether their parents had gotten in trouble with the police, and whether the students themselves would acknowledge being involved in criminal activities.

Also while I was with the U.S. Department of Education, on July 27, 1984, Utah Superintendent of Public Instruction G. Leland Burningham wrote a letter to U.S. Secretary of Education Terrel Bell stating:

I am forwarding this letter to accompany the proposal which you recommended Bill Spady and I prepare in connection with Outcome-Based Education. This proposal centres around the detailed process by which we will work together to implement Outcome-Based Education in place, not only in Utah but in all schools of the nation. William Spady is the "father" of Outcome-Based Education (OBE), and he would write in "Future Trends: Considerations in Developing Exit Outcomes" (September 1987) that "Despite the historical trend toward intellectual enlightenment and cultural pluralism, there has been a major rise in religious and political orthodoxy, intolerance, fundamentalism, and conservatism with which young people will have to be prepared to deal." OBE emphasizes the 'group' over the individual student, and therefore fits perfectly in the movement toward Socialism. Note the following words of American Communist Party chief Gus Hall: "The battle will be lost, not when freedom of speech is finally taken away, but when Americans become so 'adjusted or conditioned' to getting along with the 'group' that when they finally see the threat, they will say, 'I can't afford to be controversial.'"

Thus, the power elite now apparently believes the public has been conditioned into complacency when forced to submit to such things as mandatory mental health screenings. Alexis De Tocqueville in Democracy in America in 1840 warned of this when he explained: Above this race of men stands an immense and tutelary power, which takes upon itself alone to secure their gratifications and to watch over their fate. That power is absolute, minute, regular, provident, and mild. It would be like the authority of a parent... It provides for their security, foresees and supplies their necessities, facilitates their pleasures, manages their principal concerns, directs their industry. . . . After having thus successively taken each member of the community in its powerful grasp and fashioned him at will, the supreme power then extends its arm over the whole community. It covers the surface of society with a network of small complicated rules, minute and uniform... The will of man is not shattered, but softened, bent, and guided... It does not tyrannize, but it compresses, enervates, extinguishes, and stupifies a people, till each nation is reduced to nothing better than a flock of timid and industrious animals, of which the government is the shepherd.... It is vain to summon a people who have been rendered so dependent on the central power to choose from time to time the representatives of that power; this rare and brief exercise of their free choice ... will not prevent them from gradually losing the faculties of thinking, feeling, and acting for themselves, and thus gradually falling below the level of humanity.

Commenting on Illinois' Children's Mental Health Act of 2003, which has flowed from the New Freedom Initiative's initial impetus, Laura Dawn Lewis has described the reasons we all should be concerned. She believes that this act, which requires all children through age eighteen years and all pregnant women to be tested for mental health needs, is wrong because it is profiling, compulsory, a violation of privacy, and unconstitutional.

U.S. Rep. Ron Paul attempted to stop the federal government from mandatory mental health screenings, but he failed. On November 20, 2004, Congress passed the omnibus spending bill without Rep. Paul's amendment, which provided that none of the funds made available
for the State Incentive Grants for transformation should be used for any programs of
mandatory or universal mental-health screening that performs mental-health screening on
anyone under 18 years of age without the express, written permission of the parents or
legal guardians of each individual involved.

Kent Snyder, executive director of the Liberty Committee (founded by Rep. Paul), remarked:
"We believe the drug companies and the psychiatric establishment convinced Senators Arlen
Specter and Bill Frist to block it." Apparently, the U.S. Senate does not care about parental
rights when it comes to something as psychologically invasive as the forced mental health
screening of children.

Clearly, the government is seeking more and more power over us, and desires the ability to
track us wherever we go. Three days before the Idaho Statesman article, WorldNetDaily
(WND) on October 7 published "Life With Big Brother: Feds plan to track every car," detailing
how the federal Intelligent Transportation Systems Joint Program Office will not only track
(using global positioning satellite, GPS, technology) the movement of every vehicle in the
nation, but it will also archive this information in massive databases for future use. The first
models of vehicles with transceivers, or "onboard units," that will transmit data will be
unveiled in 2005, with the goal of equipping 57 million vehicles by 2015. According to the
WND article, John Worthington, president and CEO of TransCore (one of the companies
currently under contract to develop the onboard units for cars), described the system as
"kind of an Orwellian all-singing, all-dancing collector/aggregator/disseminator of
transportation information." And three days after the Idaho Statesman article, the federal
Food and Drug Administration (FDA) on October 13 approved an implantable computer chip
containing hospital patients' medical information. Of course, best of all from the power
elite's perspective would be if every American had a national ID card. In that regard, WND on
December 8 published "Intel bill to institute national ID system?" which began with the
words: "A Republican congressman is decrying the intelligence reform bill set to pass
Congress today, saying it creates a de facto national ID-card system. Rep. Ron Paul, R-
Texas, says by establishing standards for state drivers' licenses on a federal level, the
government is setting up a national system that's 'not proper in a free society.'" He further
stated that a national identification card, in whatever form it may take, will allow the
federal government to inappropriately monitor the movements and transactions of every
American. History shows that governments inevitably use such power in harmful ways. The
9-11 commission, whose recommendations underlie this bill, has called for internal
screening points where identification will be demanded. Domestic travel restrictions are the
hallmark of authoritarian states, not free nations. It is just a matter of time until those who
refuse to carry the new licenses will be denied the ability to drive or board an airplane.
Nationalizing standards for drivers licenses and birth certificates, and linking them together
via a national database, creates a national ID system pure and simple. This legislation
imposes federal standards in a federal bill, and it creates a federalized ID regardless of
whether the ID itself is still stamped with the name of your state. Rep. Paul likened an
internal checkpoint plan to a "Soviet-style internal passport system."

In the companion to this series on "Mental Health, Education and Social Control," I had
mentioned that Ford Foundation president H. Rowan Gaither in the fall of 1953 told the
Congressional Reece Committee staff director Norman Dodd: Of course, you know that we at
the executive level here were, at one time or another, active in either the OSS, the State
Department, or the European Economic Administration. During those times, and without
exception, we operated under directives issued by the White House. We are continuing to be
guided by just such directives. . . . The substance [of these directives] was to the effect that
we should make every effort to so alter life in the United States as to make possible a
comfortable merger with the Soviet Union. Fulfilling the power elite's dialectical plan of
synthesizing western Capitalism and eastern Communism into a world Socialist government,
it clearly looks like we are moving in that direction with more and more government control
being exercised over Americans' lives. There are many who believe that recent federal
legislation mandates mental health screening of children. However, it does not! Therefore, it
seems appropriate at this time to explain what has transpired and why there are concerns.
In February 2001, almost immediately after taking office, President George W. Bush announced his New Freedom Initiative. Then on April 29, 2002, President Bush established the New Freedom Commission on Mental Health (NFCMH), which developed a number of recommendations, among which was mental health screening for Americans, especially children. Then, H.R. 5006 was introduced into the U.S. House of Representatives, and it was later rolled into the larger H.R. 4818, which on December 8, 2004, became Public Law 108-447. In this law, Division F, Title II concerns "Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services," which provides funds for mental health "data collection and evaluation activities." Since it was logical to assume this could include mental health screenings, U.S. Rep. Ron Paul tried to amend the earlier legislation (H.R. 5006) to exclude such screenings, but he was defeated. Later, he tried to amend legislation at least to require parental permission before such screenings would occur. However, he was once again defeated, primarily by U.S. Senate leader Bill Frist and Sen. Arlen Specter. This logically has resulted in the conclusion that Congress indeed does want to allow funds from this public law to be used for mental health screening of children, perhaps even without parental permission. To try to overcome this, Rep. Paul on January 4, 2005, introduced H.R. 181 into the new 109th Congress. The bill is titled "To Prohibit the Use of Federal Funds for Any Universal or Mandatory Mental Health Screening Program" (short title: "Parental Consent Act of 2005").

Although there is no federal law mandating mental health screening, lawyer Phyllis Schlafly in her November 24, 2004, article "No Child Left Unmedicated" has written that "President Bush has instructed 25 federal agencies to develop a plan to implement the NFCMH's recommendations." In her article, she further explained that the NFCMH recommends "routine and comprehensive" testing and mental health screening for every child in America, including preschoolers. . . . The NFCMH proposes utilizing electronic medical records for mental health interrogation of both children and adults for mental illnesses in school and during routine physical exams. The NFCMH also recommends integrating electronic health records and personal health information systems. The NFCMH recommends "linkage" of these mental examinations with "state-of-the-art treatments" using "specific medications for specific conditions." ... "State-of-the-art treatments" will result in many thousands of children being medicated by expensive, ineffective, and dangerous drugs. The long-term safety and effectiveness of psychiatric medications on children have never been proven. The side effects of suggested medications in children are severe. They include suicide, violence, psychosis, cardiac toxicity, and growth suppression. Several school shooters, such as Eric Harris (Columbine) and Kip Kinkel (Oregon) had been on antidepressants or stimulants when they committed their crimes. ... A Columbia University pilot project of screening students called TeenScreen resulted in one-third being flagged as 'positive' for mental health problems, and half of those being turned over for mental health treatment. If this is a preview of what would happen when 52 million public school students are screened, it would mean hanging a libellous label on 17 million American children and putting 8 million children into the hands of the psychiatric/pharmaceutical industry.

And to make it clear that the NFCMH recommendations do not only include children, Dr. Karen Effrem at Phyllis Schlafly's Eagle Forum Conference on September 18, 2004, explained that the NFCMH recommends "screening for mental disorders in primary health care, across the life span, and connect to treatment and supports." Dr. Effrem emphasized, "That is cradle-to-grave."

In the earlier part to this series, I mentioned that President Bush had appointed Sidney Taurel, chairman and CEO of Eli Lilly, to the Homeland Security Advisory Council. Eli Lilly & Co. (pharmaceuticals) has manufactured thimerosal, a mercury-based preservative recently removed from childhood vaccines, which has been the subject of recent lawsuits. On November 4, 2002, WRAL television in Raleigh, North Carolina, aired a report stating that "a study sanctioned by the Centres for Disease Control and Prevention shows infants immunized with thimerosal vaccines were 2.5 times more likely to develop neurological disorders, but it was never released (autismlayer.net)." And on December 11, 2004, Reuters
reporters Maggie Fox and Joanne Kenen wrote that members of both the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate vowed to get rid of controversial provisions, slipped quietly into the Homeland Security Act, that they say benefit vaccine makers at the expense of children with autism and other diseases. Tennessee Republican Sen. Bill Frist said the provisions came from a bill he was sponsoring that was aimed at encouraging more companies to make vaccines.

Another drug widely used on children today is Ritalin, which was first marketed by Ciba Company in 1957. According to The Dan Smoot Report (August 17, 1970), In the 1960s, psychologists discovered that Ritalin works on the central nervous system in children, with a tranquillizing effect. By the late 1960s, Ritalin was being used widely as a personality-changing, mind-controlling drug on small children. [But some] authorities expressed grave concern. Dr. John Dorsey, a Birmingham paediatrician, said: 'Here we are trying ... to combat increased use of drugs in adolescents, and the schools are recommending that kids be put on this personality-changing drug at the age of five and six.' ... Fritz Redl, professor of behavioural science at Wayne State, said 'Ritalin and related drugs are just one more threat in the continuing chemical warfare we are waging on our children.' —See 'Drug Is Called Peril to Pupils' by Robert Kraus, Detroit Free Press, November 7, 1969

More recently, Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes on the Fox News Network (September 26, 2002) interviewed Neil Bush (President Bush's brother) and his son, Pierce. Colmes began by saying, Neil Bush says too many parents are pressured by educators to give their kids powerful drugs they really don't need. Seven years ago, teachers diagnosed his own son, Pierce, with Attention Deficit Disorder. And doctors prescribed Ritalin to help him concentrate. They later found out Pierce never had ADD. Pierce Bush said ADD is "way overdiagnosed," and both Neil Bush and Sean Hannity said drugs are "overprescribed" for children. Hannity then commented, "Ritalin acts on the brain the same way cocaine does. And you see now there's a lot of abuse of Ritalin." Given what Neil and Pierce Bush said, one must wonder why President Bush isn't being more cautious concerning the mental health aspects of his New Freedom Initiative? Perhaps it is because of the influence of communitarianism upon his thinking. In Dana Milbank's February 1, 2001 Washington Post article, "Needed: Catchword for Bush Ideology; 'Communitarianism' Finds Favor," one reads: "Some Bush advisors and friends say ... his actions have less to do with the left vs. the right than with his embrace of many of the ideas contained in the movement known as "communitarianism," which places the importance of society ahead of the unfettered rights of the individual.

"This is the ultimate Third Way," said Don Eberly, an advisor in the Bush White House, using a favourite phrase of President Clinton. ... Bush's inaugural address, said George Washington University professor Amitai Etzioni, a communitarian thinker, "was a communitarian text." ... That's no accident: Bush's advisors consulted on the speech with Robert D. Putnam of Harvard University (a leading communitarian thinker). At the same time, Bush has recruited some of the leading thinkers of the "civil society," or "communitarian," movements to his White House... Top Bush strategist Karl Rove introduced Bush to the thinking.

Returning to former FBI agent Dan Smoot, in his Report of October 31, 1966, he asked, "When will our water supplies be similarly treated with mind-control drugs to promote mental health?" Smoot further indicated that on August 14, 1965, Health Bulletin quoted Dr. Joseph W. Goldzieher, a Texas physician, as saying that governments could control quantity and quality of populations by use of birth-control chemicals, made compulsory upon entire populations "just as salt is iodized or water is fluoridated." It is worth emphasizing here Dr. Goldzieher's reference to fluoridated water, because prior to its use in water, fluoride had been primarily associated with bug and rat poison. In 1947, President Harry Truman appointed Oscar R. Ewing to head the Federal Security Agency, which included the Public Health Service (later HEW). Ewing hired Edward Bernays (Sigmund Freud's nephew) to develop a propaganda campaign which was successful in getting the
American public to accept water fluoridation. Bernays in 1928 had authored Propaganda, in which he wrote:

Those who manipulate the organized habits and opinions of the masses constitute an invisible government which is the true ruling power of the country. ... It remains a fact that in almost every act of our daily lives, whether in the sphere of politics or business, in our social conduct or our ethical thinking, we are dominated by the relatively small number of persons. ... It is they who pull the wires which control the public mind, who harness old social forces and contrive new ways to bind and guide the world. ... As civilization has become more complex, and as the need for invisible government has been increasingly demonstrated, the technical means have been invented and developed by which opinion may be regimented.

In case the American public doesn't believe the current Bush administration is capable of using "propaganda," it should be remembered that in early January 2005, it was revealed that the administration had paid commentator Armstrong Williams $240,000 to promote "No Child Left Behind." By the late 1940s, a "science of coercion" had been developed, and in Colin Simpson's Science of Coercion: Communication Research and Psychological Warfare 1945-1960, he refers to the engineering of consent of targeted populations at home and abroad. . . . Various leaders in the social sciences engaged one another in tacit alliances to promote their particular interpretation of society. . . . They regarded mass communication as a tool for social management and as a weapon in social conflict.... Key academic journals of the day ... concentrated on how modern technology could be used by elites to manage social change, extract political concessions, or win purchasing decisions from targeted audiences...This orientation reduced the extraordinarily complex, inherently communal process of communication to simple models based on the dynamics of transmission of persuasive—and, in the final analysis, coercive—messages.

Returning to the subject of water fluoridation, what the American public was not told is how the Nazis had used it to control people. In Dr. Swinburne Clymer's The Age of Treason (1957), he revealed: Charles Eliot Perkins, a research worker in chemistry, biochemistry, physiology and pathology,... was sent by the United States Government to help take charge of the I. G. Farben chemical plants in Germany at the end of the Second World War. What follows are statements from a letter which Mr. Perkins wrote the Lee Foundation for Nutritional Research on October 2, 1954... In the 1930s Hitler and the German Nazis envisioned a world to be dominated and controlled by the Nazi philosophy.... The German chemists worked out a very ingenious and far-reaching plan of mass control which was submitted to and adopted by the German General Staff. This plan was to control the population in any given area through mass medication of drinking water supplies. By this method they could control the population of whole areas, reduce population by water medication that would produce sterility in the women, and so on. In this scheme of mass control, sodium fluoride occupied a prominent place... The real purpose behind water fluoridation is to reduce the resistance of the masses to domination and control and loss of liberty. . . . There is a small area of the brain tissue that is responsible for the individual's power to resist domination. Repeated doses of infinitesimal amounts of fluorine will in time gradually reduce the individual's power to resist domination by slowly poisoning and narcotizing this area of the brain tissue and make him submissive to the will of those who wish to govern him. . . ." Not only did the Nazis control populations via water fluoridation, but also through eugenics as well. In Source Book on European Governments (1937) by William Rappard, Walter R. Sharp, et al, one reads:

A new educational policy has been developed by the Nazis and is now in operation.... The terms of an express order issued by the Minister of Education on January 15, 1935 [are] to the effect that courses of instruction in biology shall deal primarily with questions of heredity,... mental traits. ... It is the duty of such institutions to separate the unsuitable and unworthy from those more fitted and capable of advancement and promotion. Constant tests must be made as to physical, moral, mental and general qualifications.
It is important to raise questions about what the so-called experts will be doing concerning the mental health screenings recommended by the New Freedom Commission on Mental Health (NFCMH). Some of these questions have been raised by Dr. Jane Orient (executive director of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons) in her article, "Are Your Children Crazy?" She has asked among many other questions, what are the credentials of the screeners, what are the criteria for possible abnormality, what is the scientific validation, will you be allowed to get a second opinion, can you see the record and enter corrections if indicated, what will happen if your child fails the screen, what sort of treatment will be given, who will supervise it, what if you don't approve of it, can you refuse to participate in the program, and what are the repercussions if you refuse to participate? In case you don't think you have to raise these questions because you haven't heard anything about the NFCMH recommendations being implemented in your state, think again! On January 21, 2005, Leslie La-Prise (information centre manager for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration of the federal Department of Health and Human Services) sent an e-mail stating that "all the states are moving toward implementation of the New Freedom Commission report." In terms of the elite's social control of the populace, what happens to those who resist mental health screenings and the labelling that may ensue is important, given what Erich Fromm wrote in the afterword of the commemorative edition of George Orwell's book 1984. Fromm explains that "Orwell shows quite clearly that in a system in which the concept of truth as an objective judgment concerning reality is abolished, anyone who is a minority of one must be convinced he is insane." Judgments made from mental health screenings as to whether one is "abnormal" will often be subjective rather than representative of objective "truth." If you complain about such screenings, there may be an attempt to isolate you as someone who overreacts. Have you ever heard of parents who went to school about a problem there, only to be told they are the only ones to have complained, even though the "truth" is that other parents have expressed concern about the same problem?
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Dramatic and thought-provoking. Inventive Spelling

It is called “invented spelling” or “inventive spelling,” and many teachers encourage it in the early grades. It's not because they've given up teaching children to spell, but because of a general shift in understanding about how children learn.

When children create their own spellings for words they do not know how to spell correctly they're using invented spelling. They use what they know about letters, sounds and spelling patterns to spell the word as well as they can.

Written in standard spelling, the above excerpt from a first-grader's story would say: “There once was two flowers. One was pink and the other was purple. They did not like each other because they were different colours. One day they had a fight.”

Commentary on Inventive Math (with a little tung in chek tossed in):

Of course, I now realize that I was also a master of inventive math, and I've read that it is still practiced in our schools. Sister James Edward was the dedicated Dominican nun whose misfortune it was to have me in her Algebra II class in 1960, and again in 1961. Today, she would no doubt smile and tweak my cheek playfully, congratulating me for my inventiveness. But in 1960, and again in 1961 the operative word was accuracy.

Things are so much better now. Enlightened educators have come to understand their students' basic need for affirmation and acceptance at every turn. And in this millennium it has become painfully obvious that attempts to confine inventive techniques to spelling and math have gone by the wayside.
Backlash from the Frontline episode utilizing Creative Math to discuss Ritalin usage in children

DEAs take on Ritalin (1996):

The DEA has become alarmed by the tremendous increase in the prescribing of these drugs in recent years. Since 1990, prescriptions for methylphenidate have increased by 500 percent, while prescriptions for amphetamine for the same purpose have increased 400 percent.

Ron Paul’s 2005 take on the efforts of Congress for mental health screenings in public education.

Every parent in America should be made aware of a presidential initiative called the “New Freedom Commission on Mental Health.” This commission issued a report last year calling for the mandatory mental health screening of American schoolchildren, meaning millions of kids will be forced to undergo psychiatric screening whether their parents consent or not. At issue is the fundamental right of parents to decide what medical treatment is appropriate for their children.

Forced mental health screening simply has no place in a free or decent society. The government does not own you or your kids, and it has no legitimate authority to interfere in your family’s intimate health matters. Psychiatric diagnoses are inherently subjective, and the drugs regularly prescribed produce serious side effects, especially in children’s developing brains. The bottom line is that mental health issues are a matter for parents, children, and their doctors, not government.

Unfortunately, however, the mental health screening initiative received funding from House and Senate appropriators in the 2005 federal budget. This funding allows states to create or expand mental health screening programs with your tax dollars. More importantly, the commission recommends a broader federal program in the near future.

Parents “encouraged to cooperate” with the foster care system for “the sake of the children” (2003), but more funding needed for the issue?! "When parents cede their rights in order to place their children in foster care or in a program for delinquent youth, they may also be inadvertently placing their children at risk for abuse or neglect,” the commission said.

The commission said that 5 percent to 9 percent of all children in the United States — at least four million — had serious emotional disturbances. A survey by the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill, an advocacy group, found that parents give up custody to get care for about one-fifth of such children.

While some of the quotes in the commentary may have been taken out of context, the NIMH does confirm that 8.6% of children and teenagers were reported in 2009 to have ADHD and in 2010 that number seems to have increased to 10%.

Searching for some non-government study numbers I discovered a pretty comprehensive site for National and Local issues in the Public Education System is EdWatch.org whose mission as stated is the following:

EdWatch supports knowledge-based education that promotes the American Creed, free enterprise, limited government, and the primacy of parental rights.

Of particular interest is this 2006 pdf titled “Concerns with Indiana’s State Social, Emotional, and Behavioural Health Plan” in which the opening paragraphs state:

INTRODUCTION: Indiana’s (IN) state children’s mental health plan legislation passed in the Spring of 2005 corresponds closely, and in many cases exactly with the legislation passed
in 2004 and state mental health plan being implemented in Illinois (IL), the Florida Strategic plan for infant mental health, as well as legislation proposed, but blocked in Texas (TX) in 2005. This state legislation was in turn based on the New Freedom Commission Report on Mental Health (NFC), the preliminary version being published in 2003. The Federal Mental Health Action Agenda (FMHAA), although published in August of 2005 was in process well before then and also contains many of the same elements. This plan is full of statements and assumptions that are not supported by science by agencies and groups that have a direct financial and policy self-interest in see that these types of programs expand. They are uncritical supporters of screening and treatment without looking at any of the problems with these programs and treatments. The assumptions and ideas in this report are helping to spread universal mental health screening starting in infancy; invasive, non-academic early childhood programs that interfere with parental autonomy; and the use of dangerous, ineffective psychiatric medication.

DANGEROUS ASSUMPTIONS:

It is government’s job via the schools and other agencies to monitor, screen, set norms regarding, and intervene in the social emotional and behavioural health for all of Indiana’s children, beginning at birth, as long as active parental consent is obtained – The plan says on p. 30, “Assure earlier identification and intervention of mental health disorders in infants and toddlers and young children by providing practitioners with mental health consultation and training to increase their capacity to identify and assist families with infants and young children whose behaviour has begun to deviate from the normal range of development.”

Six pages of highly detailed scientific facts follow on why Mental Health Screening (MHS) has become a “solution seeking a problem”.

It appears that the general understanding that MHSing is perpetuated by those who would benefit economically or in some way socially through the “Dumbing Down” of publicly educated children (some of those may be educators who grew up in the system therefore continuing the circle of damage) is already well-known.

After viewing the above on youtube, I encourage all parents to investigate exactly what the Screening process affecting their children might be and also be aware that one has options concerning programs such as “TeenScreen” (ages 12 – 18) which is being used in 46 states at this point.

TeenScreen utilizes “passive consent” – knowing that this program even exists can be challenging when most teens returning home from school will tell you they “done nothing” all day. I'm a parent, I've seen it!

Attempting to skate past the radar with “passive consent”

In some areas, TeenScreen currently uses what they call “passive consent” or “opt-out consent”, which requires no written parental approval to screen their child. Instead, a passive consent form is sent home to parents with the child and if they don't return it, signed by their parents, TeenScreen considers that the parents approve. But what if a parent never sees the form? What if the child never delivers it? Leslie McGuire, TeenScreen’s Co-Director, says: “Unless we hear from you that we can't screen your child we assume we have your permission and we're gonna' screen them.” TeenScreen officials discovered that using (illegal) passive consent boosted the number of teens to be tested from 50% to over 95%.

In the end, only a parent can make the decision if this is an issue in their family. The dramatic music and sometimes unsupported “facts” make one cringe, however the overall message is one we see in American Society today. Children are receiving a poorer education, increasing on the rolls of “mentally ill”, and suffering. Maya may be a fictional
character designed to tug at ones heartstrings, but your child is real. Take the time to investigate.

**Horrific Mind Control: Children age TWO to get lessons in anger management and how to contain themselves**

Google the article for yourself to find out which paper it was from as I can't be arsed to.

**War mongering Britain:**

*The proposal is part of a package drawn up by Mr Taylor to improve provision for disruptive youngsters in the wake of last summer's riots*

Children as young as two who are violent and aggressive at nursery will be targeted for lessons in social skills and ‘how to contain themselves’, under plans unveiled yesterday.

The most disruptive could be sent to special centres to learn how to control their anger and get on with classmates before starting formal school.

Under the proposals made by the Government's behaviour tsar, schools and nurseries will be encouraged to identify children who could benefit from help to tackle their behaviour and stop them being expelled.

Unveiling the plan, school discipline expert Charlie Taylor said the aim was to help children early ‘rather than waiting until they are throwing tables around when they are 14 or 15’.

He said it was easier to tackle poor behaviour among young children because habits were less ingrained. ‘If you can see it coming when they are two or three or four or five, then that's when we can intervene,’ he said.

Following an inquiry, he found that too many pupils who have been kicked out of school are left languishing in so-called ‘sin bins’.

Mr Taylor, headmaster of the Willows School, in West London, which caters exclusively for pupils with behavioural and emotional problems, said: ‘Often these children are showing some quite extreme behaviours very early on, so very aggressive, violent. Also some difficulties around speech and language very often as well. Often not potty trained.’

Mr Taylor said young children should learn ‘simple social skills like asking for stuff without hitting people’.

‘It's about training them how to be in school, how to behave properly in school, what the rules are, how to contain themselves, how to express themselves,’ he said.

In a report published yesterday, Mr Taylor calls for an ‘increased focus on effective assessment and identification of children's needs’.

It adds: ‘This should take place as early as possible and before a child's behaviour has deteriorated to the extent that permanent exclusion is the only option.’

From the age of two, youngsters could be given intensive help from expert staff from outside their nursery, and in some cases sent to specialist nurseries.

**Discipline expert: Government advisor Charlie Taylor says the aim is to help children early.**

From five, disruptive youngsters could be placed in pupil referral units, which will become more closely linked to schools.

Pupils would be encouraged to return quickly to their mainstream classes instead of spending years 'out of sight, out of mind' in a referral unit.
Mr Taylor’s school has a nursery section which accepts up to eight children at a time aged between three and five.

‘The best thing that happens in my own school by miles...is actually the intervention we do with three and four-year-olds,’ he said.

what is being planned for the future of psychological care surely will. Read them about all about three times each.

Now these people want to get involved with your child BEFORE it is born! The next logical step after that, is FORCED ABORTION. Think about it when you have finished reading this, the next step after this is to say "Mrs So an So, we think you are going to have a bad baby, so we recommend you have an abortion" or worse still they’ll enact some law to stop “certain” types of people from having children, most likely the poor, and by some crazy coincidence, all those people with a bit more of a tan than us palefaces. To use this occurrence as an excuse to talk openly about what is really just an old school euthanasia or eugenics programme is downright evil, NO-ONE CAN JUDGE A CHILD THAT HAS NOT YET BEEN BORN, UNLESS OF COURSE THEY CONSIDER THEMSELVES TO BE A GOD.

I’m Mark Easton, the BBC’s home editor. This is where I discuss the way we live in the ever-changing UK.

How early should something be done?

The appalling crimes of the two small boys in Doncaster lead, inevitably, to the question: "Should something have been done earlier?"

The answer must be yes - but the evidence is that something should have been done much, much earlier. Before the neighbours saw them scavenging for food and clothing. Before they got into trouble with police for violence and burglary. Before they were expelled from their local primary school.

What these children’s behaviour tells us is that they lacked empathy. Empathy is the ability to share and understand another person’s emotions and feelings - to put oneself in someone else’s shoes. Without it, even very young children are capable of horrifying cruelty.

I remember making a film for Newsnight in 1993 after the conviction of two 10-year-olds for the murder of the toddler James Bulger. What I wanted to understand was how such young children could commit such a ghastly crime. My research took me to Edinburgh, I recall, and a research programme looking at the bonding of mothers and babies.

A mother was put into a sealed room with her infant and monitored by cameras. She was instructed to avoid making eye contact with the baby, whatever the child might do.

As we watched through a two-way glass, the baby began quickly to become agitated. Within a few minutes, its apparent desperation to make eye contact with its mother resulted in tears. A few minutes later, the child was almost hysterical - red in the face and screaming. The experiment was stopped.

I was asked to imagine the same situation in a domestic setting - a young mother, perhaps herself a victim of abuse, struggling to bring up a child in a chaotic household. Without help and support, it was suggested, such distress might generate further chaos and itself lead to the abuse of the child.

I then went to a project which supported mothers with "difficult" toddlers. Even by the age of two, these children were clearly emotionally injured - some biting and scratching other kids, others cowering in a corner.
My final stop was an organisation in Oxford which cared for deeply troubled children from the age of about seven. They told me, to my surprise, that in some cases the damage was so bad that the youngsters would never fully recover. Before their eighth birthday, it was already too late to rescue them.

That was 16 years ago. Three years ago, I was invited to interview the then prime minister, Tony Blair at Chequers, in an exclusive for the BBC. He told me of his conviction that one answer to the problem of anti-social behaviour in children was to target vulnerable pregnant women.

He showed me tables and graphs, brain scans of babies and scientific reports. His conclusion was that we could spot children at risk of becoming socially problematic before they were born, and that if we provided the right support, the benefits for those families and wider society would be huge.

Some papers dubbed his idea FASBOs - foetus ASBOs - and ridiculed the notion that government should brand babies as troublemakers even before they had left the womb. But the idea of very early intervention is no longer quite the stuff of partisan politics.

Former Tory leader Iain Duncan Smith and the Labour MP Graham Allen are both evangelical about it and have together written a pamphlet on the subject.

We have seen the introduction of Family Nurse Partnerships in some parts of the country, offering intensive support for vulnerable, first time, young parents.

Family Intervention Projects, piloted in Dundee and the north west of England, have shown encouraging results when "a strong, persistent and assertive key worker" works with chaotic families - offering intensive support but with the threat of sanctions.

From what we know of the Doncaster case, it would appear that the family of the two young boys had been allowed to go from chaos to catastrophe. Yes, something should have been done. But probably it needed to happen before the children were even born.

This article is so unbelievably nazi-ish that I find it frightening. Once "They" decide who is going to have "bad" children, what is the next step? Forced abortion? Sterilization? Banning certain "unworthy" types from having kids at all? People, WTF is happening to us? What the hell are we becoming?

Child brain scans to pick out future criminals

The seeds of criminal and anti-social behaviour can be found in children as young as three, scientists have claimed.

By Richard Alleyne, Science Correspondent 12:29AM GMT 22 Feb 2011 The Telegraph

More researchers believe that violent tendencies have a biological basis and that tests and brain imaging can pick them up in children.

They argue that, by predicting which children have the potential to be trouble, treatments could be introduced to keep them on the straight and narrow. If the tests are accurate enough then a form of screening could be introduced in the same way we test for some diseases.

The theories were put forward by two leading criminologists at the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Washington.

Prof Adrian Raine, a British criminologist, argued that abnormal physical brain make-up could be a cause of criminality, as well as helping to predict it.
His studies have shown that psychopaths and criminals have smaller areas of the brain such as the amygdala and prefrontal cortex, both of which regulate and control emotion and behaviour. He also believes that a lack of conditioning to fear punishment, which can be measured in toddlers before disruptive behaviour is apparent, could also be a strong indicator.

Dr Nathalie Fontaine, who also spoke at the conference, argued that children as young as four exhibited “callous unemotional traits” such as lack of guilt and empathy that could also suggest future bad behaviour. Linking these features with “conduct problems” such as throwing tantrums could be a strong way to predict who could be anti-social in later life.

Both speakers said that identifying these issues earlier could be important in stopping children from becoming criminals.

Dr Raine, a former Home Office psychologist who works at the University of Pennsylvania, said therapy could include counselling to counteract innate behavioural problems and boosting the brain with drugs or foods rich in Omega 3.

Dr Fontaine, from Indiana University, said the work showed that punishment did not necessarily work and that reinforcing positive behaviour rather than punishing bad might be the solution.

“If we could identify those children early enough, we could help them as well as their families,” she said.

Dr Fontaine used data from more than 9,000 twins from the Twins Early Development Study, a survey of twins born in England and Wales between 1994 and 1996. Assessments of callous unemotional traits and conduct problems were based on teacher questionnaires when the children were seven, nine and 12. Information was taken from parents when the children were as young as four.

She found there was a correlation between risk factors at a young age and bad behaviour at an older age.

Dr Raine said he acknowledged the ethical implications of treating children before they had done anything wrong, but argued that “biological” causes of crime could not be ignored.

“We could be ostriches and stick our heads in the sand but I believe we have to pursue the causes of crime at a biological and genetic level as well as at a social,” he said.

Green light for genetic screening for inherited diseases

There are no specific "social, ethical or legal" reasons why couples cannot undergo pre-pregnancy genetic screening on the NHS to determine if they are at risk of passing on diseases, according to a new report.

From the Telegraph 9:46AM BST 06 Apr 2011

The Human Genetics Commission (HGC) gave the green light to preconception genetic tests to determine whether people carry conditions that could be passed on to their future children.

The HGC developed the guidance following a request for advice from the UK National Screening Committee.

The UK committee will now decide whether widespread screening should be introduced in places such as GP surgeries, family planning centres, IVF clinics and pharmacies.

Diseases such as cystic fibrosis or sickle cell disease can develop in youngsters if both parents are carriers of the genetic condition.
At the moment, only people with a known risk of inherited disease, or those with access to local programmes, can get the tests.

Dr Frances Flinter, chair of the working group which developed the report, said: "At the moment, preconception genetic testing only occurs if an individual knows they are at risk of carrying a genetic condition or they belong to a community which has set up a local screening programme.

"This means many individuals or couples do not discover that they carry a genetic condition until they are pregnant.

"A preconception test rather than a test during pregnancy or after a child is born will ensure greater patient choice and access to information that will help support people who are planning to have children.

"There is variable and inconsistent access to these tests in the UK.

"We believe there are no specific social, ethical or legal principles that prevent preconception genetic testing in population screening programmes, which would help ensure fairer access to these tests."

The report recommends preconception genetic testing is made available to "all those who may benefit from it".

People should also be given advice so they can make informed choices about the reproductive options available to them.

Where antenatal testing is currently offered then, where technically feasible, preconception screening should also be offered, the report said.

Children and young people should also learn about antenatal and preconception screening in the final years of school.

A spokesman for the Department of Health said: "Genetic screening can be a powerful diagnostic tool in assessing an individual's risk of conditions such as cystic fibrosis.

"But there are a number of considerations that are broader than the remit of this report which influence whether specific screening programmes should be established.

"The UK National Screening Committee will now consider the findings."

Today's report said that if screening for older schoolchildren and young people is introduced it would be essential to make sure they are not pressured into having the tests.

Couples found to be at risk of conceiving a baby with a genetic condition should be referred to experts in the condition and their options for pregnancy considered.

If genetic conditions are identified during the course of other screening tests, such as at birth, the results should be "provided to GPs and stored in a secure and accessible format so that the children have this information when they reach adulthood", the report said.

Keep in mind what you have already learned in the earlier chapter's about psychiatric screening of our young, add this last article to that and then also consider the couple of articles about screening for criminality that I included a moment ago and you have what I can only describe as a living nightmare for our young, because one of these wacky schemes will no doubt flag an abnormality with EVERY child that is “screened”. – (I will discuss the “genetic” angle to all of this at the end of this work and throughout book three)

And to continue this horrible chapter on psychiatric drugs, care, and standards, let me now show that the old are just as viable target's as the young are to these murdering parasites:
Dementia 'chemical cosh' warning

By Nick Triggle  Health reporter, BBC News

Nearly 150,000 dementia patients each year are given anti-psychotic drugs unnecessarily, an official review says.

The figure represents four in five of all the people who are being prescribed the drugs in care homes, hospitals and their own homes to manage aggression.

The use of the drugs - dubbed a chemical cosh - is linked to 1,800 deaths as well as leaving people struggling after strokes and falls.

The government in England has agreed to take steps to reduce use of the drugs.

These include:

- Improving access to other types of therapy, such as counselling
- Better monitoring of prescribing practices
- Guidance for families explaining what they can do if they are worried about drug use
- Specialist training in dementia for health and social care staff
- Appointment of a new national director for dementia to oversee the measures

The review - and the government pledge to take action - comes after long-running concerns about the use of anti-psychotic drugs.

Over the past 30 years, the NHS has increasingly turned to the treatment, which was originally aimed at people with schizophrenia, as it has struggled to cope with the rise in people with dementia.

'Different mindset'

There are currently 700,000 people in the UK with the condition, but this is expected to rise to one million in the next 10 years because of the ageing population.

The review, led by King's College London expert Professor Sube Banerjee, accepted that for some people anti-psychotic drugs would be necessary.

But it said they should be used only for a maximum of three months and when the person represented a risk to themselves or others.

Professor Banerjee estimated that of the 180,000 people given the drugs each year, only 36,000 benefited.

He said health and social care services needed to develop a "different mindset".

He believes if the steps the government has agreed to are followed, anti-psychotic drug use could be reduced by two-thirds within three years.

Care services minister Phil Hope agreed action was needed.

"We know there are situations where anti-psychotic drug use is necessary - we're not calling for a ban, but we do want to see a significant reduction in use."

Neil Hunt, chief executive of the Alzheimer's Society, said the long-awaited review was a welcome recognition of the scale of the problem.
He added: "This goes beyond quality of care. It is a fundamental rights issue.

"Our members tell us of enormous worry and distress over what is happening to their loved ones."

But Paul Burstow, a Liberal Democrat MP who has been campaigning on the issue for years, said the measures were long overdue.

"This review comes much too late for thousands of elderly people whose lives have been cut short by the reckless prescribing of anti-psychotic drugs."

'Scandalous abuse' of the elderly prescribed antipsychotics in hospital exposed

Tens of thousands of vulnerable dementia patients are being prescribed 'chemical cosh' drugs in hospital wards in a 'scandalous abuse' of the elderly, ten leading health organisations have said in a letter to The Daily Telegraph.

By Rebecca Smith, Medical Editor The Telegraph  Published: 7:40AM BST 07 Oct 2009

Three quarters of nurses have seen people with dementia in general wards in hospital prescribed antipsychotic drugs that are known to double the risk of death and triple the risk of a stroke in these patients, research has shown.

It is the first time the scale of the abuse in hospital wards is exposed, following warnings that 100,000 dementia patients in care homes are prescribed the drugs leading to the deaths of 23,000 a year.

Ten leading charities, carers groups and experts have written to The Daily Telegraph saying: "We cannot stand by while this scandalous abuse of vulnerable citizens continues."

Neil Hunt, Chief Executive of Alzheimer's Society said: "The massive over prescription of antipsychotics to people with dementia is an abuse of human rights, causing serious side effects and increasing risk of death. These powerful drugs should only be used in a small number of cases. The Government must take action to ensure that these drugs are only ever used as a last resort."

They have called on the government to publish its long-overdue review of the use of antipsychotics which ministers promised would be out in May of this year.

Rebecca Wood, Chief Executive of the Alzheimer's Research Trust, said: "While the Department of Health prevaricates, thousands of people are being put at risk through the misuse of antipsychotics."

There are 700,000 people in Britain with dementia and the numbers are rising rapidly.

Antipsychotics have a sedative effect and are not licensed for use in dementia but are prescribed when patients become agitated or difficult and often then are left on them for long periods.

A survey by the Alzheimer's Society of over 1,000 nurses and nurse managers working on general wards in hospitals found more than three quarters said antipsychotics were used always or sometimes and one quarter said that the drugs were used inappropriately.

Mr Hunt said the numbers of patients prescribed the drugs in hospital is likely to be in the order of tens of thousands.

The letter to The Daily Telegraph reads: "100,000 people with dementia in care homes are being inappropriately prescribed a damaging chemical cosh of antipsychotic drugs and new research suggests that there is a significant problem in hospitals too."
"Antipsychotics should only ever be a last resort. This over prescription is abuse and it must stop.

"The government must urgently publish its plans to tackle the overuse of antipsychotics. These plans must deliver better support for people with dementia and those working with them as well as cracking down on inappropriate prescribing practice.

"We need to make good care the norm and move away from resorting to dangerous drugs which can increase confusion and the risk of premature death. We must all work together to improve dementia care.

"We cannot stand by while this scandalous abuse of vulnerable citizens continues."

It is signed by Neil Hunt, Chief Executive, Alzheimer’s Society; Rebecca Wood, Chief Executive, Alzheimer's Research Trust; Jeremy Wright MP, Chair, All Party Parliamentary Group on Dementia; Tim Hammond, Managing Director, Barchester Healthcare; Andrew Harrop, Head of Policy, Age Concern and Help the Aged; Martin Green, Chief Executive, English Community Care Association; Imelda Redmond, Chief Executive, Carers UK; David Rogers, Chair Local Government Association Community Wellbeing Board; Stephen Burke, Chief Executive, Counsel and Care; Karen Jennings, Head of Health, UNISON; and Des Kelly, Director, National Care Forum.

Earlier this year, a study published in Lancet Neurology found that antipsychotic drugs double risk of death for many patients if used over a three year period. A second study, using the records of six million people, published by the British Medical Journal online found antipsychotics tripled the risk of stroke in dementia patients.

Around 100,000 people with dementia are routinely prescribed antipsychotics in UK care homes. This could mean 23,500 people dying prematurely, according to a 2008 report by Paul Burstow MP.

Ms Wood added: "After so many delays, the government must take swift and decisive action.

"Alzheimer's Research Trust scientists at the Institute of Psychiatry are investigating alternative safer means of reducing agitation among dementia patients. We must urgently develop safe and effective treatments for people with dementia.

"By breaking its promise to take prompt action on the misuse of antipsychotic drugs the government is failing the most vulnerable people in our society."

On April 1st this year Phil Hope, health minister, told the House of Commons: “I am pleased to be able to tell the House that the antipsychotics review will be completed shortly: that is, in May this year.”

The review is yet to be published.

Dr Dave Anderson, chairman of the Royal College of Psychiatrists' Faculty of Old Age Psychiatry, said: "This is symptomatic of a health and care system ill designed for people with dementia, yet, 30 per cent to 40 per cent of older people admitted to a general hospital will suffer from dementia.

"The staff in general hospitals need access to dementia training and advice from a specialist liaison mental health team for older people if we are to eradicate this problem."

A spokesman for The Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain said: “Pharmacists recognise that once treatment with an antipsychotic has started it will often be continued when a patient is admitted to hospital, and that it is not surprising that hospital nurses also see an overuse of the medicines."
"The role of our profession is to oversee the appropriate use of medicine."

Dr Peter Carter, head of the Royal College of Nursing said: 'This snapshot survey does not suggest that hospitals are awash with antipsychotic drugs.

"It is important to realise that the majority of nurses say these are occasionally used and a quarter agree this is inappropriate. However, these are powerful drugs, and as with all strong drugs the side-effects can be dangerous.

"The important thing is that all staff administering these drugs should receive appropriate training, education and support – this will help them provide the highest standard of care for older people."

A spokesman for the Department of Health said: 'The government commissioned an independent review of prescribing antipsychotics to people with dementia and this is now being peer reviewed in the usual way.

"We expect to publish the review together with the Department's response, shortly.

"This is an important issue which directly affects the experience of people with dementia in all care settings and we want to make sure that we get it right.

"People with dementia should only be offered antipsychotics if they are severely distressed or there is an immediate risk of harm to the person or others."

Dementia patient care criticised

Half of all dementia patients leave hospital in a worse state than when they arrive, it is claimed.

The Alzheimer's Society says patients with dementia stay far longer than patients being treated for the same illness or injury without dementia.

It wants their stays cut by a week, saying it will save the health service millions of pounds.

The government said it had already asked NHS hospitals to take urgent action on this issue.

The Alzheimer's Society blames longer stays on a lack of communication, which can exacerbate problems associated with dementia, such as incontinence.

It says there is a need for better clinical leadership, training of nurses to deal with dementia patients and better co-ordination of support services to allow the patient to come out of hospital.

'Challenging work'

The Alzheimer's Society questioned 1,300 carers who looked after dementia patients and 1,100 nurses in England, Wales and Northern Ireland.

Alzheimer's Scotland said the situation there was not dissimilar.

The main reasons for a hospital stay were falls, broken hips or hip replacements, urine infections, chest infections and strokes.

The average length of a hospital stay is about a week but more than half (57%) of dementia patients with a broken or fractured hip stayed two weeks or more.

For urinary tract infections more than half (53%) stayed two weeks or more.

Nearly half of the carers (47%) said being in hospital had a significantly negative effect on the general physical health of the person with dementia.
And more than half (54%) said being in hospital had made the symptoms of dementia worse.

Most of the nurses (89%) said they found working with people with dementia challenging and 80% said they wanted more access to specialist advice.

The society said most of the hundreds of millions of pounds currently spent on dementia in hospitals could be more effectively invested in workforce development and community services outside the hospital.

Neil Hunt, chief executive of the Alzheimer's Society, said: "It is shocking that people with dementia are occupying up to a quarter of hospital beds yet there are scandalous variations in the quality of dementia care in hospitals.

"At least £80m a year and probably hundreds of millions could be saved if people with dementia are enabled to leave the hospital one week earlier."

Angela Rippon, ambassador for the society, said she had personal experience of what can happen when a person with dementia has to be admitted to hospital.

"It was awful watching my mother so vulnerable and frightened in this strange, noisy environment full of people she didn't know," she said.

"Some people with dementia are not able to eat or drink due to a lack of appropriate dementia care and many are not being treated with dignity and respect.

"But this important study shows us that staff want to be empowered to deliver good quality care."

The Patients' Association said it was a "sad indictment" of the priority our society gives to elderly people.

"There is now an overwhelming amount of evidence that elderly patients are being neglected in hospitals across the NHS.

"Whether they have dementia or not, if they are in need of help with personal care many of them won't get it. Time after time the issue is raised, but the problems continue."

'Proper training'

Care Services Minister Phil Hope said the national dementia strategy published earlier this year had launched a major programme of work to benefit people with dementia across the NHS.

However, he said the report was a reminder of the scale of work that still needs to be done.

"We have set priority areas for all hospitals to take urgent action, including appointing a senior member of staff to improve quality of care for people with dementia, proper training for all staff, and specialist older people's mental health teams working in hospitals.

He said the dementia strategy was backed with "substantial funding" and a national clinical director for dementia was being appointed. "We expect to see urgent improvements so people with dementia and their carers get the best care the NHS has to offer no matter where they are or what treatment they need," he added.
So there you have it my dear reader, these sick cunt’s are lying to you, robbing you, poisoning you, turning your kids into psycho’s, mentally neutering your elderly, sticking ice-pick’s in the brains of children, and electrocuting you. Oh yeah, and they also want to control every single aspect of your whole wretched life from its start to its end.

And if you complain about any of this torture, murder, madness or sadism... (I'm sorry but this is the best bit) - ...If you complain about any of this or their “science” they’ll throw you in one of their exclusive country clubs, sorry did I say country club, I meant to say lunatic asylum. - And now that you have read these last few chapter's you fully realise the (even) worse truth of all of this. - The lunatics actually DO run the asylums, in fact as it turns out, it seems quite certain that they quite probably always have done.

**PSYCHIATRIST’S – (ANALYSE THIS!)**

THERE IS A PART OF ME THAT WOULD LOVE TO STAND IN A ROOM FULL OF THESE TWISTED CONTROL FREAKS, I’D TAKE GREAT PLEASURE IN VERBALLY FUCKING RAPING OR FIST-FUCKING THEM, (AND FEEL FREE TO ANALYSE THAT STATEMENT IN ITS ENTIRETY YOU MOST HEINOUS, SOULLESS, AND FUCKED UP OF INDIVIDUALS) – YOU THINK YOU ARE THE NEW PRIESTHOOD, THE NEW INQUISITION IN FACT, AND WHAT’S MORE YOUR “SCIENCE” IS WORKING WITH THE EXACT SAME AUTHORITY, GOOD INTENTIONS AND MORAL, OR INTELLECTUAL GROUNDING AS THE LAST INQUISITION - ABSOLUTELY NONE WHATSOEVER!

YOU PEOPLE HAVE NO JURISDICTION OVER A SOUL BECAUSE IN TRUTH YOUR ENTIRE PROFESSION LACKS ONE.

AND TO YOU THE READER:

WE NEED TO CHANGE THE LAW (AND QUICKLY) TO ENSURE THAT WE TAKE CERTAIN POWERS AWAY FROM THESE EVIL MINDED BASTARD’S.

THEIR SCIENCE IS PURE VOODOO, AND WHAT’S MORE IT’S ACTUALLY WAY FUCKING SCARIER THAN VOODOO.

HOW CAN THEY POSSIBLY CLAIM TO KNOW THE MIND WHEN IT IS QUITE CLEAR THAT MANY OF THEM ARE TOTALLY AND UTTERLY OUT OF THEIR’S?

WE ARE COLLECTIVELY JUST AS MAD AS THE PEOPLE YOU HAVE JUST READ ABOUT FOR EVER ALLOWING THIS BUNCH OF WITCH DOCTORS TO PRACTISE MEDICINE AND CONTROL ASPECTS OF OUR LIVES IN THE FIRST PLACE.

New psychiatric disorders flag normal human behaviours as "diseases"

Tuesday, March 02, 2010 by Mike Adams, the Health Ranger Editor of NaturalNews.com

The Disease Mongering Engine, which I invented a couple of years ago and posted on NaturalNews, was initially created as a joke to demonstrate the ridiculousness of the fictitious diseases that are constantly created by the psychiatric industry. This hilarious online disease generator (http://www.naturalnews.com/disease-...) allows you to instantly create your own fictitious diseases and disorders such as:

• Repetitive Dysmorphic Nose Picking Disorder With Itching (RDNPDIW)
• Oppositional Disorganized Speaking Disorder With Indigestion (ODSDDIW)
• Chronic Bipolar Anticipation Dysfunction With Smelly Feet (CBADWSF) ... and so on.

Here's the bizarre part: All of a sudden, the new psychiatric diagnostic manual (DSM-V) appears to have adopted as medical fact many of the disorders that were created by the Disease Mongering Engine!
This new manual, for example, now says that spending a lot of time thinking about sex is a disorder. (That immediately paints every teenage boy as "diseased.")

Another new disease is "Oppositional Defiant Disorder" (ODD), which includes anyone who disagrees with authority. All those who are sceptical about the safety of vaccines, for example, are about to be diagnosed with ODD.

Now, people who are antisocial aren't merely antisocial. They're suffering from "Antisocial Personality Disorder" and require pharmacological treatment. So the prick neighbour isn't merely a prick anymore; he's a "sufferer" of a "disorder" who needs "treatment."

Children are no longer unhappy or throwing a temper tantrum, they are suffering from "Temper Dysregulation Disorder with Dysphoria." (I'm not making this up...)

Are you cracking up yet? If George Carlin were still alive today, he'd go berserk over this... Carlin, of course, would have been diagnosed with countless psychiatric disorders just for being different in his own genius way.

Federal law protects jackasses

The examples of ridiculous disorders seems endless. But here's the real kicker in all this: Thanks to federal laws that were designed to protect people who are physically disabled, people who now "suffer" from these fictitious disorders are now protected under federal law. So the antisocial prick jackass working at your office can't be fired now because he's actually suffering from a diagnosed "mental disorder" and he's being "treated" by psychiatrists.

As columnist George Will described it in a Washington Post article, "If every character blemish or emotional turbulence is a "disorder" akin to a physical disability, legal accommodations are mandatory. Under federal law, "disabilities" include any "mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities"; "mental impairments" include "emotional or mental illness." So there might be a legal entitlement to be a jerk."

There might even be legal protections for people who are sexual predators. So the creepy pervert at the office who feels you up in the snack room can't be fired either – he's only suffering from "Hypersexual Disorder", a new disorder now defined as a "mental illness" by the psychiatric manual which describes it, in part, as: "A great deal of time is consumed by sexual fantasies and urges and by planning for and engaging in sexual behaviour." (Well gee, there goes half the population...)

Let's make all the children "normal"

There's another danger in all this psych-tagging of human behaviour: What about all the creative, genius children who operate far beyond the intellectual norms of regular, average kids? As George Will explains:

"Childhood eccentricities, sometimes inextricable from creativity, might be labelled "disorders" to be "cured." If 7-year-old Mozart tried composing his concertos today, he might be diagnosed with attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder and medicated into barren normality."

Based on the new DSM-V, children who don't fit in as dumbed-down, average kids will be flagged as diseased and could be cognitively castrated by whatever psychiatric drugs are necessary to bring them down to the level of all the other kids. Why have exceptional children when they can fit in better as "average!"
It's all just pure disease mongering

The point in all this is that psychiatry has gone completely loony. Now even the mainstream media is seeing the stupidity in naming every human emotion or eccentricity a "disorder."

When the Wall Street Journal and the Washington Post (among other mainstream papers) start questioning the validity of modern psychiatry, you know a line has been crossed.

As the Wall Street Journal reported just yesterday, "Patients who seek psychiatric help today for mood disorders stand a good chance of being diagnosed with a disease that doesn't exist and treated with a medication little more effective than a placebo." (http://online.wsj.com/article/SB100...)

Three years ago, such a sentence only would have appeared on websites like NaturalNews.com, but now these words are appearing in the mainstream media. Amazing.

It just goes to show you that psychiatry has now lost credibility with even the mainstream media that has long support the industry's disease mongering schemes. Psychiatry's greatest achievement over the last decade appears to have been destroying its own integrity, much to the benefit of the world population which would be far better off without psychiatry. That's my opinion, at least. Or maybe I'm just suffering from Oppositional Defiance Disorder like everyone else who thinks for themselves.

Don't forget to generate your own fictitious psychiatric disorders by playing with the Disease Mongering Engine:

http://www.naturalnews.com/disease-...

Depression among the young at alarming level, says charity

Mary O'Hara The Guardian, Monday 5 January 2009

A significant number of young people are depressed or struggling to cope and the situation is likely to worsen as recession takes hold, according to a report by the Prince's Trust. One in 10 16- to 25-year-olds polled by the charity for its Youth Index study said they felt that life was meaningless, and more than a quarter (27%) said they were always or often down or depressed. Almost half of all those surveyed (47%) said they were regularly stressed.

The trust, which interviewed more than 2,000 young people across Britain, said the results were "alarming". Young people not in work, training or education were worst affected, the research found.

Some 37% of those outside paid employment or education admitted to being frequently down or depressed, while 27% said their lives had no purpose. With young people expected to bear the brunt of job losses over the coming year, the findings are likely to raise concerns among policymakers.

Martina Milburn, chief executive of the Prince's Trust, said the study revealed "an increasingly vulnerable generation". Paul Brown, a director at the trust responsible for the research, added: "We already have evidence that young people are likely to be disproportionately affected during a recession. We also know that young people often have problems, especially those without supportive families. That one in 10 young people think their life is not worth living is a really worrying thing to see quantified."
Brown said the Prince's Trust, which provides support to about 40,000 young people a year, is introducing a new mental health awareness programme for team leaders in local projects to identify early signs of distress.

Peter Kellner, of YouGov, which conducted the research, said the majority of young people had a generally positive outlook on life. He warned, however, that the serious concerns of the "core" of unhappy people under the age of 25 "need to be addressed". He added that failing to take the issue seriously "would be storing up big problems for the future".

Concerns about the mental health and wellbeing of young people have risen sharply following reports about the emotional fragility of the current generation of children and teenagers, and problems around violence and knife crime.

In April last year the Children's Society's Good Childhood Inquiry, a state-of-the-nation overview of childhood, said in an interim report that more than a quarter (27%) of the 8,000 14- to 16-year-olds it interviewed regularly felt depressed. The inquiry, a two-year rolling programme of research, also reported that just 9% of adults felt children are happier today than when they were growing up.

The final report, by Lord Richard Layard, the economist and author of the book Happiness, is due to be published at the end of this month. The Prince's Trust research could raise additional concern because it suggests that the emotional malaise already identified by the Children's Society in younger teenagers is stretching into early adulthood.

Why are children today so unhappy?

by SUE PALMER DailyMail.co.uk

We live in one of the wealthiest, most technologically advanced nations on earth. We've had 60 years of peace and prosperity with free education and medical services for all.

Our homes are crammed with labour-saving devices and electronic entertainment that previous generations couldn't even dream of. Surely our children should be growing happier every year?

Well, no. According to figures released last month, one in ten now suffers from a clinically-recognised mental health problem, and earlier this year a UNICEF report on "childhood well-being" found that out of 21 nations across the developed world, British children are the unhappiest.

A damming survey by the National Consumer Council, reported in the Mail, revealed that children who watch too much television and spend hours on the internet are "greedy and unhappy".

"These children argue more with their families, have a lower opinion of their parents, and lower self-esteem than other children," the report said.

Even Gordon Brown has been moved to comment on his determination to halt the "erosion of childhood".

So how is this unhappiness manifesting itself?

Well, there's increasing evidence of mushrooming behavioural problems in our schools, these days even among the very youngest pupils in primary schools. But many unhappy
children lie low, bottling up their misery, and the symptoms don't become apparent until the teenage years.

There again, we see the evidence: the UK has the worst problems with drugs, binge-drinking and under-age sex in Europe.

We're also near the top of international polls for anti-social behaviour, self-harm and eating disorders.

And, according to figures from the Institute for Public Policy Research, last year 24,000 youngsters tried to kill themselves - that's one every 22 minutes.

So what IS happening? After researching the state of modern childhood for over five years, I'm convinced that, as our country has grown richer and more "advanced", we've lost sight of certain fundamental truths about child-rearing.

We've come to believe that 21st century children are different from children in the past - that they can get by with less parental time and attention, skip stages in their development and cope with pressures and emotional burdens children shouldn't have to cope with.

The brutal truth is that they can't. Life may have changed enormously over the past few decades, but the human brain evolves much more slowly - in fact, it hasn't changed since Cro-Magnon times.

All babies are born as little Stone Age babies, and it's up to their parents - supported by their wider community - to help them towards maturity, gradually equipping them with the inner strength, skills and knowledge they need to live in a complex technological culture.

We can't rush this business, we can't opt out of it as individuals or as a society, and we can't miss bits out.

Every adult in Britain - including the politicians and businessmen who determine so many aspects of our daily lives - has to recognise that children's basic developmental needs have not changed over the millennia.

The most obvious ones are the physical ones: food, shelter and sleep.

The "obesity explosion" of recent years shows that society - parents, manufacturers, marketers, even the schools that fed children turkey twizzlers - lost sight of the importance of wholesome food in recent decades.

As for shelter, we've confused that with over-protection, keeping children wrapped in cotton wool to keep them "safe", and thus denying them essential opportunities to learn through real-life experience - actually getting out on their bikes and breathing fresh air.

And in a 24/7 culture, where sleep has been sidelined as electronic entertainment fizzes on throughout the night, children may well be getting less sleep than at any time in human history.

Another essential childhood need is the emotional stability that comes from feeling cared-for and secure.

Tiny babies, who can't feed or look after themselves, need to know someone is caring for them at all times, and are programmed to recognise and become attached to this "someone" by sight, sound, smell and so on.
The carer therefore needs to be a constant and consistent loving presence in the child's life.

We've comprehensively blown this one by putting so many tiny children into day nurseries, so that both their parents can go out to work and feed the economy rather than the baby.

As children grow older, emotional security is associated with regularity and routine, such as family meals and a familiar bedtime ritual.

Children need adults not only to love them, but to provide regularity and to set and maintain boundaries for their behaviour. So parents have to balance warmth with a degree of firmness.

This sort of balanced parenting is extremely difficult when adults are exhausted from juggling work and domestic responsibilities or - in a materialistic society based on an "I want" philosophy - unsure where the boundaries ought to be drawn.

If a child gets used to eating dinner with the television on every night, how are you going to tell them they can't do that anymore because you've finally realised they never talk to you at all?

Or if, like millions of children, they have a television in their room which they watch late in the evening, how are you to insist it's taken away because they're exhausted every day?

It's even more difficult if, because of the pressures of modern life, a parents' marriage is collapsing or they're trying to bring up a child alone.

Children also need to learn communication skills, another essential element in emotional and social development.

This starts from the moment they're born, and is an important part of the bond with the carer that underpins emotional development.

As parents sing and talk to their babies, they awaken the language instinct wired deep in the human brain and provide the data through which children will learn to speak their mother tongue.

But if adults don't spend time with their children, communication skills won't develop as they should - and, in a busy modern world, many parents aren't available to play their part in this process.

Many children now spend the majority of their day in institutional care.

At home, babies often sit in front of an electronic babysitter and, as they grow older, there is that problem of older children having TVs in their rooms, which means that even when the family is in the same building, its members are splintered off from each other.

Ironically, in a world where there are more ways to communicate than ever before, parents communicate less and less with their own children.

There's one other absolutely vital ingredient if children are to grow strong in body and mind - one that, to the great concern of developmental psychologists, is being practically eradicated from many children's lives.
They need to play. What's more, they need to play in a relaxed, unstructured way, preferably outdoors with other children and - as they grow older - away from the eagle eyes of the adults.

The need for play is built into the DNA of all higher animals - lion cubs, for instance, are programmed to play-hunt, play-stalk and playfight to sort out their place in the family pecking order.

If they didn't learn these lion life-skills through play, the species would die out.

Human children develop physical control and coordination through running, jumping, climbing, skipping or kicking a football around.

They gain first-hand experience of the world they're going to live in by making mud-pies or paddling in puddles or messing about in a sandpit, riding a home-made go-kart or climbing a tree.

These experiences underpin the understanding of the world on which human science and learning are based - without play, education is built on very shifting sands.

Without play also, children's imagination and creativity is likely to be stunted.

So, too, their social skills. It's through playing with other children - without adult interference - that youngsters learn how to make friends, resolve quarrels, work collaboratively and, indeed, avoid small enemies.

They also learn how to take "safe risks" and make their own judgments, thus developing independence and self-reliance.

As far as play is concerned, our society hasn't just taken its eye off the ball, we've completely lost track of it.

Our paranoid obsession with "health and safety" means many parents now keep their children cooped up indoors living a sedentary, screen-based existence.

"Play" happens on a PlayStation, games on a GameBoy, and children often spend their day mindlessly gazing at TV.

That appalling scenario was the focus of this week's National Consumer Council report, which found that in millions of households "the screen appears to be ever-present, particularly during meal times".

As the Prime Minister pointed out, this "exposes children to the pressures of very aggressive advertising".

That, in turn, creates a generation of mini-consumers who want everything they see on screen and equate happiness with materialism.

"Safe" in their bedrooms, our youngsters are learning about life from the people they see on screens - pop stars, celebrities and other attention-seekers - and from the anonymous army of marketers lurking behind those screens.

And the message those celebrities and marketers sell is that happiness comes from being rich and famous, from ownership of the latest must have products, and a "cool" lifestyle.
All these changes in children's lifestyles are the unintended consequences of rapid social and cultural change, driven by new technology and an increasingly competitive consumer society.

Nobody planned them - indeed, we've all been so rushed off our feet that we didn't even notice them happening - but together they amount to a toxic cocktail of side-effects of "progress".

The statistics emerging now - which I alluded to earlier - about children's mental health must act as a wake-up call to parents, politicians and the nation as a whole.

Given that they're growing up in a land of peace and plenty, unhappiness is not a natural state for our children.

There are, of course, a few unlucky souls genetically predisposed to depression, but most human beings develop a natural resilience. I fear natural toughness is becoming absent in today's children because the developmental needs described above have not been met.

Unfortunately, the challenges children face today are pretty toxic as well.

Two other side effects of cultural change have been the massive increase in marketing pressure on children and a simultaneous increase in the pressures they face at school. We now live in a winners and losers culture.

Meanwhile, the obsession with competition has also infected primary schools, which abound with tests, targets and even league tables for young children's achievements.

Children now face up to 70 academic tests before the age of 16. We enter our offspring into this highstakes educational rat race at a younger age than any other country, with many embarking on formal learning at the tender age of four.

At this age many children (especially boys) aren't even physically competent to hold a pencil, let alone write with one.

However, now that we've become aware of the problem of childhood unhappiness, there's no reason why we can't find a solution.

Since we know what's necessary for bringing up happy, healthy, successful children (the prescription is now ratified by decades of neuroscientific research), a society as advanced as ours should be able to provide it.

A good start would be to rein in marketing, which is now increasingly predatory towards children, and change the tests-and-targets culture of primary education.

Our consumer culture, along with the breakdown of extended families and far greater mobility, has broken down the trust that in the past held communities together.

Parents, teachers and other members of the community must find ways of reforging an "adult alliance" in their community to support families in raising their young.

The main responsibility for rearing children, however, lies - as it always has - with parents.

They have to wise up, stop being paralysed by a combination of rapid change, uncertainty and guilt, and find new ways to provide a secure, healthy family life for their offspring.
None of this is rocket science, but in terms of our nation's future, it's more important than rocket science.

Unless, very soon, we start attending to the well-being of our children (all our children) and tackle the growing problems with their mental health, the next generation may not be bright or balanced enough to keep our economy healthy and our nation together.

Sue Palmer's book Toxic Childhood is published by Orion Books.

New ADHD guidelines: Kids as young as 4 can be diagnosed

Rachael Rettner MyHealthNewsDaily from msnbc.com 20 Oct 2011

BOSTON — Attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) can now be diagnosed in children as young as 4 and as old as 18, according to the nation's largest organization of paediatricians.

The new guidelines from the American Academy of Paediatrics (AAP) expand the age range over which doctors can diagnose and manage ADHD in children, and are based on recent research; previous guidelines released in 2000 and 2001 covered children ages 6 to 12.

"Treating children at a young age is important, because when we can identify them earlier and provide appropriate treatment, we can increase their chances of succeeding in school," said Dr. Mark Wolraich, a paediatrician at the University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Centre and lead author of the report.

The guidelines were released today in Boston at the paediatricians' annual conference.

But with ADHD now the most common neurobehavioral disorder in children, some experts worry about changes that could lead to even more kids being diagnosed -- and medicated.

A text-message survey of 100 U.S. paediatricians conducted by Truth On Call for msnbc.com found that 60 of them think ADHD is overdiagnosed in kids, 35 feel it's diagnosed appropriately and 5 think it might be underdiagnosed.

As of 2007, 9.5 percent of U.S. children had been diagnosed with ADHD, according to the Centre for Disease Control and Prevention. And cases of ADHD are already on the rise; between 2003 and 2007, rates of ADHD diagnoses increased 5.5 percent per year, the CDC says.

Any child ages 4 to 18 who has behavioural problems or problems in school and has symptoms of inattention, hyperactivity and impulsivity should be evaluated for ADHD, Wolraich said. To be diagnosed as having the condition, the child must display these problems in more than one setting (for instance, both at home and at school).

Although the new guidelines allow for children as young as 4 can be diagnosed with ADHD, there are challenges in diagnosing these kids, Wolraich said. For instance, children too young to have started school may be under the supervision of only their parents, in which case, there are no teachers or daycare providers to confirm behaviours.

In making diagnoses in these young kids, doctors should look for symptoms to last at least 9 months, instead of the 6 months required for older children, Wolraich said.

"These are the kids who are really getting into trouble," and may have been kicked out of two or three preschool programs, Wolraich said.
In some cases, parents could undergo training to help manage behaviour problems in their kids before a diagnosis is made, he said.

Diagnosing teens, on the other hand, likely requires talking to adults other than their parents, who may have little contact with them, Wolraich said. Doctors should try to obtain information from teachers, couches, counsellors and other community leaders who may interact with the teen.

In children ages 4 and 5, doctors should first try to treat ADHD with behavioural therapies. Only if such therapies fail, and a child has problems functioning in everyday life because of ADHD, should doctors prescribe the ADHD drug methylphenidate (known by its brand names Ritalin, Concerta and others) to kids in this age group, according to the new guidelines.

For elementary school children and adolescents, both behavioural therapy and FDA-approved ADHD medications are recommended.

The guidelines emphasize that ADHD is a long-term condition that may last into adulthood.

"As a chronic illness, you have to do all the things that are important to managing a chronic condition," including educating the family and following the children closely as they grow up, Wolraich said.

The new guidelines will be published in the November issue of the journal Paediatrics.

These sick bastard's have no shame. They will only create untold thousands of 4 year old junkie's and the next generation of school shooter's in the process.

Psychiatrists snatching our children? That's Stalin's trick

By Peter Hitchens PUBLISHED: 22:09, 24 March 2012 Daily Mail

I must continue to warn, as long as I can, against the threats to our freedom now massing on all sides.

My blood ran cold at the story of a psychiatrist who is alleged to have labelled parents with mental 'disorders' so that their children were snatched away from them.

One has been exposed, and thank heaven for that. But how many others continue undisturbed?

There are growing signs of the State's power to burst in on private lives and wreck them

Such 'disorders' are 90 per cent jargon and ten per cent guesswork.

There is no objective test for them. If a qualified person says you have one, you have one, and goodbye to your children for ever.

How can this possibly be permitted in a supposedly free country?

Like the secret family tribunals, in which parents struggle in vain against loaded accusations, from which they are not permitted to defend themselves, these are growing signs of the State's power to burst in on private lives and wreck them.

The abuse of psychiatry is a symptom of tyranny. I have no doubt that many psychiatrists are honourable and thoughtful people.

But their discipline, which largely lacks any objective measures, can all too easily be used to crush individuals for the purposes of the State.
If it can be deployed to snatch children, then there is not far to go before it is also used to terrify or subdue opposition.

The old Soviet Union employed it for this purpose. I once met (and I will always be proud to have shaken his hand) Dr Anatoly Koryagin, the fantastically brave Russian psychiatrist who spoke out against this perversion, and who was then himself locked away without trial in conditions so vile that his own wife could not recognise him.

When the USSR was still there, we always had before our eyes a great glaring warning of where the seemingly nice ideas of ‘progressives’ and reformers can so easily lead.

Since its collapse, we have assumed that the danger is gone. Far from it. Our homegrown revolutionaries were liberated by the fall of the Soviet Union.

No longer were their weird anti-family, anti-patriotic views associated with treachery and oppression.

And so they fanned out into the schools, the Civil Service, the newspapers, the universities, the BBC and even the medical profession. And those of us who experienced Soviet power and remember it are endlessly reminded, in the politically corrected one-party state that is modern Britain, of that miserable place.

To end this chapter let’s look at the original bit of “Science” that spawned the modern day Pharmaceutical industry. You’ll be shocked to see who sponsored it.

The Flexner Report: How John D. Rockefeller used the AMA to take over Western Medicine

The Flexner Report (which discredited all forms of medicine except allopathy) was the tool by which John D. Rockefeller used the AMA to dominate Western Medicine with Big Pharma drugs

The Flexner Report was a very useful tool commissioned by oil magnate John D. Rockefeller. Rockefeller had made a massive fortune with Standard Oil and was setting his sights on gaining a monopoly in the drug and pharmaceutical industry. However, first he had to get rid of the competition, which consisted of natural non-allopathic healing modalities – naturopathy, homeopathy, eclectic medicine (botanical and herbal medicine), holistic medicine, etc. Hemp was also a threat to his plans, since cannabis has tremendous medical benefit – it can be used to alleviate pain for numerous diseases and even has anti-cancer properties.

Rockefeller paid Abraham Flexner to visit all the medical schools in the US at that time. He released the so-called “Flexner Report” in 1910, which called for the standardization of medical education and concluded there were too many doctors and medical schools in America. Rockefeller then used his control of the media to generate public outcry at the findings of the report – which, by means of the classic elite strategy of “Problem, Reaction, Solution” as David Icke calls it, ultimately led Congress to declare the AMA (American Medical Association) the only body with the right to grant medical school licenses in the United States. This suited Rockefeller perfectly – he then used the AMA (which may be better called to the American Murder Association due their widespread use and endorsement of toxic vaccines, drugs, chemotherapy and radiation) to compel the Government destroy the natural competition, which it did through regulating medical schools.

The AMA only endorsed schools with a drug-based curriculum. It didn’t take long before non-allopathic schools fell by the wayside due to lack of funding. Thus, Rockefeller had his monopoly on drugs, and Big Pharma was born – and has only grown bigger and more terrible since, now routinely bribing doctors to prescribe their toxic and side effect-laden pills, not to mention their autism-causing vaccines. Rockefeller, the AMA and Big Pharma are now all key aspects of the NWO (New World Order), but it all started with the Flexner Report. - By Makia Freeman on August 22, 2012 the freedomarticles.com
The Flexner Report

That's what the foundations are all about, ladies and gentlemen. Make no mistake about it. The foundation takeover of the "American Medical Schools" followed almost immediately after Gates went to work for Rockefeller. It was fast and it was simple. It took place in three steps.

The first was when Rockefeller and Carnegie together financed the famous Flexner Report of 1910 written by Abraham Flexner, hired by Rockefeller and Carnegie. Flexner travelled all over the country and made a very scholarly analysis of how bad the level of medical education was in America and he was right. He didn't distort it. To my knowledge he didn't distort (any of it). He didn't have to. There were diploma mills. There were a few good schools. But, there were a lot of mediocre schools and there were a lot of bad schools. And people could get a medical degree just by paying enough money and so Flexner brought all of this together in the Flexner Report. It was published by the foundation as a public service and everybody was very much concerned. Something had to be done. You see now, the problem was crystallized with foundation money.

The next step was to solve the problems. Rockefeller and Carnegie then provided the money to solve the problem. They offered tax-free grants. Tremendous infusions of millions and millions of dollars to those selected medical schools that were cooperative and that were willing to go along with the recommendations made by Rockefeller and Carnegie. The ones who weren't willing to submit themselves to the influence of the money didn't get any, and they fell by the wayside. The ones who did go along got this money and were able to build big buildings to attract qualified teachers. They were able to get the necessary equipment, and they became the large medical schools in America today, through Rockefeller and Carnegie money.

Now, there is an old saying that "he who pays the piper calls the tune." And that is exactly what happened. Gates and Flexner, and those whom they appointed, became Board members and consultants for all of these schools. And you can be sure, ladies and gentlemen, that if you are on the Board of Trustees of the school and you are struggling for money and somebody comes to you and says here is 10 million dollars and then they say, however, or by the way, we would suggest that the next time you look for a president we suggest that you look at Mr. Smith, he's a fine, reputable man. You will listen very carefully when they make that suggestion and Mr. Smith becomes the next president.

Mr. Smith listens very carefully when Mr. Gates, Mr. Rockefeller, or Mr. Carnegie say, "now, Mr. Smith, you need people on your teaching staff with these qualifications, and we suggest that you look at Dr. Jones, Dr. Radcliff" and so forth. They all listen. Money has a distinct sound. It is the ruffling of thousand dollar bills. Now there is no corruption there. It is not necessary to set down and say we are going to control the school. We want you to do what we tell you, it is all just very gentlemanly and done gently. But it's done, nevertheless. And so you can be sure that those schools that were willing to cooperate were the ones who got the money. The record indeed shows that this is true. - From a LECTURE BY MR. G. EDWARD GRIFFIN

The Flexner Report's Stranglehold on Health Care

November 19, 2009

Congressman Ron Paul recently gave a speech on the House floor covering the topic of health care. In it he brought up the Flexner Report, an item that few individuals have even heard about that is worthy of much more attention than it currently receives.

"A lot of problems were created in 20th century as a consequence the Flexner Report (1910), which was financed by the Carnegie Foundation and strongly supported by the AMA.
Many medical schools were closed and the number of doctors was drastically reduced.” — Ron Paul; September 24, 2009

The seeds of the Flexner Report were planted in 1908 when the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching commissioned Abraham Flexner, a high school principle, to research and report on medical schools in the U.S. Flexner himself was not involved in the medical industry, but after being asked to take on the report he researched and grew fond of the medical systems in England, France, and Germany.

In the report, which was officially published in 1910, Flexner called homeopathic schools “a striking demonstration of the incompatibility of science and dogma.” What’s curious is that Flexner points out that between 1900 and 1909 homeopathic schools decreased from 22 to 15 and students within the schools decreased from 1,909 to 1,009. Flexner uses these figures to conclude that “the rise of legal standard must inevitably affect homeopathic practitioners.” In short, even with the marketplace whittling out the unproductive and unsustainable homeopathic colleges (or any colleges, for that matter) that Flexner clearly did not appreciate, he still advocated increased government intervention to further clear out homeopathic schools.

Flexner believed the problems in medicine were primarily because there were too many doctors and medical colleges. “The country needs fewer and better doctors; and...the way to get them better is to produce fewer.” The flaws of Flexner’s arguments and his general report is that he may indeed have made some noticeable observations, but he did not consider the economic consequences of increased government intervention, a centralized medical system in the hands of the American Medical Association (AMA), and the impact of fewer doctors and medical schools.

Basic economic common sense tells us that when you forcibly remove one product without subsequently lowering demand, you will increase the price of that product. Less supply without less demand means higher prices. The homeopathic schools that Flexner so strongly criticized may have lacked in some areas of educational standards compared to more traditional health schools, but they provided a key element of competition for allopathic medicine and an essential choice for individuals who needed health care.

Basic economics also tells us that weak products and services are bound to fail to the competition due to inefficiency and poor judgment. As I previously mentioned, Flexner’s own research displayed that homeopathic schools were struggling to stay open and maintain steady attendance. Their services had difficulty competing in some cases, and those schools (or services) disappeared or were in the process of failing.

The publishing of the Flexner Report in 1910 led to many educational reforms. Among Flexner’s final proposals included extending years spent in health education (two years in undergraduate collegiate studies and four years in medical school), increasing the calibre of medical schools to universities, expanding government involvement in medicine, decreasing total graduates to 3,500 from 4,500, and bringing the total amount of medical schools in the U.S. from 150 to roughly 31. In short, Flexner proposed a medical system driven not by the free market and individuals, but a manipulated system moulded by some of the wealthiest men and foundations in the world. In fact, the Rockefeller Foundation donated large sums of money to schools who followed the model recommended by the Flexner Report.

One of the unfortunate impacts the Flexner Report had on medical education was the shutdown of many schools geared toward disadvantaged rural areas, African-Americans, and women. Because of mandated school time regulated by the AMA and state governments, only those wealthy enough to afford at least six years of college had a chance at becoming a licensed doctor. This essentially limited the market for prospective doctors to wealthy white males. (All but two African-American medical colleges were closed.)
The flaw with the Flexner Report is the same flaw that has brought us to today’s broken medical system. When a product is forcefully limited to be provided by a certain central group (in this case the AMA), it will reduce choice and competition. Choice and competition in a free marketplace are what drive businesses to become more efficient and productive, which provides the greatest possible benefits to individuals who are able to freely buy and sell in the market. A strong, sustainable system built for individuals cannot come from a manipulative central source, it must come from the demands and choices of the people whom it is intended to help.

Government regulatory standards do not necessarily serve the individual as many people believe. In the case of medical care, the Flexner Report recognized many flaws with education that the free market was already weeding out on its own. Rather than allow people and communities to make their own choices with doctors, medicine, and education, it was all placed in the hands of the AMA and state governments, thus limiting the supply. This resulted in less doctors, more expensive education, and decreased access to medical care.

A central system concentrates power into the hands of a select few individuals, groups, and organizations who have the means to control that respective market. A free market divides that power among individuals who have the ability to make their own decisions themselves and through their communities.

Concentrated control, as proposed and implemented in the Flexner Report, is the direct cause of the majority of problems with health care today. The solution does not lie with more government intervention and centralized power, but rather with increased individual freedom. The answer is not centralized power in government, but centralized power within ourselves. - From FreedomChatter.com

Now let’s put the capital “K” in mind kontrol by learning about this subject properly.

As you can see these nut-jobs want to totally run our lives. It’s scary, but not half as scary as us for allowing it to happen. We’re both extremely lazy and far, far too trusting.

In the next chapter we’ll look at some of the early mile-stones in the chronology of MK. I then supply the transcript from a TV show from Canada which you’ll find horrifying. Then we concentrate on the UK for while by learning all about one of the maddest institutes on the face of this planet - Tavistock.
Chapter Twenty

Now that I have spent some time giving you not only the history, but also two of the defining fundamental principles concerning psychiatry; in that it is both rooted and based in total and utter falsehood, and also that it was being used by a select few to control the many. We will now spend a fair portion of our time examining in great detail the true aim of not just psychopathic psychiatry, but of all of the subjects that were covered by us in the chapters that happened to be preceding it:

Mind Control

As wacky as that might initially sound to those among you who are still sceptical (fuck knows how!) the fact is it’s true, and that is, as you will soon discover, quite easily provable with just the official and admitted documentation and official governmental hearings on the matter, never mind all the other stuff you can find on the net. Not only does mind control seem to have more web sites dedicated to it than any other so called “conspiracy” subject, - (and some of it is actually good and not just crazy nonsense!) There has been a lot of very good work done by a fair few of these intrepid people. I have hopefully served my purpose by both filtering all the shit out for you and by only putting the best of it together for your consumption and appraisal. Trust me it doesn't disappoint. But before we start, first know this: As I have just said, you have been reading about issues that were ALL utilising mind control all along, you just probably never fully realised it until now at this moment. I hope that these next few chapters will hopefully be able to help sew them all together for you.

You may remember the earlier chapter's of this work mentioning the mental health issues surrounding some of the weirder and darker paedophilia matters, and also now a couple of times we have brushed upon something called Disassociative Identity Disorder or DID, (which seems could be a product of some of the more horrific organised paedo’ stuff covered earlier) (not that much of this will have been anything to you but horrific I would imagine. It most certainly was for me). Do you remember what I’m on about? It was the very dark and even “satanic” or ritualistic sort of material that Dave McGowan (remember Aquino?) and I both spoke about that was also fleetingly covered in the part about “The Finders”. In fact the Hippie chapter may well have alluded to aspects of it as well I think.

These issues all dealt with matters that these next few chapters will not only clarify but hammer home to you were all issues concerning the phenomena of mind control.

There was a reason for introducing you to these points before we (finally) got to the crux of the matter, in essence these topics were utilised early on not only to try and shock you to your senses but also to demonstrate to you some of the noticeable effects of mind control. (As it was also true in many ways with the chapters on the encouragement/discouragement (or whatever our masters dictate style of manipulation) of many matters we've covered, like having children, gay or straight relationships, feminism, paedophilia, the hippie movement (more aptly titled sex drugs and rock and roll), - As much as it may surprise you, there has been all along, at least a bit of method to my madness. These apparently unrelated subjects are in fact quite provably and inextricably related to each other. Mind control truly does exist my friend, and it appears that in modern times it is all pervasive. You just probably never knew just how pervasive. But don’t worry I’ll mend that in less than 2:: pages.

You have just read about the so called root “science” that is meant to be behind it, now we will examine the actual science of mind control itself. Then we'll look at it in practise.

The more observant among you will have been noticing that I have been levelling a fair portion of my observations, and criticism, at this field of so called expertise (science) all the way through this work (and I will continue to do so with the utmost vigour for the next 2000 odd pages too, so don't think I'm even close to being done with these “incredibly intelligent” men yet, - the fact is, I'm just getting started with science, medicine “gets it” after this subject, and the material I have on that will quite literally make your hair stand on end.)
Sorry, sometimes I “drift” while writing, you'll get used to it, and my ranting’s I hope, (either that or if I was you I'd toss this and just go back to reading something else, probably something banal and shit just to clear your head of all these inconvenient and nasty facts that are flying around that maybe you can’t deal with. Maybe you would be better off with processing the sort of crap material that most of you are used to, you know what I'm on about, the mainstream media mince which actually sucks things out your head as opposed to putting any real stuff in it). (Hmm looks like someone’s in a touchy mood this evening)

From Jim Keith’s “Mind Control, World Control – The Encyclopaedia of Mind Control”

"Only the small secrets need to be protected. The big ones are kept secret by public incredulity.” —Marshall McCluhan

"If both the past and the external world exist only in the mind, and if the mind itself is controllable—what then?” —George Orwell

Introduction: WAR FOR THE MIND

Since the beginning of recorded history men have lusted for control of their fellows—the impulse seemingly part of the makeup of the half-ape, half-angel we call human. Until modern times brute force, propaganda, and religion were the most successful methods for the manipulation of human beings, but by the turn of this century coercive methodology had advanced far beyond the sword, the inflammatory slogan, and the stick and carrot of heaven and hell.

Now, in the 20th century, scientists in the pay of governments and other monied interests have made technical breakthroughs that render actual mind control feasible, and on a nigh-universal scale. Invasive control techniques have been fine-tuned to the point where the controllers are literally able to get inside our heads and to command us. They are able to tinker with our humanness, to manipulate it, to destroy it if they choose. They are able to use high tech networks of electronic entrainment and broadcasting whose nature has not even been hinted of in the mass media—since the mass media itself is employed in the same manner, for the manipulation of the populace. Even the subject of mind control in the media is mentioned only in the context of science fiction, or is derided as the delusions of the crazy "aluminium foil hat crowd,” never mind that those guys might be on to something.

Now the powerful in their quest for a totalitarian state are provided with unprecedented access and control of our minds and humanity, to do with as they will. The means for the creation of worldwide slavery are in sight, and the implementation of this technology progresses day to day. The signs are all around us.

Many suspect that there is an overarching philosophy that has been engineering the crises and chaos of the latter portion of the 20th century, and I believe they are right. There are forces working behind the scenes, working to promote a New World Order not significantly different than the nega-utopian worldstate described in George Orwell's 1984. If this elite is cold-blooded enough to have calculatedly created war, famine, and designer disease, as many suspect they have, what qualms would discourage them from creating worldwide mind control? This book is meant to portray certain aspects of the history of world mind control, its evolution, and the political currents that have historically dictated its directions.

Chapter 2:

While the one-world elitists in England were scheming for control of the planet, and for the suppression and elimination of “the masses” by one means or another, their American brethren—and brethren they were, in a deal reportedly cut in 1897 to apportion the business of the world—were thinking along the same lines. [1]
In these early years of the 20th century, British Round Table controllers and—acting at a command level in the U.S. members of the German-spawned Skull and Bones society, worked in concert with the Rockefellers and others to pour huge sums of money into American and German coffers for the research of psychiatry, psychiatric genetics, eugenics, euthanasia, and other means of controlling and "perfecting" what they conceived of as an otherwise imperfect human race, at least in terms acceptable to the elite.

Although it may seem obvious, political and economic imperialism are almost always linked to an imperialism of the mind. In the early 20th century, embryonic studies of biology, eugenics, and the human mind were massively funded to be utilized, not for the overall improvement of the human condition, but for domination of the many by the few, for the "good" of the State.

Chapter 3:

Among the basic studies consulted by Rockefeller-funded scientists (My Note. Our old friends) and others interested in social control at the beginning of this century were those of the official Prussian state psychologist Wilhelm Maximilian Wundt, professor of psychology at the University of Heidelberg. It's fascinating that Wundt's grandfather is mentioned in the Illuminati Provincial Report from Utica (Heidelberg) of September 1782, as being the member known as "Raphael." [1] (My Note. We spoke of him briefly in the last chapter too, and wouldn't you know it he came from Prussia. Remember that area...)

During the period before Wundt's ascendancy in the field, psychology was considered to be, simply enough, the study of the soul or mind (psyche). Wundt was to change all that, defining and propagandizing for the materialistic viewpoint that would disinform the work of successors like Pavlov, Skinner, and Watson.

Wundt took a chair in philosophy at the University of Leipzig in 1875, establishing the world's first psychological laboratory, creating the psychological journal Philosophical Studies, and redefining psychology for this century. Wundt stated with characteristic modesty, "The work which I here present to the public is an attempt to mark out a new domain in science." Wundt was to remain at the University of Leipzig until his death in 1920.

Wundt's doctrine might be characterized as science meets the Hegelian sturm und drang. One of the primary underpinnings of the New World Order is that its strategy for world conquest originates in the philosophy of Hegel. Hegel was a professor of philosophy at the University of Berlin, and his works formed the basis for both Marxist dialectical materialism and fascist Statism.

Hegel's stated belief was that Man is subordinate to the State, and only finds fulfillment in obedience to the diktats of the State. As he said, "The State is the absolute reality and the individual himself has objective existence, truth and morality only in his capacity as a member of the State." This philosophy can be and has been used for the justification of any number of atrocities committed upon the human race, and provides an unexamined substratum to the philosophies of many politicians today. If only the omelette (the State) is important, what does it matter if we lose a few million eggs (humans) in the process of cooking up the dish?

Hegel was the originator of the theory of the "dialectic," the idea that conflict determines history. According to Hegel, a force (thesis) dictates its own opposing force (antithesis). These forces in conflict result in the creation of a third force: a synthesis. Out of this synthesis the process begins again. Marx later revised the theory of the dialectic, insisting that only material events were relevant, and that the dialectic was inherent in matter, thus divorcing the idea from metaphysics, at least to his own satisfaction.
From the theory of the dialectic comes the realization that the creation of conflicts can create determined outcomes, or syntheses. Those who promote the New World Order, again and again, are seen to be using the theory of the Hegelian dialectic to bring it about. They are manipulating events, creating conflicts, creating wars, and destroying the lives of untold millions in the bargain. The New World Order is the desired synthesis of the controlling forces operant in the world today.

Naturally, the Hegelian system goes completely against the grain of most people, particularly in the West, who view the individual as the true sovereign. Thus the real enemies are not America vs. the Soviets, or the political Left vs. the Right, but those who would manipulate the yin and yang of history.

To return to Wundt: Like Marx, he maintained that unless a thing could be scientifically quantified, there was no point in considering it or including it as a factor in scientific investigation. All psychological studies should be based upon physiology: body reactions. Wundt essentially redefined psychological studies as studies of the brain and nervous system, and redefined man as an animal without a soul, thus legitimizing at least for his associates and their employers the treating of man as such. This, no doubt, was a welcome rationalization for the controllers who could now happily slaughter whomever they pleased without fear of ultimate spiritual retribution or accounting.

Wundt said, "It truly appears to be a useless waste of energy to keep returning to such aimless discussions about the nature of the psyche, which were in vogue for a while, and practically still are, instead, rather, of applying one's energies where they will produce real results."

According to researcher Paolo Lionni, "For Wundt, will was the direct result of the combination of perceived stimuli, not an independent, individual intention as psychology and philosophy had, with some notable exceptions, held up to that time."

Wundt's rejection of the intangibles of life, such as soul, mind, and free will, have influenced psychiatry and psychology up to the present day. And now you know why shrinks look so weird and often have nervous tics. They have been taught that they do not have a soul. [2]

According to one chronicler of the history of psychology, after Wundt's theories became popular, 'Naturally Leipzig became the Mecca of students who wished to study the 'new' psychology—a psychology that was no longer a branch of speculative philosophy, no longer a fragment of the science of physiology, but a novel and daring and exciting attempt to study mental processes by the experimental and quantitative methods common to all science.

For the psychology of Leipzig was, in the eighties and nineties, the newest thing under the sun. It was the psychology for bold young radicals who believed that the ways of the mind could be measured and treated experimentally—and who possibly thought of themselves, in their private reflections, as pioneers on the newest frontier of science, pushing its method into reaches of experience that it had never before invaded. At any rate they threw themselves into their tasks with industry and zest.

They became trained introspectionists and, adding introspection to the resources of the physiological laboratories, they attempted the minute analysis of sensation and perception. They measured reaction times, following their problems into numerous and widespread ramifications. They investigated verbal reactions, thus extending their researches into the field of association. They measured the span and the fluctuations of attention and noted some of its more complex features in the 'complication experiment,' a laboratory method patterned after the situation that gave rise to the astronomer's problem of the 'personal equation.' In their studies of feeling and emotion they recorded pulse-rates, breathing rates, and fluctuations in muscular strength, and in the same connection they developed methods
of recording systematically and treating statistically the impressions observed by introspection.

They also developed the psychophysical methods and in addition made constant use of resources of the physiological laboratory. And throughout all their endeavours they were dominated by the conception of a psychology that should be scientific as opposed to speculative; always they attempted to rely on exact observation, experimentation, and measurement. Finally when they left Leipzig and worked in laboratories of their own—chiefly in American or German universities—most of them retained enough of the Leipzig impress to teach a psychology that, whatever the subsequent development of the individual's thought, bore traces of the system which was recognized at Leipzig as orthodox." [3]

The essence of Wundt's research was that man was a machine, albeit a soft one. Wundt also went along with the Hegelian axiom that man was simply a cog in the greater machine of the State. Was it just a coincidence that Wundt and his cohorts, funded by and working with the Prussian military and political establishment, provided the justification for treating humanity as individual pieces of nearly valueless machinery, to be tinkered with or destroyed at will?

Wundt, along with other Hegelians, rejected the moral equation in dealing with mankind—thereby putting man in a test tube—and by doing so opened the door to many of the atrocities that followed in this century, including the horrors of mind control. Another mainstay in the arsenal of elitist mind control research was the work of Ivan Petrovich Pavlov, who studied physiology at Leipzig in 1884, five years after Wundt had a laboratory there, and first worked at the St. Petersburg Military Medical Academy in Russia. In 1906 Pavlov cut holes in dogs' cheeks and inserted tubes to measure salivation. A bell was rung just before food was given to the dogs, and after a period of time it was observed that the ringing of the bell alone would increase the rate of the dogs' salivation. The observation that responses could be so precisely conditioned was then brainstormed to apply to the mental processes of humans—and Pavlov's successors, the shrinks and social controllers, have continued ringing their bells, selectively keeping us drooling ever since. [4]

Shortly after Pavlov was driving dogs crazy in Russia, John B. Watson at Johns Hopkins University—the Hegel hotbed for the United States—was doing the same thing to humans. Watson, the founder of what is known as the behaviourist school of psychology—but is really only research following in the dark shadow of Wundt—believed that complex forms of behaviour could be programmed into humans. He conducted one experiment in which a young boy, "Little Albert," was given a white rat to play with. After the boy became accustomed to the rat, Watson would beat on the floor with a steel bar every time the rat was brought in. The boy was understandably terrified by such lunatic behaviour, and eventually reacted with terror every time the rat was given to him, and finally, whenever any small furry animal was around him.

Dr. Watson himself drooled over the possibilities of this kind of mechanical conditioning of human beings: "Give me the baby, and I'll make it climb and use its hands in constructing buildings of stone or wood... I'll make it a thief, a gunman or a dope fiend. The possibilities of shaping in any direction are almost endless... Men are built, not born."

Watson later became a highly successful advertising executive, although there are no records available of what happened to Little Albert. [5]

In the late 1930s, Harvard psychologist Burrhus Frederick (B.F.) Skinner, an unapologetic student of Wundt's theories, and a member of U.S. Army intelligence, fine-tuned the art of human control into what he termed "operant conditioning," becoming a guru to generations of mind shapers that followed. His simple (and quite familiar, by this time) notion was that
the reinforcement of a repeated negative stimulus (punishment) or positive stimulus (reward) formed the basis for learned behaviour.

Skinner's early experiments produced pigeons that could dance, do figure eights, and play table tennis. His experiments did not stop with pigeons.

Skinner's most famous invention, aimed at producing a "socialized child," was the environmentally controlled "Skinner box," a crib-sized container into which he put scores of children, including his own. His ultimate aim was not only to control the behaviour of isolated persons, but to gain insights into how to control society as a whole. [6]

Skinner's most explicit statement of his philosophy, ultimately one of world control, is contained in his book Walden Two written in 1948. The book describes a perfect communist utopia run along behaviourist lines.

In Walden Two society is run by Frazier, a straw man designed to dramatize Skinner's beliefs about human conditioning. Below Frazier in the pigeon-pecking order are six Planners, who in turn run Managers, who are held responsible for the "controlees" who perform the menial tasks of daily life.

Members of the Walden Two society follow a puritanical "Code of Conduct," that applies to virtually every aspect of day-to-day life, including the forbidding of midnight snacks. Education is a subset of "human engineering," and children are turned over to the group by the parents. "Home is no place to raise children," draws Frazier, his philosophy one that has seemingly been adopted by many current-day shrinks and social workers.

The essence of Walden Two is the application of positive and negative reinforcement to create a smoothly running state, free of such unwanted encumbrances as crime and choice. Skinner followed up his vision of Walden Two in 1971, with his vastly hyped nonfiction book Beyond Freedom and Dignity, awarded the honour of being the most important book of the year by the New York Times. "What is needed is more control, not less," Skinner reminded us. [7]

It may be revelatory that throughout his life, Skinner was interested in mechanical contraptions, even working for years on a perpetual motion machine. His view of the composition of human beings was no less mechanical—a vision which characterizes the philosophies of most psychiatrists to this day.

This atheist/materialistic viewpoint, again, provides a justification for the atrocities which are daily committed in the name of science: How can it be unethical to tinker with, or even destroy a human, if in fact he is really only a machine?

With B.F. Skinner, the philosophy of psychosocial control was finely honed. Although many psychologists today insist that the behaviourist's vision of a controlled world is crude and outdated, and that a docile society cannot be engineered by science, they protest too much. The behaviourist doctrine—forecast by Hegel, invented by Wundt, and fostered by a legion of followers in science and education—is firmly in place in the halls of academia and in the offices of population-shaping worldwide, and are being applied at every level of society. The elite could not be happier if the whole world was placed in a Skinner box.

Chapter 4:

One of the major world arenas in which Hegelian philosophy and the materialistic anti-psychology of Wundt has been applied is that of education. (My Note. Which we will be conveniently covering in the chapters that follow, after we have dealt with this subject.)
In 1819 in Prussia the first compulsory schooling for children was instituted. According to educator John Taylor Gatto, society in Prussia was divided "into children who will become policy makers; children who will become assistants to policy makers (the engineers, architects, lawyers, and doctors); and the children who will be the vast, massed, used.

"Prussia sets up a three-tier school system, in which one half of one percent of the population is taught to think. They go to school called academie. Five and a half percent of the population go to Realschulen, where they partially learn to think, but not completely, because Prussia believed their defeat at the hands of Napoleon was caused by people thinking for themselves at times of stress on the battlefield. They were going to see to it that scientifically this couldn't happen. The lowest 94%, (that's some pyramid, right?) went to volkschulen, where they were to learn harmony, obedience, freedom from stressful thinking, how to follow orders. They worked out a system that would in fact guarantee such results. In the volkschulen, it was to divide whole ideas (which really simultaneously participate in math, science, social thinking, language and art) into subjects which hardly had existed before, to divide the subjects further into units; to divide the time into small enough units of time. With enough variations in the course of a day, no one would know what was going on."

[1]

This subject will be taken up in earnest after these chapters dealing with the issue of mind control. I just like it when I see others making points that I have also seen are obvious or apparent. Basically all these subjects are so closely related to each other their family tree is basically a stick, - but that is for you to discover for yourself. - Let's get back to this story of the mental domination of the masses for now.

Now we will look at another man's work. It was called “Operation Mind Control” and it was by an incredibly smart fellow called Walter Bowart.

I have skipped his introduction and I am throwing you straight in at the deep end, so to speak. The matter being discussed is hypnotism, which as you will find out was a field of study that was one of the earliest attempts at mind control. Obviously it was a subjective form of control designed initially for individuals but the aim is the same whether for a group or an individual. Making you act against your will.

Once you have grasped the concept of how easy it is to manipulate us all one at a time then hopefully it won't be too much of a leap for you to come to the realisation that it isn't that hard to manipulate us en masse, in fact it's standard practise.

As you will see straight from the start of this, even with hypnosis, we can be made to do many things that we ordinarily would not. I saw a Derren Brown show on TV the other night where he managed to hypnotise a guy into “killing” Stephen Fry without remembering a thing about it! (I love this guy as he is always trying to tell you SO much in his shows (apart from the obvious) an example would be the Messiah show where he shows (if you look at it objectively) that Religion uses HIS tricks and that spiritualists/mediums use HIS tricks).

From Page 66 - George Estabrooks had evidence which made him conclude that "one in every five of the human race are highly suggestible, at least half are suggestible to a very considerable degree." And he warned, ". . . mere figures do not tell the story. That one fifth has a power far beyond its numbers; for this type of man, acting under direct suggestion, is no mere average person. He is a fanatic, with all that fanaticism may imply for good or evil. . . . Can this prospective subject—this one in five individual—be hypnotized against his will?"

"The answer to this very vital question," Estabrooks concluded, 'is 'yes' though we prefer to say 'without his consent' instead of 'against his will.' We do not need the subject's consent when we wish to hypnotize him for we use 'disguised' technique . . . ."
The Rand study dwelt at length upon Soviet experiments in hypnosis dating back to 1923. "At the State Institute of Experimental Psychology in Moscow," the report stated, "it was demonstrated that hypnosis could be used in inducing an innocent person to develop intense guilt feelings and to confess to a criminal or immoral act which he did not commit. In 1932 the experiments on hypnotically implanted 'crimes' were reported (in English translation) by A. R. Luria, who at that time was a professor in the Academy of Communist Education."

Quoting Luria, the report described how hypnosis was used as a device for producing emotional disturbances in order to control behaviour. "We suggested to the person under test, while in a sufficiently deep hypnotic state, a certain situation, more often a disagreeable one, in which he was playing a role irreconcilable with his habits and contrary to his usual behaviour—we thus obtained an actual and rather sharply expressed acute effect. After awakening the person under test . . . we had a subject who was 'loaded' with certain definite affective complexes, which mostly remained unknown to himself . . ."

Luria described an experiment with a twenty-year-old female college student who was told under deep hypnosis that she was sitting in her room studying when a neighbours child, a boy of six, came into the room. She was told that the child shouted when he came into the room and disturbed her studies. She asked him to stop, but he did not listen. The young woman was then told that she would get angry and forget herself. She would take a stick and beat the boy, first on the back and then on the head. The boy would cry out from the wounds on his head, but she would keep on beating him. She would then feel very ashamed and would be unable to understand how such a thing could happen, how she could beat up a child. Finally, she was told that she must try to forget the incident altogether.

Luria explained that he had chosen this situation with a definite purpose. Since the hallucinated event was entirely unacceptable by the moral standards of the young woman's personality, it was natural that she would feel repentant. He reinforced her natural desire to forget by suggesting to her that she remove the memory of the event from her mind. In subsequent trances the subject was questioned about the "beating." With great difficulty she reconstructed the event, but shifted the emphasis on several points so that the imagined event would conform more to her basic moral code. At first she refused to remember that she had "beaten" the child. She then conceded that she had "pulled his ears." Then, finally, she admitted she had "beaten him," but she maintained she had not beaten him with a stick.

Luria said that this showed how unacceptable the situation was to her personality. The student said twice, "My conscience has tortured me." Luria said this showed the effectiveness of the hypnotic suggestion.

Of the experiment, Irving Janis, author of the Rand report, observed, "In this particular case, the implanted memory was initially referred to by the examiner as a 'dream' rather than as a real event. But from the detailed reports of other investigators, this procedure does not appear to be necessary for eliciting a false confession: a hypnotized subject will often accept and confess to an implanted memory as a real event in his own past life."

The Rand report itself suggested that this trick of hypnotic suggestion might be used on a defendant awaiting trial. The defendant could be 'prepared' in a series of hypnotic sessions to accept guilt about a criminal act he did not commit, and then, if placed in a hypnotic trance while in the courtroom, the prosecutor's interrogation would elicit a false confession.
confess when examined by a hypnotist or anyone else designated by the hypnotist. Third, train the subject, by means of posthypnotic suggestion, to go into the trance whenever a simple signal was encountered." The subject would be trained to give his false confession in a normal, convincing manner, so that observers would not be able to detect the trance state.

To induce hypnosis in an unwilling subject, the report suggested any of three possibilities which were then well supported by research findings:

1. As part of a medical examination, talk relaxation to the subject, thus disguising the hypnotic induction. For example, the person could be given a blood pressure test, told that he must relax completely in order to give an adequate test record, and then be given suggestions to go to sleep which would result in a hypnotic trance.

2. Induce hypnosis while the person is actually asleep from normal fatigue. This could be done by simply talking softly into the sleeper's ear.

3. Use injections of drugs to induce hypnosis. The hypnotic drugs would relax the subject and put him in a "twilight state" where the subconscious mind is very susceptible to suggestion. Subjects who refuse or resist the simple "talking" methods of hypnotic induction could be given a few grams of paraldehyde or an intravenous injection of sodium pentothal or sodium amytal. The appropriate dosage of these drugs invariably induces a state of light hypnotic sleep. During sleep, the subject could then be given suggestions which would produce the characteristic deep hypnotic trance. While in the first drug-induced trance, the patient could be given posthypnotic suggestions to the effect that he would be susceptible to hypnosis thereafter without the use of drugs. Subsequently the subject could be allowed to practice carrying out posthypnotic suggestions. He could then be rehypnotized, still without his conscious cooperation, but this time without the use of drugs.

The report admitted that at the time of its writing there was no certain knowledge of just how successful each of the three methods described might prove to be with individuals "who are on their guard against being victimized by hostile authorities."

"The drug technique," suggested the report, "would probably turn out to be the simplest and most efficient of the three and so it would be the most likely candidate for . . . hypnotizing defendants against their will."

Another important use of hypnosis for the government, the report said, would be the induction of amnesia: "Once a deep hypnotic trance is achieved, it is possible to introduce posthypnotic amnesia so that [a subject] . . . would not know . . . that he had been subjected to hypnosis, to drugs, or to any other treatment."

Page 72 - In 1958 the Bureau of Social Science Research (BSSR), a subcontractor to the Rand Corporation, issued a "technical report" on hypnosis to the air force that took up where the earlier Rand report had left off. Once again a "think tank" was calling for action in the mind-control race against the Communists.

"To both the lay person and the behaviour scientist," the author, Seymour Fisher, wrote in the introduction, "hypnosis has long been regarded as a potentially powerful instrument for controlling human behaviour. Undoubtedly, the intelligence divisions of many countries have given serious thought to this potential and have done classified research in various areas of hypnosis . . . it is conceivable that these techniques could have been used and covered up so successfully that they might be impossible to recognize . . ."

Page 141 to 143 - John Foster and Allen Dulles had worked together before coming to government. Foster was the star attorney of the international law firm of Sullivan and Cromwell. He persuaded his partners to take Allen in "to soften up customers," which Allen
had a great gift for. Eventually, Sullivan and Cromwell sent Allen to Berlin to negotiate private affairs with the German industrial barons before the war. (My Note. Oh, he done much, much, more than that, but that's for much, much, later).

After the war broke out, he was sent to Switzerland with OSS, where, under cover, he used his former business contacts inside Germany to supply information for his many spectacular single-handed intelligence coups against the Axis.

Though Allen Dulles was more gifted as a diplomat than his elder brother Foster, it was Foster who can be considered the mastermind of the Cold War Aberration. Foster played upon the fear of Communists and implemented the world-policing foreign policy of the Pax Americana which eventually led to our involvement in Vietnam. It was his Cold War campaign at home that made citizens tremble in fear of Communist attack and their children crouch under school desks in atomic air-raid drills. It was John Foster Dulles, in the company of men like Senator Joe McCarthy and Richard Nixon, who presented the spectre of the Communist menace to the American public. They convinced the nation that the communists were about to unleash a global war and even a direct nuclear attack upon the United States.

During Eisenhower's 1952 campaign for the presidency, he promised to "peacefully bring about freedom for the captive nations." John Foster Dulles later repeated Eisenhower's promise, omitting, however, the word "peacefully."

Lest we judge John Foster Dulles unfairly by the standards of our own time, it must be said that, to his mind, there must have seemed to have been good reasons for invoking the Communist threat. As Senator Frank Church's (1976) Senate Committee to Study Governmental Operations said: "The extent to which the urgency of the Communist threat had become shared perception is difficult to appreciate." More likely, there was another, more insidious reason for the Cold War: the economy. A glance at a historical graph of the American business cycle will show that since the Civil War, economic depressions tend to precede and follow U.S. wars. Dulles' generation came to power in World War II after having suffered the longest and deepest depression in American history. It could be considered natural for them to overreact to the recessions of 1945-46 and 1949-50 by fomenting war—hot or cold—to feed the military-industrial base of the economy. The research and development of death-dealing technology created the need for unprecedented secrecy. The instrument of keeping those secrets was the cryptocracy.

The Cold War strategy proved to be economically successful.

Without having to risk a full-scale nuclear war and simply by arming the world against communism through weapons marketing, propaganda, and the psychological warfare of the Cold War scheme, the United States achieved a capital goods boom unequalled in modern history.

In the most simple terms, arms constituted the bulk of United States exports from World War Two to the present and figured as the single most important industry which maintained the United States trade balance.

The central core of the Dulles brothers' American containment policy grew from the CIA's covert operations and propaganda efforts. The mood of those times is reflected in a top-secret report submitted by the second Hoover Commission to President Eisenhower in September, 1954, and made public by former CIA man Harry Rositzke. The report urged the United States to make its " . . . aggressive covert psychological, political, and paramilitary organization more effective, more unique, and if necessary, more ruthless than that employed by the enemy . . . We are facing an implacable enemy whose avowed objective is world domination by whatever means and at whatever cost. There are no rules in such a
game . . . We . . . must learn to subvert, sabotage, and destroy our enemies by more clever, more sophisticated, and more effective methods than those used against us . . ."

According to Rositzke "The next year a National Security Council directive reaffirmed the Executive's commitment to covert operations. It instructed the CIA to continue creating problems for 'international Communism,' to reduce its strength and its control worldwide, and to 'increase the capacity and the will of peoples and nations to resist International Communism. It specifically reaffirmed CIA's authority to develop underground resistance and facilitate covert and guerrilla operations.'"

Although the Cold War is generally said to date from 1948, with the Berlin Blockade and the Greek civil war, John Foster Dulles contributed to its architecture before he came to office in 1953. He epitomized the fearful gestalt of his generation, took hold of the floundering Cold War strategy, and moulded it with his personality. He was fond of quoting Alexander Hamilton, who wrote in the Federalist Papers, "Safety from external danger is the most powerful director of national conduct." Hamilton's statement, when taken at face value, seems quite innocent. But in the context of John Foster Dulles' materialistic and puritan upbringing, it is not difficult to see how he construed it to mean something quite different than Hamilton intended. Hamilton's thoughts gave Dulles the moral rationale to try to motivate national political, industrial, and economic conduct by posing an overwhelming external danger—the threat of a nuclear war initiated by the "international Communist conspiracy."

If, at the end of World War II, the growth of our economy, still the strongest and richest in the world, did depend upon the military-industrial complex for sustenance, then Dulles' Cold War saved the U.S. from certain recession.

Without the threat of communism, what could the free world have armed against? And if the health of the U.S. economy continues to depend on that merger of military and industrial interests, then we may well expect to see efforts at detente collapse and the Cold War resume as the already inflated armaments industry expands.

In his farewell address to the nation in 1960, President Eisenhower issued his famous warning about the military industrial complex:

"Our military organization today bears little relation to that known of any of my predecessors in peacetime—or, indeed, by fighting men of World War II or Korea. Until the latest of our world conflicts, the United States had no armaments industry. We annually spend on military security alone more than the net income of all United States corporations. Now this conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence—economic, political, even spiritual—is felt in every city, every state house, every office of the federal government. We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist. "We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted."

Eisenhower accurately predicted the course of history.

"The prospect of domination of the nation's scholars by federal employment, project allocations, and the power of money is ever present and is gravely to be regarded.

"Yet, in holding scientific research and discovery in respect, as we should, we must be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite."
The Cold War was World War III—a war waged largely with words.

Yet the men who had won World War II with advanced weaponry were less artful in the use of the new psychological warfare. As the Cold War escalated, propaganda was followed by sabotage, assassinations, "paramilitary" covert operations, and limited "police actions."

America had traditionally been a free and open society. But after the war, U.S. leaders held in their hands an awesome technological superiority. While being the love object of government, the new technologies, especially nuclear energy, made the leaders fearful of losing their monopoly. That fear gave rise to the belief that new secret agencies and operations were needed to guard against technological thefts by foreign governments. The Cold War was a "secret" war in more ways than one.

The psychological war, originally waged only against "enemy" countries, was nevertheless created at home. It was used within the United States, against beliefs and free thought, by a secret bureaucracy which is still supported by all the power of the federal government, but which operates outside the chain of government command. It is a secret bureaucracy become paranoid—a cryptocracy mad with world power.

Although the Central Intelligence Agency has long been the convenient symbol for all those who have committed atrocities in the name of national security, the secret bureaucracy, the cryptocracy, does not consist solely of the CIA. It is as well a vast network of alliances between individuals in a number of government agencies normally thought to be outside the intelligence field.

Since the cryptocracy violates every constitutional principle as a matter of course, and commits every crime known to man in the interest of "national security," it cannot entirely rely on the patriotism of its agents to keep its secrets. Therefore, no single individual is told more than he has a "need to know."

The cryptocracy is a brotherhood reminiscent of the ancient secret societies, with rites of initiation and indoctrination programs to develop in its loyal membership the special understanding of its mysteries. It has secret codes and oaths of silence which reinforce the sense of elitism necessary for the maintenance of its strict loyalty. It is automated, organized in the mode of a computer, where all have access to general knowledge and the most obvious aims and goals, but where the individual is isolated by tribal rituals and compartmentalization.

It is a technocratic organization without ideology, loyal only to an unspoken, expedient, and undefined patriotism. Its members are anonymous. Its funds are secret. Its operational history is secret. Even its goals are secret. It is a degenerative disease of the body politic which has grown rampantly, spreading so invisibly that after nearly four decades its existence is known only to a handful of "decision makers."

The cryptocracy is designed to function like a machine. It also has the feelings of a machine—none at all. But, unlike a machine, it does have ambition. To it, human beings are so much cheap hardware who perform certain set functions which produce certain predetermined results. They are valued relative to cost and efficiency. The cryptocracy is the perfect cybernetic organism—pure logic at the planning level—nothing but automatic response in the field.

If a prospective agent cannot be recruited by an appeal to patriotism, he is bribed. If he cannot be bribed, he is blackmailed. If he refuses to be blackmailed, he is "programmed." If all these fail, he is killed, for it must not be known that he had ever been approached—so important is "national security."
It is sometimes hard to determine whether the cryptocracy is working for or against the interests of the U.S. President, to whom its constituent agencies are supposed to be accountable. Many of its crimes, now a matter of public record, would indicate that it has often worked against, the President. It has, we know, worked against the U.S. Constitution and the American people. It has needlessly caused the death of innocent people who were working for it, just as it has tortured and murdered those who have stood in its way. Documented atrocities and criminal blunders have been revealed by congressional investigations, yet no one has been brought to trial. Little congressional, judicial, or executive action has been taken to limit its power or ferret out its leaders. Figureheads have been changed, but the organization and the National Security Act which has bred this cancer remains in essence unchanged.

The cryptocracy serves big business and spends a good deal of time and energy supplying American corporations with industrial intelligence. These favours, offered only to those companies friendly to the cryptocracy, may be repaid by such things as political campaign contributions to candidates who are either sympathetic to or compromised by the cryptocracy. In the past the cryptocracy has supported both foreign and domestic politicians with such campaign contributions.

The "old boy network" of retired cryptocrats working within major corporations plays an important role in the cryptocracy's international influence. Secret funds are shunted not only from one agency of government to another, but also from agency to corporation and then, under cover of the corporation's legal business activities, throughout the world, wherever expediency dictates.

Through its authorized functions, the cryptocracy controls the United States government. It feeds the executive branch "intelligence reports" which are often slanted and sometimes falsified, so that the policy decisions which result will be those which fit the cryptocracy's game plan.

Like a fifteenth century Machiavellian principedom that has been computerized and automated, the cryptocracy has systematically manipulated the American consciousness. By justifying its existence by citing an exaggerated danger from communism, it has justified its own totalitarianism by convincing key politicians that fire must be fought with fire. The practices of the cryptocracy, once officially sanctioned only in operations outside the U.S., have become internalized. Those practices have included spying, stealing, blackmail, and murder, even within the borders of the country it is supposed to protect and defend.

Chapter Ten: BRAVE NEW WORLD IN A SKINNER BOX

The cryptocracy's search for reliable mind-control methods was one of the most far-reaching secret projects ever undertaken. In addition to research and development in drugs and hypnosis, CIA funds and cryptocracy guidance gave impetus to a number of behaviour modification projects carried out in federal prisons and mental institutions. Most of the projects were arranged secretly so that recipients of the funds would have no way of knowing that the CIA was backing the research.

Even if they had known of the CIA's involvement, their interest in behaviour modification probably would not have been dampened. Previously called conditioned reflex therapy behaviour modification, in the sixties and seventies, was becoming the most popular tool of psycho-science since Sigmund Freud asked his first patient to lie down on the couch.

Behaviour modification is based on conditioning, but "conditioning" is a big word for a simple form of learning in which a reaction is evoked by an outside action. The reaction is called a response; the outside action is called a stimulus.
In 1927 Pavlov won the Nobel Prize for his discovery of a method of making dogs salivate at the ringing of a bell. Salivating dogs were not much good to anyone, and it was not for making dogs drool that Pavlov was so honoured. He was honoured with the world’s most prestigious award for making dogs drool on cue. He called his process "conditioning."

The dogs’ involuntary response, he called a "reflex." Pavlov's discoveries provided the breakthrough which behavioural science needed to begin to control the human mind.

Pavlov had begun in 1906 by seeking a simple model of the activity of the brain. He decided that the salivary reflex in dogs could be just such a model, so he raided the dog pound and cut holes in the animals’ cheeks to implant measuring devices for the flow of saliva.

By regularly ringing a bell just before feeding the dogs, he found that the stimulus—the sound of the bell intrinsically unrelated to food, began to evoke the salivation that had initially been observed only when the dogs were eating. His patient studies revealed that the quality, rate, and frequency of salivation changed depending upon the quality, rate, and frequency of the stimuli. (My Note. I know that we've already covered this in the last chapter but this time it's from another angle, so bear with it.)

Pavlov's experiments with dogs have been repeated numerous times by different scientists with the same results. Science now agrees that when a hungry dog is given a piece of meat immediately after a bell rings, and when this procedure is repeated a number of times the bell alone will produce the flow of saliva almost as if the bell and not the meat were activating the glands. When the bell rings, not only will a properly conditioned dog salivate but his ears will stand up, he'll turn toward the food source, and even make anticipatory chewing movements. Conditioned reflexes in dogs, however, are a long way from the conditioning of volitional thinking in humans.

But Pavlov established the groundwork by which anyone's emotional stability (Pavlov called it "perpetual equalibration") and sanity could be reliably balanced or unbalanced. To that end the Soviets, and later the People's Republic of China, employed Pavlov's new science for the creation of the totalitarian state.

While the general public in the West may continue to associate behaviour modification with Pavlov's conditioning of dogs, the science is actually an ancient one. In its modern form it has its roots in the works of Descartes who, in 1664, put forward the idea that every activity of an organism is the reaction to an external stimulus. Experimental studies to test Descartes' idea did not begin until several centuries later. Then, simultaneously experimentation began in a number of different countries.

At the same time Pavlov was experimenting with dogs in Russia, John B. Watson was experimenting with humans in the United States. Watson was the founder of the behaviourist school psychology in the 1920s. His most notorious accomplishment was his series of experiments on an eleven-month-old infant known to history as Little Albert.

Watson showed Little Albert a white rat and the child reacted naturally and tried to pet and cuddle the animal.

After Albert had established a playful rapport with the rat, Watson began to aversely condition the lad. Each time the rat would come into Albert's view, Watson would beat the floor with a steel bar and produce a deafening sound. Quite naturally, whenever Albert heard the sound he would jump with fright. Eventually Albert associated the loud sound with the white rat and became frightened of it. Every time the rat came into his view he would begin to cry.
Albert became so aversely conditioned to the rat that he would exhibit fear whenever any small animal came into his view. He became so conditioned that he reacted with equal fear to rabbits, dogs, and a sealskin coat—in short, to anything with fur.

Quite proudly Dr. Watson exclaimed, "Give me the baby, and I'll make it climb and use its hands in constructing buildings of stone or wood . . . I'll make it a thief, a gunman or a dope fiend. The possibilities of shaping in any direction are almost endless. Even gross differences in anatomical structure limits are far less than you may think . . . Make him a deaf mute, and I will still build you a Helen Keller . . . Men are built, not born."

Watson saw things, as Pavlov did, in physical and chemical terms. He was not interested in anything beyond overt and observable behaviour. And Watson was only the first in a long line of American psycho-scientists who were to take the mechanistic path to control of the mind.

Pavlov and Watson's classical conditioning did not, however, go far in producing a reliable science of mind-control. In the late thirties Harvard psychologist Burrhus Frederick Skinner discovered new principles of conditioning which allowed more complete control. Skinner came up with what he called *operant conditioning*. It was based on the idea that reinforcement (the repetition of either a positive or a negative response to an action) was at the root of all learned behaviour. The distinction between *classical* and *operant* conditioning was made only because different techniques were used to elicit the responses. In essence, the effects of either kind of conditioning were the same.

The three most common methods of modern behaviour therapy are operant conditioning, aversion therapy, and desensitization. Operant conditioning is the reinforcement of certain behaviour by reward (usually food), often accompanied by simultaneous sound or light stimulation. Reinforcement is contingent upon the occurrence of the response, and the reinforcing mechanisms are often built into the environment. When rats are used as subjects, the device to be operated is a bar which, when depressed, delivers the reward of food or water. In this situation the behaviour which is reinforced is the pressing of the bar. It makes no difference how the bar is pressed, whether the rat presses the bar with its paw, nose, or tail. Once the bar is pressed, the operation has been performed and the animal is rewarded. The dependent variable in operant conditioning is the response rate—the number of times the bar is pressed. Response rate, or the frequency of the response, is an important factor in judging the success of the operant conditioning.

Aversion therapy is a technique in which an undesirable response is inhibited by a painful or unpleasant reinforcement such as electric shock, noxious odours, or any technique which produces fear and avoidance. It is an ancient form of counter-conditioning, or punishment, which has been widely used in the treatment of homosexuality, stuttering, and alcoholism.

In desensitization the subject is first trained to relax beyond his normal state. He is then presented with images which evoke mild anxiety. At first the images are very mild, and they are repeated until the subject shows no anxiety. Then a stronger image is introduced and the process is repeated. Finally the subject becomes desensitized to even the strongest image. Desensitization has been used to relieve people of phobic fears and anxieties. Skinner began his experiments by building a number of boxes in which pigeons were required to run mazes and press levers to receive the rewards of birdseed. By manipulating the way the reward was given, Skinner found that he could control the rate and the style of the lever pressing.

Eventually Skinner was able to get pigeons to bob and weave in prescribed ways. He was even able to get birds to distinguish colours by having them peck only at levers of specific
colours for food. He soon learned to obtain just about any kind of behaviour he desired from a number of different animals.

Skinner concluded that every action is determined by the environment and that all behaviour is "shaped and maintained by its consequences." The behaviourists' mechanistic view of man was summed up by Skinner when he said, "if by 'machine' you simply mean any system which behaves in an orderly way, then man and all other animals are machines." Skinner's subsequent research, however, showed that behaviour which is supported by continuous rewards stops when the rewards are withheld. Further experimentation showed that by shifting from continuous to intermittent rewards, the behaviour could be kept going even though the rewards became less frequent. This discovery made behaviourism a practical science, for now it could explain how behaviour was maintained in the real world.

With unshakable faith in his own science, Dr. Skinner built a large box with a glass window on one side. It was a soundproof cage, much like the ones he'd used in experiments with pigeons and monkeys. But this box was for children, and into it Skinner put his own child.

This "Skinner box" was about as large as a spacious crib. The temperature of the box was carefully controlled, and Skinner testified proudly that "crying and fussing could always be stopped by slightly lowering the temperature." With the soundproof box, Skinner was "never concerned lest the doorbell, telephone, piano, or children at play wake the baby . . ." And, he added, "soundproofing also protects the family from the baby."

Apparently Skinner's scheme to produce "socialized" children was not so successful. In the opinion of the kindergarten teacher of Skinner's youngest daughter, who had received the "benefits" of spending her early childhood in her daddy's box, she was not an obedient automaton, but a rather independent and even rebellious child. Somehow Skinner's programming of his offspring must have failed in his own terms, for it would appear from his writings that Skinner's ideas are quite in line with the dreams of the cryptocrats who would seek to control us all.

In his popular work *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*, Skinner wrote: "The problem is to free men, not from control, but from certain kinds of control, and it can be solved only if our analysis takes all consequences into account. How people feel about control . . . does not lead to useful distinctions."

Skinner is not only concerned with controlling individuals, he desires to build a controlled society, ruled from crib to coffin by behaviour modification. "The intentional design of a culture and the control of human behaviour it implies are essential if the human species is to continue to develop," he said.

Today B. F. Skinner is the centre of a personality cult. He is the guru and founder of the modern psychophiliology which holds that it is morally and ethically permissible to change the behaviour of others as well as to modify others' belief. About belief Skinner writes, "People must believe that what they are doing has some chance of obtaining what they want or avoiding something to which they are averse. But the chances are in the contingencies. The relation of beliefs to other conditions, such as wants and needs, can be easily stated: to say that desires enter into the causation of beliefs is simply to say that the probability of behaviour with which a belief is associated depends not only upon reinforcement but upon a state of deprivation or aversive stimulation."

Aversion stimulation was the process upon which the Cold War faith was built. The Cold War faith, in turn, loosed the cryptocracy upon the world to murder, maim, or rape the minds of any who posed a real threat to its goals of "defending the free world from communism."

In the words of Lewis Andrews and Marvin Karlins, "The world is, in a sense, one large 'Skinner box' . . ."
And if this is not already true, it soon may be, because there are behaviourists at work in practically every federal and state institution, as well as in the private sector. Using federal and state institutions for testing purposes provided many benefits to the cryptocracy. They functioned as recruitment centres, where selected criminals were released to the custody of career spooks who could apply their skills in undercover work. Prisons were also valuable testing grounds.

Philip Hilts, describing the attitude prevalent in both the cryptocracy and prison bureaucracies, wrote: "There are three possibilities for criminals. The first is deterrent: Keep them from doing it again. The second is punishment: Knock the hell out of the bastards; they deserve it. The third is treatment: They're defective; let's fix them."

Behaviourists who work the prison circuit hold that the last is the only humane way of reducing recidivism. Perhaps. But one also begins to sense in such theorizing a preview of what is to come for the whole society.

"These behavioural engineers are growing mightily in numbers and influence, nourished by a law-and-order administration that though riddled by corruption itself, can still deliver the material goods," wrote David Rorvich. "They are not out to change the world but to make man adjust to it; they seek results, not understanding. A thick-skinned lot they are, not loath to admit the crudity of some of their techniques, claiming results that would take the more elegant psychotherapies and social reforms years to attain. What the world needs now in the service of 'curing' its deviant and miserable masses, proclaim the new psycho-technologists, is not more prison reform, urban renewal, and nude group gropes but a few well-placed corrective kilovolts in the collective brain."

The California Medical Facility at Vacaville was the centre of a number of behavioural research projects funded by various agencies, including the Veterans Administration, HEW, the Bureau of Prisons, private drug companies, and others. Many of these agencies were fronting for the CIA.

In 1973, there was a "flap" in the press over the testing of drugs by these agencies under the guise of behaviour modification. It was revealed that tranquilizers, depressants, sedatives, narcotic antagonists, and hypnotics were being tested in the hospitals and prisons.

Dr. Leo E. Hollister, a medical investigator for the Veterans Administration, defended the practice: 'The exemplary Medical Facility at Vacaville is one of the few places in the country where such [drug] studies are possible . . . at a time when the demands for such facilities are increasing, in response to an urgent public health problem, it would be sad to see them denied to responsible and highly reputable clinical investigators."

It is debatable whether you can characterize the scientists who participated in all the projects as "responsible and highly reputable." It appears from the evidence that some may rather have been, as Philip Hilts playfully suggests, "... hunchbacked wart-infested evil scientists . . ."

Perhaps the greatest danger to freedom of thought and behaviour is posed by the breed of psycho-scientists who call themselves 'behaviourists.' While most psychologists once concerned themselves with the study of human thought and the rich life of the mind, the behaviourists believe that man's problems can best be understood by studying his actions. What a man thinks, sees, feels, wants and knows—everything that a man is, behaviourists believe, can be most easily understood in terms of what he does.
Behaviourism would appear to be a predictable expression of materialistic cultures, East and West, which value externals above all else. You will seldom hear a behaviourist speak of "will" or even "mind." These are considered unscientific, subjective terms. Instead, the behaviourists speak only of "reflexes" which are reinforced by conditioning from the environment. They look forward to the day when they can conclusively prove that conditioning begins at the moment of conception, and that reflexes are ultimately the very stuff of what was once called the soul! The science of behaviourism portrays the human being as mechanistic protoplasm.

The most avant-garde behaviourists have developed an unholy alliance with biochemists who together are exploring genetics, hoping to find the key for breeding selected behavioural characteristics. (My Note. This is covered both at the end of this work, and in book three.)

Certainly a person born with all his limbs will behave differently from a person who is born with genetic damage and without limbs. But beyond that, what some behaviourists are looking for is a genetic factor which controls anger, docility, and other personality tendencies. While many new scientific insights have come from behaviourism, so have many new dangers—especially to the freedom of choice.

"The day has come," said Professor James V. McConnel, head of the Department of Mental Health Research at the University of Michigan, "when we can combine sensory deprivation with the use of drugs, hypnosis, and the astute manipulation of reward and punishment to gain almost absolute control over an individual's behaviour." Dr. McConnel expressed the sentiments of behaviour modifiers who, like cryptocrats, believe that mankind's salvation resides in the control of individual behaviour in an engineered society.

But engineered by whom?

"... We want to reshape our society drastically," McConnel said, "so that all of us will be trained from birth to want to do what society wants us to do. Today's behavioural psychologists are the architects and engineers who are shaping the Brave New World of Tomorrow."

In the practical American way—stripped for action—the psychology profession appears to be turning away from psychotherapy and is becoming dependent upon the time and labour-saving practical mechanics of behaviour modification depending upon principles developed largely through laboratory experimentation. Voluntary as well as involuntary actions can be conditioned. Once a reflex is trained into a subject, he becomes an automaton, responding to the artificial stimulus to which he has been programmed.

When light shines into the pupil of the eye, it contracts, and when the light is removed, it dilates. This papillary reflex is involuntary; the individual has no conscious control over it, but it can be conditioned. C. V. Hudgins demonstrated this by conditioning the pupil to a bell using a light as the unconditioned stimulus. He would turn on the light, which shone directly into the subject's eyes at the same instant he rang a bell. The light made the pupil contract every time just as meat made Pavlov's dog drool.

Hudgins then taught his subjects to use their own hands to operate the bell and light mechanisms. Then he would say "contract" and the subject would press the switch. When he said "relax" the subject would relax and turn off both bell and light. After only a few hours' training, Hudgins found that he could do away with the bell, the hand switch, and the light. He had only to say the word "contract," and the pupil would contract.

A modern apostle of conditioning, Andrew Salter, asserts that hypnosis in essence is the same as conditioning. Salter said that after he had conditioned the reader of his book to contract his pupil, as Hudgins had done, he would take him to an ophthalmologist. "Doctor,"
Salter would declare, "here is a splendid hypnotic subject. I control this person so thoroughly that at my command his pupil will contract, and perceptibly."

"Come now," the doctor would say, "you know very well that pupillary contraction is involuntary. You need light for that." Salter would then tell his conditioned reader "contract," and the reader's pupil would obey every time, and the doctor would be perplexed. "How do you like hypnotism?" Salter would ask the doctor. "It's amazing," he would answer, but his interest would diminish after Salter explained how, paralleling Pavlov and Hudgins, the reader's pupil had been conditioned. "Well," he would say, "come back next time when you have some real hypnotism."

"Our doctor is wrong," Salter said. "There, in the conditioned reflex, he had seen the essence of hypnosis. (And parenthetically, when we see that the essence of hypnotism is conditioning—or quite loosely, that the essence of the 'unconscious mind' is conditioning—we are in a strategic position to develop a sound understanding of the deepest wellsprings of human behaviour)."

The cryptocracy, having discovered the wonders of hypnosis, drugs, behaviour modification, and even more revolutionary electrical and sonic manipulations of the brain, learned how to reliably control individual behaviour.

**Whether or not the Constitution protects the individual's free thought and speech, and whether one regards mind control as bondage or a necessary tool for social engineering, one must recognize that the power to control the mind exists—and is being used.**

Did Philip Hilts know how close he'd come when he offered his chilling description of the crypto-behaviourists? He wrote: "Suppose a dozen controllers with that incurable twitch for power are meeting, now, in some secret mountain cabin. There, amid piles of rat-behaviour charts, rows of cumulative recorders, and reams of human-foibles data, they are designing an environment. They are creating blueprints for a system that would produce the most terrible, violent, and antisocial people possible."

The next (unbefuckinglievable) bit of this that you are now going to read covers something that we will be looking at in much greater detail in the obligatory Dave McGowan chapter.

Page 161 - In July, 1975, the *Sunday Times* in London quoted a U.S. Navy psychologist who admitted that U.S. Naval Intelligence had taken convicted murderers from military prisons, conditioned them as political assassins, and then placed them in American embassies around the world. This admission came shortly after the Senate Intelligence Committee had scolded the CIA for plotting a number of political assassinations around the world...

According to the *Sunday Times* story, naval psychologist Lt. Comdr. Thomas Narut was assigned to the U.S. Regional Medical Centre at Naples, Italy. When he first made public the navy's part in programming assassins, he was attending a NATO conference in Oslo on "Dimensions of Stress and Anxiety." In attendance at that conference were 120 psychologists of all descriptions and from many countries. Many of them were involved in research on how to improve man's ability to cope with stress, but none of them felt compelled, as Narut did, to discuss their work so fully or so frankly.

The stated objective of the conference was to exchange information on how soldiers and people in difficult jobs could cope with stress. Dr. Narut's talk was on "The Use of a Symbolic Model and Verbal Intervention in Inducing and Reducing Stress." His speech began with a plug for the navy. He knew, he said, that many of the scientists present had often encountered problems in their purely scientific research because of the military's inclination to research that would yield quick and useful results. He sympathized with those who had trouble getting subjects, funds, or both, out of the military for their purely scientific research. But things were different in the navy he said.
In the navy, Narut bragged, there were plenty of captive personnel who could be used as guinea pigs. In the navy there was a computerized record of each man's background and psychological profile, so that a quick selection of men with suitable psychological inclinations for experiments could be made. Navy psychologists not only had access to computerized records, but also to psychological tests and background data on a large number of people. In the navy, Narut said, funds were plentiful, and there were no problems with transporting subjects for study to nearly any place in the world. Narut stated proudly that the U.S. Navy provided scientists with the most advanced research facilities in the world.

A Canadian psychologist at the conference later remarked, "Narut's message was loud and clear—'Join the navy and study the world.'" In his brief discourse, Dr. Narut did no more than hint at the work he had been doing in teaching "combat readiness units" to cope with the stress of killing. Later, however, during private questioning with a small group of listeners (reporter Peter Watson of the Sunday Times, a former psychologist, among them), Narut unfolded the amazing story of the navy's programming of assassins on an assembly-line basis.

In his mid-thirties, Dr. Narut had just completed his doctoral dissertation on the question of whether certain films provoke anxiety, and whether forcing a man to do irrelevant tasks while watching violent films would help him cope with the anxiety they produced. When pressed by Watson to explain the details of this kind of conditioning, Narut said that he had worked with "combat readiness units" which included men being programmed for commando-type operations and for undercover placement at U.S. embassies. These, Narut said, were "hit men and assassins" (Narut's words) made ready to kill in selected countries should the need arise. Dr. Alfred Zitani, an American delegate to the conference, was very surprised by Narut's disclosure. "Do you think Dr. Narut realizes what he has just said?" Zitani asked. "That kind of information must be classified."

The conditioning of Narut's assassins was accomplished by audio-visual desensitization, a standard behaviour modification process. These men were "desensitized" to mayhem by being shown films of people being killed or injured in a number of different ways. At first the films would show only mild forms of bloodshed. As the men became acclimated to the scenes of carnage, they would see progressively more violent scenes. The assassin candidates, Narut explained, would eventually be able to dissociate any feelings they might have from even the goriest scenes they viewed. (My Note. Think about today's horror films or PC games).

Narut said that of course U.S. naval psychologists would have first selected the candidates for training by their psychological makeup. Those selected for assassination assignments were often from submarine crews and paratroops.

Others were convicted murderers from military prisons who had already shown a proclivity for violence. Still others were men who had been given awards for valour. World War II Medal of Honour winner Audie Murphy was a subject of extensive research.

The best killers, according to Narut, were men whom psychologists would classify as "passive-aggressive" personalities. These were people with strong drives that were usually kept under tight control. Such types were usually calm, but from time to time would exhibit outbursts of temper during which they could literally kill without remorse.

Narut said that through psychological testing, he and his colleagues were looking for more such men, for further conditioning.

Among the tests used by the navy to determine violent natures was the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, which is used widely by educators and businessmen to determine psychological qualities of students and employees. The tests consist of hundreds
of questions designed to measure such personality traits as hostility, depression, and psychopathy.

According to Narut, the men selected by the tests, or by evidence of past violence, were taken for programming to the navy's neuropsychiatric laboratory in San Diego, California, or to the Naples medical centre which employed Dr. Narut. Audio-visual desensitization was the major technique used in programming the assassins. Psychological indoctrination completed the programming by instilling the desired prejudicial attitudes. The audio-visual desensitization began with the subject strapped into a chair with his head clamped so that he could not look away from the screen. A special mechanism prevented the subject's eyelids from closing. The candidate was then shown a film of an African youth being crudely circumcised by fellow members of his tribe. The youth was circumsised with a blunt knife, painfully and without anaesthetic. This well-known film is used widely in psychological experiments to create stress. Afterwards the candidate was asked about details of what he had seen. He was asked, for example, to describe the colour of the belt on the doctor's trousers, or the motif on the handle of the knife that cut off the foreskin.

The next film showed a man in a sawmill, where planks were sliced from huge logs. In the operation of the saw the man slipped and cut off his fingers.

As the films progressed in gruesomeness, the reactions of the candidate were measured by sensing devices. Heartbeat, breathing rate, and brain waves were recorded, very much as on a polygraph. If the physiological responses, which might have been great in the beginning, slowed down and resumed normal patterns as the more bloodthirsty scenes were viewed, the candidates were judged to have completed this stage of conditioning.

The last phase of conditioning, Narut said, was to indoctrinate the candidates to think of their potential enemies as inferior forms of life. By this stage, the candidates would have already been selected for assignment to particular countries. They would be shown films and given lectures which portrayed the customs and cultural habits of the foreign countries in a biased fashion. The people of those countries would be portrayed as enemies of the United States and were always spoken of in demeaning terms. They were often presented as if they were "less than human." Their customs were ridiculed, and local leaders were presented as evil demagogues, even if they were legitimate political figures.

According to Dr. Narut it took only a few weeks to indoctrinate susceptible candidates by this process. Those who were not susceptible to the conditioning were dropped earlier in the program and returned to other assignments. Narut admitted that he did not have the necessary "need to know" as to where all the programmed men were sent, although at one point in his conversation with Peter Watson, Narut specified that programmed assassins have been installed in the Athens embassy. He said that his busiest time was when a large group of men went through such training towards the end of 1973, at the time of the Yom Kippur War.

After the Oslo conference interview, Watson returned to London to file his story. Writing up the details, he found a few points which needed clarification but he could not reach Narut either at his home or in his laboratory in Naples. Watson then asked the U.S. embassy in London to comment on the information Narut had volunteered. The embassy passed the buck to the U.S. Navy. Within a few days the Pentagon issued a categorical denial that the U.S. Navy had ever "engaged in psychological training or other types of training of personnel as assassins. They also denied that any such training had ever taken place either in San Diego or in Naples. They said they too had been unable to contact Lieutenant Commander Narut, but they did confirm that he was on the staff of the U.S. Regional Medical Centre in Naples as a psychologist. But Dr. Zitani later offered to testify about what Narut had told him to "appropriate authorities." Watson was also approached later by a psychologist in Los Angeles who said he had seen the Pentagon denials so thought Watson would like to know
that he had lent the San Diego psychologists a copy of his film on circumcision which was used in the desensitization conditioning.

A few days later Narut was located. He flew to London to discuss the matter ostensibly with Watson's paper, the *Sunday Times*, but instead he held a press conference saying only that he had been talking in "theoretical and not practical terms." He then flew back to the Naples base. After his return to Naples, U.S. naval headquarters in London offered the official explanation for Narut's statement: Narut had "personal problems." A few days later Watson was able to contact Narut at the U.S. hospital in Naples, but he refused to elaborate on his disclosure.

During the Oslo conference interview, Narut had said several times that what he was saying about the assassins was "coming out anyway." He was referring to the congressional disclosures about CIA assassination plots. But the fact that the navy had been operating along lines similar to the CIA was not known to the public nor has it subsequently been admitted. The details of the story that Lieutenant Commander Narut related have been strongly and categorically denied in all subsequent queries of the navy.

It came as no surprise to many that the navy had been interested in psychological research to help its men cope with "stress." Several years before, one of the organizers of the Oslo conference, Dr. Irwin Sarason, had been approached by the navy to work on projects similar to Narut's. At the time, the navy had said nothing to him about programming assassins; it said it wanted him to adapt his work for applications to "spies."

In response to that request, Sarason devised a film which showed how successful students asked questions in school. The film was shown to a group of juvenile delinquents for a period of time until they too, learned how to pose the right questions. As a result, over the next two years they did much better in their studies and got in trouble less. The control group who had *not* seen the films did just as poorly in school as they'd always done and were just as delinquent.

Since his "symbolic modelling" study had been successful, Sarason wanted to continue his research and applied to the Office of Naval Research for more funding. A few weeks after his application was received, Sarason was called by a navy official who asked him if he would object to having his work classified. Sarason wondered why, and the navy official told him his research would be most valuable to the navy's neuropsychiatric laboratory in California, as spies were being trained there to resist interrogation. The naval official said that if Sarason would allow his work to be classified, he'd get all the funds he needed. But Sarason was interested in the peaceful scientific nature of his work, not its military applications, so he refused to have the project classified. His goal was the exception rather than the rule.

The federal government supports most scientific research in the United States. Enough psychologists and other social scientists haven't asked questions about what their research is to be used for; their main objective has been to get the grant, so they could support themselves and their scientific curiosity. Since too many of them have been politically disinterested or naive, they have been easy prey for the cryptocracy.

Lieutenant Commander Narut was therefore but one in a long line of psychologists being employed for psychological warfare and illegal clandestine operations.

Another such operation was the training of security officers at the Washington-based International Police Academy by psychologists and sociologists. The officers were supposedly being taught interrogation techniques for Third World countries; actually it was a highly sensitive clandestine operation organized for the training of U.S. spies. Congress closed the Academy on January 1, 1974, after its real purpose was disclosed to the press.
Another, uncovered in the late 1960s, was "Project CAMELOT," purportedly a sociopolitical analysis of Chile, but actually designed to keep Chile free of Communist leaders by discrediting them. Project CAMELOT played an important role in the overthrow of Salvador Allende and his democratically elected leftist government.

In 1975 Congress questioned the navy about its development of a questionnaire to survey attitudes toward death. Congressmen had learned that psychologists were eagerly working on such a questionnaire, known as the "Value of Life" study, that would allow the navy to assess a recruit's willingness and ability to kill from the very first day he entered the service.

In still another government-funded experiment, psychologists working for the Human Resources Research Organization in Alexandria, Virginia, had conducted a brutal series of "stress-training" experiments in the early 1960s. In one experiment army "volunteers" were taken on an airplane flight. Suddenly, the airplane's engines failed and the plane was forced to land abruptly on a rough airstrip. The soldiers were later tested to see if this incident had caused a fear of flying. In another experiment soldiers were taken out and "lost" in a forest. Suddenly, a huge forest fire engulfed them, so that the men found themselves "off course" and surrounded by fire. These men were tested to see if that experience had given them a fear of fire. In yet another experiment, soldiers were allowed to "stray" into an artillery target area. Shells were exploding all around them, and they had to get out of the area by keeping cool and following orders. Since artillery shells fired from a distance of twenty-five miles away are hard to control, the explosions were created by detonating underground charges triggered by remote control from a lookout point. After the realistic shelling was over the men were tested to see if they suffered any discernible "shell shock."

During all these experiments the men were under visual observation. In some, they also wore telemetry devices which allowed scientists to measure their pulse rate, respiration, and other vital signs to determine the level of stress they were experiencing at the time they were exposed to the dangers.

As this battery of experiments became known to the outside world, public opinion and congressional pressure brought a stop to them. The military was not deterred, however, from other kinds of cruel and dangerous experimentation; it continued its stress research in spite of the bad publicity.

While military "stress testing" may have developed useful insights into the psychology of warriors, its primary goal, as Lieutenant Commander Narut pointed out, was the programming of assassins. These experiments were most useful in programming those men who were already inclined to kill. Hypnosis was still the only effective tool for motivating those who were not inclined to kill, then for erasing the memory of their crimes or eliciting false confessions.

Alarmed by evidence found in the assassinations of John and Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King, Dr. Joseph L. Bernd of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in 1968 questioned leading authorities on hypnosis about the possible use of hypnosis to motivate assassins.

Bernd wanted to know if political influences could be induced by hypnosis; could people be hypno-programmed to operate unconsciously and take what seemed to be independent action? Could people be influenced to commit political assassination as a consequence of hypnotic influence?

In his query Bernd asked authorities to assume that a skilled hypnotist found a subject who was both a good hypnotic subject and highly capable in the use of weapons. They were to assume that the subject also had a deep hatred for some political personality prominent in the news. Bernd's first question to the authorities was: 'Could the hypnotist use hypnotic suggestion to persuade the weapons expert to kill the hated political personality at a
time and under conditions suggested by the hypnotist?"

His second question was: "Could the hypnotic suggestion of this action be achieved in a way which could leave the subject assassin unconscious of and unable to recall to consciousness the fact that his violent act was made as a consequence of hypnotic suggestion?"

The authorities who responded to Bernd's questions stated that they did think it possible to induce a subject to kill. One expert said, "... I would say that a highly skilled hypnotist, working with a highly susceptible subject, could possibly persuade the subject to kill another human..." Another expert went further, saying that it was possible through posthypnotic suggestion to make a subject unable to recall his act. "There could be a conspiracy," one expert wrote, "but a conspiracy of which the principal was unaware."

It may well be that Bernd hit a nerve in the cryptocracy. His report, "Assassination and Hypnosis: Political Influence or Conspiracy," was never published.

But despite all the efforts of the cryptocracy, slowly, the secrets of mind control began to emerge.

page 236 - It should come as no surprise that many men will murder for simple, old-fashioned motives: sex, love, or money.

One psychologist found that a sizable percentage of Americans would be willing to kill another human being if they were offered enough money and assured they would never be caught.

In 1976 a Pasadena, California, psychologist, Dr. Paul Cameron, put the murder-for-pay question to 452 persons. Those questioned were divided into two groups. The first group included those who had already deliberately killed or attempted to kill another human being—usually in military service. The second group consisted of those who had never attempted to kill another person.

The question was: "What is the least amount of money you would take to push a button to kill a person inside a black box—if no one would ever know what you did?"

To Cameron's surprise, 45 percent of those who had killed before said they would be willing to push the black box button for an average price of only $20,000. Twenty five percent of those who'd never killed said they'd be willing to commit murder for an average price of $50,000, about the price of a house in the suburbs.

Chapter Twenty THE ENGINES OF SECURITY

The gases of technology fuel the engines of security. New terrifying technology created secret systems to conceal its potential for devastation. Those systems, in turn, proliferated into an industry of secrecy. That industry turned its vast potential to research and development to create a science of secrecy—mind control—a science unto itself.

The cryptocracy has used mind control for the past thirty years. It has used it on its own agents and employees, on enemies and friends alike. It has used it on thousands of Americans without their knowledge or consent. The CIA has programmed assassins and couriers by it. The CIA has even openly confessed to its conspiracy of mind control.

Many people will believe that since the CIA has publicly disclosed its interest in mind control, it has now ceased its activities. The earlier CIA records, however, contain a number of termination dates for aspects of Operation Mind Control, yet evidence clearly suggests that it continued past those dates.
In 1975, following the release of the Rockefeller (My Note. do I even have to say anything to you about this?) Commission Report and the subsequent investigations by Senator Church's and Congressman Pike's committees, a public accounting was given and apologies were made. The intelligence community was reprimanded and small changes made.

But then in July, 1977, following a wave of resignations in the CIA's clandestine services, CIA Director Adm. Stansfield Turner informed the Senate Intelligence Committee that the whole story had not been told, even though the case had been put to rest. Turner informed the committee and the White House that additional information had been "found" that proved the CIA had given a number of mind-controlling drugs to untold numbers of Americans, including alcoholics, drug addicts, and terminal cancer patients.

A CIA spokesman questioned by reporters could say no more than he did not know how many persons were tested or whether any harm resulted, but that the new records indicated that there had been cases in addition to those revealed in the previous congressional hearings.

The result was headlines in the press about the CIA and drugs (the two words were now commonly linked), but few newsmen made the connection between drug tests and behaviour control or mind control.

Recent history documents the fact that the CIA, as the whipping boy of the cryptocracy, covers up and routinely lies about its activities, heaping one lie on another, in a labyrinthine network of falsehood. It stretches credibility to believe, therefore, that the CIA and especially lower-profile members of the cryptocracy have terminated the mind control research and development that has been going on for thirty years. While it may be true that the pain-drug hypnosis aspects of mind control have been stopped, one cannot believe that it has ceased because it is thought illegal or immoral. If it has ceased, it has ceased only because it is obsolete and the new technology of radiation and electronic brain stimulation has given the cryptocracy a more powerful form of control. What is likely is that the cryptocracy is moving from the control of an individual's mind and body to the control of the masses.

There is usually a twenty-year lag between the laboratory development of new technology and its application at large. For example, the techniques of audio-visual desensitization were developed at Stanford University in the mid-fifties by Volpe and Lazarus. Working under government contracts at the time, they discovered how a person could be cured of phobic fears (such as the fear of flying), alcoholism, drug addiction, homosexuality, and other "social illnesses" that were previously thought incurable. While Volpe and Lazarus thought that they were merely trying to develop a technique to help people, the government kept a watchful eye on their research. As we discovered by the confession of Commander Narut, the navy used audiovisual desensitization for its own purposes in the mid-seventies, exactly twenty years after its original development.

The techniques of narco-hypnosis were developed before World War II and became widely applied in the early sixties. The next stage of mind control is based on radiation which can stimulate the brain for the purpose of remote control. This technology already exists today and is in the experimental stage. We can be assured that inside twenty years it will be used widely by people outside the government.

The problem of mass manipulation is much easier to solve than individual manipulation. A number of studies have demonstrated that people behave in groups much differently than they do alone. One navy study showed that the most potent modifier of behaviour is peer-group pressure. This same pressure comes into play in crowd psychology.
By controlling the leaders of a crowd, the entire crowd can be controlled through simple suggestion. It has been demonstrated that the cryptocracy has the desire and the technology to control us all.

The cryptocracy's desire for control comes from the desire for national security. National security has been the excuse for illegal U.S. activities everywhere in the world. National security has made a mockery of the Geneva Convention as well as the Constitution of the United States. It has become the fool proof cover not only for authorized foreign activities but also for unsanctioned deeds of both cryptocrats and politicians. It has been the main instrument for the manipulation of public opinion. The primary target against which the national security managers have waged their psychological war has been the people of the United States.

Secret government cannot function in a climate of free speech, open criticism, and public exposure. The question comes down to one of democracy: are the American people willing to give up their democratic principles in exchange for this elusive national security?

In his book Roots of War, retired cryptocrat Richard Barnet wrote: "[The] great root of war is the vulnerability of the public to manipulation on national security issues. People do not perceive where their true interests lie and hence are easily swayed by emotional appeals to support policies that cost them their money, their sons, and their own lives. Because they have been willing to accept uncritically the myth of the national interest—i.e., the definition advanced by the national security managers—they exercise almost no control over the commitments the managers make in their name. Supposedly [they are] the beneficiaries of national security policy which really protects the interests of all Americans only if those interests are articulated in the political process."

Even Gen. Maxwell Taylor has lamented the corruption of the national security premise: "National security," he said, "once a trumpet call to the nation to man the ramparts and repel invaders, has fallen into disrepute, a victim of complications arising from the Vietnam syndrome and from its own internal contradictions, excessive defence budgets and collusive dealings with the military-industrial complex. Watergate revelations have fuelled suspicions that it may be little more than a cover for executive encroachments upon civil liberties and a free press."

While propaganda, disinformation, misinformation, and assassination have all played an important role in bringing the American democracy to heel, mind control holds its future. It is not surprising that under the label of national security the cryptocracy should seek to control minds. Nor can it come as a surprise that the cryptocracy (always in the vanguard of technology) should develop efficient methods of mind control. But that the legal machinery of the Constitution of the United States should become so fouled by the practitioners of psycho-politics can be experienced only with the outrage one feels at a case of rape, for it not only represents the rape of law and democratic values, but also the rape of heretofore inviolate recesses of man—his mind and soul.

America's form of government was created by men who clearly saw that those in power, no matter how well meaning, could unwittingly endanger the liberties of individuals. The Bill of Rights was incorporated in the Constitution to ensure liberty. Most important, it set limits on what the government could not do to its citizens, even with the approval of the majority. The constitutional protections were largely effective until they were circumvented by the technological revolution and the National Security Act of 1947. By that one act, the safeguards of privacy which had protected U.S. citizens for nearly two centuries were dissolved by a President and approved by a Congress which emerged into a Cold War paralyzed by fear of the new death-dealing technology the cryptocracy had created. The National Security Act is a Catch-22. It grants the National Security Council sweeping and virtually unlimited powers to integrate all policies of government and coordinate all agencies, both foreign and domestic.
And just what is "national security"? Presidents, secretaries of state and defence, and scholars have been trying to define it since the term was coined.

According to Frank N. Trager and Frank L. Simonie, in their book *National Security and American Society*, national security is "the part of government policy having as its objective the creation of national and international conditions favourable to the protection or extension of vital national values against existing and potential adversaries."

Over the years we've seen the "adversaries" defined as home-grown Communists, critics of government policy, and all those who marched to end the Vietnam conflict, and eventually anyone Richard Nixon thought did not agree with his political outlook. We've seen "vital national values" defined as those values which work for the interests of corporate oligopolies, regardless of their effects on the national economy or the best interests of the people of the United States. (My Note. Remember this was written back in 1976. Today it's terrorists and Muslims, as they seem to be practically interchangeable according to the news, and come to think about it, maybe guys like me for telling you about all this stuff!)

Rather than live by the principles of democracy, and demonstrate to the totalitarian countries the dynamics of freedom, the cryptocrats resorted to the practice of tyrants. In so doing they damaged their own cherished institutions, and lost time, money, and lives in the useless and poorly conceived Cold War campaign. Since its beginning the cryptocracy's Cold War against communism has been a losing battle. In the postindustrial World, politics and nationalism were replaced by economics as the motivating force of modern society. The U.S. cryptocrats seemed not to believe in the strength of the 'free enterprise' system. They ignored the fact that the world had become more than anything else an economic battleground.

Despite the realities of modern global politics, the U.S. cryptocracy has continued to assert that secrecy is its most vital weapon against the Communists. On this point the argument goes: "In our open society with its free press, it is very difficult to win against a closed Communist world. We must assume the cloak of secrecy, like the Communists, in order to hold our own against them." (My Note. now it's us the public who are the threat!!)

The "national security" mentality, while manifesting a paranoid need for secrecy and control, was not the major cause of the growth of cryptocracy. The wonders of the post industrial age were the real cause for the erosion of freedom and privacy. The creation of new weapons of terrible proportions created a nuclear medusa complex; all who looked upon the bomb were turned to stone by their fear.

The growth of the "soft" social sciences made possible an invisible totalitarianism. These "humanist" sciences became new tools for studying and labelling individual behaviour. They came to be applied to create boundaries of conformity. Further, the desire for conformity created the need for the surveillance of individual behaviour.

The growth of government and the creation of large industry inevitably gave birth to bureaucracy. Bureaucracy with the aid and encouragement of the educational establishment created files, and cryptocracy created super secret psychological files. With advancements in electronic technology— increasingly sophisticated microphones, transmitters, and surveillance devices—the erosion of privacy becomes a mudslide.

Although the most often invoked justification for secrecy is to keep technology from falling into enemy hands, history has shown that secrecy is, at best, only a delay to public access. Since modern technologies have been developed from a pool of common scientific knowledge, they cannot be kept secret for long. Eventually, all the fruits of the empirical pool slip from specific control and find their way into general use as independent discoveries take place.
Mind control, as it exists today, will certainly become available within twenty years to anyone who desires it and can afford it. (My Note. Remember this was wrote in 1976!)

Equally to blame with the cryptocracy for the development of mind control are the psycho-sciences. Here are educated men and women who have spent many hours in study, preparing (supposedly) for years of service to their fellow men. They have high standing in the society and are well paid. They are the priests of a new religion.

The psycho-scientists who have allowed their research to be used against humanity should be known. They must be held ethically accountable for their research into coercive mind control.

Psychology itself is not entirely made up of cryptocrats and people who seek control over others. There are "humanist" psychologists who seek only to help people. But to behaviourists humanistic psychology seems to be not much more than a fad. And if a fad it is, it will probably fade into history, leaving behind the Skinnerian kind of psychology, the kind that now dominates American college classrooms, the only really reliable psychology, the psychology of conditioning — behaviourism. And from behaviourism comes behaviour modification.

Mind control remains above United States law, making it a most attractive tool for clandestine operators. U.S. courts, and even the majority of the psychiatric profession, will not admit that it is possible to take over someone's memory and willpower by mind control. Until now, there has been little to prove the case.

In several foreign democracies, however, cases have come to trial which involved hypnotists who had their subjects commit crimes while acting under posthypnotic suggestion. The "criminals" robbed banks or committed murders without being conscious of their crimes. In these cases the foreign courts placed the burden of blame on the mind controllers. The hypnotists, received the stiff sentences, while the "trigger persons" were either allowed to go free or given greatly reduced terms. In the United States no such precedent exists. When it has come up in a trial, the question has been ducked, since it would require lengthy testimony by psycho-scientific experts, few of whom seem able to agree on the subject.

The closest the courts have come to considering the case of mind control was in the Patty Hearst case, but F. Lee Bailey at the last minute backed away from his planned "brainwashing" defence. One of the witnesses for the defence was Dr. Martin T. Orne. (more on him later on people, much more!) Dr. Orne testified at the trial that Patty Hearst had indeed been "brainwashed" by the SLA. Orne should have known whether or not Patty Was brainwashed since, as the head of the Office of Naval Research's Committee on Hypnosis, he helped develop the coercive use of hypnotic mind control for the cryptocracy.

Despite Orne's expert testimony Ms. Hearst's plea of duress was ignored and she was imprisoned subject to psychiatric review. A close examination of her trial records may shed a great deal of light on the problem an individual faces in pleading "mind control."

There is no one who dispenses freedom, but there are many who would take it away.

Freedom is not free; it must be won. The individual must stand with others against even the smallest tyranny.

The price of freedom is eternal vigilance.

Former CIA official Victor Marchetti put it plainly when he told Freedom News Service what he thought ought to be done.
When pressed for concrete examples of what a citizen can do to curb secrecy, dismantle the cryptocracy, and return democracy to the people, he said, "You know, you just can't beat it. The only way you're going to clean up some of these outfits would be if a President came in there and said, 'Well, I'm just not going to tolerate some of this stuff.' And even then it would be difficult for the President because this bureaucracy is so entrenched and so fortified that it has connections all over in our society. 'The CIA and the FBI do not completely control the office of the President obviously, but they have an awful lot of influence in that office. Their influence derives from their capabilities and the fact that they operate in secrecy . . . They are not really concerned with the public interest. They always hide behind such things as 'national security' and they say that their activities are in the 'national interests' but the record doesn't substantiate that. 'You may stem the tide, and then begin to push it back, but you're not going to change it overnight. This thing was building for thirty-five years. . . . These guys aren't going to just change. They're going to go down swinging; we've seen that already.'"

In July, 1977, President Carter appointed his former Annapolis classmate, Adm. Stansfield Turner, to head the entire intelligence community. In so doing he gave him sweeping powers which no other intelligence director in the history of the United States has ever possessed. With one quick stroke of the pen Carter created America's version of Lavrenti Beria, the late chief of the Soviet secret police.

This was Carter's promised reorganization of the intelligence community. Appearing to reorganize it under Turner, he merely strengthened its totalitarian potential.

Only days before Turner was made intelligence czar, as director of CIA he testified before the Senate Intelligence Committee investigating MKULTRA. Turner told the senators that the CIA had stopped all drug testing. He was not asked nor did he volunteer information about new technologies of mind control. He did not say the mind-control operations had stopped, only that the experiments had stopped.

While the CIA has been severely criticized, and some of its activities appear to have been apparently curtailed, so unfettered is the cryptocracy that some other, as yet unnamed, agency may be right now consolidating power and extending the ruthless and subtle psychological war against democracy.

The individual can do little to stop the use of psychopolitics, the cryptocracy's most important weapon, against him. But individuals working together can be effective. Americans are a people with a tradition of freedom—as always, paid for in blood. Regardless of how difficult life becomes in the complex modern world, men must not give up their freedom to think for themselves. From that freedom springs all others. But we must not be naive. To attempt to stop mind control is to confront the cryptocracy in its lair. Without mind control how can the cryptocracy be certain it will be able to keep its secrets?

Operation Mind Control will not be exposed by the work of an honest security guard and diligent reporters, as was the case with Watergate. It will take nothing less than a concerted effort on the part of an informed and outraged public, their legal representatives, and the press to uncover even the beginning of the trail to the identity of the elite core of the secret government which rapes the human mind. And, in the process of uncovering the cabal of mind controllers, the entire fabric of the United States government may well come unravelled.

To stop the cryptocracy, the Congress and the people will have to wage a ceaseless campaign to dismantle and reorganize the entire intelligence community from the ground up under some law other than the ill-defined National Security Act. Congress has taken only token steps in this direction, having embraced the myth of National Security.
The campaign to stop the cryptocracy will require the same sacrifice, the same endurance, the same expression of national group feeling that it took to end the Vietnam conflict. In one way the fight is the same—the enemy is within.

Somewhere within the United States the technology for the creation of the perfect slave state is being perfected.

Whether or not the mind-controlled state becomes a reality depends not so much upon the efforts of the cryptocrats, but upon the free will, determination, and strength of character of the American people.

And now a brief summation of MK-Ultra for you that was taken from Wikipedia.

Project MKULTRA from Wikipedia, the free encyclopaedia

Project MK-ULTRA, or MKULTRA, was the code name for a covert CIA mind-control and chemical interrogation research program, run by the Office of Scientific Intelligence. The program began in the early 1950s, continuing at least through the late 1960s, and it used United States citizens as its test subjects. The published evidence indicates that Project MK-ULTRA involved the surreptitious use of many types of drugs, as well as other methods, to manipulate individual mental states and to alter brain function.

Project MK-ULTRA was first brought to wide public attention in 1975 by the U.S. Congress, through investigations by the Church Committee, and by a presidential commission known as the Rockefeller Commission. Investigative efforts were hampered by the fact that CIA Director Richard Helms ordered all MK-ULTRA files destroyed in 1973; the Church Committee and Rockefeller Commission investigations relied on the sworn testimony of direct participants and on the relatively small number of documents that survived Helms' destruction order.

Although the CIA insists that MK-ULTRA-type experiments have been abandoned, 14-year CIA veteran Victor Marchetti has stated in various interviews that the CIA routinely conducts disinformation campaigns and that CIA mind control research continued. In a 1977 interview, Marchetti specifically called the CIA claim that MK-ULTRA was abandoned a "cover story."

On the Senate floor in 1977, Senator Ted Kennedy said:

The Deputy Director of the CIA revealed that over thirty universities and institutions were involved in an "extensive testing and experimentation" program which included covert drug tests on unwitting citizens "at all social levels, high and low, native Americans and foreign." Several of these tests involved the administration of LSD to "unwitting subjects in social situations." At least one death, that of Dr. Olson, resulted from these activities. The Agency itself acknowledged that these tests made little scientific sense. The agents doing the monitoring were not qualified scientific observers.

To this day most specific information regarding Project MKULTRA remains highly classified.

The project's intentionally oblique CIA cryptonym is made up of the digraph MK, meaning that the project was sponsored by the agency's Technical Services Division, followed by the word ULTRA (which had previously been used to designate the most secret classification of World War II intelligence). Other related cryptonyms include MK-NAOMI and MK-DELTA.

A precursor of the MK-ULTRA program began in 1945 when the Joint Intelligence Objectives Agency was established and given direct responsibility for Operation Paperclip. Operation
Paperclip was a program to recruit former Nazi scientists. Some of these scientists studied torture and brainwashing, and several had just been identified and prosecuted as war criminals during the Nuremberg Trials.[8][9]

Several secret U.S. government projects grew out of Operation Paperclip. These projects included Project CHATTER (established 1947), and Project BLUEBIRD (established 1950), which was later renamed to Project ARTICHOKE in 1951. Their purpose was to study mind-control, interrogation, behaviour modification and related topics.

Headed by Dr. Sidney Gottlieb, the MK-ULTRA project was started on the order of CIA director Allen Dulles on April 13, 1953,[10] largely in response to Soviet, Chinese, and North Korean use of mind-control techniques on U.S. prisoners of war in Korea.[11] The CIA wanted to use similar methods on their own captives. The CIA was also interested in being able to manipulate foreign leaders with such techniques,[12] and would later invent several schemes to drug Fidel Castro.

Experiments were often conducted without the subjects' knowledge or consent.[13] In some cases, academic researchers being funded through grants from CIA front organizations were unaware that their work was being used for these purposes.[14]

In 1964, the project was renamed MK-SEARCH. The project attempted to produce a perfect truth drug for use in interrogating suspected Soviet spies during the Cold War, and generally to explore any other possibilities of mind control.

Another MK-ULTRA effort, Subproject 54, was the Navy's top secret "Perfect Concussion" program, which used sub-aural frequency blasts to erase memory.[15]

Because most MK-ULTRA records were deliberately destroyed in 1973 by order of then CIA Director Richard Helms, it has been difficult, if not impossible, for investigators to gain a complete understanding of the more than 150 individually funded research sub-projects sponsored by MK-ULTRA and related CIA programs.[16]

Goals

The Agency poured millions of dollars into studies probing dozens of methods of influencing and controlling the mind. One 1955 MK-ULTRA document gives an indication of the size and range of the effort; this document refers to the study of an assortment of mind-altering substances described as follows:[17]

1. Substances which will promote illogical thinking and impulsiveness to the point where the recipient would be discredited in public.
2. Substances which increase the efficiency of mentation and perception.
3. Materials which will prevent or counteract the intoxicating effect of alcohol.
4. Materials which will promote the intoxicating effect of alcohol.
5. Materials which will produce the signs and symptoms of recognized diseases in a reversible way so that they may be used for malingering, etc.
6. Materials which will render the induction of hypnosis easier or otherwise enhance its usefulness.
7. Substances which will enhance the ability of individuals to withstand privation, torture and coercion during interrogation and so-called "brain-washing".
8. Materials and physical methods which will produce amnesia for events preceding and during their use.
9. Physical methods of producing shock and confusion over extended periods of time and capable of surreptitious use.
10. Substances which produce physical disablement such as paralysis of the legs, acute anaemia, etc.
11. Substances which will produce "pure" euphoria with no subsequent let-down.
12. Substances which alter personality structure in such a way that the tendency of the recipient to become dependent upon another person is enhanced.
13. A material which will cause mental confusion of such a type that the individual under its influence will find it difficult to maintain a fabrication under questioning.
14. Substances which will lower the ambition and general working efficiency of men when administered in undetectable amounts.
15. Substances which promote weakness or distortion of the eyesight or hearing faculties, preferably without permanent effects.
16. A knockout pill which can surreptitiously be administered in drinks, food, cigarettes, as an aerosol, etc., which will be safe to use, provide a maximum of amnesia, and be suitable for use by agent types on an ad hoc basis.
17. A material which can be surreptitiously administered by the above routes and which in very small amounts will make it impossible for a man to perform any physical activity whatsoever.

Historians have asserted that creating a "Manchurian Candidate" subject through "mind control" techniques was a goal of MK-ULTRA and related CIA projects.\[^{[18]}\]

**Canadian experiments**

The experiments were exported to Canada when the CIA recruited Scottish physician Donald Ewen Cameron, creator of the "psychic driving" concept, which the CIA found particularly interesting. Cameron had been hoping to correct schizophrenia by erasing existing memories and reprogramming the psyche. He commuted from Albany, New York to Montreal every week to work at the Allan Memorial Institute of McGill University and was paid $69,000 from 1957 to 1964 to carry out MKULTRA experiments there. In addition to LSD, Cameron also experimented with various paralytic drugs as well as electroconvulsive therapy at thirty to forty times the normal power. His "driving" experiments consisted of putting subjects into drug-induced coma for weeks at a time (up to three months in one case) while playing tape loops of noise or simple repetitive statements. His experiments were typically carried out on patients who had entered the institute for minor problems such as anxiety disorders and postpartum depression, many of whom suffered permanently from his actions.\[^{[27]}\] His treatments resulted in victims' incontinence, amnesia, forgetting how to talk, forgetting their parents, and thinking their interrogators were their parents.\[^{[28]}\] His work was inspired and paralleled by the British psychiatrist Dr William Sargant at St Thomas' Hospital, London, and Belmont Hospital, Surrey, who was also involved in the Intelligence Services and who experimented extensively on his patients without their consent, causing similar long-term damage.\[^{[29]}\] Dr. Cameron and Dr. Sargant are the only two identified Canadian experimenters, but the MKULTRA file makes reference to many other unnamed physicians who were recruited by the CIA.\[^{[citation needed]}\]

It was during this era that Cameron became known worldwide as the first chairman of the World Psychiatric Association as well as president of the American and Canadian psychiatric associations. Cameron had also been a member of the Nuremberg medical tribunal in 1946-47.\[^{[30]}\]

**Revelation**

In 1973, CIA Director Richard Helms ordered all MK-ULTRA files destroyed. Pursuant to this order, most CIA documents regarding the project were destroyed, making a full investigation of MK-ULTRA impossible.
In December 1974, The New York Times reported that the CIA had conducted illegal domestic activities, including experiments on U.S. citizens, during the 1960s. That report prompted investigations by the U.S. Congress, in the form of the Church Committee, and by a presidential commission known as the Rockefeller Commission that looked into domestic activities of the CIA, the FBI, and intelligence-related agencies of the military.

In the summer of 1975, congressional Church Committee reports and the presidential Rockefeller Commission report revealed to the public for the first time that the CIA and the Department of Defence had conducted experiments on both unwitting and cognizant human subjects as part of an extensive program to influence and control human behaviour through the use of psychoactive drugs such as LSD and mescaline and other chemical, biological, and psychological means. They also revealed that at least one subject had died after administration of LSD. Much of what the Church Committee and the Rockefeller Commission learned about MKULTRA was contained in a report, prepared by the Inspector General's office in 1963, that had survived the destruction of records ordered in 1973. However, it contained little detail.

The congressional committee investigating the CIA research, chaired by Senator Frank Church, concluded that "[p]rior consent was obviously not obtained from any of the subjects". The committee noted that the "experiments sponsored by these researchers ... call into question the decision by the agencies not to fix guidelines for experiments."

Following the recommendations of the Church Committee, President Gerald Ford in 1976 issued the first Executive Order on Intelligence Activities which, among other things, prohibited "experimentation with drugs on human subjects, except with the informed consent, in writing and witnessed by a disinterested party, of each such human subject" and in accordance with the guidelines issued by the National Commission. Subsequent orders by Presidents Carter and Reagan expanded the directive to apply to any human experimentation.

On the heels of the revelations about CIA experiments, similar stories surfaced regarding U.S. Army experiments. In 1975 the Secretary of the Army instructed the Army Inspector General to conduct an investigation. Among the findings of the Inspector General was the existence of a 1953 memorandum penned by then Secretary of Defence Charles Erwin Wilson. Documents show that the CIA participated in at least two of Department of Defence committees during 1952. These committee findings led to the issuance of the "Wilson Memo," which mandated—in accord with Nuremberg Code protocols—that only volunteers be used for experimental operations conducted in the U.S. armed forces. In response to the Inspector General's investigation, the Wilson Memo was declassified in August 1975.

With regard to drug testing within the Army, the Inspector General found that "the evidence clearly reflected that every possible medical consideration was observed by the professional investigators at the Medical Research Laboratories." However the Inspector General also found that the mandated requirements of Wilson's 1953 memorandum had been only partially adhered to; he concluded that the "volunteers were not fully informed, as required, prior to their participation; and the methods of procuring their services, in many cases, appeared not to have been in accord with the intent of Department of the Army policies governing use of volunteers in research."

Other branches of the U.S. armed forces, the Air Force for example, were found not to have adhered to Wilson Memo stipulations regarding voluntary drug testing.

In 1977, during a hearing held by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, to look further into MKULTRA, Admiral Stansfield Turner, then Director of Central Intelligence, revealed that the CIA had found a set of records, consisting of about 20,000 pages, that had survived the 1973 destruction orders, due to having been stored at a records centre
not usually used for such documents.[31] These files dealt with the financing of MKULTRA projects, and as such contained few details of those projects, but much more was learned from them than from the Inspector General's 1963 report.

In Canada, the issue took much longer to surface, becoming widely known in 1984 on a CBC news show, The Fifth Estate. It was learned that not only had the CIA funded Dr. Cameron's efforts, but perhaps even more shockingly, the Canadian government was fully aware of this, and had later provided another $500,000 in funding to continue the experiments. This revelation largely derailed efforts by the victims to sue the CIA as their U.S. counterparts had, and the Canadian government eventually settled out of court for $100,000 to each of the 127 victims. None of Dr. Cameron's personal records of his involvement with MKULTRA survive, since his family destroyed them after his death from a heart attack while mountain climbing in 1967.[32]

MK-ULTRA plays a part in many conspiracy theories given its nature and the destruction of most records.

Lawrence Teeter, attorney for convicted assassin Sirhan Sirhan, believed Sirhan was under the influence of hypnosis when he fired his weapon at Robert F. Kennedy in 1968. Teeter linked the CIA's MKULTRA program to mind control techniques that he claimed were used to control Sirhan.[44]

Jonestown, the Guyana location of the Jim Jones cult and Peoples Temple mass suicide, was thought to be a test site for MKULTRA medical and mind control experiments after the official end of the program. Congressman Leo Ryan, a known critic of the CIA, was assassinated after he personally visited Jonestown to investigate various reported irregularities.[51]

10. ^ Church Committee; p. 390 "MKULTRA was approved by the DCI [Director of Central Intelligence] on April 13, 1953"


12. ^ Church Committee; p. 391 "A special procedure, designated MKDELTA, was established to govern the use of MKULTRA materials abroad. Such materials were used on a number of occasions."

13. ^ Church Committee; "The congressional committee investigating the CIA research, chaired by Senator Frank Church, concluded that 'prior consent was obviously not obtained from any of the subjects.'"
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There is probably more material on this subject than any other so called conspiracy topic other than 9/11 and the JFK assassination, once you have read this look into it for yourself because it is fascinating and undeniably pertinent to each and every one of us. If you don´t think so ponder this: Advertising, Governments and Politics, All Religions, Sales, Marketing, Media, Psychiatry, Psychology, and being in the Armed Forces, all of these things are primarily functioning based on just one thing and one thing only:

MIND CONTROL!

They either make you buy things you don´t need, tell you that your country is fine when it is not, make you feel you have a say in your country when you have no such thing and NEVER have, or they tell you directly what to think and more importantly WHAT NOT TO THINK, i.e., don´t look at 9/11 or you are an unpatriotic terrorist, don´t look at any of the details of the holocaust because if you do then you must be a Nazi. This War is for Peace, We are preserving your freedom by taking away all your rights! Collateral damage, believe in a God who preaches tolerance by annihilating everybody else who doesn´t believe in him! (and ALL of the big three practise this, ALL of them.) It´s all mind control my friend whether you want to accept it or not.

Now a transcript from a Canadian TV documentary concerning one of the “gentlemen” mentioned earlier, Ewen Cameron.

MKULTRA’S "Dr." Ewen Cameron
Psychiatrist and Torturer

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's Documentary
on "Fifth Estate", January 6, 1998

Transcription courtesy of the Mind Control Forum

Announcer: Behind closed doors, human guinea pigs in shocking mind control experiments conducted by our government and the CIA.

Female victim: I had no identity, I had no memory, I'd never existed in the world before.

Announcer: The horrors of "the sleep room" -- next on "The Fifth Estate."

...Interlude...

Announcer: Tonight!

Female victim: The man whom I had thought cared about what happened to me, didn't give a damn. I was a fly. Just a fly.

Announcer: Revisiting Canada's infamous "sleep room."

Female victim: I was -- had to be toilet trained; I was a vegetable.

Announcer: In the 1960s Dr. Ewen Cameron conducted CIA funded experiments on troubled Canadian patients he was meant to help.
Male victim: It wasn't treatment for anything. It was out and out guinea pigs for brainwashing experiments.

Announcer: A Fifth Estate investigation revealed how one Canadian government secretly supported these horrific experiments, and then another blocked the victims' fight for justice.

Male voice: The Mulrooney government, in effect, stabbed its citizens in the back at every turn.

Announcer: Linden MacIntyre [spelling?] with the real life victims of "the sleep room," and behind the scenes of a new CBC movie about this nightmare chapter in our history.

...Interlude...

Linden MacIntyre: Welcome to the Fifth Estate. When Canadians first learned that CIA brainwashing experiments had been carried out on Canadians in Canada, with the knowledge of our government, it was a tremendous shock. As the Fifth Estate was first to report in 1984, the work that Dr. Ewen Cameron oversaw at his Montreal clinic was shocking. Now, the story of Cameron's experiments, and the victims' struggle for justice, have been made into a riveting movie, to be broadcast on CBC Television this Sunday and Monday nights. For the victims of the "sleep room," the horror has never really ended.

Even if you don't know the history of the Allen Memorial Institute in Montreal, it looks like a natural setting for a movie -- a horror movie, maybe.

...women's scream...

But then the truth of what happened to hundreds of psychiatric patients there a long time ago is a horror story.

Male voice: O.K. So we're on route, guys. Peaceably on.

Linden MacIntyre: And now, it has become a movie -- a dramatized account of a bleak chapter in the history of Canadian psychiatry, produced by a former Fifth Estate documentary maker, Bernard Zuckerman.

The central character in the movie is a world-renowned psychiatrist at the Allen in the early 60s. His name was Dr. Ewen Cameron.

Male voice: It's the classic story of good turning to evil in its most simplistic terms. Dr. Cameron started off as someone who is probably one of the most enlightened psychiatrists in the country, but then something happened, and whatever happened, suddenly here is this enlightened doctor, this noble doctor, who begins doing more and more and more bizarre experiments on his patients to the point where he is destroying the minds of hundreds of people.

Male speaker [giving a speech - could be Franklin Roosevelt]:

These are the days, and ours are the occasions.

Linden MacIntyre: Inspired by the exuberant post-war optimism and technology, Cameron thought he'd achieved a major scientific breakthrough -- how to repair a damaged human mind. The media rejoiced -- even coined a phrase which would become a tragically silly oxymoron: "beneficial brainwashing."
Linda McDonald was a young mother with five children under the age of five, when she started feeling low. Her family doctor knew just the man to make her better.

Linda McDonald: I was tired, I was depressed, my back was hurting – and so he said, to the children's father, why don't you go to Montreal and visit this Dr. Ewen Cameron, this famous man, who has all of these accolades, and have an assessment.

So we went. My medical file even says that I took my guitar with me; and that was the end of my life.

Within three weeks Dr. Cameron decided to call me an acute schizophrenic, and shipped me up to the "sleep room."

Linden MacIntyre: How long did they put you to sleep for?

Linda McDonald: I was in a coma for 86 days.

Linden MacIntyre: Eighty-six days of unbroken sleep.

Linda McDonald: Yeah. Total comatose state.

Linden MacIntyre: The theory was simple: erase a disturbed mind and start all over again.

One of Dr. Cameron's colleagues at the time was Dr. Peter Roper.

Dr. Peter Roper: The aim, I think, really, was to wipe out the patterns of thought and behaviour which were detrimental to the patient which were sick, and replace them with healthy patterns of thought and behaviour. I think this may have been – uh – stimulated by the effects of the – uh – American troops of the war in Korea, how they seem to have been brainwashed.

Linden MacIntyre: The movie called "The Sleep Room" dramatizes one technique for brainwashing: extreme sessions of electroshock therapy, massive jolts of electricity three or four times a day for weeks. According to her hospital records, Linda McDonald had one-hundred of these treatments.

She entered hospital for what we can now guess was post-partum depression. Her records show the results of shock and radical drug therapy.

May 15th shows some confusion; June 3rd: "Knows her name, but that's about all." June 11th: "Doesn't know her name."

Linda McDonald: I was – had to be toilet trained. I was a vegetable. I had no identity, I had no memory; I had never existed in the world before. Like a baby. Just like a baby that has to be toilet trained.

Linden MacIntyre: She eventually went home, her depression gone, and her entire previous life gone with it.

Linda McDonald: This is – this is one of the twins, in 62 before I went to the Allen, and this is the same one I think. I just look at the pictures and I know that is who they are, but I don't remember them as my children at all. I mean, I know that they came from my body – um – but, there's no – that's all. I don't know, and that's because I was told that. So, these are my children.
Linden MacIntyre: Robert Loguey [spelling?] was little more than a child himself when he was referred to Dr. Cameron. He was 18, he had a sore leg. His doctor thought it was all in his head, and sent him to the Allen. Like Linda McDonald, he went through a nightmare of shock therapy and drugs, including LSD.

Robert Loguey: Well, I was given LSD about every second day and – uh – injected, and – uh – sometimes it was mixed with sodium amethal and other drugs.

Film-maker: One on one, take two.

Linden MacIntyre: Most of the drugs were experimental but seemed suitable for brainwashing or, as Cameron preferred to call it, de-patterning.

Then, during the long sleep, the patient would be forced to listen to subliminal messages that were supposed to print new, sometimes bizarre, thoughts on his blank mind.

Robert Loguey: I was aware of the speaker under my pillow; I was aware of the words.

Linden MacIntyre: Which were?

Robert Loguey: "You killed your mother."

Linden MacIntyre: "You killed your mother."

Robert Loguey: Yeah.

Linden MacIntyre: Who was alive and well.

Robert Loguey: Who was alive and well. And, uh...

Linden MacIntyre: Over and over again this voice is talking....

Robert Loguey: Uh, well, like I say, it takes about two seconds to say that message, and this was going on for 23 days, and – uh – when I went home, after being there, when I went home my mother was there, and why was she there, and – it didn't make any sense.

Linden MacIntyre: So what was going on here? Dr. Ewen Cameron was at one point head of the World Psychiatric Association, and is still admired by some of his former colleagues. Dr. Peter Roper:

What is the possibility that we had a good, well-motivated man whose ego and ambition took charge of his professionalism and led him into some fairly dark places?

Dr. Peter Roper: Well, I would put that chance as pretty slight. I think it's more likely that – um – if he'd been around to defend himself when this story came out, we'd have a perfectly different picture of it.

Linden MacIntyre: What would he say? Put yourself in his shoes; what would he say?

Dr. Peter Roper: Uh – I think he'd say – uh – "look, I treated these patients to the best of my ability; I – uh – I didn't get all of them well, but most of them I got better than they were.

Movie excerpt, actor: A travesty. I agree.
Linden MacIntyre: But in the movie, Dr. Cameron will not come off so well.

Movie excerpt, actor: They're your patients. Most of these people were discharged as cured.

Linden MacIntyre: It accurately shows that many of his patients, inaccurately diagnosed as schizophrenics, were permanently damaged by his methods.

Movie excerpt: woman screaming.

Linden MacIntyre: Eventually even Cameron had doubts about his experiments. He left the Allen in 1964, died of a heart attack three years later. By then, the hospital had quietly abandoned the experiments.

Movie excerpt, actor, angered: So, these people had nothing. You can't just walk away from this, Cameron! It'll come back and it'll ruin you! You can't walk away!

Linden MacIntyre: Nobody knows for sure exactly how many people doctor Cameron and his colleagues exposed to the program of chemical and electro-shock treatments they called de-patterning and psychic driving, a process which some experts have since called barbaric.

But many years would pass before there would be any public or official acknowledgment of what those damaged patients had been through. It would take a dramatic disclosure in the late 70s. But the Allen memorial had been part of a cold war program of brainwashing experiments, paid for in part by the CIA. Hidden among its most sensitive files were CIA records documenting a project called MKULTRA.

Between 1957 and 1961 a CIA front funnelled about 62,000 dollars US for brainwashing research by Dr. Ewen Cameron.

The American media got the story first, but The Fifth Estate exposed the magnitude of the human tragedy.

Fifth Estate Announcer (historical): Experimental drugs, including LSD, were administered to human guinea pigs. The patients were never told that their treatment was part of a CIA experiment.

Linden MacIntyre: One of those patients was Velma Orlikow of Winnipeg. She'd been at the Allen in the late 50s for treatment of depression. She happened to be married to a member of parliament, David Orlikow of the NDP. She'd considered Dr. Cameron a near-saint. Now she was being told she'd been betrayed by him.

Velma Orlikow: It was an awful feeling to realize, when I found this out, that the man whom I had thought cared about what happened to me didn't give a damn. I was a fly. Just a fly.

Linden MacIntyre: First she felt hurt. Then she got angry, and decided to sue one of the most powerful institutions in the world, the CIA.

David Orlikow: As a matter of fact, when she said she wanted to sue the CIA I said, "you're crazy, how a couple -- how can an ape[?] from Winnipeg sue the CIA?"

Linden MacIntyre: But she did, along with eight other former patients -- a massive lawsuit that would consume many years and become an obsession for a distinguished American civil-liberties lawyer named Joseph Rauh].
Joseph Rauh: Cameron, all he did was what the CIA was in effect asking him to do, and what he said he was going to do, and he did it.

Linden MacIntyre: Rauh and a young assistant name James Turner knew they were up against a formidable opponent in the CIA, but they thought the odds would be evened a bit by help from a natural ally. They were in for a disappointment.

James Turner: Well, we expected to have a very potent ally in the form of the Canadian government and, unfortunately, instead of helping their own citizens, because the Canadian government was worried about its possible liability, the Mulrooney government in effect stabbed its citizens in the back at every turn of the litigation.

Linden MacIntyre: Ottawa actually helped suppress a key piece of information: evidence that CIA officials at the US embassy had actually apologized to the Canadian government when the CIA experiments were first revealed. Jim Turner is still flabbergasted.

James Turner: You gotta understand how important these apologies and expressions of regret were. This is an admission. This is legally admissible in court because it is one of the parties of the litigation saying, "I did something wrong and I'm sorry I did it." That is prima facie evidence of negligence and of wrong-doing that goes a long, long way to bringing the case to a timely conclusion instead of the protracted ten years of litigation that we had.

Movie excerpt: And action!

Mr. Mulrooney!

Linden MacIntyre: The movie underscores the impact of Ottawa's refusal to give the lawyers details of the CIA apology. The lawyers eventually upped the ante. On The Fifth Estate.

Fifth Estate director (historical): And action.

Announcer: Tonight on The Fifth Estate, startling revelations about the activities of the CIA in Canada.

Linden MacIntyre: With a publicity wave gathering momentum, and the strength of the victims' case becoming more apparent, the CIA caved in the day before the trial was to begin. They settled out-of-court for 750,000 dollars. At the time it was the largest settlement the CIA had ever awarded, and it provides a dramatic finale for the movie.

Movie preview, actress: Because we made them pay. They couldn't beat us! We won. Write that down, mister!

Linden MacIntyre: Producer Bernard Zuckerman says, besides the financial terms, this was a major moral victory.

Bernard Zuckerman: Here you've got nine "little" Canadian victims taking on probably the most powerful institution in America, the CIA, and, these "little" Canadians, they win – they get the CIA to settle and give them money and, in effect, an apology saying, "what we did is wrong."

Linden MacIntyre: The movie ends with a CIA settlement, but the story didn't end there. Troubling questions would persist, especially about the government of Canada.
So why was Ottawa so ambiguous when it came to helping some Canadian citizens get compensation from Washington for what they endured in a program that was inspired mostly by American Cold War fears?

Well, the answer was simple. The government of Canada was even more deeply involved in the Allen Memorial experiments than the Americans. Dr. Cameron's experiments were funded to the tune of half-a-million dollars by the Federal Department of Health and Welfare during the 50s, and the funding didn't stop then. They kicked in over 51,000 dollars after the CIA project ended in 1961, which was when a young, stressed-out mother named Linda McDonald became part of the Allen Memorial story.

When she discovered that her own government had been funding brainwashing experiments on her, she made a dramatic decision.

[To Linda McDonald] You decided to take on the government of Canada.

Linda McDonald: Oh, sure. Well, hey, considering what I'd already been through, that was a snap! [Laughs.] You know, what else -- went on?

Linden MacIntyre: It must have become obvious to you fairly quickly that you were ramming your head into a brick wall.

Linda McDonald: Yes, yes. I'm stubborn too; it got to the point where every time, whether it was John Crosby or Reina Tishen [spelling?] or then the Honourable Ken Campbell, it got to be -- uh -- "you guys, we're gonna, we're gonna stay alive," and I said that to Brian Mulrooney too, "If you think I'm going away, you've got another thing coming. I'm not going to go away!" [Laughs.] I finally discovered...

Linden MacIntyre: Linda McDonald would hound the federal government for four years before finally, in 1992, Ottawa grudgingly agreed to compensate her and some of Dr. Cameron's other victims 100,000 dollars each. In exchange, for signing away the right to sue the government or the hospital.

But it was an ambiguous victory. Ottawa refused to acknowledge any wrongdoing at the Allen, a conclusion backed up by a legal review of what happened there. The report, by a prominent progressive conservative lawyer, relied partly on expert advice from Dr. Frederick Grunberg [spelling?], one of Quebec's leading psychiatrists, who made two controversial assertions: the patients hadn't suffered irreparable harm, and that they had consented to the treatment.

Dr. Frederick Grunberg: Well, when I went to -- uh -- the patient were admitted at -- uh -- the Allen Memorial Institute where patients were went in voluntarily. So, the sort of consent they gave is -- uh -- was sort of general consent to the hospital. So the consent that was given for surgery or any other procedure.

Linda McDonald: Consent had nothing to do with it. Dr. Cameron did not describe the treatment; he did not clarify; he did not give any way shape or form, any kind of a hint what was going to happen. That's not consent, and, I don't even know whether he talked to me because I'll never remember anyway.

Linden MacIntyre: Dr. Grunberg shares a widely-held view in his profession about the legacy of Dr. Ewen Cameron.

Dr. Frederick Grunberg: I think he was a misguided man -- he worked on a sort of a very poor theoretical -- uh -- basis, and I think he was important -- uh -- considering, but I am
convinced, still convinced, that — uh — he really wanted a therapeutic way through the — he had this motivation that he was going to break this — uh — terrible — uh — condition.

Linden MacIntyre: You seem to be saying, "the things that Cameron did were awful, but he meant well, so we'll forgive him, and the victims, or patients, will have to live with it."

Dr. Frederick Grunberg: It's not a question of forgiving — the thing is, we put what he was doing in the perspective of his time, and a lot of awful things were going on.

Linden MacIntyre: A lot of people are saying, considering the accepted practice and the science available at the time, this was an appropriate thing to do to you. What...

Robert Loguey[?]: It wasn't treatment — uh — if that's what you're suggesting, it wasn't treatment for anything; not a toenail, or anything. It was out and out guinea pigs for brainwashing experiments. That's what it was.

Linden MacIntyre: It's been more than 33 years since the Allen put an end to the practices initiated by its most notorious doctor. It has recovered its world-class reputation as a leader in the treatment of mental illness.

Dr. Peter Roper was dismissed from the Allen two years after Dr. Cameron left. One of the reasons: he insisted on following Dr. Cameron's technique.

Review how you strenuously — to continue the de-patterning of your patients.

Dr. Peter Roper: Well, I felt that I had a duty to my patients to give them the best possible treatment, and if there were some who were not responding to any other form of treatment the only thing left was de-patterning for them, then I felt that should be done.

Linden MacIntyre: You sound — you sound almost nostalgic for the 50s and 60s.

Dr. Peter Roper: Oh no, it's not nostalgia; it's the question, I think, that bothers a lot of doctors that it's rather sad if they're prevented from having that treatment because of adherence to political or other reasons which have nothing to do with good medical practice.

Linden MacIntyre: For Linda McDonald, good medical practice in 1963 turned an emotional crisis into a horror that would haunt a lifetime.

[Sound of a gathering.]

Female voice: Here we are.

Linda McDonald: It feels strange.

Linden MacIntyre: This spring she returned to the Ottawa high school where she graduated in 1957.

Anne Highland: Hi, Linda. I'm Anne Argue[?] Highland. How are you?

Linda McDonald: Oh! Well, hi.

Anne Highland: I was in the liars club; I don't know if you remember.
Linda McDonald: I don't remember at all!

Anne Highland: Oh, well that's normal.

Linda McDonald: And all of these people -- we knew all of these people.

Linden MacIntyre: She has no memory of this place, or those times, or even of who she was back then.

Linda McDonald: Oh, here I am. Look at me! You did call me Lindy?

[Back to interview.]

I am who I am today. My family tells me that I am very much like the Linda that they knew when I was growing up: gregarious, always talking, laughing, singing, happy, positive person. I have no memory of that person; all I'm grateful for is that Cameron might have been able to wipe a memory but he couldn't wipe a spirit.

LEADING PSYCHIATRIST BLOWS WHISTLE ON PROFESSION:
PROVES 50+ YEARS OF MIND CONTROL

By W.H. Bowart December 1996

Is the profession of psychiatry beginning to rival the legal profession as having the most useless information, the most know-nothing, corrupt and mercenary practitioners of any profession?

The proof of the psychiatric pudding might be that doctors who once easily earned $300,000 or more a year are having a hard time pulling in $100,000 a year these days. This could be due to the cuts in national health care payments, to the competition that has been created by the lower prices of the HMO's, and/or it could be partly caused by the accumulative effects of the CIA's fifty years of covert manipulation of that profession.

Almost every psychiatrist of the aged generation (especially those who also hold diplomas in psychology) worked for the CIA or another branch of the cryptocracy in one or another dirty project which tested drugs, hypnosis, brain stimulation and a variety of other things on unwitting humans -- often employees of the government who'd already signed their lives away. These psychiatrists were hell-bent on seeing that this government chattel would, since they hadn't given their lives for their country, give their minds and souls and too often their children's minds and souls for it.

In any of the professions it's hard to find a whistle blower. Seldom will one lawyer speak ill of a peer. Even harder is it to find justice in the self-regulated profession of health -- especially mental health. Doctor's seldom bear witness against other doctors.

But there are heroes even among psychiatrists. At least one, a Canadian Psychiatrist, Dr. Colin Ross, has begun to put a lot of time into trying to identify and correct the wrongs done by his peers in the profession.

Ross said: "Virtually every leading psychiatrist in North America between the 1940's and the 1970's was involved in some aspect of the CIA's mind control research."

"There is something real peculiar about this whole story. It's a very strange story. It tells us that there is something going on in our culture and in the mental health field that is hidden and secret. This is another kind of incest secret in the field of psychiatry that all of these people who have been running psychiatry in the latter half of the 20th century are either
directly or loosely connected to a whole huge universe of covert, hidden, secretly funded mind control research, and as emphasized, that's a fact...

In his workshop Ross offered the names of some of the more insidious doctors and the institutions which supported them.

At the top of the list was Dr. George Estabrooks who, in 1950 wrote:

"I can hypnotize a man – without his knowledge or consent – into committing treason against the United States." Ross described Estabrooks as a pivotal figure in the cryptocracy's mind-control research. He drew an elaborate map connecting Estabrooks to the CIA's MKULTRA research, the FBI and other agencies. Then, he named the following professionals as part of the mind control conspiracy:

William C. Hollinger, L. Wilson Green, Richard Ofshe (Sociologist), James Hamilton, Harold Abramson, Carl Pfeiffer, Louis Jolyon West (Psychiatrist UCLA), Carl Rogers, Martin T. Orne, George White (Army Col, CIA, BNDD), Maitland Baldwin, Harold Wolff, Raymond Prince (Mass. General Hospital), R. Gordon Wasson (stock broker and mycologist mushroom expert), John Mulholland (magician), B.F. Skinner (Harvard Behaviourist), Garner Murphy (Harvard), E.R. Hilgard (member of DSM IV Dissociative Disorders Committee), Ron Shore (collaborator with Martin Orne) Milton Erickson (Psychiatrist and inspiration for Neurolinguistics Programming), Daniel X. Friedman (Editor of Archives of the Journal of Psychiatry 1970-1993), Allen Dulles (Director CIA 1953-1961), Loretta Bender, Paul Hawk (psychiatrist who killed Harold Blauer in 1953 with an injection of supposed mescaline), Robert White (Harvard), J. Edgar Hoover (Director of the FBI), John Gittinger (CIA psychologist), Robert Lifton (psychiatrist and well-known author), Margaret Singer (psychologist, author of "Cults in Our Midst"), Paul McHugh (Chairman of Psychiatry at Johns Hopkins), James Whitehorn (former Chairman of Psychiatry at Johns Hopkins and advisor of the Human Ecology Foundation with Top Secret Clearance), Harold Lief (advisor of the False Memory Syndrome Foundation), Colston Westbrook (CIA Psy-War expert who worked at Vacatville Prison with prisoners such as Donald Defreeze and Timothy Leary), Robert Heath (doing brain electrode implant research at Tulane), Francisco Silva (Cuban psychiatrist who allegedly put Lee Harvey Oswald up in his home and got him a job at the hospital where Silva worked prior to the assassination), Mark Sweet (collaborator with L.J. West for the UCLA Violence Project), Wagner Joreg (son of Wagner Joreg who won the Nobel Prize for treating syphilis with malaria), Amadeo Morazzi (LSD researcher at the University of Minnesota), Gregory Bateson, Allen Ginsburg, Ken Kesey, Sydney Mallett, and the list goes on.

Ross linked dozens of institutions to the research which, he said he suspects, is still going on in one form or another. Among the institutions he reeled off the top of his head were:

Butler Hospital Health Centre (part of Harvard), Children's International Summer Village, Columbia University, Cornell University, Denver University, Emory College, Florida University, George Washington University, Harvard University, Houston University, Illinois University, Indiana University, Johns Hopkins University, Eli Lilly Pharmaceuticals, University of Minnesota, New Jersey Reformatory, Bordentown in Tennessee, Ohio University, University of Pennsylvania, Penn State University, Princeton University, Stanford University, Wisconsin University, University of Texas, University of Oklahoma, McGill, the National Institute of Health, the National Institute of Mental Health, the New Jersey Psychiatric Research Institute, National Philosophical Society, Office of Naval Research, Worcester Foundation for Experimental Biology, Vacaville State Prison, Public Health Service, Cornell, Bureau of Narcotics, Bureau of Prisons, and many others.

"You get the idea," Ross said. Then, the well-prepared researcher gave a litany of declassified code names under which many of these atrocities occurred: MKULTRA, MKSEARCH, MKNAOMI, ARTICHOKE, BLUEBIRD, STARGATE, CHATTER, OFTEN, CHICKWIT, DERBYHAT, THIRD CHANCE, MKDELTA, QK HILLTOP and others.
"It just shows you," Ross said, "the theme here is not that there is a military intelligence conspiracy to cover up Manchurian Candidate creation with the myth of borderline personality disorder. The point now is more of a global general meta point which is: this whole network of old boys in psychiatry and psychology, who were covertly funded for part of the military and CIA intelligence mind-control network, are very influential in the history of psychiatry in a kind of nebulous fashion that just permeates the whole field. It isn't part of the sort of one-to-one correspondences that I have been showing before. It's a matter of the whole mind set of psychiatry – how we think about borderlines (Borderline Personality Disorder), how we think about temporal lobe epilepsy, how we are going to react to MPD?"

"The point is that the history of psychiatry in the second half of the twentieth century has undoubtedly been strongly skewed -- not by an agenda that has to do with academic research, not by the best interest of clients, not by ethical psychiatry -- but by an Intelligence agenda." Ross said that the full story of the CIA's involvement with his profession is still unknown. "We are missing a ton of experimental research data that's still classified that bears directly on this false memory debate that is going on in our society now." (My Note. We will be covering this subject in detail soon.)

In an attempt to uncover more information Ross visited the CIA Reading Room in Washington, D.C. He said it was "a very unusual experience," and dealt with it with humour, as a skilled psychiatrist would deal with a client suffering from Dissociated Identity Disorder.

"This is the way it goes in trying to document this stuff and trying to make it public and identify the specific individuals. It's a big slow job. And when you make Freedom of Information requests, it's like interacting with any Federal Bureaucracy." Ross said that, in fact, the CIA had been extremely helpful to him. The CIA, he said, was "extremely polite, extremely courteous when I went to the CIA Reading Room..." "Let me just tell you the story.," Ross said, "Here I am, a Canadian psychiatrist, going down to the Eastern Regional Conference, and a day early I pop over to the CIA Reading Room to look at the MKULTRA documents to figure out which ones I want to order at 10 cents a page which they then shipped to me. It arrives at my office via UPS with CIA stamped in the corner. I'm wondering who thinks that's weird?"

Ross said he found the CIA Reading Room "just this building in Virginia on a street. It is completely unrecognizable as anything. I get dropped off there ... whoa ... there's all these guys in uniforms and here I am, this civilian." "I go walking along accompanied by this CIA person, and I go into the first room which has a steel vault door and says 'Secured Area: Treasury Department.' I go into that room and they close the door. I am now in a 'Secured Area.' I sit down and they bring in all the documents on a little cart and (an elderly woman) gives me 15-20 pencils beautifully sharpened, and a notepad and everything. You order which documents you want at the end of the day. "I am sitting there working away on this huge amount of documents all day," Ross said. "Work, work, work, work ..."Some time in the middle of the day this old woman comes at me. Now I am thinking, is this old woman trying to pump me for information? What's here? (Is she) going to report back at the end of the day? She says, 'Well, what's that stuff you are reading?' I am trying to act casually, I just say, 'Well, it's just a bunch of mind control documents from the 50's and 60's.' And she says, 'Is that stuff classified?' And I say, 'No, no. It was declassified a long time ago,' And she says, 'Well what do they need me here for?' And I said, 'I don't know.' And then I stopped talking to her and I started focusing down on the paper."

Ross said his "beef" was not with the intelligence community or the CIA, but with the psychiatrists and psychologist "who created a little loophole where they can step out of normal ethical oversight, violate the Hippocratic Oath, get away with it, not talk about it. It's just like the conspiracy to keep incest under the carpet. This is all conspired and kept under the carpet – not by twelve guys in a room at Langley who are doing the planning, but just by this pervasive old boys network. That's what keeps the mind control secret down just like it
kept the incest secret down. So that's another reason why this is important, and needs to be uncovered...

"...The idea that there could be a deliberate disinformation campaign element to the False Memory movement is perfectly plausible, consistent with history, and could be expected. There is bound to be some sort of disinformation strategy if, in fact, Manchurian Candidates have been leaking out into civilian psychotherapy. So here we have, with all of this documentation, all of this proof -- we know that it is perfectly possible that people we are seeing in therapy who are claiming to be victims of systematic military mind-control experimentation are telling us about what actually happened to them...

"We have a major disinformation campaign which has basically fooled mental health professionals and the general public concerning brain-washing, concerning LSD.

We have already covered this subject in detail back in part one, and I guess you'd have to agree with me by now when I say what a small world it's turning out to be.

To finish this introductory portion of my series on mind control I feel that we must pay special attention to an interesting institution called Tavistock: You may well remember them from part one, they were the clinic helping to delay puberty for kids who (apparently) wanted a sex change. In truth their other exploits make that fact look like nothing in significance. To begin with though, we will look at an article from Henry Makow.

**War on Terror is Elite Mind Control**

By Henry Makow Ph.D.  April 21, 2006

It is more effective to manage society by mind control than by physical coercion. The events of 9-11 and the "war on terror" mostly are exercises in mass brainwashing.

German psychiatrist Kurt Lewin, who became director of the elite-sponsored Tavistock Institute in 1932, developed the thinking behind 9-11. In the book "Mind Control World Control" (1997) Jim Keith writes:

"Lewin is credited with much of the original Tavistock research into mass brainwashing applying the results of repeated trauma and torture [of individuals] in mind control to society at large."

"If terror can be induced on a widespread basis into a society, Lewin has stated, then society reverts to a tabula rasa, a blank slate, a situation where control can easily be instituted from an external point." (My note. Remember this quote for slightly later)

"Put another way: By the creation of controlled chaos, the populace can be brought to the point where it willingly submits to greater control. Lewin maintained that society must be driven into a state equivalent to an 'early childhood situation.' He termed this societal chaos 'fluidity.'" (Page 44)

Elite planners designed Sept. 11 for its shock value. In the aftermath, they were able to impose a security crackdown, a costly military build-up and a war in Afghanistan and Iraq on a stunned population.

Keith cites another Tavistock researcher Dr. William Sargent author of "Battle for the Mind: A Physiology of Conversion and Brain-Washing" (1957): "Various types of beliefs can be implanted after brain function has been sufficiently disturbed by ...deliberately induced fear, anger or excitement." (48)
This blueprint was laid out long before Sept. 11, 2001. The official story of that tragedy doesn't bear scrutiny [http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-8260059923762628848&q=9-11+Loose+Change].

There was no wreckage at the Pentagon. All three buildings were demolished by explosives. Our "leaders" are accomplices to the murder of over 3000 people and the destruction of an American icon. The plan is to fold the US into a "world government" controlled by London-based central bankers. Our cultural, economic and political elite are complicit in the ongoing cover up.

FUTURE SHOCK

Most political and cultural events are contrived by the elite for their psychological effect. JFK could have been disposed of in more humane ways. (He had many health problems.) Instead, for its shock value, they shot him down, in Mort Sahls' words, "like a dog in the street."

Jim Keith: "The Kennedy assassination was a British Intelligence, i.e. Tavistock hit, and its purpose was to shock the American consciousness into a near-comatose state for reprogramming, the standard Tavistock modus operandi." (p.143)

The same can be said for the assassinations of Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy. It all climaxed with the beatings of demonstrators at the 1968 Chicago Democratic convention. After that, my generation turned inward as we were programmed to do. "Turn on, Tune in, Drop Out" said CIA funded pied piper Timothy Leary.

[I"I mean who was I supposed to work for, the KGB?" Leary quipped. (Keith p.99) Leary didn't realize that there wasn't a big difference.]

Many young people became "dead heads" after Jerry Garcia's Grateful Dead. Keith writes:

"An FBI internal memo from 1968 mentions the employment of the Grateful Dead as an avenue 'to channel youth dissent and rebellion into more benign and non-threatening directions.' [They] performed a vital service in distracting many young person's into drugs and mysticism, rather than politics." (179)

Keith goes on to document CIA connections to the creation of mind control cults used to create "controlled chaos." These include the Symbionese Liberation Army, Jim Jones, Charles Manson, Scientology, the Unification Church, Son of Sam and Heaven's Gate. The John Lennon assassination also ties in. (183)

To bring the picture up to date, add the murder of Princess Diana, Columbine, the blowing of the levees in New Orleans, the burning of Black churches, and the bird flu scare. What we have is an ongoing secret war by the central bankers against society, a drumbeat of psychological torture designed to keep society off balance or zoned out.

THE BITTER TRUTH

The most significant thing about our life is that we are victims of elite mind control. We have been trained to be apathetic, trivia-minded and self absorbed. Apart from the political shocks, we are hardly aware of the vicious attack on our natural heterosexuality by a psy-op known as "feminism" masquerading as women's rights.

We get our values, identity, meaning and love from our family roles. Women were brainwashed to abandon the female role and compete for the male role. A woman who
dedicated herself to husband, home and children was stigmatized. This is part of the long-term elite program to eliminate the institutions of marriage and family.

According to this web site http://covertmatrix.atspace.com/tavistock.html, "Tavistock Institute has developed such power in the USA, that no one achieves prominence in any field unless he has been trained in behavioural science at Tavistock, or one of its subsidiaries." Read how Tavistock directs hundreds of elite think tanks and corporations in the United States. The degree of elite coordination is breath taking.

Now we will cover in greater detail this “daddy” of all brainwashing institutes – Tavistock.

Tavistock by Dr Dennis Cuddy

The term "psychiatry" was first used in 1808 by Johann Christian Reil, and it means "doctoring of the soul." The primary schools of psychiatry were established in the early 1800s in Leipzig and Berlin.

At Leipzig University in 1879, Wilhelm Wundt established the first psychological laboratory, and among his students were Ivan Pavlov, William James (the "Father of American Psychology"), and G. Stanley Hall (who would become the mentor of John Dewey, the "Father of Progressive Education"). Pavlov is well-known for his stimulus-response experiments with dogs. in Clarence Karier's SCIENTISTS OF THE MIND (1986), one reads concerning James that "we pass from a culture with God at its centre to a culture with man at its centre." James was also noted for his famous description of reality as "one great blooming, buzzing confusion." And Hall founded "genetic psychology" while also using Wundt's experimental psychology in the area of child development. Hall and James meshed in John Dewey, an educational psychologist, who co-authored the first "man-centred" HUMANIST MANIFESTO in 1933. Dewey, John B. Watson and other leading psychologists in the early 20th century were interested in the behaviour of people. They didn't believe that man had a soul in the Biblical sense of the word. Thus it was not surprising that at the 6th International Congress of Philosophy, which took place at Harvard University in 1926, it was stated that the "soul or consciousness... now is of very little importance.... Behaviourism sang their funeral dirge while materialism—the smiling heir—arranges a suitable funeral for them."

What does all this have to do with Tavistock? In 1920, the Tavistock Institute of Medical Psychology (TIMP) was founded. It was involved in psychotherapy, and psychiatrists at the Tavistock Clinic wanted to apply their findings to the general public in the form of certain social service programs.

John Rawlings Rees (who would be a co-founder of the World Federation for Mental Health in 1948) was Deputy Director of Tavistock at this time (he would become Director in 1932). Rees developed the "Tavistock Method," which induces and controls stress via what Rees called "psychologically controlled environments" in order to make people give up firmly held beliefs under "peer pressure."

Rees' Tavistock Method was based on work done by British psychoanalyst Wilfrid Bion regarding the roles of individuals within groups. This design was later shifted in a series of conferences (1957-1965) led by A. Kenneth Rice, chairman of Tavistock's Centre for the Applied Social Research. The shift was to the dynamics of leadership and authority relations in groups. According to the A.K. Rice Institute, "In 1965 Rice led a conference in the United States, as the Tavistock Method began to be developed in the U.S. by Margaret Riocch and others. The A.K. Rice Institute is now the U.S. equivalent of the Tavistock Institute."

In 1930, TIMP had been involved with the second biennial Conference on Mental Health, where psychiatrist J.R. Lord advocated challenging old values, saying "the aim should be to
control not only nature, but human nature." And he spoke of the "necessity to disarm the mind."

Rees went even further than this on June 18, 1940 at the annual meeting of the National Council for Mental Hygiene of the United Kingdom. In his speech on "Strategic Planning for Mental Health," he proclaimed: "We can therefore justifiably stress our particular point of view with regard to the proper development of the human psyche, even though our knowledge be incomplete. We must aim to make it permeate every educational activity in our national life.... We have made a useful attack upon a number of professions. The two easiest of them naturally are the teaching profession and the Church: the two most difficult are law and medicine.... Public life, politics and industry should all of them be within our sphere of influence.... If we are to infiltrate the professional and social activities of other people, I think we must imitate the Totalitarians and organize some kind of fifth column activity! If better ideas on mental health are to progress and spread we, as the salesmen, must lose our identity.... Let us all, therefore, very secretly be 'fifth columnists.'" (See MENTAL HEALTH, Vol. 1, No. 4, October 1940)

In 1935, Harvard psychologist (1930-1967) Gordon Allport co-authored THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RADIO with Hadley Cantril. Allport would be a leading agent in the U.S. for the Tavistock Institute, and Cantril in 1937 would be a member of the Rockefeller Foundation-funded Office of Radio Research at Princeton University established to study the influence of radio on different groups of listeners. In 1940, Cantril would author THE INVASION FROM MARS: A STUDY IN THE PSYCHOLOGY OF PANIC regarding the radio broadcast of H.G. Wells' THE WAR OF THE WORLDS. Tavistock senior staffer, Fred Emery, would later (HUMAN RELATIONS, Vol. 12, No. 3, August 1959) begin his article on "Working Hypotheses on the Psychology of Television" with the words: "The psychological after-effects of television are of considerable interest to the would-be social engineer."

During the Second World War, Tavistock was part of Great Britain's Psychological Warfare Department. On May 7, 1944, Dr. Rees of Tavistock and the British War Ministry injected Nazi prisoner Rudolf Hess with the narcotic Evipan. According to Lt. Col. Eugene Bird in PRISONER NO. 7: RUDOLF HESS (in the chapter titled "A Secret Drug"), Rees examined Hess 35 times. Rees and his associates via chemicals caused Hess's memory to fail and then "explained that they could bring back the memory with an injection of Evipan." Hess was told that "while under its influence he would remember the past he had forgotten."

In 1945, Rockefeller Foundation medical director Alan Gregg was touring various institutions that had been involved in war medicine to see if any group would commit to undertake the kind of social psychiatry that had been developed by the Army during wartime (e.g., cultural psychiatry for the analysis of the enemy mentality), and see if it could be relevant for the civilian society (on April 11, 1933, Rockefeller Foundation president Max Mason assured trustees that in their program, "the Social Sciences will concern themselves with the rationalization of social control,... the control of human behaviour"). This led to a Rockefeller grant that resulted in the birth of the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations in London in 1947. (My Note. A chapter would feel empty without these guys!) Tavistock would join with Kurt Lewin's Research Centre for Group Dynamics (RCGD) at the University of Michigan the next year to begin publication of the international journal, HUMAN RELATIONS, relating theory to practice. The first volume contained articles such as "Overcoming Resistance to Change," and "A Comparison of the Aims of the Hitler Youth and the Boy Scouts of America." The Tavistock Institute would use Lewin's techniques to arrange "therapeutic communities."

Lewin had received his Ph.D. from Berlin University in 1914, and in 1932 came to the U.S. in the area of child psychology. During the Second World War, he worked for the U.S. Office of Strategic Services (which would become the CIA) in psychological warfare. He founded the RCGD in 1946. The next year his research centre along with a division of the National Education Association (NEA) began the National Training Laboratories (NTL) which furthered
Lewin's social engineering via "T-groups" (training groups), where group consensus is facilitated by trained individuals.

Over the next two decades, the NTL would spread its operations to various countries around the world. And in its ISSUES IN (HUMAN RELATIONS) TRAINING (1962), its sensitivity training is referred to as "brainwashing." Recently, NTL has conducted programs relevant to Tavistock such as "NTL and Tavistock: Two Traditions of Group Work," "Tavistock Program: Re-Thinking and Planning for Organizational Change," and "The Tavistock--Task Working Conference which is a program structured around various group configurations.... Periodically each group will review its actions and results to learn from processes, roles, values, and methods as they evolve." Other recent NTL programs have featured people such as New Ager Jean Houston and the witch Starhawk. The year after Tavistock and the RCGD began publishing HUMAN RELATIONS, the journal (Vol. II, No. 3, 1949), published "Some Principles of Mass Persuasion" by Dorwin Cartwright who helped establish the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan. In this article, Cartwright reveals: "It is conceivable that one persuasive person could, through the use of mass media, bend the world's population to his will." The article goes on to describe "the modification of cognitive structure in individuals by means of mass media" and how "a person can be induced to do voluntarily something that he would otherwise not do." The article also provides "a list of essential requirements for the success of any campaign of mass persuasion.

Seven years after Cartwright's article appeared, prominent psychiatrist R.D. Laing was appointed senior registrar at the Tavistock Clinic in 1956, three years after he left the British Army Psychiatric Unit. He began experimenting with LSD in 1960, and then in 1962 when he became a family therapist at the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations, he also met Gregory Bateson while visiting the U.S. Bateson had been with the Office of Strategic Services (forerunner of the CIA), and then led the MK-Ultra hallucinogen (LSD) project. Bateson's and Margaret Mead's daughter, Mary Catherine Bateson, along with New Ager Jean Houston, would later help Hilary Clinton write IT TAKES A VILLAGE. In 1964 Laing met LSD proponent Timothy Leary in New York and also authored "Transcendental Experience in Relation and Psychosis" (THE PSYCHEDELIC REVIEW, Vol. 1, No. 3, 1964). Three years later Laing participated in the July 15-30 1967 Dialectics of Liberation Congress.

In 1970, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) of the NEA published TO NURTURE HUMANENESS: COMMITMENT FOR THE '70s, in which Sidney Jourard (Fellow at the Tavistock Clinic and former president of the Association for Humanist Psychology), wrote: "We are in a time of revolt.... The new society will be a fascist state or it will be pluralistic and humanistic." The primary characteristic of the fascist state is increasing control over people's lives by government in league with corporations.

In 1970, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) of the NEA published TO NURTURE HUMANENESS: COMMITMENT FOR THE '70s, in which Sidney Jourard (Fellow at the Tavistock Clinic and former president of the Association for Humanist Psychology), wrote: "We are in a time of revolt.... The new society will be a fascist state or it will be pluralistic and humanistic." The primary characteristic of the fascist state is increasing control over people's lives by government in league with corporations.

"Sound like today?"

Relevant to this, in October 1997 the Tavistock Institute (and Manchester University) completed a final report (under Contract ERB-SOE2-CT-96-2011) for the European Commission, and described in a report summary was that there will be "partnerships between government, industry, and representatives of worker organizations." The report summary also described "the relevancy of Goals 2000, SCANS (U.S. Department of Labour SECRETARY'S COMMISSION ON ACHIEVING NECESSARY SKILLS) typology with its profound implications for the curriculum and training changes that this will require," valid skills standards and portable credentials "benchmarked to international standards such as those
promulgated by the International Standards Organization (ISO)." The report summary went on to say that "there is increasing attention being focused on developing global skill standards and accreditation agreements."

In the 1990s, the Tavistock Institute not only began a new journal titled EVALUATION in 1995, but the Institute and the European Commission also worked on a feasibility study to research the effect of using "Smart Cards" in competence accreditation. The study was carried out in the U.S. and parts of Europe. The project involved assessing and validating students' skills, with information placed on personal skills Smart Cards which "become real passports to employment." The implication, of course, is that without this "real passport," one will not be employed.

Welcome to the Tavistock psychologically conditioned feudal fascist state of the future, under the power elite's planned World Socialist Government! © 2008 Dennis Cuddy - All Rights Reserved

Remember that “drugs to put off puberty for gender confused children” article way back in chapter four (I think). Tavistock was one of only two places offering this treatment.

You might also remember the 7/7 bus bomb that exploded there, you will ALL remember this photo too, the one with the blood splattered over the door at “Tavistock” Square.

You might also remember the German psychiatrist Kurt Lewin, who became director of the elite-sponsored Tavistock Institute in 1932?

I wonder if you can remember his most famous policy?

... "Lewin is credited with much of the original Tavistock research into mass brainwashing applying the results of repeated trauma and torture [of individuals] in mind control to society at large."

"If (outright) terror can be induced on a widespread basis into a society, Lewin has stated, then society reverts to a tabula rasa, a blank slate, a situation where control can easily be instituted from an external point."

"Put another way: By the creation of controlled chaos, the populace can be brought to the point where it willingly submits to greater control.

I honestly in my heart know 100% that what happened that day in London was an “Inside Job” and NOT the work of Muslim extremists, and (much) later on I'll prove it to you.

Whether you choose to believe me or not on this is entirely up to you. I believe that the people who run the world today are so evil, sick and especially arrogant, that they have “inside joke’s” or “calling cards” of the sickest standard imaginable that they have left on many of the “terrorist” events of the last century, and all of the “terrorist” events of the new century.

The pictures on the page that follow are (I believe) one of these inside jokes/calling cards. As repulsive a thought as that may be to YOU please don't discount the notion simply because you could never be this callous, that by no means indicates that others couldn't be this sick.

In another 5000 pages you will have came to terms with just how sick these people really are, by then what I suggest on the following page will seem quite tame in comparison.
Just know that this is how THEY think not you. This is their idea of a joke not yours, and most definitely not mine. This isn't a joking matter in the slightest. This is deadly serious.

Both the arrows point to the Tavistock sign. This is the name of the same institute who probably hatched the plan for what happened on the street outside.

...And if that wasn't blatantly rubbing what these people are doing right in your face I don't know what is. But if this in itself wasn't enough to tell you who it was actually was that was behind this, then there was also the bus that was blown to bits on the street right beside Tavistock, with the following words on it – “Outright Terror...Bold and Brilliant”...These people are so cocky they think they can leave inside-joke/caller cards!

Then again, you may well believe that both of these occurrences were just coincidences. Not me though, I think they were both part of some unbelievably sick inner-circle private joke.
And here it is blown up to confirm what I say. So what do you think is this just a “weird” coincidence? – (Like the “coincidence” of body parts splattered over the door carrying the name of the very institution that originally concocted the sick idea that “to manipulate the public first they must be put into a state of shock”). - I don’t believe in coincidence with these guys.

Tavistock - The Best Kept Secret In America By Dr. Byron T. Weeks, MD

Col. AFUS, MC, Ret. 8-8-1
http://educate-yourself.org/ nwotavistockbestkeptsecret.html

Editor's Note: This penetrating article by was sent to John Quinn by the author, Dr. Byron Weeks. The insidious propaganda and public opinion manipulations (including mind control
Formed in 1947, the Tavistock Institute is an independent not-for-profit organization which seeks to combine research in the social sciences with professional practice. Problems of institution-building and organizational design and change are being tackled in all sectors - government, industry and commerce, health and welfare, education, etc. - nationally and internationally, and clients range from multinationals to small community groups. A growth area has been the use of a developmental approach to evaluation of new and experimental programs, particularly in health, education and community development. This has also produced new training events alongside the regular program of group relations conferences. The Institute owns and edits the monthly journal Human Relations (published by Plenum Press) which is now in its 48th year, and has recently launched (in conjunction with Sage Publications) a new journal Evaluation.

Three elements combine to make the Institute unusual, if not unique: it has the independence of being entirely self-financing, with no subsidies from the government or other sources; the action research orientation places it between, but not in, the worlds of academia and consultancy; and its range of disciplines include anthropology, economics, organizational behaviour, political science, psychoanalysis, psychology and sociology.

The ideology of American foundations was created by the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations in London. In 1921, the Duke of Bedford, Marques of Tavistock, the 11th Duke, gave a building to the Institute to study the effect of shellshock on British soldiers who survived World War I. Its purpose was to establish the "breaking point" of men under stress, under the direction of the British Army Bureau of Psychological Warfare, commanded by Sir John Rawlings-Reese.

Tavistock Institute is headquartered in London. Its prophet, Sigmund Freud, settled in Maresfield Gardens when he moved to England. He was given a mansion by Princess Bonaparte. Tavistock's pioneer work in behavioural science along Freudian lines of "controlling" humans established it as the world centre of foundation ideology. Its network now extends from the University of Sussex to the U.S. through the Stanford Research Institute, Esalen, MIT, http://watch.pair.com/Hudson.html Hudson Institute, http://watch.pair.com/heritage.html Heritage Foundation, Centre of Strategic and International Studies at Georgetown, where State Dept. personal are trained, US Air Force Intelligence, and the Rand and Mitre corporations. The personnel of the corporations are required to undergo indoctrination at one or more of these Tavistock controlled institutions. A network of secret groups, the Mont Pelerin Society, Trilateral Commission, Ditchley Foundation, and the Club of Rome is conduit for instructions to the Tavistock network.

Tavistock Institute developed the mass brain-washing techniques which were first used experimentally on American prisoners of war in Korea. Its experiments in crowd control methods have been widely used on the American public, a surreptitious but nevertheless outrageous assault on human freedom by modifying individual behaviour through topical psychology. A German refugee, Kurt Lewin, became director of Tavistock in 1932. He came to the U.S. in 1933 as a "refugee", the first of many infiltrators, and set up the Harvard Psychology Clinic, which originated the propaganda campaign to turn the American public against Germany and involve us in World War II.

In 1938, Roosevelt executed a secret agreement with Churchill which in effect ceded U.S. sovereignty to England, because it agreed to let Special Operations Executive control U.S. policies. To implement this agreement, Roosevelt sent General Donovan to London for indoctrination before setting up OSS (now the CIA) under the aegis of SOE-SIS. The entire
OSS program, as well as the CIA has always worked on guidelines set up by the Tavistock Institute.

Tavistock Institute originated the mass civilian bombing raids carried out by Roosevelt and Churchill purely as a clinical experiment in mass terror, keeping records of the results as they watched the "guinea pigs" reacting under "controlled laboratory conditions". All Tavistock and American foundation techniques have a single goal—to break down the psychological strength of the individual and render him helpless to oppose the dictators of the World Order. Any technique which helps to break down the family unit, and family inculcated principles of religion, honour, patriotism and sexual behaviour, is used by the Tavistock scientists as weapons of crowd control.

The methods of Freudian psychotherapy induce permanent mental illness in those who undergo this treatment by destabilizing their character. The victim is then advised to "establish new rituals of personal interaction", that is, to indulge in brief sexual encounters which actually set the participants adrift with no stable personal relationships in their lives, destroying their ability to establish or maintain a family. Tavistock Institute has developed such power in the U.S. that no one achieves prominence in any field unless he has been trained in behavioural science at Tavistock or one of its subsidiaries.

Henry Kissinger, whose meteoric rise to power is otherwise inexplicable, was a German refugee and student of Sir John Rawlings-Reese at SHAEF. Dr. Peter Bourne, a Tavistock Institute psychologist, picked Jimmy Carter for President of the U.S. solely because Carter had undergone an intensive brainwashing program administered by Admiral Hyman Rickover at Annapolis. The 'experiment' in compulsory racial integration in the U.S. was organized by Ronald Lippert, of the OSS and the American Jewish Congress, and director of child training at the Commission on Community Relations. The program was designed to break down the individual's sense of personal knowledge in his identity, his racial heritage. Through the Stanford Research Institute, Tavistock controls the National Education Association. The Institute of Social Research at the National Training Lab brain washes the leading executives of business and government.

Such is the power of Tavistock that our entire space program was scrapped for nine years so that the Soviets could catch up. The hiatus was demanded in an article written by Dr. Anatol Rapport, and was promptly granted by the government, to the complete mystification of everyone connected with NASA. Another prominent Tavistock operation is the Wharton School of Finance, at the University of Pennsylvania. A single common denominator identifies the common Tavistock strategy—the use of drugs. The infamous MK Ultra program of the CIA, in which unsuspecting CIA officials were given LSD, and their reaction studied like "guinea pigs", resulted in several deaths.

The U.S. Government had to pay millions in damages to the families of the victims, but the culprits were never indicted. The program originated when Sandoz AG, a Swiss drug firm, owned by S.G. Warburg Co. of London, developed Lysergic Acid [LSD]. Roosevelt's advisor, James Paul Warburg, son of Paul Warburg who wrote the Federal Reserve Act, and nephew of Max Warburg who had financed Hitler, set up the Institute for Policy Studies to promote the drug. The result was the LSD "counter-culture" of the 1960s, the "student revolution", which was financed by $25 million from the CIA.

(My note – all of this should be old news to you, we have covered this period of time quite extensively in the initial chapters.)

One part of MK Ultra was the Human Ecology Fund; the CIA also paid Dr. Herbert Kelman of Harvard to carry out further experiments on mind control. In the 1950s, the CIA financed extensive LSD experiments in Canada. Dr. D. Ewen Cameron, president of the Canadian Psychological Association, and director of Royal Victorian Hospital, Montreal, received large
payments from the CIA to give 53 patients large doses of LSD and record their reactions; the patients were drugged into weeks of sleep and then given electric shock treatments.

One victim, the wife of a member of the Canadian Parliament, is now suing the U.S. companies who provided the drug for the CIA. All the records of the CIA's drug testing program were ordered destroyed by the head of MK Ultra. Because all efforts of the Tavistock Institute are directed toward producing cyclical collapse, the effect of the CIA programs are tragically apparent. R. Emmett Tyrell Jr., writing in the Washington Post August 20, 1984, cites the "squalid consequences of the 60s radicals in SDS" as resulting in "the growing rate of illegitimacy, petty lawlessness, drug addiction, welfare, VD, and mental illness".

This is the legacy of the Warburg's and the CIA. Their principal agency, the Institute for Policy Studies, was funded by James Paul Warburg; its co-founder was Marcus Raskin, protegé of McGeorge Bundy, president of the Ford Foundation. Bundy had Raskin appointed to the post of President Kennedy's personal representative on the National Security Council, and in 1963 funded Students for Democratic Society, through which the CIA operated the drug culture.

Today the Tavistock Institute operates a $6 Billion a year network of Foundations in the U.S., all of it funded by U.S. taxpayers' money. Ten major institutions are under its direct control, with 400 subsidiaries, and 3000 other study groups and think tanks which originate many types of programs to increase the control of the World Order over the American people. The Stanford Research Institute, adjoining the Hoover Institution, is a $150 million a year operation with 3300 employees. It carries on program surveillance for Bechtel, Kaiser, and 400 other companies, and extensive intelligence operations for the CIA. It is the largest institution on the West Coast promoting mind control and the behavioural sciences.

One of the key agencies as a conduit for secret instructions from Tavistock is the Ditchley Foundation, founded in 1957. The American branch of the Ditchley Foundation is run by Cyrus Vance, former Secretary of State, and director of the Rockefeller Foundation, and Winston Lord, president of the Council on Foreign Relations.

One of the principal but little known operations of the Rockefeller Foundation has been its techniques for controlling world agriculture. (My note – this will be covered in great detail in book four) Its director, Kenneth Wernimont, set up Rockefeller controlled agricultural programs throughout Mexico and Latin America. The independent farmer is a great threat to the World Order, because he produces for himself, and because his produce can be converted into capital, which gives him independence. In Soviet Russia, the Bolsheviks believed they had attained total control over the people; they were dismayed to find their plans threatened by the stubborn independence of the small farmers, the Kulaks.

Stalin ordered the OGPU to seize all food and animals of the Kulaks, and to starve them out. The Chicago American, February 25, 1935 carried a front page headline, SIX MILLION PERISH IN SOVIET FAMINE; Peasants' Crops Seized, They and their Animals Starve. To draw attention from this atrocity, it was later alleged that the Germans, not the Soviets, had killed six million people, the number taken from the Chicago American headline by a Chicago publicist.

The Communist Party, the Party of the Peasants and Workers, exterminated the peasants and enslaved the workers. Many totalitarian regimes have found the small farmer to be their biggest stumbling block. The French Reign of Terror was directed, not against the aristocrats, many of whom were sympathetic to it, but against the small farmers who refused to turn over their grain to the revolutionary tribunals in exchange for the worthless assignats. In the United States, the foundations are presently engaged in the same type of war of extermination against the American farmer.
The traditional formula of land plus labour for the farmer has been altered due to the farmer's need for purchasing power, to buy industrial goods needed in his farming operations. Because of this need for capital, the farmer is especially vulnerable to the World Order's manipulation of interest rates, which is bankrupting him. Just as in the Soviet Union, in the early 1930s, when Stalin ordered the Kulaks to give up their small plots of land to live and work on the collective farms, the American small farmer faces the same type of extermination, being forced to give up his small plot of land to become a hired hand for the big agricultural trusts. The Brookings Institution and other foundations originated the monetary programs implemented by the Federal Reserve System to destroy the American farmer, a replay of the Soviet tragedy in Russia, with one proviso that the farmer will be allowed to survive if he becomes a slave worker of the giant trusts.

Once the citizen becomes aware of the true role of the foundations, he can understand the high interest rates, high taxes, the destruction of the family, the degradation of the churches into forums for revolution, the subversion of the universities into CIA cesspools of drug addiction, and the halls of government into sewers of international espionage and intrigue. The American citizen can now understand why every agent of the federal government is against him; the alphabet agencies, the FBI, IRS, CIA and BATF must make war on the citizen in order to carry out the programs of the foundations. These foundations are in direct violation of their charters, which commit them to do "charitable" work, because they make no grants which are not part of a political goal. The charge has been made, and never denied, that the Heritage-AEI network has at least two KGB moles on its staff. The employment of professional intelligence operatives as "charitable" workers, as was done in the Red Cross Mission to Russia in 1917, exposes the sinister political economic and social goals which the World Order requires the foundations to achieve through their "bequests ".

Not only is this tax fraud, because the foundations are granted tax exemption solely to do charitable work, but it is criminal syndicalism, conspiracy to commit offenses against the United States of America, Constitutional Law 213, Corpus Juris Secundum 16. For the first time, the close interlocking of the foundation "syndicate" has been revealed by the names of its principle incorporators—Daniel Coit Gilman, who incorporated the Peabody Fund and the John Slater Fund, and became an incorporator of the General Education Board (now the Rockefeller Foundation); Gilman, who also incorporated the Russell Trust in 1856, later became an incorporator of the Carnegie Institution with Andrew Dickson White (Russell Trust) and Frederic A. Delano. Delano also was an original incorporator of the Brookings Institution and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Daniel Coit Gilman incorporated the Russell Sage Foundation with Cleveland H. Dodge of the National City Bank. These foundations incorporators have been closely linked with the Federal Reserve System, the War Industries Board of World War I, the OSS of World War II and the CIA. They have also been closely linked with the American International Corporation, which was formed to instigate the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia. Delano, an uncle of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, was on the original Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in 1914. His brother-in-law founded the influential Washington law firm of Covington and Burling. The Delano's and other ruling families of the World Order trace their lineage directly back to William of Orange and the regime which granted the charter of the Bank of England.

Tavistock Institutions In The United States

* Flow Laboratories - Gets contracts from the National Institutes of Health.

* Merle Thomas Corporation - Gets contracts from the U.S. Navy, analyzes data from satellites.

* Walden Research - Does work in the field of pollution control.
Part of approximately 350 firms who conduct research and surveys, make recommendations to government. They are part of what President Eisenhower called "a possible danger to public policy that could itself become captive of a scientific-technological elite."

* Brookings Institution - Dedicates its work to what it calls a "national agenda." Wrote President Hoover's program, President Roosevelt's "New Deal", the Kennedy Administration's "New Frontiers" program (deviation from it may have cost John F. Kennedy his life), and President Johnson's "Great Society." Brookings has been telling the United States Government how to conduct its affairs for the past 70 years and is still doing so.

* Hudson Institute - This institution has done more to shape the way Americans react to political and social events, think, vote and generally conduct themselves than perhaps any except the BIG FIVE. Hudson specializes in defence policy research and relations with the USSR. Most of its military work is classified as SECRET. (One idea during the Vietnam War was to build a moat around Saigon.) Hudson may be properly classified as one of the Committee of 300's BRAINWASHING establishments. One of its largest clients is the U.S. Department of Defence which includes matters of civil defence, national security, military policy and arms control.

[Editor, Tim Aho: This is the same http://watch.pair.com/Hudson.html Hudson Institute which gave us GOALS 2000 and authored the Freedom From Religious Persecution Act, which became the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998. This law required the creation of a federal commission to monitor religion chaired by a presidentially-appointed Ambassador-at-Large on International Religious Freedom under the mandates of the United Nations' covenants and authority of the International Criminal Court.]

* National Training Laboratories - One of the key institutions established for this purpose in the United States was the National Training Laboratories (NTL). Founded in 1947 by members of the Tavistock network in the United States and located originally on an estate in Bethel, Maine, NTL had as its explicit purpose the brainwashing of leaders of the government, educational institutions, and corporate bureaucracies in the Tavistock method, and then using these "leaders" to either themselves run Tavistock group sessions in their organizations or to hire other similarly trained group leaders to do the job. The "nuts and bolts" of the NTL operation revolves around the particular form of Tavistock degenerate psychology known as "group dynamics," developed by German Tavistock operative Kurt Lewin, who emigrated to the United States in the 1930s and whose students founded NTL. In a Lewinite brainwashing group, a number of individuals from varying backgrounds and personalities are manipulated by a "group leader" to form a "consensus" of opinion, achieving a new "group identity." The key to the process is the creation of a controlled environment, in which stress is introduced (sometimes called dissonance) to crack an individual's belief structure. Using the peer pressure of other group members, the individual is "cracked," and a new personality emerges with new values. The degrading experience causes the person to deny that any change has taken place. In that way, an individual is brainwashed without the victim knowing what has taken place.

(My Note. Think about your place of work and ask yourself, doesn't this all sound and feel a little bit familiar?)

This method is the same, with some minor modification, used in all so-called "sensitivity groups" or "T-groups," or in the more extreme rock-drug-sex counterculture form, "touchy-feely groups," such as the kind popularized from the 1960s onward by the Esalen Institute, which was set up with the help of NTL. From the mid-1950s onward, NTL put the majority of the nation's corporate leaderships through such brainwashing programs, while running similar programs for the State Department, the Navy, the Department of Education, and other sections of the federal bureaucracy. There is no firm estimate of the number of
Americans who have been put through this process in last 40 years at either NTL, or as it is now known the NTL Institute for Applied Behavioural Sciences, which is based in Rosslyn, Virginia, or its West Coast base of operations, the Western Training Laboratories in Group Development, or in various satellite institutions. The most reliable estimate is in the several millions.

One of the groups that went through the NTL mill in the 1950s was the leadership of the National Education Association, the largest organization of teachers in the United States. Thus, the NEA's outlook has been "shaped" by Tavistock, through the NTL. In 1964, the NTL Institute became a direct part of the NEA, with the NTL setting up "group sessions" for all its affiliates. With funding from the Department of Education, the NTL Institute drafted the programs for the training of the nation's primary and secondary school teachers, and has a hand as well in developing the content of educational "reforms," including OBE.

Also known as the International Institute for Applied Behavioural Sciences. This institute is a brainwashing centre in artificial stress training whereby participants suddenly find themselves immersed in defending themselves against vicious accusations. NTL takes in the National Education Association, the largest teacher group in the United States. While officially decrying "racism", it is interesting to note that NTL, working with NEA, produced a paper proposing education vouchers which would separate the hard-to-teach children from the brighter ones, and funding would be allocated according to the number of difficult children who would be separated from those who progressed at a normal rate. The proposal was not taken up.

University of Pennsylvania, Wharton School of Finance & Commerce Founded by Eric Trist One of the "brain trusts" of Tavistock, Wharton has become one of the more important Tavistock in so far as "Behavioural Research" is concerned. Wharton attracts clients such as the U.S. Department of Labour—which teaches how to produce "cooked" statistics at the Wharton Econometric Forecasting Associates Incorporated. This method was very much in demand as we came to the close of 1991 with millions more out of work than was reflected in USDL statistics. Wharton's ECONOMETRIC MODELING is used by every major Committee of 300 company in the United States, Western Europe, the International Monetary Fund, the United Nations, and the World Bank. Institute for Social Research Among its clients are The Ford Foundation, U.S. Department of Defence, U.S. Postal Service and the U.S. Department of Justice. Among its studies are "The Human Meaning Of Social Change", "Youth in Transition" and "How Americans View Their Mental Health".

Institute For The Future This is not a typical Tavistock institution in that it is funded by the Ford Foundation, yet it draws its long-range forecasting from the mother of all think tanks. Institute for the Future projects what it believes to be changes that will be taking place in time frames of fifty years. So called "DELPHI PANELS" decide what is normal and what is not, and prepare position papers to "steer" government in the right direction to head off such groups as "people creating civil disorder." (This could be patriotic groups demanding abolition of graduated taxes, or demanding that their right to bear arms is not infringed.) This institute recommends action such as liberalizing abortion laws, drug usage and that cars entering an urban area pay tolls, teaching birth control in public schools, requiring registration of firearms, making use of drugs a non-criminal offense, legalizing homosexuality, paying students for scholastic achievements, requiring zoning controls a preserve of the state, offering bonuses for family planning and last, but most frightening, a Pol Pot Cambodia-style proposal that new communities be established in rural areas, (concentration camp compounds). As can be observed, many of their goals have already been more than fully realized.

INSTITUTE FOR POLICY STUDIES (IPS)

One of the "Big Three", IPS has shaped and reshaped United States policies, foreign and domestic, since it was founded by James P. Warburg and the Rothschild entities in the
United States. Its networks in America include the League for Industrial Democracy. Lead players in the League for Industrial Democracy have included Jeane Kirkpatrick, former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Irwin Sull of the ADL, Eugene Rostow, Arms control negotiator, Lane Kirkland, Labour Leader, and Albert Shanker. IPS was incorporated in 1963 by Marcus Raskin and Richard Barnett, both highly trained Tavistock Institute graduates. The objectives of IPS came from an agenda laid down for it by the Tavistock Institute, one of the most notable being to create the "New Left" as a grass roots movement in the U.S. It's been said that Barnett and Raskin controlled such diverse elements as the Black Panthers, Daniel Ellsberg, National Security Council staff member Halprin, The Weathermen Underground, the Venceramos and the campaign staff of candidate George McGovern. No scheme was too big for IPS and its controllers to take on and manage.

Through its many powerful lobbying groups on Capitol Hill, IPS relentlessly used its "Big Stick" to beat Congress. IPS has a network of lobbyists, all supposedly operating independently but in actual fact acting cohesively, so that Congressmen are pummelled from all sides by seemingly different and varied lobbyists, In this way, IPS was, and is still, able to successfully sway individual Representatives and Senators to vote for "the trend, the way things are going." By using key pointmen on Capitol Hill, IPS was able to break into the very infrastructure of our legislative system and the way it works.

IPS became, and remains to this day, one of the most prestigious "think tanks" controlling foreign policy decisions, which we, the people, foolishly believe are those of our law makers. By sponsoring militant activism at home and with links to revolutionaries abroad, by engineering such victories as "The Pentagon Papers," besieging the corporate structure, bridging the credibility gap between underground movements and acceptable political activism, by penetrating religious organizations and using them to sow discord in America, such as radical racial policies under the guise of religion, using establishment media to spread IPS ideas, and then supporting them, IPS has lived up to the role which it was founded to play.

Jesse Hobson, the first president of Stanford Research Institute, in a 1952 speech made it clear what lines the institute was to follow. Stanford can be described as one of the "jewels" in Tavistock's Crown in its rule over the United States. Founded in 1946 immediately after the close of WWII, it was presided over by Charles A. Anderson, with emphasis on mind control research and "future sciences." Included under the Stanford umbrella was Charles F. Kettering Foundation which developed the "Changing Images of Man" upon which the Aquarian Conspiracy rests.

Some of Stanford's major clients and contracts were at first centred around the defence establishment but, as Stanford grew, so, did the diversity of its services: Applications of Behavioural Sciences to Research Management Office of Science and Technology SRI Business Intelligence Program U.S. Department of Defence Directorate of Defence Research and Engineering U.S. Department of Defence Office of Aerospace Research. Among corporations seeking Stanford's services were Wells Fargo Bank, Bechtel Corporation, Hewlett Packard, Bank of America, McDonnell Douglas Corporation, Blyth, Eastman Dillon and TRW Company. One of Stanford's more secret projects was extensive work on chemical and bacteriological warfare (CAB) weapons.

Stanford Research is plugged into at least 200 smaller "think tanks" doing research into every facet of life in America. This is ARPA networking and represents the emergence of probably the most far reaching effort to control the environment of every individual in the country. At present Stanford's computers are linked with 2500 "sister" research consoles which include the CIA, Bell Telephone Laboratories, U.S. Army Intelligence, The Office of Naval Intelligence (ONI), Rand, MIT, Harvard and UCLA. Stanford plays a key role in that it is the "library", cataloguing all ARPA documentation.
"Other agencies".....one can use one's imagination here, are allowed to search through SRI's "library" for key words, phrases, look through sources and update their own master files with those of Stanford Research Centre. The Pentagon uses SRI's master files extensively, and there is little doubt that other U.S. Government agencies do the same. Pentagon "command and control" problems are worked out by Stanford. While ostensibly these apply only to weapons and soldiers, there is absolutely no guarantee that the same research could not, and will not be turned to civilian applications. Stanford is known to be willing to do anything for anyone.

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY (MIT), ALFRED P. SLOAN SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT

This major institute is not generally recognized as being a part of Tavistock U.S.A. Most people look upon it as being a purely American institution, but that is far from the truth. MIT- Alfred Sloan can be roughly divided into the following groups:

Contemporary Technology Industrial Relations NASA-ERC Computer Research Laboratories Office of Naval Research Group, Psychology Systems Dynamics

Some of MIT's clients are:

RAND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Without a doubt, RAND is THE think tank most beholden to Tavistock Institute and certainly the RIIA's most prestigious vehicle for control of United States policies at every level. Specific RAND policies that became operative include our ICBM program, prime analyses for U.S. foreign policy making, instigator of space programs, U.S. nuclear policies, corporate analyses, hundreds of projects for the military, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) in relation to the use of mind altering drugs like peyote, LSD (the covert MK-ULTRA operation which lasted for 20 years).

[Editor, Tim Aho's note: The founder of the Rand Corporation, Herman Kahn, also founded the Hudson Institute in 1961. In Educating for the New World Order, B.K. Eakman tells of a training manual for "change agents" developed for the U.S. government by Rand Corporation: ". . . a how-to manual with a 1971 U.S. Office of Education contract number on it entitled Training for Change Agents'; seven volumes of 'change agent studies' commissioned by the U.S. Office of Education to the Rand Corporation in 1973-74; scores of other papers submitted by behaviourist researchers who had obtained grants from the U.S. Office of Education for the purpose of exploring ways to 'freeze' and 'unfreeze' values, 'to implement change,' and to turn potentially hostile groups and committees into acquiescent, rubber-stamp bodies by means of such strategies as the 'Delphi Technique.'" (p. 118)]

Some of RAND's clients include:

There are literally THOUSANDS of highly important companies, government institutions and organizations that make use of RAND's services. To list them all would be impossible. Among RAND's specialities is a study group that predicts the timing and the direction of a thermonuclear war, plus working out the many scenarios based upon its findings. RAND was once accused of being commissioned by the USSR to work out terms of surrender of the United States Government, an accusation that went all the way to the United States Senate,
where it was taken up by Senator Symington and subsequently fell victim to scorn poured out by the establishment press. BRAINWASHING remains the primary function of RAND. These institutions are among those that fund The UNIFORM LAW FOUNDATION, whose function is to ensure that the Uniform Commercial Code remains the instrument for conducting business in the United States.

Tavistock Institute, Stanford Research Institute and the Institute for Social Relations, in fact the entire wide-spectrum of research-organizations in applied social-psychiatry, either had delegates on the board of the Club of Rome, or acted as advisors and played a guiding role in NATO's attempt to adopt the “Aquarian Conspiracy”.

To summarize, the major Tavistock institutions in the United States engaged in brainwashing at all levels, including government, the military, business, religious organizations and education are the following:

- Brookings Institution.
- Hudson Institute.
- Institute for Policy Studies.
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- National Training Laboratories.
- Rand Research and Development Corporation.
- Stanford Research Institute.
- Wharton School at University of Pennsylvania.

It is estimated by sources of mine that the total number of people employed by these institutions is in the region of 50,000 with funding close to $10 billion dollars.

Now an extract from “The Tavistock Grin” from “The Campaigner” Magazine April 1974:

The Tavistock Grin is a term coined to connote the knowing grin -- the smile of John Rawlings Rees. This is the grin of men who engage in the most vicious forms of psychological warfare.

Rees served as a medical officer in Churchill's British expeditionary force invading the Caucus region. According to his own account, Rees spent the overwhelming majority of his adult years as, first, a military psychiatrist, and later on as the most influential operative of both the CIA and British Intelligence.

His known connection to the Rockefellers begins in 1934, in connection with the sponsorship of the Tavistock Clinic.

After the transformation of that clinic into one of the world's leading fascist "think-tanks," the Tavistock Institute.

At the end of the war, Rees moved onward and upward, directing his far-flung and ever expanding influence and operations through the CIA cover known as the World Federation of Mental Health.
The theme of all of Rees's known work is the development of the uses of psychiatry as a weapon of (Control for) the ruling class.

...."With the discovery and extensive de-programming Christopher White during the first week of this year, the Labour Committees picked up the threads of a conspiracy against the working class, led by the Rockefeller faction of international capital and using the techniques developed by Dr. John Rawlings Rees of the Tavistock Clinic in Britain. - Reesian methods rely, completely on the destruction of the mental life of world society and a forced march into universal sadism".

“Our purpose here is to expose the development of the Reesian method, the formation of the Tavistock network and its takeover of the British armed forces.

This network is designed, fundamentally, to maintain class rule under the direction of the Tavistock network and the CIA. Since the 1930's, John Rees and the small circle of psychiatrists around him, with Rockefeller money, had consciously developed that capability”.

“The Tavistock network and the Reesian method brought to Western Europe and North America the class war" - (Their perceived “class” versus the all of the rest of us that is) –

Waged with "weapons [that] affect morale more than they take life".

And later with reference to what they done with us at the workplace...

..."Developing in the worker to the highest degree automatic mechanical attitudes, breaking up the old psycho-physical nexus of qualified professional work, which demands a certain active participation of intelligence, fantasy, and initiative on the part of the worker, and reducing productive operations exclusively to the mechanical, physical aspect. But these things, in reality, are not original nor novel they represent simply the most recent phase of a long process which began with industrialism itself".

As you'll find out later they made your job soul destroying on purpose, but that's for later...

And now to finally end this chapter here's a short extract from:

How To Think In a Time of Crisis Part I

This article is reprinted from the Spring 1998 issue of FIDELIO Magazine.

Aversive Behavioural Modification

The key word for each of the two revolutions, that of the 1964-1972 interval, and that emerging now, is “shock.” Consider the 1964-1972 case first.

The preferred theoretical account of the way the 1964-1972 transformation occurred, is supplied by the London Tavistock Clinic and its offshoot, the London Tavistock Institute. The theory had its origins in the British intelligence services' studies of behaviour of “shell-shock” victims, those produced by conditions of trench warfare on the western front, during World War I. Brigadier Dr. John Rawlings Rees headed up the Tavistock Clinic, which studied the matter.' The question Rees et al. posed to themselves was: How might it be possible to replicate the kind of heightened lability and suggestibility experienced in clinical studies of populations of “shell-shock” victims? The study focussed upon both the induced behavioural modification of the individual subject and small group, and also the way in which similar effects could be induced through informed use of policy-making institutions, in virtually entire populations. This work of both that Clinic and Institute played a key role...
in evoking the 'Sixty-Eighter phenomenon among an influential large ration of the 1964-1973 university-student population here in the U.S., as also in Germany, and elsewhere.

Typical centres of work to this effect were those established by German emigre Dr. Kurt Lewin at Massachusetts Institute of Technology (M.I.T.), and at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, and elsewhere. The small, but significant Josiah Macy, Jr. Foundation, one of the interfaces with British intelligence channels, contributed a coordinating role. The reports of “mass brainwashing” of U.S. prisoners of war, in North Korea camps, provided the pretext for a massive expansion of work on “aversive behavioural modification,” with included sponsorship from the U.S. government, under such official rubrics as MK-Ultra. The “mind wars” faddism which gripped the U.S. intelligence community during the 1952-1975 interval, until the mid-1970's, when C.I.A. Director Bill Colby blew the proverbial whistle, was key to the possibility of the kind of transformation which produced the 1964-1973 youth-counterculture phenomenon.

“Mind wars” licensed the application of techniques of aversive behavioural modification to one's own population, in addition to those of suspected adversary nations. The impact of these techniques, including MK-Ultra’s LSD-25 researches, researches into psychological changes induced by rock rhythms, and studies of deleterious effects of frequent use of marijuana, as also the British Tavistock Clinic's promotion of LSD-25, contributed greatly to the emergence of the “youth counterculture” among the 'Sixty-Eighters.'


12. Otherwise known as the RLE associated with the Josiah Macy, Jr., Foundation, and of Bertrand-Russell/Karl-Korsch epigone Professor Noam Chomsky.


Now that we have looked at some of the fundamental building blocks and “stepping stones” of Mind Control, (and also one of its great “churches”) it's now time to step it up a little bit by looking at the subject in much greater detail. We'll kick off by looking at the first big thing that I heard on the matter. I said heard because I initially heard this series read out on the radio by a great man and teacher named William Cooper. The series he was reading out was originally by Harry V. Martin and David Caul and it was taken from the Napa Sentinel series on the matter. I included it because it is not only informative and succinct, it was also utilised for sentimental value – this is what got me into the subject in the first place. Enjoy.
Chapter Twenty One

Mind Control

By Harry V. Martin and David Caul Taken from the Napa Sentinel series on the matter.

There was just a small news announcement on the radio in early July after a short heat wave, three inmates of Vacaville Medical Facility had died in non-air conditioned cells. Two of those prisoners, the announcement said, may have died as a result of medical treatment. No media inquiries were made, no major news stories developed because of these deaths.

But what was the medical treatment that may have caused their deaths? The Medical Facility indicates they were mind control or behaviour modification treatments. A deeper probe into the death of these two inmates unravels a mind-boggling tale of horror that has been part of California penal history for a long time, and one that caused national outcries two decades ago.

Mind control experiments have been part of California for decades and permeate mental institutions and prisons. But, it is not just in the penal society that mind control measures have been used. Minority children were subjected to experimentation at abandoned Nike Missile Sites, veterans who fought for American freedom were also subjected to the programs. Funding and experimentations of mind control have been part of the U.S. Health, Education and Welfare Department, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Central Intelligence Agency through the Phoenix Program, the Stanford Research Institute, the Agency for International Development, the Department of Defence, the Department of Labour, the National Institute of Mental Health, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, and the National Science Foundation.

California has been in the forefront of mind control experimentation. Government experiments also were conducted in the Haight-Ashbury District in San Francisco at the height of the Hippy reign. In 1974, Senator Sam Erwin, of Watergate fame, headed a U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights studying the subject of "Individual rights and the Federal role in behaviour modification." Though little publicity was given to this committee's investigation, Senator Erwin issued a strong condemnation of the federal role in mind control. That condemnation, however, did not halt mind control experiments, they just received more circuitous funding.

Many of the case histories concerning individuals of whom the mind control experiments were used, show a strange concept in the minds of those seeking guinea pigs. Those subject to the mind control experiments would be given indefinite sentences, his freedom was dependent upon how well the experiment went. One individual, for example, was arrested for joyriding, given a two-year sentence and held for mind control experiments. He was held for 18 years.

Here are just a few experiments used in the mind control program:

- A naked inmate is strapped down on a board. His wrists and ankles are cuffed to the board and his head is rigidly held in place by a strap around his neck and a helmet on his head. He is left in a darkened cell, unable to remove his body wastes. When a meal is delivered, one wrist is unlocked so he could feel around in the dark for his food and attempt to pour liquid down his throat without being able to lift his head.
- Another experiment creates a muscle relaxant. Within 30 to 40 seconds paralysis begins to invade the small muscles of the fingers, toes, and eyes and then the intercostal muscles and diaphragm. The heart slows down to about 60 beats per minute. This condition, together with respiratory arrests, sets in for as long as two to five
minutes before the drug begins to wear off. The individual remains fully conscious and is gasping for breath. It is "likened to dying, it is almost like drowning" the experiment states.

- Another drug induces vomiting and was administered to prisoners who didn't get up on time or caught swearing or lying, or even not greeting their guards formally. The treatment brings about uncontrolled vomiting that lasts from 15 minutes to an hour, accompanied by a temporary cardiovascular effect involving changes in the blood pressure.
- Another deals with creating body rigidness, aching restlessness, blurred vision, severe muscular pain, trembling and fogged cognition.

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the U.S. Army have admitted mind control experiments. Many deaths have occurred.

In tracing the steps of government mind control experiments, the trail leads to legal and illegal usages, usage for covert intelligence operations, and experiments on innocent people who were unaware that they were being used.
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EDITOR'S NOTE: The Sentinel commenced a series on mind control in early August and suspended it until September because of the extensive research required after additional information was received.

In July, two inmates died at the Vacaville Medical Facility. According to prison officials at the time, the two may have died as a result of medical treatment, that treatment was the use of mind control or behaviour modification drugs. A deeper study into the deaths of the two inmates has unravelled a mind-boggling tale of horror that has been part of California penal history for a long time, and one that caused national outcries years ago.

In the August article, the Sentinel presented a graphic portrait of some of the mind control experiments that have been allowed to continue in the United States. On November 1974 a U.S. Senate Sub committee on Constitutional Rights investigated federally-funded behaviour modification programs, with emphasis on federal involvement in, and the possible threat to individual constitutional rights of behaviour modification, especially involving inmates in prisons and mental institutions.

The Senate committee was appalled after reviewing documents from the following sources:

- Neuro-Research Foundation's study entitled The Medical Epidemiology of Criminals.
- The Centre for the Study and Reduction of Violence from UCLA.
- The closed adolescent treatment centre.

A national uproar was created by various articles in 1974, which prompted the Senate investigation. But after all these years, the news that two inmates at Vacaville may have died from these same experiments indicates that though a nation was shocked in 1974, little was done to correct the experimentations. In 1977, a Senate subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research, chaired by Senator Ted Kennedy, focussed on the CIA's testing of LSD on unwitting citizens. Only a mere handful of people within the CIA knew about the scope and details of the program.

To understand the full scope of the problem, it is important to study its origins. The Kennedy subcommittee learned about the CIA Operation M.K.-Ultra through the testimony of Dr. Sidney Gottlieb. The purpose of the program, according to his testimony, was to 'investigate whether and how it was possible to modify an individual's behaviour by covert
means". Claiming the protection of the National Security Act, Dr. Gottlieb was unwilling to
tell the Senate subcommittee what had been learned or gained by these experiments.

He did state, however, that the program was initially engendered by a concern that the
Soviets and other enemies of the United States would get ahead of the U.S. in this field.

Through the Freedom of Information Act, researchers are now able to obtain documents
detailing the M.K.-Ultra program and other CIA behaviour modification projects in a special
reading room located on the bottom floor of the Hyatt Regency in Rosslyn, VA.

The most daring phase of the M.K.-Ultra program involved slipping unwitting American
citizens LSD in real life situations. The idea for the series of experiments originated in
November 1941, when William Donovan, founder and director of the Office of Strategic
Services (OSS), the forerunner of the CIA during World War Two. At that time the
intelligence agency invested $5000 for the "truth drug" program. Experiments with
scopolamine and morphine proved both unfruitful and very dangerous. The program tested
scores of other drugs, including mescaline, barbituates, benzedrine, cannabis indica, to
name a few.

The U.S. was highly concerned over the heavy losses of freighters and other ships in the
North Atlantic, all victims of German U-boats. Information about German U-boat strategy was
desperately needed and it was believed that the information could be obtained through drug-
influenced interrogations of German naval P.O.W.s, in violation of the Geneva Accords.

Tetrahydrocannabinol acetate, a colourless, odourless marijuana extract, was used to lace a
cigarette or food substance without detection. Initially, the experiments were done on
volunteer U.S. Army and OSS personnel, and testing was also disguised as a remedy for
shell shock. The volunteers became known as "Donovan's Dreamers". The experiments were
so hush-hush, that only a few top officials knew about them. President Franklin Roosevelt
was aware of the experiments. The "truth drug" achieved mixed success.

The experiments were halted when a memo was written: "The drug defies all but the most
expert and search analysis, and for all practical purposes can be considered beyond
analysis." The OSS did not, however, halt the program. In 1943 field tests of the extract
were being conducted, despite the order to halt them. The most celebrated test was
conducted by Captain George Hunter White, an OSS agent and ex-law enforcement official,
on August Del Grazio, aka Augie Dallas, aka Dell, aka Little Augie, a New York gangster.
Cigarettes laced with the acetate were offered to Augie without his knowledge of the content.
Augie, who had served time in prison for assault and murder, had been one of the world's
most notorious drug dealers and smugglers. He operated an opium alkaloid factory in
Turkey and he was a leader in the Italian underworld on the Lower East Side of New York.
Under the influence of the drug, Augie revealed volumes of information about the under
world operations, including the names of high ranking officials who took bribes from the
mob. These experiments led to the encouragement of Donovan. A new memo was issued:
"Cigarette experiments indicated that we had a mechanism which offered promise in
relaxing prisoners to be interrogated."

When the OSS was disbanded after the war, Captain White continued to administer
behaviour modifying drugs. In 1947, the CIA replaced the OSS. White's service record
indicates that he worked with the OSS, and by 1954 he was a high ranking Federal
Narcotics Bureau officer who had been loaned to the CIA on a part-time basis.

White rented an apartment in Greenwich Village equipped with one-way mirrors, surveillance
gadgets and disguised himself as a seaman. White drugged his acquaintances with LSD and
brought them back to his apartment. In 1955, the operation shifted to San Francisco. In
San Francisco, "safehouses" were established under the code name Operation Midnight
Climax. Midnight Climax hired prostitute addicts who lured men from bars back to the
safehouses after their drinks had been spiked with LSD. White filmed the events in the
safehouses. The purpose of these "national security brothels" was to enable the CIA to
experiment with the act of lovemaking for extracting information from men. The safehouse
experiments continued until 1963 until CIA Inspector General John Earman criticized
Richard Helms, the director of the CIA and father of the M.K.-Ultra project. Earman charged
the new director John Mc Cone had not been fully briefed on the M.K.-Ultra Project when he
took office and that "the concepts involved in manipulating human behaviour are found by
many people within and outside the Agency to be distasteful and unethical." He stated that
"the rights and interest of U.S. citizens are placed in jeopardy". The Inspector General stated
that LSD had been tested on individuals at all social levels, high and low, native American
and foreign."

Earman's criticisms were rebuffed by Helms, who warned, "Positive operation capacity to
use drugs is diminishing owing to a lack of realistic testing. Tests were necessary to keep
up with the Soviets." But in 1964, Helms had testified before the Warren Commission
investigating the assassination of President John Kennedy, that "Soviet research has
consistently lagged five years behind Western research".

Upon leaving government service in 1966, Captain White wrote a startling letter to his
superior. In the letter to Dr. Gottlieb, Captain White reminisced about his work in the
safehouses with LSD. His comments were frightening. "I was a very minor missionary,
actually a heretic, but I toiled wholeheartedly in the vineyards because it was fun, fun, fun," 
White wrote. "Where else could a red-blooded American boy lie, kill, cheat, steal, rape and
pillage with the sanction and blessing of the all-highest?"

(NEXT: How the drug experiments helped bring about the rebirth of the mafia and the
French Connection.)
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Though the CIA continued to maintain drug experiments in the streets of America after the
program was official cancelled, the United States reaped tremendous value from it. With
George Hunter Whites connection to underworld figure Little Augie, connections were made
with Mafia king-pin Lucky Luciano, who was in Dannemore Prison.

Luciano wanted freedom, the Mafia wanted drugs, and the United States wanted Sicily. The
date was 1943. Augie was the go-between between Luciano and the United States War
Department.

Luciano was transferred to a less harsh prison and began to be visited by representatives of
the Office of Naval Intelligence and from underworld figures, such as Meyer Lansky. A
strange alliance was formed between the U.S. Intelligence agencies and the Mafia, who
controlled the West Side docks in New York. Luciano regained active leadership in organized
crime in America.

The U.S. Intelligence community utilized Luciano's underworld connections in Italy. In July of
1943, Allied forces launched their invasion of Sicily, the beginning push into occupied
Europe. General George Patton's Seventh Army advanced through hundreds of miles of
territory that was fraught with difficulty, booby trapped roads, snipers, confusing mountain
topography, all within close range of 60,000 hostile Italian troops. All this was
accomplished in four days, a military "miracle" even for Patton.

Senate Estes Kefauver's Senate Sub committee on Organized Crime asked, in 1951, how all
this was possible. The answer was that the Mafia had helped to protect roads from Italian
snipers, served as guides through treacherous mountain terrain, and provided needed
intelligence to Patton's army. The part of Sicily which Patton's forces traversed had at one time been completely controlled by the Sicilian Mafia, until Benito Mussolini smashed it through the use of police repression.

Just prior to the invasion, it was hardly even able to continue shaking down farmers and shepherds for protection money. But the invasion changed all this, and the Mafia went on to play a very prominent and well-documented role in the American military occupation of Italy.

The expedience of war opened the doors to American drug traffic and Mafia domination. This was the beginning of the Mafia-U.S. Intelligence alliance, an alliance that lasts to this day and helped to support the covert operations of the CIA, such as the Iran-Contra operations. In these covert operations, the CIA would obtain drugs from South America and Southeast Asia, sell them to the Mafia and use the money for the covert purchase of military equipment. These operations accelerated when Congress cut off military funding for the Contras.

One of the Allies top occupation priorities was to liberate as many of their own soldiers from garrison duties so that they could participate in the military offensive. In order to accomplish this, Don Calogero's Mafia were pressed into service, and in July of 1943, the Civil Affairs Control Office of the U.S. Army appointed him mayor of Villalba and other Mafia officials as mayors of other towns in Sicily.

As the northern Italian offensive continued, Allied intelligence became very concerned over the extent to which the Italian Communists resistance to Mussolini had driven Italian politics to the left. Community Party membership had doubled between 1943 and 1944, huge leftist strikes had shut down factories and the Italian underground fighting Mussolini had risen to almost 150,000 men. By mid-1944, the situation came to a head and the U.S. Army terminated arms drops to the Italian Resistance, and started appointing Mafia officials to occupation administration posts. Mafia groups broke up leftists rallies and reactivated black market operations throughout southern Italy.

Lucky Luciano was released from prison in 1946 and deported to Italy, where he rebuilt the heroin trade. The court's decision to release him was made possible by the testimony of intelligence agents at his hearing, and a letter written by a naval officer reciting what Luciano had done for the Navy. Luciano was supposed to have served from 30 to 50 years in prison. Over 100 Mafia members were similarly deported within a couple of years.

Luciano set up a syndicate which transported morphine base from the Middle East to Europe, refined it into heroin, and then shipped it into the United States via Cuba. During the 1950's, Marseilles, in Southern France, became a major city for the heroin labs and the Corsican syndicate began to actively cooperate with the Mafia in the heroin trade. Those became popularly known as the French Connection.

In 1948, Captain White visited Luciano and his narcotics associate Nick Gentile in Europe. Gentile was a former American gangster who had worked for the Allied Military Government in Sicily. By this time, the CIA was already subsidizing Corsican and Italian gangsters to oust Communist unions from the Port of Marseilles. American strategic planners saw Italy and southern France as extremely important for their naval bases as a counterbalance to the growing naval forces of the Soviet Union. CIO/AFL organizer Irving Brown testified that by the time the CIA subsidies were terminated in 1953, U.S. support was no longer needed because the profits from the heroin traffic was sufficient to sustain operations.

When Luciano was originally jailed, the U.S. felt it had eliminated the world's most effective underworld leader and the activities of the Mafia were seriously damaged. Mussolini had been waging a war since 1924 to rid the world of the Sicilian Mafia. Thousands of Mafia
members were convicted of crimes and forced to leave the cities and hide out in the mountains.

Mussolini's reign of terror had virtually eradicated the international drug syndicates. Combined with the shipping surveillance during the war years, heroin trafficking had become almost nil. Drug use in the United States, before Luciano's release from prison, was on the verge of being entirely wiped out.
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The U.S. government has conducted three types of mind-control experiments:

- Real life experiences, such as those used on Little Augie and the LSD experiments in the safehouses of San Francisco and Greenwich Village.
- Experiments on prisoners, such as in the California Medical Facility at Vacaville.
- Experiments conducted in both mental hospitals and the Veterans Administration hospitals.

Such experimentation requires money, and the United States government has funnelled funds for drug experiments through different agencies, both overtly and covertly.

One of the funding agencies to contribute to the experimentation is the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), a unit of the U.S. Justice Department and one of President Richard Nixon's favourite pet agencies. The Nixon Administration was, at one time, putting together a program for detaining youngsters who showed a tendency toward violence in "concentration" camps. According to the Washington Post, the plan was authored by Dr. Arnold Hutschnecker. Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Robert Finch was told by John Erlichman, Chief of Staff for the Nixon White House, to implement the program. He proposed the screening of children of six years of age for tendencies toward criminality. Those who failed these tests were to be destined to be sent to the camps. The program was never implemented.

LEAA came into existence in 1968 with a huge budget to assist various U.S. law enforcement agencies. Its effectiveness, however, was not considered too great. After spending $6 billion, the F.B.I. reports general crime rose 31 percent and violent crime rose 50 percent. But little accountability was required of LEAA on how it spent its funds.

LEAA's role in the behaviour modification research began at a meeting held in 1970 in Colorado Springs. Attending that meeting were Richard Nixon, Attorney General John Mitchell, John Erlichman, H.R. Haldemann and other White House staffers. They met with Dr. Bertram Brown, director of the National Institute of Mental Health, and forged a close collaboration between LEAA and the Institute. LEAA was a product of the Justice Department and the Institute was a product of HEW.

LEAA funded 350 projects involving medical procedures, behaviour modification and drugs for delinquency control. Money from the Criminal Justice System was being used to fund mental health projects and vice versa. Eventually, the leadership responsibility and control of the Institute began to deteriorate and their scientists began to answer to LEAA alone.

The National Institute of Mental Health went on to become one of the greatest supporters of behaviour modification research. Throughout the 1960s, court calendars became blighted with lawsuits on the part of "human guinea pigs" who had been experimented upon in prisons and mental institutions. It was these lawsuits which triggered the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights investigation, headed by Senator Sam Erwin. The subcommittee's harrowing report was virtually ignored by the news media.
Thirteen behaviour modification programs were conducted by the Department of Defence. The Department of Labour had also conducted several experiments, as well as the National Science Foundation. The Veterans’ Administration was also deeply involved in behaviour modification and mind control. Each of these agencies, including LEAA, and the Institute, were named in secret CIA documents as those who provided research cover for the MK-ULTRA program.

Eventually, LEAA was using much of its budget to fund experiments, including aversive techniques and psychosurgery, which involved, in some cases, irreversible brain surgery on normal brain tissue for the purpose of changing or controlling behaviour and/or emotions.

Senator Erwin questioned the head of LEAA concerning ethical standards of the behaviour modification projects which LEAA had been funding. Erwin was extremely dubious about the idea of the government spending money on this kind of project without strict guidelines and reasonable research supervision in order to protect the human subjects. After Senator Erwin's denunciation of the funding polices, LEAA announced that it would no longer fund medical research into behaviour modification and psychosurgery. Despite the pledge by LEAA’s director, Donald E. Santarelli, LEAA ended up funding 537 research projects dealing with behaviour modification. There is strong evidence to indicate psychosurgery was still being used in prisons in the 1980’s. Immediately after the funding announcement by LEAA, there were 50 psychosurgical operations at Atmore State Prison in Alabama. The inmates became virtual zombies. The operations, according to Dr. Swan of Fisk University, were done on black prisoners who were considered politically active.

The Veterans' Administration openly admitted that psychosurgery was a standard procedure for treatment and not used just in experiments. The VA Hospitals in Durham, Long Beach, New York, Syracuse and Minneapolis were known to employ these products on a regular basis. VA clients could typically be subject to these behaviour alteration procedures against their will. The Erwin subcommittee concluded that the rights of VA clients had been violated.

LEAA also subsidized the research and development of gadgets and techniques useful to behaviour modification. Much of the technology, whose perfection LEAA funded, had originally been developed and made operational for use in the Vietnam War. Companies like Bangor Punta Corporation and Walter Kidde and Co., through its subsidiary Globe Security System, adapted these devices to domestic use in the U.S. ITT was another company that domesticated the warfare technology for potential use on U.S. citizens. Rand Corporation executive Paul Baran warned that the influx back to the United State of the Vietnam War surveillance gadgets alone, not to mention the behaviour modification hardware, could bring about “the most effective, oppressive police state ever created”.
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One of the fascinating aspects of the scandals that plague the U.S. Government is the fact that so often the same names appear from scandal to scandal. From the origins of Ronald Reagan's political career, as Governor of California, Dr. Earl Brian and Edward Meese played key advisory roles.

Dr. Brian’s name has been linked to the October Surprise and is a central figure in the government’s theft of PROMIS software from INSLAW. Brian’s role touches from the Cabazon Indian scandals to United Press International. He is one of those low-profile key figures.

And, alas, his name appears again in the nation’s behaviour modification and mind control experiments. Dr. Brian was Reagan’s Secretary of Health when Reagan was Governor. Dr. Brian was an advocate of state subsidies for a research centre for the study of violent behaviour. The centre was to begin operations by mid-1975, and its research was intended to shed light on why people murder or rape, or hijack aircraft. The centre was to be
operated by the University of California at Los Angeles, and its primary purpose, according to Dr. Brian, was to unify scattered studies on anti-social violence and possibly even touch on socially tolerated violence, such as football or war. Dr. Brian sought $1.3 million for the centre.

It certainly was possible that prison inmates might be used as volunteer subjects at the centre to discover the unknowns which triggered their violent behaviour. Dr. Brian's quest for the centre came at the same time Governor Reagan concluded his plans to phase the state of California out of the mental hospital business by 1982. Reagan's plan is echoed by Governor Pete Wilson today, to place the responsibility of rehabilitating young offenders squarely on the shoulders of local communities.

But as the proposal became known more publicly, a swell of controversy surrounded it. It ended in a fiasco. The inspiration for the violence centre came from three doctors in 1967, five years before Dr. Brian and Governor Reagan unveiled their plans. Amidst urban rioting and civil protest, Doctors Sweet, Mark and Ervin of Harvard put forward the thesis that individuals who engage in civil disobedience possess defective or damaged brain cells. If this conclusion were applied to the American Revolution or the Women's Rights Movement, a good portion of American society would be labelled as having brain damage.

In a letter to the Journal of the American Medical Association, they stated: "That poverty, unemployment, slum housing, and inadequate education underlie the nation's urban riots is well known, but the obviousness of these causes may have blinded us to the more subtle role of other possible factors, including brain dysfunction in the rioters who engaged in arson, sniping and physical assault.

"There is evidence from several sources that brain dysfunction related to a focal lesion plays a significant role in the violent and assaultive behaviour of thoroughly studied patients. Individuals with electroencephalographic abnormalities in the temporal region have been found to have a much greater frequency of behavioural abnormalities (such as poor impulse control, assaultiveness, and psychosis) than is present in people with a normal brain wave pattern."

Soon after the publication in the Journal, Dr. Ervin and Dr. Mark published their book Violence and the Brain, which included the claim that there were as many as 10 million individuals in the United States "who suffer from obvious brain disease". They argued that the data of their book provided a strong reason for starting a program of mass screening of Americans.

"Our greatest danger no longer comes from famine or communicable disease. Our greatest danger lies in ourselves and in our fellow humans...we need to develop an 'early warning test' of limbic brain function to detect those humans who have a low threshold for impulsive violence...Violence is a public health problem, and the major thrust of any program dealing with violence must be toward its prevention," they wrote.

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration funded the doctors $108,000 and the National Institute of Mental Health kicked in another $500,000, under pressure from Congress. They believed that psychosurgery would inevitably be performed in connection with the program, and that, since it irreversibly impaired people's emotional and intellectual capacities, it could be used as an instrument of repression and social control.

The doctors wanted screening centres established throughout the nation. In California, the publicity associated with the doctors' report, aided in the development of The Centre for the study and Reduction of Violence. Both the state and LEAA provided the funding. The centre was to serve as a model for future facilities to be set up throughout the United States.
The Director of the Neuropsychiatric Institute and chairman of the Department of Psychiatry at UCLA, Dr. Louis Jolyon West was selected to run the centre. Dr. West is alleged to have been a contract agent for the CIA, who, as part of a network of doctors and scientists, gathered intelligence on hallucinogenic drugs, including LSD, for the super-secret MK-ULTRA program. Like Captain White (see part three of the series), West conducted LSD experiments for the CIA on unwitting citizens in the safehouses of San Francisco. He achieved notoriety for his injection of a massive dose of LSD into an elephant at the Oklahoma Zoo, the elephant died when West tried to revive it by administering a combination of drugs.

Dr. West was further known as the psychiatrist who was called upon to examine Jack Ruby, Lee Harvey Oswald's assassin. It was on the basis of West's diagnosis that Ruby was compelled to be treated for mental disorders and put on happy pills. The West examination was ordered after Ruby began to say that he was part of a right-wing conspiracy to kill President John Kennedy. Two years after the commencement of treatment for mental disorder, Ruby died of cancer in prison.

After January 11, 1973, when Governor Reagan announced plans for the Violence Centre, West wrote a letter to the then Director of Health for California, J. M. Stubblebine.

"Dear Stub:

"I am in possession of confidential information that the Army is prepared to turn over Nike missile bases to state and local agencies for non-military purposes. They may look with special favour on health-related applications.

"Such a Nike missile base is located in the Santa Monica Mountains, within a half-hour's drive of the Neuropsychiatric Institute. It is accessible, but relatively remote. The site is securely fenced, and includes various buildings and improvements, making it suitable for prompt occupancy.

"If this site were made available to the Neuropsychiatric Institute as a research facility, perhaps initially as an adjunct to the new Centre for the Prevention of Violence, we could put it to very good use. Comparative studies could be carried out there, in an isolated but convenient location, of experimental or model programs for the alteration of undesirable behaviour.

"Such programs might include control of drug or alcohol abuse, modification of chronic anti-social or impulsive aggressiveness, etc. The site could also accommodate conferences or retreats for instruction of selected groups of mental-health related professionals and of others (e.g., law enforcement personnel, parole officers, special educators) for whom both demonstration and participation would be effective modes of instruction.

"My understanding is that a direct request by the Governor, or other appropriate officers of the State, to the Secretary of Defence (or, of course, the President), could be most likely to produce prompt results."

Some of the planned areas of study for the Centre included:

- Studies of violent individuals.
- Experiments on prisoners from Vacaville and Atascadero, and hyperkinetic children.
- Experiments with violence-producing and violent inhibiting drugs.
- Hormonal aspects of passivity and aggressiveness in boys.
- Studies to discover and compare norms of violence among various ethnic groups.
- Studies of pre-delinquent children.
It would also encourage law enforcement to keep computer files on pre-delinquent children, which would make possible the treatment of children before they became delinquents.

The purpose of the Violence Centre was not just research. The staff was to include sociologists, lawyers, police officers, clergymen and probation officers. With the backing of Governor Reagan and Dr. Brian, West had secured guarantees of prisoner volunteers from several California correctional institutions, including Vacaville. Vacaville and Atascadero were chosen as the primary sources for the human guinea pigs. These institutions had established a reputation, by that time, of committing some of the worst atrocities in West Coast history. Some of the experimentations differed little from what the Nazis did in the death camps.

(NEXT: What happened to the Centre?)
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Dr. Earl Brian, Governor Ronald Reagan's Secretary of Health, was adamant about his support for mind control centres in California. He felt the behaviour modification plan of the Violence Control Centres was important in the prevention of crime.

The Violence Control Centre was actually the brain child of William Herrmann as part of a pacification plan for California. A counter insurgency expert for Systems Development Corporation and an advisor to Governor Reagan, Herrmann worked with the Stand Research Institute, the RAND Corporation, and the Hoover Centre on Violence. Herrman was also a CIA agent who is now serving an eight year prison sentence for his role in a CIA counterfeiting operation. He was also directly linked with the Iran-Contra affair according to government records and Herrmann's own testimony.

In 1970, Herrmann worked with Colston Westbrook as his CIA control officer when Westbrook formed and implemented the Black Cultural Association at the Vacaville Medical Facility, a facility which in July experienced the death of three inmates who were forcibly subjected to behaviour modification drugs. The Black Cultural Association was ostensibly an education program designed to instil black pride identity in prisons, the Association was really a cover for an experimental behaviour modification pilot project designed to test the feasibility of programming unstable prisoners to become more manageable.

Westbrook worked for the CIA in Vietnam as a psychological warfare expert, and as an advisor to the Korean equivalent of the CIA and for the Lon Nol regime in Cambodia. Between 1966 and 1969, he was an advisor to the Vietnamese Police Special Branch under the cover of working as an employee of Pacific Architects and Engineers.

His "firm" contracted the building of the interrogation/torture centres in every province of South Vietnam as part of the CIA's Phoenix Program. The program was centred around behaviour modification experiments to learn how to extract information from prisoners of war, a direct violation of the Geneva Accords.

Westbrook's most prominent client at Vacaville was Donald DeFreeze, who be tween 1967 and 1969, had worked for the Los Angeles Police Department's Public Disorder Intelligence unit and later became the leader of the Symbionese Liberation Army. Many authorities now believe that the Black Cultural Association at Vacaville was the seedling of the SLA. Westbrook even designed the SLA logo, the cobra with seven heads, and gave De Freeze his African name of Cinque. The SLA was responsible for the assassination of Marcus Foster, superintendent of School in Oakland and the kidnapping of Patty Hearst.
As a counterinsurgency consultant for Systems Development Corporation, a security firm, Herrmann told the Los Angeles Times that a good computer intelligence system "would separate out the activist bent on destroying the system" and then develop a master plan "to win the hearts and minds of the people". The San Francisco-based Bay Guardian, recently identified Herrmann as an international arms dealer working with Iran in 1980, and possibly involved in the October Surprise. Herrmann is in an English prison for counterfeiting. He allegedly met with Iranian officials to ascertain whether the Iranians would trade arms for hostages held in Lebanon.

The London Sunday Telegraph confirmed Herrmann's CIA connections, tracing them from 1976 to 1986. He also worked for the FBI. This information was revealed in his London trial.

In the 1970's, Dr. Brian and Herrmann worked together under Governor Reagan on the Centre for the Study and Reduction of Violence, and then, a decade later, again worked under Reagan. Both men have been identified as working for Reagan with the Iranians.

The Violence Centre, however, died an agonizing death. Despite the Ervin Senate Committee investigation and chastation of mind control, the experiments continued. But when the Watergate scandal broke in the early 1970's, Washington felt it was too politically risky to continue to push for mind control centres.

Top doctors began to withdraw from the proposal because they felt that there were not enough safeguards. Even the Law Enforcement Assistance Agency, which funded the program, backed out, stating, the proposal showed "little evidence of established research ability of the kind of level necessary for a study of this cope".

Eventually it became known that control of the Violence Centre was not going to rest with the University of California, but instead with the Department of Corrections and other law enforcement officials. This information was released publicly by the Committee Opposed to Psychiatric Abuse of Prisoners. The disclosure of the letter resulted in the main backers of the program bowing out and the eventual demise of the centre.

Dr. Brian's final public statement on the matter was that the decision to cut off funding represented "a callous disregard for public safety". Though the Centre was not built, the mind control experiments continue to this day.

(NEXT: What these torturous drugs do.)
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The Central Intelligence Agency held two major interests in use of L.S.D. to alter normal behaviour patterns. The first interest centred around obtaining information from prisoners of war and enemy agents, in contravention of the Geneva Accords. The second was to deter the effectiveness of drugs used against the enemy on the battlefield.

The MK-ULTRA program was originally run by a small number of people within the CIA known as the Technical Services Staff (TSS). Another CIA department, the Office of Security, also began its own testing program. Friction arose and then infighting broke out when the Office of Security commenced to spy on TSS people after it was learned that LSD was being tested on unwitting Americans.

Not only did the two branches disagree over the issue of testing the drug on the unwitting, they also disagreed over the issue of how the drug was actually to be used by the CIA. The office of Security envisioned the drug as an interrogation weapon. But the TSS group
thought the drug could be used to help destabilize another country, it could be slipped into the food or beverage of a public official in order to make him behave foolishly or oddly in public. One CIA document reveals that L.S.D. could be administered right before an official was to make a public speech.

Realizing that gaining information about the drug in real life situations was crucial to exploiting the drug to its fullest, TSS started conducting experiments on its own people. There was an extensive amount of self-experimentation. The Office of Security felt the TSS group was playing with fire, especially when it was learned that TSS was prepared to spike an annual office Christmas party punch with LSD, the Christmas party of the CIA. L.S.D. could produce serious insanity for periods of eight to 18 hours and possibly longer.

One of the "victims" of the punch was agent Frank Olson. Having never had drugs before, L.S.D. took its toll on Olson. He reported that, every automobile that came by was a terrible monster with fantastic eyes, out to get him personally. Each time a car passed he would huddle down against a parapet, terribly frightened. Olson began to behave erratically. The CIA made preparation to treat Olson at Chestnut Lodge, but before they could, Olson checked into a New York hotel and threw himself out from his tenth story room. The CIA was ordered to cease all drug testing.

Mind control drugs and experiments were torturous to the victims. One of three inmates who died in Vacaville Prison in July was scheduled to appear in court in an attempt to stop forced administration of a drug, the very drug that may have played a role in his death.

Joseph Cannata believed he was making progress and did not need forced dosages of the drug Haldol. The Solano County Coroner's Office said that Cannata and two other inmates died of hyperthermia, extremely elevated body temperature. Their bodies all had at least 108 degrees temperature when they died. The psychotropic drugs they were being forced to take will elevate body temperature.

Dr. Ewen Cameron, working at McGill University in Montreal, used a variety of experimental techniques, including keeping subjects unconscious for months at a time, administering huge electroshocks and continual doses of L.S.D.

Massive lawsuits developed as a result of this testing, and many of the subjects who suffered trauma had never agreed to participate in the experiments. Such CIA experiments infringed upon the much-honoured Nuremberg Code concerning medical ethics. Dr. Cameron was one of the members of the Nuremberg Tribunal.

L.S.D. research was also conducted at the Addiction Research Centre of the U.S. Public Health Service in Lexington, Kentucky. This institution was one of several used by the CIA. The National Institute of Mental Health and the U.S. Navy funded this operation. Vast supplies of L.S.D. and other hallucinogenic drugs were required to keep the experiments going. Dr. Harris Isbell ran the program. He was a member of the Food and Drug Administration's Advisory Committee on the Abuse of Depressant and Stimulants Drugs. Almost all of the inmates were black. In many cases, L.S.D. dosage was increased daily for 75 days.

Some 1500 U.S. soldiers were also victims of drug experimentation. Some claimed they had agreed to become guinea pigs only through pressure from their superior officers. Many claimed they suffered from severe depression and other psychological stress.

One such soldier was Master Sergeant Jim Stanley. L.S.D. was put in Stanley's drinking water and he freaked out. Stanley's hallucinations continued even after he returned to his regular duties. His service record suffered, his marriage went on the rocks and he ended up
beating his wife and children. It wasn't until 17 years later that Stanley was informed by the military that he had been an L.S.D. experiment. He sued the government, but the Supreme Court ruled no soldier could sue the Army for the L.S.D. experiments. Justice William Brennen disagreed with the Court decision. He wrote, "Experimentation with unknowing human subjects is morally and legally unacceptable."

Private James Thornwell was given L.S.D. in a military test in 1961. For the next 23 years he lived in a mental fog, eventually drowning in a Vallejo swimming pool in 1984. Congress had set up a $625,000 trust fund for him. Large scale L.S.D. tests on American soldiers were conducted at Aberdeen Proving Ground in Maryland, Fort Benning, Georgia, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, and in Europe and the Pacific. The Army conducted a series of L.S.D. tests at Fort Bragg in North Carolina. The purpose of the tests were to ascertain how well soldiers could perform their tasks on the battlefield while under the influence of L.S.D. At Fort McClellan, Alabama, 200 officers in the Chemical Corps were given L.S.D. in order to familiarize them with the drug's effects. At Edgewood Arsenal, soldiers were given L.S.D. and then confined to sensory deprivation chambers and later exposed to a harsh interrogation sessions by intelligence people. In these sessions, it was discovered that soldiers would cooperate if promised they would be allowed to get off the L.S.D.

In Operation Derby Hat, foreign nationals accused of drug trafficking were given L.S.D. by the Special Purpose Team, with one subject begging to be killed in order to end his ordeal. Such experiments were also conducted in Saigon on Viet Cong POWs. One of the most potent drugs in the U.S. arsenal is called BZ or quinuclidinyl benzilate. It is a long-lasting drug and brings on a litany of psychotic experiences and almost completely isolates any person from his environment. The main effects of BZ last up to 80 hours compared to eight hours for L.S.D. Negative after-effects may persist for up to six weeks.

The BZ experiments were conducted on soldiers at Edgewood Arsenal for 16 years. Many of the "victims" claim that the drug permanently affected their lives in a negative way. It so disorientated one paratrooper that he was found taking a shower in his uniform and smoking a cigar. BZ was eventually put in hand grenades and a 750 pound cluster bomb. Other configurations were made for mortars, artillery and missiles. The bomb was tested in Vietnam and CIA documents indicate it was prepared for use by the U.S. in the event of large-scale civilian uprisings.

In Vacaville, psychosurgery has long been a policy. In one set of cases, experimental psychosurgery was conducted on three inmates, a black, a Chicano and a white person. This involved the procedure of pushing electrodes deep into the brain in order to determine the position of defective brain cells, and then shooting enough voltage into the suspected area to kill the defective cells. One prisoner, who appeared to be improving after surgery, was released on parole, but ended up back in prison. The second inmate became violent and there is no information on the third inmate.

Vacaville also administered a "terror drug" Anectine as a way of "suppressing hazardous behaviour". In small doses, Anectine serves as a muscle relaxant; in huge doses, it produces prolonged seizure of the respiratory system and a sensation "worse than dying". The drug goes to work within 30 to 40 seconds by paralyzing the small muscles of the fingers, toes, and eyes, and then moves into the intercostal muscles and the diaphragm. The heart rate subsides to 60 beats per minute, respiratory arrest sets in and the patient remains completely conscious throughout the ordeal, which lasts two to five minutes. The experiments were also used at Atascadero.

Several mind altering drugs were originally developed for non-psychoactive purposes. Some of these drugs are Phenothiazine and Thorazine. The side effects of these drugs can be a living hell. The impact includes the feeling of drowsiness, disorientation, shakiness, dry
mouth, blurred vision and an inability to concentrate. Drugs like Prolixin are described by users as "sheer torture" and "becoming a zombie".

The Veterans Administration Hospital has been shown by the General Accounting Office to apply heavy dosages of psychotherapeutic drugs. One patient was taking eight different drugs, three antipsychotic, two antianxiety, one antidepressant, one sedative and one anti-Parkinson. Three of these drugs were being given in dosages equal to the maximum recommended. Another patient was taking seven different drugs. One report tells of a patient who refused to take the drug. 'I told them I don't want the drug to start with, they grabbed me and strapped me down and gave me a forced intramuscular shot of Prolixin. They gave me Artane to counteract the Prolixin and they gave me Sinequan, which is a kind of tranquilizer to make me calm down, which over calmed me, so rather than letting up on the medication, they then gave me Ritalin to pep me up.'

Prolixin lasts for two weeks. One patient describes how the drug does not calm or sedate nerves, but instead attacks from so deep inside you, you cannot locate the source of the pain. "The drugs turn your nerves in upon yourself. Against your will, your resistance, your resolve, are directed at your own tissues, your own muscles, reflexes, etc." The patient continues, "The pain grinds into your fibre, your vision is so blurred you cannot read. You ache with restlessness, so that you feel you have to walk, to pace. And then as soon as you start pacing, the opposite occurs to you, you must sit and rest. Back and forth, up and down, you go in pain you cannot locate. In such wretched anxiety you are overwhelmed because you cannot get relief even in breathing."
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"We need a program of psychosurgery for political control of our society. The purpose is physical control of the mind. Everyone who deviates from the given norm can be surgically mutilated.

"The individual may think that the most important reality is his own existence, but this is only his personal point of view. This lacks historical perspective.

"Man does not have the right to develop his own mind. This kind of liberal orientation has great appeal. We must electrically control the brain. Some day armies and generals will be controlled by electric stimulation of the brain." These were the remarks of Dr. Jose Delgado as they appeared in the February 24, 1974 edition of the Congressional Record, No. 26., Vol. 118.

Despite Dr. Delgado's outlandish statements before Congress, his work was financed by grants from the Office of Naval Research, the Air Force Aero-Medical Research Laboratory, and the Public Health Foundation of Boston.

Dr. Delgado was a pioneer of the technology of Electrical Stimulation of the Brain (ESB). The New York Times ran an article on May 17, 1965 entitled Matador With a Radio Stops Wild Bull. The story details Dr. Delgado's experiments at Yale University School of Medicine and work in the field at Cordova, Spain. The New York Times stated:

"Afternoon sunlight poured over the high wooden barriers into the ring, as the brave bull bore down on the unarmed matador, a scientist who had never faced fighting bull. But the charging animal's horn never reached the man behind the heavy red cape. Moments before that could happen, Dr. Delgado pressed a button on a small radio transmitter in his hand and the bull braked to a halt. Then he pressed another button on the transmitter, and the
bull obediently turned to the right and trotted away. The bull was obeying commands in his brain that were being called forth by electrical stimulation by the radio signals to certain regions in which fine wires had been painlessly planted the day before."

According to Dr. Delgado, experiments of this type have also been performed on humans. While giving a lecture on the Brain in 1965, Dr. Delgado said, "Science has developed a new methodology for the study and control of cerebral function in animals and humans."

The late L.L. Vasiliev, professor of physiology at the University of Leningrad wrote in a paper about hypnotism: "As a control of the subject's condition, when she was outside the laboratory in another set of experiments, a radio set was used. The results obtained indicate that the method of using radio signals substantially enhances the experimental possibilities." The professor continued to write, "I.F. Tomaschevsky (a Russian physiologist) carried out the first experiments with this subject at a distance of one or two rooms, and under conditions that the participant would not know or suspect that she would be experimented with. In other cases, the sender was not in the same house, and someone else observed the subject's behaviour. Subsequent experiments at considerable distances were successful. One such experiment was carried out in a park at a distance. Mental suggestions to go to sleep were complied with within a minute."

The Russian experiments in the control of a person's mind through hypnosis and radio waves were conducted in the 1930s, some 30 years before Dr. Delgado's bull experiment. Dr. Vasiliev definitely demonstrated that radio transmission can produce stimulation of the brain. It is not a complex process. In fact, it need not be implanted within the skull or be productive of stimulation of the brain, itself. All that is needed to accomplish the radio control of the brain is a twitching muscle. The subject becomes hypnotized and a muscle stimulant is implanted. The subject, while still under hypnosis, is commanded to respond when the muscle stimulant is activated, in this case by radio transmission.

Lincoln Lawrence wrote a book entitled Were We Controlled? Lawrence wrote, "If the subject is placed under hypnosis and mentally programmed to maintain a determination eventually to perform one specific act, perhaps to shoot someone, it is suggested thereafter, each time a particular muscle twitches in a certain manner, which is then demonstrated by using the transmitter, he will increase this determination even more strongly. As the hypnotic spell is renewed again and again, he makes it his life's purpose to carry out this act until it is finally achieved. Thus are the two complementary aspects of Radio-Hypnotic Intracerebral Control (RHIC) joined to reinforce each other, and perpetuate the control, until such time as the controlled behaviour is called for. This is done by a second session with the hypnotist giving final instructions. These might be reinforced with radio stimulation in more frequent cycles. They could even carry over the moments after the act to reassure calm behaviour during the escape period, or to assure that one conspirator would not indicate that he was aware of the co-conspirator's role, or that he was even acquainted with him."

RHIC constitutes the joining of two well known tools, the radio part and the hypnotism part. People have found it difficult to accept that an individual can be hypnotized to perform an act which is against his moral principles. Some experiments have been conducted by the U.S. Army which show that this popular perception is untrue. The chairman of the Department of Psychology at Colgate University, Dr. Estabrooks, has stated, "I can hypnotize a man without his knowledge or consent into committing treason against the United States." Estabrooks was one of the nation's most authoritative sources in the hypnotic field. The psychologist told officials in Washington that a mere 200 well trained hypnotists could develop an army of mind-controlled sixth columnists in wartime United States. He laid out a scenario of an enemy doctor placing thousands of patients under hypnotic mind control, and eventually programming key military officers to follow his assignment. Through such manoeuvres, he said, the entire U.S. Army could be taken over. Large numbers of saboteurs
could also be created using hypnotism through the work of a doctor practicing in a neighbourhood or foreign born nationals with close cultural ties with an enemy power.

Dr. Estabrooks actually conducted experiments on U.S. soldiers to prove his point. Soldiers of low rank and little formal education were placed under hypnotism and their memories tested. Surprisingly, hypnotists were able to control the subjects' ability to retain complicated verbal information. J. G. Watkins followed in Estabrooks steps and induced soldiers of lower rank to commit acts which conflicted not only with their moral code, but also the military code which they had come to accept through their basic training. One of the experiments involved placing a normal, stable army private in a deep trance. Watkins was trying to see if he could get the private to attack a superior officer, a cardinal sin in the military. While the private was in a deep trance, Watkins told him that the officer sitting across from him was an enemy soldier who was going to attempt to kill him. In the private's mind, it was a kill or be killed situation. The private immediately jumped up and grabbed the officer by the throat. The experiment was repeated several times, and in one case the man who was hypnotized and the man who was attacked were very close friends. The results were always the same. In one experiment, the hypnotized subject pulled out a knife and nearly stabbed another person.

Watkins concluded that people could be induced to commit acts contrary to their morality if their reality was distorted by the hypnotism. Similar experiments were conducted by Watkins using WACs exploring the possibility of making military personnel divulge military secrets. A related experiment had to be discontinued because a researcher, who had been one of the subjects, was exposing numerous top-secret projects to his hypnotist, who did not have the proper security clearance for such information. The information was divulged before an audience of 200 military personnel.

(NEXT: School for Assassins)

Mind Control: a Navy school for assassins By Harry V. Martin and David Caul
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In man's quest to control the behaviour of humans, there was a great breakthrough established by Pavlov, who devised a way to make dogs salivate on cue. He perfected his conditioning response technique by cutting holes in the cheeks of dogs and measured the amount they salivated in response to different stimuli. Pavlov verified that "quality, rate and frequency of the salivation changed depending upon the quality, rate and frequency of the stimuli."

Though Pavlov's work falls far short of human mind control, it did lay the groundwork for future studies in mind and behaviour control of humans. John B. Watson conducted experiments in the United States on an 11-month-old infant. After allowing the infant to establish a rapport with a white rat, Watson began to beat on the floor with an iron bar every time the infant came in contact with the rat. After a time, the infant made the association between the appearance of the rat and the frightening sound, and began to cry every time the rat came into view. Eventually, the infant developed a fear of any type of small animal. Watson was the founder of the behaviourist school of psychology.

"Give me the baby, and I'll make it climb and use its hands in constructing buildings or stone or wood. I'll make it a thief, a gunman or a dope fiend. The possibilities of shaping in any direction are almost endless. Even gross differences in anatomical structure limits are far less than you may think. Make him a deaf mute, and I will build you a Helen Keller. Men are built, not born," Watson proclaimed. His psychology did not recognize inner feelings and thoughts as legitimate objects of scientific study, he was only interested in overt behaviour.
Though Watson's work was the beginning of man's attempts to control human actions, the real work was done by B.F. Skinner, the high priest of the behaviourists' movement. The key to Skinner's work was the concept of operant conditioning, which relied on the notion of reinforcement, all behaviour which is learned is rooted in either a positive or negative response to that action. There are two corollaries of operant conditioning: Aversion therapy and desensitization.

Aversion therapy uses unpleasant reinforcement to a response which is undesirable. This can take the form of electric shock, exposing the subject to fear producing situations, and the infliction of pain in general. It has been used as a way of "curing" homosexuality, alcoholism and stuttering. Desensitization involves forcing the subject to view disturbing images over and over again until they no longer produce any anxiety, then moving on to more extreme images, and repeating the process over again until no anxiety is produced. Eventually, the subject becomes immune to even the most extreme images. This technique is typically used to treat people's phobias. Thus, the violence shown on TV could be said to have the unsystematic and unintended effect of desensitization.

Skinnerian behaviourism has been accused of attempting to deprive man of his free will, his dignity and his autonomy. It is said to be intolerant of uncertainty in human behaviour, and refuses to recognize the private, the ineffable, and the unpredictable. It sees the individual merely as a medical, chemical and mechanistic entity which has no comprehension of its real interests.

Skinner believed that people are going to be manipulated. "I just want them to be manipulated effectively," he said. He measured his success by the absence of resistance and counter control on the part of the person he was manipulating. He thought that his techniques could be perfected to the point that the subject would not even suspect that he was being manipulated.

Dr. James V. McConnel, head of the Department of Mental Health Research at the University of Michigan, said, "The day has come when we can combine sensory deprivation with the use of drugs, hypnosis, and the astute manipulation of reward and punishment to gain almost absolute control over an individual's behaviour. We want to reshape our society drastically."

A U.S. Navy psychologist, who claims that the Office of Naval Intelligence had taken convicted murderers from military prisons, used behaviour modification techniques on them, and then relocated them in American embassies throughout the world. Just prior to that time, the U.S. Senate Intelligence Committee had censured the CIA for its global political assassination plots, including plots against Fidel Castro. The Navy psychologist was Lt. Commander Thomas Narut of the U.S. Regional Medical Centre in Naples, Italy. The information was divulged at an Oslo NATO conference of 120 psychologists from the eleven nation alliance. According to Dr. Narut, the U.S. Navy was an excellent place for a researcher to find "captive personnel" whom they could use as guinea pigs in experiments. The Navy provided all the funding necessary, according to Narut.

Dr. Narut, in a question and answer session with reporters from many nations, revealed how the Navy was secretly programming large numbers of assassins. He said that the men he had worked with for the Navy were being prepared for commando-type operations, as well as covert operations in U.S. embassies worldwide. He described the men who went through his program as "hit men and assassins" who could kill on command.

Careful screening of the subjects was accomplished by Navy psychologists through the military records, and those who actually received assignments where their training could be utilized, were drawn mainly from submarine crews, the paratroops, and many were convicted murderers serving military prison sentences. Several men who had been awarded medals for bravery were drafted into the program.
The assassins were conditioned through "audio-visual desensitization". The process involved the showing of films of people being injured or killed in a variety of ways, starting with very mild depictions, leading up to the more extreme forms of mayhem. Eventually, the subjects would be able to detach their feelings even when viewing the most horrible of films. The conditioning was most successful when applied to "passive-aggressive" types, and most of these ended up being able to kill without any regrets. The prime indicator of violent tendencies was the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. Dr. Narut knew of two Navy programming centres, the neuropsychiatric laboratory in San Diego and the U.S. Regional Medical Centre in Italy, where he worked.

During the audio-visual desensitization programming, restraints were used to force the subject to view the films. A device was used on the subjects eyelids to prevent him from blinking. Typically, the preliminary film was on an African youth being ritualistically circumcised with a dull knife and without any anaesthetic. The second film showed a sawmill scene in which a man accidentally cut off his fingers.

In addition to the desensitization films, the potential assassins underwent programming to create prejudicial attitude in the men, to think of their future enemies, especially the leaders of these countries, as sub-human. Films and lectures were presented demeaning the culture and habits of the people of the countries where it had been decided they would be sent.

After his NATO lecture, Dr. Narut disappeared. He could not be located. Within a week or so after the lecture, the Pentagon issued an emphatic denial that the U.S. Navy had "engaged in psychological training or other types of training of personnel as assassins." They disavowed the programming centres in San Diego and Naples and stated they were unable to locate Narut, but did provide confirmation that he was a staff member of the U.S. Regional Medical Centre in Naples.

Dr. Alfred Zitani, an American delegate to the Oslo conference, did verify Narut's remarks and they were published in the Sunday Times.

Sometime later, Dr. Narut surfaced again in London and recanted his remarks, stating that he was "talking in theoretical and not practical terms." Shortly thereafter, the U.S. Naval headquarters in London issued a statement indicating that Dr. Narut's remarks at the NATO conference should be discounted because he had "personal problems". Dr. Narut never made any further public statements about the program.

During the NATO conference in Oslo, Dr. Narut had remarked that the reason he was divulging the information was because he believed that the information was coming out anyway. The doctor was referring to the disclosure by a Congressional subcommittee which were then appearing in the press concerning various CIA assassination plots. However, what Dr. Narut had failed to realize at the time, was that the Navy's assassination plots were not destined to be revealed to the public at that time.

(To be continued.)

Soviets, U.S. both using mind control methods By Harry V. Martin and David Caul
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There were three scientists who pioneered the work of using an electromagnetic field to control human behaviour. Their work began 25 years ago. These three were Dr. Jose Delgado, psychology professor at Yale University; Dr. W. Ross Adey, a physiologist at the Brain Research Institute at UCLA; and Dr. Wilder Penfield, a Canadian.
Dr. Penfield's experiments consisted of the implantation of electrodes deep into the cortexes of epilepsy patients who were to undergo surgery; he was able to drastically improve the memories of these patients through electrical stimulation. Dr. Adey implanted transmitters in the brains of cats and chimpanzees that could send signals to a receiver regarding the electrical activity of the brain; additional radio signals were sent back into the brains of the animals which modified their behavior at the direction of the doctor. Dr. Delgado was able to stop and turn a charging bull through the use of an implanted radio receiver.

Other experiments using platinum, gold and stainless steel electrode implants enabled researchers to induce total madness in cats, put monkeys into a stupor, or to set human beings jerking their arms up and down. Much of Delgado's work was financed by the CIA through phony funding conduits masking themselves as charitable organizations.

Following the successes of Delgado's work, the CIA set up their own research program in the field of electromagnetic behavior modification under the code name Sleeping Beauty. With the guidance of Dr. Ivor Browning, a laboratory was set up in New Mexico, specializing in working with the hypothalamus or "sweet spot" of the brain. Here it was found that stimulating this area could produce intense euphoria.

Dr. Browning was able to wire a radio receiver-amplifier into the "sweet spot" of a donkey which picked up a five-micro-amp signal, such that he could create intense happiness in the animal. Using the jolts of happiness as an "electronic carrot", Browning was able to send the donkey up a 2000 foot New Mexico mountain and back to its point of origin. When the donkey was proceeding up the path toward its destination, it was rewarded; when it deviated, the signal stopped. "You've never seen a donkey so eager to keep on course in your whole life," Dr. Browning exclaimed.

The CIA utilized the electronic carrot technique in getting trained pigeons to fly miniature microphone-transmitters to the ledge of a KGB safe house where the devices monitored conversations for months. There was a move within the CIA to conduct further experiments on humans, foreigners and prisoners, but officially the White House vetoed the idea as being unethical.

In May 1989, it was learned by the CIA that the KGB was subjecting people undergoing interrogation to electromagnetic fields, which produced a panic reaction, thereby bringing them closer to breaking down under questioning. The subjects were not told that they were being placed under the influence of these beams. A few years earlier, Dr. Ross Adey released photographs and a fact sheet concerning what he called the Russian Lida machine. This consisted of a small transmitter emitting 10-hertz waves which makes the subject susceptible to hypnotic suggestion. The device utilized the outmoded vacuum-tube design. American POWs in Korea have indicated that similar devices had been used for interrogation purposes in POW camps.

The general, long term goal of the CIA was to find out whether or not mind control could be achieved through the use of a precise, external, electromagnetic beam. The electrical activity of the brain operates within the range of 100 hertz frequency. This spectrum is called ELF or Extremely Low Frequency range. ELF waves carry very little ionizing radiation and very low heat, and therefore do not manifest gross, observable physical effects on living organisms. Published Soviet experiments with ELFs reveal that there was a marked increase in psychiatric and central nervous system disorders and symptoms of stress for sailors working close to ELF generators.

In the mid-1970s, American interest in combining EMR techniques with hypnosis was very prominent. Plans were on file to develop these techniques through experiments on human volunteers. The spoken word of the hypnotist could be conveyed by modulated electromagnetic energy directly into the subconscious parts of the human brain without
employing any technical devices for receiving or transacting the messages and without the person exposed to such influence having a chance to control the information input consciously.

In California, it was discovered by Dr. Adey that animal brain waves could be altered directly by ELF fields. It was found that monkey brains would fall in phase with ELF waves. These waves could easily pass through the skull, which normally protected the central nervous system from outside influence.

In San Leandro, Dr. Elizabeth Rauscher, director of Technic Research Laboratory, has been doing ELF/brain research with human subjects for some time. One of the frequencies produces nausea for more than an hour. Another frequency, she calls it the marijuana frequency, gets people laughing. "Give me the money and three months, "she says, "and I'll be able to affect the behaviour of eighty percent of the people in this town without their knowing it."

In the past, the Soviet Union has invested large sums of time and money investigating microwaves. In 1952, while the Cold War was showing no signs of thawing, there was a secret meeting at the Sandia Corporation in New Mexico between U.S. and Soviet scientists involving the exchange of information regarding the biological hazards and safety levels of EMR. The Soviets possessed the greater preponderance of information, and the American scientists were unwilling to take it seriously. In subsequent meetings, the Soviet scientists continued to stress the seriousness of the risks, while American scientists downplayed their importance. Shortly after the last Sandia meeting, the Soviets began directing a microwave beam at the U.S. embassy in Moscow, using embassy workers as guinea pigs for low-level EMR experiments. Washington, D.C. was oddly quiescent, regarding the Moscow embassy bombardment. Discovered in 1962, the Moscow signal was investigated by the CIA, which hired a consultant, Milton Zaret, and code named the research Project Pandora. According to Zaret, the Moscow signal was composed of several frequencies, and was focussed precisely upon the Ambassador's office. The intensity of the bombardment was not made public, but when the State Department finally admitted the existence of the signal, it announced that it was fairly low.

There was consensus among Soviet EMR researchers that a beam such as the Moscow signal was destined to produce blurred vision and loss of mental concentration. The Boston Globe reported that the American ambassador had not only developed a leukaemia-like blood disease, but also suffered from bleeding eyes and chronic headaches. Under the CIA's Project Pandora, monkeys were brought into the embassy and exposed to the Moscow signal; they were found to have developed blood composition anomalies and unusual chromosome counts. Embassy personnel were found to have a 40 percent higher than average white blood cell count. While Operation Pandora's data gathering proceeded, embassy personnel continued working in the facility and were not informed of the bombardment until 10 years later. Embassy employees were eventually granted a 20 percent hardship allowance for their service in an unhealthful post. Throughout the period of bombardment, the CIA used the opportunity to gather data on psychological and biological effects of the beam on American personnel.

The U.S. government began to examine the affects of the Moscow signal. The job was turned over to the Defence Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA). DARPA is now developing electromagnetic weaponry. The man in charge of the DARPA program, Dr. Jack Verona, is so important and so secretive that he doesn't even return President George Bush's telephone calls.

(To be continued.)

By Harry V. Martin and David Caul Eleventh in a Series Copyright, Napa Sentinel, 1991
Friday, November 8, 1991

The American public was never informed that the military had planned to develop electromagnetic weapons until 1982, when the revelation appeared in a technical Air Force magazine.

The magazine article stated, "....specifically generated radio-frequency radiation (RFR) fields may pose powerful and revolutionary anti-personnel military trends." The article indicated that it would be very easy to use electromagnetic fields to disrupt the human brain because the brain, itself, was an electrically mediated organ. It further indicated that a rapidly scanning RFR system would have a stunning or killing capability over a large area. The system was developable.

Navy Captain Dr. Paul E. Taylor read a paper at the Air University Centre for Aerospace Doctrine, Research and Education, at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama. Dr. Taylor was responsible for the Navy's Radiation Laboratory and had been studying radiation effects on humans. In his paper, Dr. Taylor stated, "The ability of individuals to function (as soldiers) could be degraded to such a point that would be combat ineffective." The system was so sophisticated that it employed microwaves and millimetre waves and was transportable by a large truck.

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in the South Bay, are working on the development of a "brain bomb". A bomb could be dropped in the middle of a battlefield which would produce microwaves, incapacitating the minds of soldiers within a circumscribed area.

Applications of microwave technology in espionage were available for over 25 years. In a meeting in Berkeley of the American Association for the Advancement of Science as early as 1965, Professor J. Anthony Deutsch of New York University, provided an important segment of research in the field of memory control. In layman terms, Professor Deutsch indicated that the mind is a transmitter and if too much information is received, like too many vehicles on a crowded freeway, the brain ceases to transmit. The Professor indicated that an excess of acetyl choline in the brain can interfere with the memory process and control. He indicated excess amounts of acetyl choline can be artificially produced, through both the administration of drugs or through the use of radio waves. The process is called Electronic Dissolution of Memory (EDOM). The memory transmission can be stopped for as long as the radio signal continues.

As a result, the awareness of the person skips over those minutes during which he is subjected to the radio signal. Memory is distorted, and time-orientation is destroyed.

According to Lincoln Lawrence, author of Were We Controlled, EDOM is now operational. "There is already in use a small EDOM generator/transmitter which can be concealed on the body of the person. Contact with this person, a casual handshake or even just a touch, transmits a tiny electronic charge plus an ultra-sonic signal tone which for a short period will disturb the time-orientation of the person affected....it can be a potent weapon for hopelessly confusing evidence in the investigation of a crime."

Thirty years ago, Allen Frey discovered that microwaves of 300 to 3000 megahertz could be "heard" by people, even if they were deaf, if pulsed at a certain rate. Appearing to be originating just in back of the head, the sound boomed, clicked, hissed or buzzed, depending upon the frequency. Later research has shown that the perception of the waves take place just in front of the ears. The microwaves causes pressure waves in the brain tissue, and this phenomenon vibrates the sound receptors in the inner ear through the bone structure. Some microwaves are capable of directly stimulating the nerve cells of the auditory pathways. This has been confirmed with experiments with rats, in which the sound registers 120 decibels, which is equal to the volume of a nearby jet during takeoff. Aside
from having the capability of causing pain and preventing auditory communication, a more subtle effect was demonstrated at the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research by Dr. Joseph C. Sharp. Dr. Sharp, himself, was the subject of an experiment in which pulsed microwave audiograms, or the microwave analogue of the sound vibrations of spoken words, were delivered to his brain in such a way that he was able to understand the words that were spoken. Military and undercover uses of such a device might include driving a subject crazy with inner voices in order to discredit him, or conveying undetectable instructions to a programmed assassin.

But the technology has been carried even a step further. It has been demonstrated by Dr. Ross Adey that microwaves can be used to directly bring about changes in the electrical patterns of different parts of the brain. His experiments showed that he could achieve the same mind control over animals as Dr. Delgado did in the bull incident. Dr. Delgado used brain implants in his animals, Dr. Adey used microwave devices without preconditioning. He made animals act and look like electronic toys.

(Conclusion next week.)

Mind control origins found in Nazi Germany By Harry V. Martin and David Caul

At the conclusion of World War Two, American investigators learned that Nazi doctors at the Dachau concentration camp in Germany had been conducting mind control experiments on inmates. They experimented with hypnosis and with the drug mescaline.

Mescaline is a quasi-synthetic extract of the peyote cactus, and is very similar to LSD in the hallucinations which it produces. Though they did not achieve the degree of success they had desired, the SS interrogators in conjunction with the Dachau doctors were able to extract the most intimate secrets from the prisoners when the inmates were given very high doses of mescaline.

There were fatal mind control experiments conducted at Auschwitz. The experiments there were described by one informant as "brainwashing with chemicals". The informant said the Gestapo wasn't satisfied with extracting information by torture. "So the next question was, why don't we do it like the Russians, who have been able to get confessions of guilt at their show trials?" They tried various barbiturates and morphine derivatives. After prisoners were fed a coffee-like substance, two of them died in the night and others died later.

The Dachau mescaline experiments were written up in a lengthy report issued by the U.S. Naval Technical Mission, whose job it was at the conclusion of the war to scour all of Europe for every shred of industrial and scientific material that had been produced by the Third Reich. It was as a result of this report that the U.S. Navy became interested in mescaline as an interrogation tool. The Navy initiated Project Chatter in 1947, the same year the Central Intelligence Agency was formed. The Chatter format included developing methods for acquiring information from people against their will, but without inflicting harm or pain.

At the conclusion of the war, the OSS was designated as the investigative unit for the International Military Tribunal, which was to become known as the Nuremberg Trials. The purpose of Nuremberg was to try the principal Nazi leaders. Some Nazis were on trial for their experiments, and the U.S. was using its own "truth drugs" on these principal Nazi prisoners, namely Goring, Ribbentrop, Speer and eight others. The Justice in charge of the tribunal had given the OSS permission to use the drugs.
The Dachau doctors who performed the mescaline experiments also were involved in aviation medicine. The aviation experiments at Dachau fascinated Heinrich Himmler. Himmler followed the progress of the tests, studied their findings and often suggested improvements. The Germans had a keen interest in several medical problems in the field of flying, they were interested in preventing pilots from slowly becoming unconscious as a result of breathing the thin air of the high altitudes and there was interest in enhancing night vision.

The main research in this area was at the Institute of Aviation in Munich, which had excellent laboratories. The experiments in relationship to the Institute were conducted at Dachau. Inmates had been immersed in tubs of ice water with instruments placed in their orifices in order to monitor their painful deaths. Dr. Hubertus Strughold, who ran the German aviation medicine team, confirmed that he had heard humans were used for the Dachau experiments. Hidden in a cave in Hallein were files recording the Dachau experiments.

On May 15, 1941, Dr. Sigmund Rascher wrote a letter to Himmler requesting permission to use the Dachau inmates for experiments on the physiology of high altitudes. Rascher lamented the fact that no such experiments have been done using human subjects. "The experiments are very dangerous and we cannot attract volunteers," he told Himmler. His request was approved.

Dachau was filled with Communists and Social Democrats, Jews, Jehovah's Witnesses, Gypsies, clergymen, homosexuals, and people critical of the Nazi government. Upon entering Dachau, prisoners lost all legal status, their hair was shaved off, all their possessions confiscated, they were poorly fed, and they were used as slaves for both the corporations and the government. The SS guards were brutal and sadistic. The idea to test subjects at Dachau was really the brain child of Erich Hippke, chief surgeon of the Luftwaffe. Between March and August of 1942 extensive experiments were conducted at Dachau regarding the limits of human endurance at high altitudes. These experiments were conducted for the benefit of the German Air Force. The experiments took place in a low-pressure chamber in which altitudes of up to 68,000 feet could be simulated. The subjects were placed in the chamber and the altitude was raised, many inmates died as a result. The survivors often suffered serious injury. One witness at the Nuremberg trials, Anton Pacholegg, who was sent to Dachau in 1942, gave an eyewitness account of the typical pressure test:

"The Luftwaffe delivered a cabinet constructed of wood and metal. It was possible in the cabinet to either decrease or increase the air pressure. You could observe through a little window the reaction of the subject inside the chamber. The purpose of these experiments was to test human energy and the subject's capacity...to take large amounts of pure oxygen, and then to test his reaction to a gradual decrease in oxygen. I have personally seen through the observation window of the chamber when a prisoner inside would stand a vacuum until his lungs ruptured. Some experiments gave men such pressure in their heads that they would go mad and pull out their hair in an effort to relieve the pressure. They would tear their heads and face with their fingers and nails in an attempt to maim themselves in their madness. They would beat the walls with their hands and head and scream in an effort to relieve pressure in their eardrums. These cases of extreme vacuums generally ended in the death of the subjects." The former prisoner also testified, "An extreme experiment was so certain to result in death that in many instances the chamber was used for routine execution purposes rather than an experiment." A minimum 200 prisoners were known to have died in these experiments.

The doctors directly involved with the research held very high positions: Karl Brandt was Hitler's personal doctor; Oskar Schroeder was the Chief of the Medical Services of the
Luftwaffe; Karl Gebhardt was Chief Surgeon on the Staff of the Reich Physician SS and Police and German Red Cross President; Joachim Mrugowsky was Chief of the Hygienic Institute of the Waffen SS; Helmut Poppendick was a senior colonel in the SS and Chief of the Personal Staff of the Reich Physicians SS and Police; Siegfried Ruff was Director of the Department of Aviation Medicine.

The first human guinea pig was a 37 year old Jew in good health. Himmler invited 40 top Luftwaffe officers to view a movie of an inmate dying in the pressure chamber. After the pressure chamber tests, the cold treatment experiments began. The experiments consisted of immersing inmates in freezing water while their vital signs were monitored. The goal was to discover the cause of death. Heart failure was the answer. An inmate described the procedures:

"The basins were filled with water and ice was added until the water measured 37.4 F and the experimental subjects were either dressed in a flying suit or were placed in the water naked. The temperature was measured rectally and through the stomach. The lowering of the body temperature to 32 degrees was terrible for experimental subjects. At 32 degrees the subject lost consciousness. They were frozen to 25 degrees. The worst experiment was performed on two Russian officer POWs. They were placed in the basin naked. Hour after hour passed, and while usually after a short time, 60 minutes, freezing had set in, these two Russians were still conscious after two hours. After the third hour one Russian told the other, 'Comrade, tell that officer to shoot us.' The other replied, 'Don't expect any mercy from this Fascist dog.' Then they shook hands and said goodbye. The experiment lasted at least five hours until death occurred.

Dry freezing experiments were also carried out a Dachau. One subject was put outdoors on a stretcher at night when it was extremely cold. While covered with a linen sheet, a bucket of cold water was poured over him every hour. He was kept outdoors under sub-freezing conditions. In subsequent experiments, subjects were simply left outside naked in a court under freezing conditions for hours. Himmler gave permission to move the experiments to Auschwitz, because it was more private and because the subjects of the experiment would howl all night as they froze. The physical pain of freezing was terrible. The subjects died by inches, heartbeat became totally irregular, breathing difficulties and lung endema resulted, hands and feet became frozen white."

As the Germans began to lose the war, the aviation doctors began to keep their names from appearing in Himmler's files for fear of future recriminations.

(To be concluded Friday.)

America made it to the moon with Dachau research By Harry V. Martin and David Caul
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The Nazi doctors who experimented on the inmates of prison camps during World War Two were tried for murder at the Nuremberg Tribunal. The accused were educated, trained physicians, they did not kill in anger or in malice, they were creating a science of death.

Ironically, in 1933, the Nazi's passed a law for the protection of animals. The law cited the prevention of cruelty and indifference to animals as one of the highest moral values of a people, animal experimentation was unthinkable, but human experimentations were acceptable. The victims of the crime of these doctors numbered into the thousands.
In 1953, while the Central Intelligence Agency was still conducting mind control and behaviour modification on unwitting humans in this country, the United States signed the Nuremberg Code, a code born out of the ashes of war and human suffering. The document was a solemn promise never to tolerate such human atrocities again. The Code maintains three fundamental principles:

- The subjects of any experimentation must be volunteers who thoroughly understand the purpose and the dangers of the experiments. They must be free to give consent and the consent must be without pressure and they must be free to quit the experiments at any time.
- The experiments must be likely to yield knowledge which is valuable to everyone. The knowledge must be such that it could not be gained in any other way.
- The experiments must be conducted by only the most competent doctors, and they must exercise extreme care.

The Nazi aviation experiments met none of these conditions. Most inmates at Dachau knew that the experiments in the pressure chamber were fatal. From the very beginning, control of the experiments was largely in the hands of the SS, which was later judged to be a criminal organization by the Nuremberg Tribunal.

Despite our lessons from Nuremberg and the death camps, the CIA, U.S. Navy and the U.S. Army Chemical Corps targeted specific groups of people for experimentation who were not able to resist, prisoners, mental patients, foreigners, ethnic minorities, sex deviants, the terminally ill, children and U.S. military personnel and prisoners of war. They violated the Nuremberg Code for conducting and subsidizing experiments on unwitting citizens. The CIA began its mind control projects in 1953, the very year that the U.S. signed the Nuremberg Code and pledged with the international community of nations to respect basic human rights and to prohibit experimentation on captive populations without full and free consent.

Dr. Cameron, a CIA operative, was one of the worst offenders against the Code, yet he was a member of the Nuremberg Tribunal, with full knowledge of its testimony. In 1973, a three judge court in Michigan ruled, "...experimental psychosurgery, which is irreversible and intrusive, often leads to the blunting of emotions, the deadening of memory, the reduction of affect, and limits the ability to generate new ideas. Its potential for injury to the creativity of the individual is great and can infringe on the right of the individual to be free from interference with his mental process."

"The state's interest in performing psychosurgery and the legal ability of the involuntarily detained mental patient to give consent, must bow to the First Amendment, which protects the generation and free flow of ideas from unwarranted interference with one's mental processes." Citing the Nuremberg Code, the court found that "the very nature of the subject's incarceration diminishes the capacity to consent to psychosurgery." In 1973, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts enacted regulations which would require informed written consent from voluntary patients before electroshock treatment could be performed.

Senator Sam Ervin's Committee lashed out bitterly at the mind control and behaviour modification experiments and ordered them discontinued, they were not. But the New England Journal of Medicine states, that the consent provisions are "no more than an elaborate ritual." They called it "a device that when the subject is uneducated and uncomprehending, confers no more than a semblance of propriety on human experimentation."

The Nuremberg Tribunal brought to light that some of the most respected figures in the medical profession were involved in the vast crime network of the SS. Only 23 persons were charged with criminal activity in this area, despite the fact that hundreds of medical personnel were involved. The defendants were charged with crimes against humanity. They
were found guilty of planning and executing experiments on humans without their consent, in a cruel and brutal manner which involved severe torture, deliberate murder and with the full knowledge of the gravity of their deeds. Only seven of the defendants were sentenced to death and hanged, others received life sentences. Five who were involved in the experiments were not tried. Ernest Grawitz committed suicide, Carl Claiberg was tried in the Soviet Union, Josef Mengele escaped to South America and was later captured by Israeli agents, Horst Schumann disappeared and Siegmund Rascher was executed by Himmler.

There were 200 German medical doctors conducting these medical experiments. Most of these doctors were friends of the United States before the war, and despite their inhuman experiments, the U.S. attempted to rebuild a relationship with them after the war. The knowledge the Germans had accumulated at the expense of human life and suffering, was considered a "booty of war", by the Americans and the Russians. The Americans tracked down Dr. Strughold, the aviation doctor who was in charge of the Dachau experiments. With full knowledge that the experiments were conducted on captive humans, the U.S. recruited the doctors to work for them. General Dwight D. Eisenhower gave his personal approval to exploit the work and research of the Nazi's in the death camps.

Within weeks of Eisenhower's order, many of these notorious doctors were working for the U.S. Army at Heidelberg. Army teams scoured Europe for scientific experimental apparatus such as pressure chambers, compressors, G-force machines, giant centrifuges, and electron microscopes. These doctors were wined and dined by the U.S. Army while most of Germany's post-war citizens virtually starved.

The German doctors were brought to the U.S. and went to work for Project Paperclip. All these doctors had been insulated against war crime charges. The Nuremberg prosecutors were shocked that U.S. authorities were using the German doctors despite their criminal past.

Under the leadership of Strughold, 34 scientists accepted contracts from Project Paperclip, and were moved to Randolph Air Force Base at San Antonio, Texas. The authorization to hire these Nazi scientists came directly for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The top military brass stated that they wished to exploit these rare minds. Project Paperclip, ironically, would use Nazi doctors to develop methods of interrogating German prisoners of war.

As hostilities began to build after the war between the Americans and the Russians, the U.S. imported as many as 1000 former Nazi scientists.

In 1969, Americans landed on the moon, and two groups of scientist in the control centre shared the credit, the rocket team from Peenemunde, Germany, under the leadership of Werner von Braun, these men had perfected the V-2s which were built in the Nordhausen caves where 20,000 slave labourers from prison camp Dora had been worked to death. The second group were the space doctors, lead by 71-year-old Dr. Hubertus Strughold, whose work was pioneered in Experimental Block No. 5 of the Dachau concentration camp and the torture and death of hundreds of inmates. The torture chambers that were used to slowly kill the prisoners of the Nazi's were the test beds for the apparatus that protected Neil Armstrong from harm, from lack of oxygen, and pressure, when he walked on the moon.

(My Note. - Oh no he fucking well didn't... But that's for a little bit later on.)
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The long evolution of developing procedures to control human behaviour all came to a head in the modern world with Pavlov, a Russian scientist. In the early years of the twentieth century, Pavlov made the discovery that you can condition a dog to salivate on command simply by associating food with the ringing of a bell. Once that association is fixed in the dog's mind, the food can be removed and the dog will salivate merely when it hears the bell.

Americans salivate in response to a wide array of bells and whistles. We can call it phase one in the evolution of human behaviour control.
Pavlov carried out the identical experiments on human beings with the same results. Those principles have been adapted to television and motion pictures and can now make Americans salivate in response to a wide array of bells and whistles. We can call it phase one in the evolution of human behaviour control.

Phase two was accomplished by the same Russian scientist, Pavlov. Very few people know of this part of his research. During a particularly severe storm in Russia, heavy rains continued for days and Pavlov’s laboratories were flooded. Pavlov and his research assistants were able to return to the laboratory only after the flood waters had receded days later. Upon returning, Pavlov discovered something truly remarkable. Before the flood, many of the dogs had been conditioned to respond to various stimuli. Lo and behold, all traces of the conditioning in the dogs had disappeared! Bells, food, nothing could induce the former salivation response that had been so carefully implanted in the dogs’ nervous systems.

What mysterious influence could account for this remarkable turn of events, Pavlov wondered. So, being a good scientist, he studied carefully what had transpired while he was away from the dogs. They had been left without food or warmth. They had been isolated for days; some of them had drowned. They had been subjected to extreme stress, never knowing if they would live or die. These were the factors that had produced the washing away of the previous conditioning from the dogs’ brains - brain-washing.

Pavlov and other Russians followed up this line of research, but it was the Chinese communists in the 1950s who first saw its real potential for use with human beings. They employed these very principles in brainwashing American and other Allied prisoners of war during the Korean conflict. Isolation, periodic denial of food or water, cold and exposure, extreme stress associated with uncertainty of life or death—these conditions, together with a continual barrage of indoctrination produced the erasing of previous beliefs and behaviour patterns in American soldiers in particular. Thus brainwashing became phase two in the evolution of human behaviour control.

But brainwashing is not very reliable, as the remarkable film "The Manchurian Candidate" shows. The trigger mechanisms can be tampered with, sometimes even erased, before the desired behaviour can be carried out.

These procedures are only used now by the CIA and other intelligence services for programming special assassins (see the movie "Parallax View"). Neither classic Pavlovian conditioning nor brainwashing can produce the general results that black-budget project directors in intelligence services desire: absolute control of a human personality. To show to what extremes the CIA is willing to go in developing the technology to control human behaviour, they funded the "research" of Dr. Jose Delgado. Delgado was infamous for implanting radio-activated electrodes in animals (and possibly in humans).
In the pictures above he is demonstrating that his implants in a bull's brain can stop it even after it starts to charge Delgado. (he pushes a button and the bull stops)

You may get a slight whiff of sulphur and brimstone as you read this quote from Delgado:

"We need a program of psychosurgery and political control of our society. The purpose is physical control of the mind. Everyone who deviates from the given norm can be surgically mutilated.

"The individual may think that the most important reality is his own existence, but this is only his personal point of view. This lacks historical perspective.

"Man does not have the right to develop his own mind. This kind of liberal orientation has great appeal. We must electrically control the brain. Some day armies and generals will be controlled by electrical stimulation of the brain."

Dr. Jose Delgado (MKULTRA experimenter who demonstrated a radio-controlled bull on CNN in 1985) Director of Neuropsychiatry, Yale University Medical School Congressional Record No. 26, Vol. 118, February 24, 1974

Phase three in the development of thought and behaviour control techniques occurred at Stanford University in the 1960s, with a scientist named William Colby. Colby was a Freudian psychiatrist whose work was funded by Department of Defence grants attempting to solve a problem outlined by the DoD: controlling human behaviour.

Colby learned how to capture the belief systems of his psychiatric patients. He then put these belief systems into computer programs. He refined his research until he was able to capture a patient's personality structure in the computer and then use this computer model to control the patient's behaviour.

B. F. Skinner developed the concept of operant conditioning in which a subject—animal or human—receives reinforcement for desired behaviour.

The techniques of Pavlov, Colby, and Skinner have been taken over by political campaign managers, television producers, and advertising executives. Today, the average person is bombarded with conditioning messages throughout each day. We are conditioned to believe,
feel, think, and act as other people choose. In study after study, cultural conditioning instruments (TV, popular songs, Web sites, newspapers, magazines) have been shown to elicit specific behaviours on the part of the 'receiver.'

In this essay, I'm using the word "brainwashing" in a non-technical sense, to refer to any attempt to influence or coerce another person. All communication has some element of persuasion, even if only to persuade a person to receive and/or consider the communication. So in some sense I'm attempting to 'brainwash' the reader of this article as does any communicator. You can distinguish between positive and negative "propaganda" or "brainwashing" by asking these questions:

- Does the communication make it clear that it is trying to persuade ("brainwash") the recipient? (reader, viewer, etc.)
  - If the propaganda is hidden or subliminal (below the ordinary threshold of awareness) then the purpose of the communication is often to control or manipulate the recipient.
  - If the propaganda overtly acknowledges it is trying to persuade or influence the recipient, and invites reflection on the message, then the purpose may be benign or positive.

- Does the communication present untruth as truth?

- Does the communication have the purpose of persuading the recipients to believe or act in ways that are inimical to their own interests?
  - In the case of the Obama regime's propaganda efforts, I'm arguing in this essay that persons being "brainwashed" are being encouraged to believe and act in ways that are destructive of their personal interests.

- This essay encourages readers to reflect on what kind of communication ("brainwashing") they're experiencing, which reflection I consider to be of benefit to the readers.

**Paradoxical Psychological Manipulation**

A powerful strategy of clandestine brainwashing is to send a communication with two, paradoxical messages.

For example, the movie series, The Godfather, contained these two contradictory messages:

Mafia crime families are just like ordinary people

A mafia criminal will kill his own family if necessary; don't think he would hesitate to kill you if ordered to

Even intelligent people can be taken in by this brainwashing technology of paradoxical messaging. An example of this phenomenon is a current operation by the Advertising Council.

In June of 2003, the Ad Council was stating its overall purpose in this
way: "We marshal [sic] the volunteer forces of advertising agencies and media companies to affect [sic] positive social change." As of December, 2003, they have corrected their statement to read: "We marshal the volunteer forces of advertising agencies and media companies to effect positive social change." You can, in the example below, interpret "effect positive change" to mean "brainwash people into fearful submission."

One of the Council’s current operations is called the "Campaign for Freedom." If you believe the Council,

"The initiative is designed to assist Americans during the war on terrorism through the development and distribution of timely and relevant public service messages. This first round of PSAs for the campaign has been created to celebrate our nation's freedom and remind Americans about the importance of freedom and the need to protect it for future generations."

"According to research, Americans are looking for messages that will inform, involve and inspire them during the war on terrorism. This inspirational campaign is advertising's gift to America on the occasion of its birthday, Independence Day." All of the ads conclude with the powerful tagline, "Freedom. Appreciate it. Cherish it. Protect it."

The first of six video clip "messages" involves the image of an American urban block, with the voiceover:

"On September eleventh, terrorists tried to change America forever."

The image changes to the same urban street but this time with American flags hanging in front of every house.

"Well, they succeeded."

Now, that seems rather prosaic, doesn't it? The message is: "We showed those terrorists what we're made of!" Nothing to quarrel with, is there?

Well, maybe. Note the critical element of the image/message: EVERY house has a flag in front of it.

So the paradoxical message is: America is changed forever to a country of “200 percent” patriotism that can see no wrong with whatever the Bush or Obama administration does.
I recommend you examine all six Ad Council “messages” to see the paradoxical communications in each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Ordinary Message</th>
<th>Paradoxical Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street Usa</td>
<td>We showed those 9/11 terrorists what we're made of.</td>
<td>America's been permanently changed into a country of 200 percent jingoistic patriotism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Aren't you happy you don't live in a war zone.</td>
<td>You actually do live in a war zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Aren't you glad you live in a country where you can read what you want to and no one will bother you.</td>
<td>You're living in a country where police and intelligence agencies monitor what you read and can arrest you on suspicion of subversive activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diner</td>
<td>Aren't you glad you live in a country where you have free speech.</td>
<td>You actually live in a country where you can be pulled over by a police officer, your car searched, and you're being arrested on nothing more than suspicion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>Aren't you glad you live in a country where you can't be pulled over by a police officer, your car searched, and you're being arrested on nothing more than suspicion.</td>
<td>Get ready for the possibility that food won't be available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>Aren't you glad your supermarket aisles are full.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"The average person in the US watches about four hours of television each day. Over the course of a year, we see roughly twenty five thousand commercials, many of them produced by the world's highest-paid cognitive psychologists.

And these heavily produced advertisements are not merely for products, but for a lifestyle based on a consumer mind-set.

What they're doing, day in and day out, twenty-five thousand times a year, is hypnotizing us into seeing ourselves as consumers who want to be entertained rather than as citizens who want to be informed and engaged.

We need to take back the airwaves as a sphere of mature conversation and dialogue about our common future.” Duane Elgin, "On Simplicity and Humanity's Future, IONS, Noetic Sciences Review, December 2002

The last few pages where extracts from “Brainwashing America” By Norman D. Livergood.

Now we are going to look at some psychiatric conditions that are used to explain away some of the ritualised and organised paedophilia that we read about earlier. It also contains some names that we have already encountered.
Chapter Twenty Two

Mind Control 101

“[T]he experimenters will be particularly interested in dissociative states, from the abaissement de niveau mental to multiple personality in so-called mediums, and an attempt will be made to induce a number of states of this kind, using hypnosis.”
—From a declassified MK-ULTRA1 document (see article above then read this again)

It is probably safe to say that this is not your typical ‘true crime’ book. It is, instead, a journey into an even darker, more disturbing world—one that exists in the shadows of the world depicted in the hundreds of formulaic serial killer biographies that line the shelves of America’s bookstores. For many readers, much of the information contained within these pages will be unfamiliar, and some of the theories and ideas that are discussed may seem rather bizarre.

Perhaps the most controversial theory that readers will find themselves confronted with concerns a phenomenon commonly referred to as “mind control.”

Although the concept of mind control has long been a staple of that polluted wellspring of information known as the ‘conspiracy theory’ literature (where it often mingles freely with outlandish tales of reptilian aliens and paranormal activity), it has never been a polite topic of discussion in mainstream culture. The only exposure that most people have had to the idea of mind control is through the often metaphorical, and frequently absurd, images that Hollywood has provided in a decades-long string of films—from The Manchurian Candidate and The Stepford Wives in the 1960s and 1970s, to such recent offerings as Conspiracy Theory and Zoolander (along with the remakes of both The Manchurian Candidate and The Stepford Wives).

Most people are naturally quite sceptical of the notion that someone’s thoughts and actions can be controlled by unseen actors. Particularly in Western culture, where the idea of “free will” is firmly indoctrinated, theories of mind control are inimical to the omnipresent mantra that “we are all responsible for our own actions.” It is quite likely then that scenarios involving mind-controlled killers—whether assassins like Lee Harvey Oswald or Sirhan Sirhan, or serial killers like Henry Lee Lucas or Charles Manson—will be summarily dismissed by many readers. Sceptics though should bear in mind that, contrary to perceptions, mind control is not a fictional creation of novelists and Hollywood screenwriters; to the contrary, there exists a substantial paper trail establishing that the U.S. intelligence community has devoted a vast amount of both human and financial resources, over a period of several decades, to the study of mind control. Along the way, luminaries of numerous social sciences have been recruited and co-opted. Detailing all the techniques and procedures that have received attention from the Central Intelligence Agency and its brethren is, unfortunately, well beyond the scope of this book. It is possible, however, to provide a rough sketch of what mind control really is—a sketch that will, it is hoped, help to demystify a phenomenon that is not, as it turns out, nearly so esoteric as it may at first appear to be.

The basic methodology of mind control was revealed many decades ago by George Estabrooks, a prominent psychologist/hypnotist who worked under contract to American intelligence agencies. In his book Hypnotism, first published in 1943, Estabrooks teased his audience by noting that the “intelligent reader...will sense that much more is withheld than has been told.” While that was undoubtedly an accurate assessment, Estabrooks nevertheless did reveal enough to allow an informed reader to construct a reasonably accurate picture of the fundamentals of mind control.
The degree to which any given person is susceptible to being mind controlled is a direct function of that person’s susceptibility to what are known as “dissociative states.” According to the psychiatric community, dissociative states (or dissociative ‘disorders’) include Amnesia, Fugue State, and what used to be called Multiple Personality Disorder (MPD) but is now generally referred to as Dissociative Identity Disorder (DID). All of these terms describe the same basic phenomenon:

A person who is seemingly in control of his or her actions over a given time period is unable, at a later date, to recall or account for those actions.

As with any category of ‘mental illness,’ there is no dividing line that separates those who are diagnosed with dissociative ‘disorders’ from those who are ‘normal.’ Virtually everyone possesses the ability to experience dissociative states. Many people, for example, are familiar with the phenomenon sometimes referred to as “driving on autopilot.” The scenario generally plays out as follows: you suddenly ‘snap out of it’ just as you are pulling into your parking space at work, and you realize, to your horror, that you can’t remember anything since leaving your house! If this has happened to you, then you have experienced being in a dissociative state. In essence, you drove to work while in a “fugue state,” and you later had “amnesia.” In a similar vein, it could be said that an “alter personality,” which you have no conscious awareness of, drove you to work. In any event, it is clear that someone piloted your car to work in a safe and reasonable manner, and it was someone other than you.

Many people are also familiar with another common example of a dissociative state: you are deep in thought, oblivious to everything around you, possibly working on the solution to one of the world’s great mysteries, when suddenly your silent meditation is interrupted—perhaps by an unexpected noise, or by someone calling your name or tapping your shoulder. As you ‘snap out of it,’ you suddenly realize, much to your dismay, that you cannot remember what it was that you were so deep in thought about just moments before. If you have ever had a similar experience, or if you are familiar with the dream-like state that some people attain just before falling asleep, or while engrossed in a book or television program, then you have experienced being in a dissociative state of consciousness. While the ability to dissociate is likely universal, or nearly so, some people are clearly more susceptible to dissociative states than are others. There is little question that someone’s innate ability to dissociate can be greatly enhanced—although not necessarily by ethical means. The most severe of the dissociative ‘disorders,’ MPD/DID, is in almost all cases created by psychological trauma so severe that the traumatic episode(s) cannot be integrated into the experiences of the core personality. By far the most common cause of MPD is early childhood trauma—usually, but not always, resulting from horrific abuse by a parent or other adult guardian. Dr. Frank Putnam noted in 1989 that he was “struck by the quality of extreme sadism that is reported by most MPD victims. Many multiples have told me of being sexually abused by groups of people, of being forced into prostitution by family members, or of being offered as sexual enticement to their mother’s boyfriends. After one has worked with a number of MPD patients, it becomes obvious that severe, sustained, and repetitive child abuse is a major element in the creation of MPD.” Dr. Deirdre Barrett, writing in 2001 for Psychology Today, offered a similar observation: “dissociaters...have the following traits in common:

Many such subjects reported a history of child abuse. Although some remembered this directly, some had been told by others that they had been battered...Other dissociaters who had not been abused had suffered childhood traumas such as prolonged, painful medical conditions and before the age of 10 experienced the deaths of their parents.”

As mental health professionals have long recognized, the normal human reaction to highly stressful situations is what is known as the “fight or flight” response. Children, however, typically lack the ability to either fight off or flee from their attackers and abusers. This is particularly true, of course, for very young children. The human brain, that wonderfully resilient organ, therefore reacts in the best way that it can under the circumstances: it allows the child to mentally ‘flee’ from the situation. When the abuse is of an extreme and
sustained nature, the brain’s response is to build a virtual wall around the traumatic experiences by creating a separate and distinct ‘alter personality’ to deal with current and future episodes of abuse.

Although MPD/DID is a ‘disorder’ listed in the DSM IV, the veritable bible of the psychiatric community, the public generally looks upon the notion of multiple personality with a healthy dose of scepticism—a scepticism encouraged by a news and entertainment media apparatus that generally mocks and ridicules the condition, and by a not insignificant number of psychologists and psychiatrists who deny the existence of MPD/DID (strangely enough, many of the most visible and vocal members of the denial crowd tend to be psychologists and psychiatrists who have received funding from the CIA).

In November 2001, researchers in Melbourne, Australia conducted what the Herald Sun described as a “world-first study” of Multiple Personality Disorder. The goal of the study was to help resolve the dispute within the mental health community. The conclusion reached by the researchers (at least one of whom “had been sceptical of the disorder” before working on the project) was that individuals “who suffer multiple personality disorder are not faking their alter-egos.” The study involved comparing the brainwave patterns of people claiming to be suffering from the disorder with the brainwave patterns of actors portraying the condition. While the actors gave “outwardly convincing performances,” the researchers found that there were “distinct changes in the brain of sufferers as they ‘switch’ personalities,” while those changes were not detected in the brains of those who were just acting the part.

So how does all of this relate to the concept of mind control? In the simplest possible terms, what the term “mind control” refers to is the process of first enhancing an unwitting subject’s natural ability to dissociate (creating, in essence, the condition of Multiple Personality Disorder), and then controlling that subject’s dissociative states (by creating one or more alter personalities that are effectively under the control of others, and that are unknown to the ‘core’ personality).

But can this really be done? Is mind control a real phenomenon, or merely the product of the fertile imaginations of various ‘conspiracy theorists’ and self described survivors? The answer to that question lies in the answers to several other questions, beginning with:

• Do dissociative states occur naturally in the human species?

As anyone who has ever driven their car to work “on autopilot”—or been caught “daydreaming” or “spacing out”—can testify, the answer is yes (although the vast majority of people would not normally use the term “dissociative state” to describe the experience).

• Can the naturally occurring ability to dissociate be enhanced?

The answer here also appears to be yes, albeit with the caveat that enhancing that ability generally requires the infliction of severe trauma, preferably during the vulnerable childhood years.

• Would the CIA and other U.S. intelligence agencies be restrained morally or ethically from inflicting such trauma?

How this question is answered depends largely upon the individual reader’s political orientation and level of awareness of national and world events. Serious students of covert operations know that the CIA has a long and very sordid history of sponsoring countless assassinations, civilian massacres, violent coups, and barbaric torture/interrogation centres (and that is just the short list). This bloody, and very well documented, record suggests that there is little, if anything, that the CIA will not attempt to justify in the name of “national security.” Documents released through FOIA requests have revealed that, at the
very least, the agency has not shied away from funding and sponsoring studies in which very young children have been dosed with LSD continuously for several weeks.

- If we accept that dissociation is a real and naturally occurring human ability, and that the tendency to dissociate can be enhanced, and that the intelligence community's hands are not tied by ethical concerns, then the final, and most critical, question becomes: can enhanced dissociative states, once created, be controlled?

George Estabrooks was clearly convinced that that was indeed the case. He claimed that once a person's core personality had been split, it was then possible to control one or more of the alter personalities, without the conscious awareness of the primary personality. This process, according to Estabrooks, allowed the intelligence community to create “Super Spies”—unwitting ‘agents’ who were willing to follow any orders unquestioningly. Among other duties, these Super Spies made ideal couriers, since they could be fed sensitive information while in a controlled dissociative state and thereafter have no conscious awareness that they were transporting important data. Even under torture, the Super Spy would reveal nothing—for as far as he (or she) was aware, there was nothing to reveal! Someone at the receiving end who was familiar with the Super Spy's programming, however, could readily extract the information—after which the Super Spy would remain blissfully unaware that a mission had been successfully completed.

As dubious as Estabrook's scenario may at first appear to be, it is not so very different from the common phenomenon of “driving on autopilot.” Let us imagine that you have managed, once again, to find yourself at work with no idea how you got there. You can remember nothing beyond pulling out of your driveway. So you decide, out of curiosity, to pay a visit to a skilled hypnotist, who succeeds in “putting you under,” so to speak. While in the “hypnotic trance” (another term for a dissociative state), you would be able to relate to the hypnotist (and anyone else in the room) all the mundane details of your drive to work. Once brought back to a normal state of consciousness, however, you would still have no conscious memory of your drive to work (unless instructed otherwise by the hypnotist). You would have served, in essence, as a Super Spy. All that is missing from the equation is the element of control.

And how would that control be attained? Estabrooks shied away from the details, only alluding to the severe psychic torture that is required to split a person's core personality and then exert control over the alter personalities that are created. The trauma is often referred to euphemistically as “a form of hypnotism.”

In one passage, for example, Estabrooks noted that multiple personalities “are caused by a form of hypnotism in the first place! We will see that emotional shock produces exactly the same results as hypnotism.” Later, he came a little closer to the truth: “multiple personality [can] be both caused and cured by hypnotism. Remember that war is a grim business. Suppose we deliberately set up that condition of multiple personality to further the ends of military intelligence.” Still later, he came even closer: “everyone [can] be thrown into the deepest state of hypnotism by the use of what [I] termed the Russian method—no holds barred, deliberate disintegration of the personality by psychic torture...The subject might easily be left a mental wreck but war is a grim business.” War is indeed a grim business, as Estabrooks was apparently fond of stating, but that argument hardly justified the type of research the doctor endorsed, including using children, who are “notoriously easy to hypnotize,” as research subjects.

Decades after the publication of Estabrooks' seminal work, another psychiatrist/hypnotist, by the name of Paul Verdier, wrote an obscure book entitled Brainwashing and the Cults: An Expose on Capturing the Human Mind. Verdier's manuscript began on a promising note, with this acknowledgement: “It must be accepted that brainwashing...is now being used here [in the United States] by devious persons with personal gain in mind.” Unfortunately, the author followed that bold proclamation with a woefully inaccurate accounting of who
those “devious persons” might be. He did though provide a reasonably good description of the process of mind control (although Verdier, like Estabrooks, did not use the term “mind control”).

By Verdier's account, the objective of the would-be “brainwasher” is to access those areas of the brain that are outside of the individual’s conscious control. This is accomplished, the doctor explained, by circumventing the normal inhibiting response of the cerebral cortex, so that “an individual’s voluntary conscious self-control [will] be bypassed or short-circuited.” In order to disable what Verdier referred to as the brain’s “cortical block,” all of the following were recommended: alcohol; euphoric drugs; isolation; solitary confinement; and “the most dramatic and unique item in the brainwashing arsenal,” hypnosis. All of these “brainwashing” techniques, significantly, have been exhaustively researched by the CIA.

Verdier went on to explain that in order to achieve truly lasting states of brainwashing (or mind control), it is necessary to subject the victim to “profound and deep emotional states.” The recommended emotional states are fear, shock, and anxiety—all of which have “an intense disinhibitive effect on the human brain.” Even more effective is pain—because, “according to the eminent neurologist, Dr. Wilder Penfield, sensations of pain from the muscular sensory system enter the sub-cortical brain regions directly.” With a passage seemingly lifted from Estabrooks’ writings, Verdier left no doubt that pain and fear are the most useful items in the MK-ULTRA toolbox: “Russian political scientists do support the belief that given enough punishment, all the people in any time or place are susceptible to hypnotic control.”

Verdier echoed other of Estabrooks’ beliefs as well, including the idea that “brainwashing” could and should be widely utilized for “benevolent” purposes, and the notion that children are ideal candidates for mind control programming: “Brainwashing can be slow, insidious and sure when applied to children early in life...it is likely that there is a short period of time following corporal punishment when the child is in a state of decortication—hypnosis, so to speak. This is the ideal time to plant the positive instructions for better behaviour in the future.” What the good doctor considered “corporal punishment” and “positive instructions” was left to the reader’s imagination.

The vulnerability of children to dissociative states brought on by traumatic abuse is one of the reasons that the CIA and other intelligence agencies have played key roles in the creation of relatively mainstream satanic groups, as well as in denying the existence of underground satanic cults engaged in violent criminal enterprises. Some of the available evidence suggests that an array of satanic groups have served as intelligence agency ‘fronts’ for mind control operations—which actually makes perfect sense, considering that if the goal is to severely traumatize children, then surely nothing compares to the seemingly outlandish stories told by those who have survived what has been dubbed “Satanic Ritual Abuse” (SRA). Verdier took note in his book of the fact that one of “the most pronounced emotional experiences that a human being can undergo is having his or her life threatened. Threats of death are used as a basic tool by brainwashing Communists. Even among them, however, this threat is used sparingly, for they know that humans quickly adapt to this type of threat, especially if it is repeatedly given but never carried out. In order to avoid this routinization of stressful emotional situations, they have been known to casually execute prisoners for the apparent effect it has on others.” The actions that Verdier predictably attributed to “brainwashing Communists” precisely mirror the stories that have been told repeatedly by self-described survivors of ritual abuse. These victims speak of receiving frequent death threats, directed against both themselves and their family members. They speak also of having those threats reinforced through their forced witnessing of, and even participate in, the killing of others. (Remember the Dutroux stuff?)

There has been a tremendous amount of energy expended to discredit all such stories. At the forefront of the movement to deny the validity of the stories told by countless survivors is the False Memory Syndrome Foundation, a group led by a truly vile coalition of CIA-funded psychiatrists and accused (and in some cases, convicted) paedophiles. Also playing a key role in the movement are Paul and Shirley Eberle, the authors of a purportedly authoritative
book entitled The Politics of Child Abuse. The Eberles’ book attempts to lay the blame for virtually all child abuse accusations and prosecutions on overzealous prosecutors, therapists and parents. That argument might be a little more credible, however, if the Eberles themselves were not known to Los Angeles police as distributors of child pornography—a fact that media outlets conveniently and rather consistently ignore while touting the Eberles as authorities in the field of child abuse.

Contrary to conventional wisdom, claims of ritual abuse are certainly not a modern phenomenon. Such claims have actually been around for quite some time, and they were given legitimacy by no less an historical figure than Sigmund Freud. Over 100 years ago, Freud recognized that ritual abuse was likely the primary cause of the psychological problems that he observed in his female patients.

Author Kevin Marron noted that Freud had commented on the marked “similarity between what [his patients] told him and the accounts of the witchcraft confessions of the 16th century.” In a letter to a colleague, written in January 1897, Freud pondered: “But why did the devil who took possession of the poor things invariably abuse them sexually and in a loathsome manner? Why are their confessions under torture so like the communications made by my patients in psychological treatment?” If Freud were alive today, he might well add: “And why are the communications made by my patients a century ago so like the stories told to therapists today by survivors of SRA?”

Should this remarkable consistency spanning several centuries be attributed to some kind of recurring mass hysteria? Or can it best be explained by the fact that, as historians (and the Chicago Tribune) have noted, “satanic cults have been documented in Europe and America as far back as the 1600s”? Has there always been something dark and evil lurking in the shadows, only occasionally raising its head—at which times its existence is denied, its perpetrators cast as victims, and its real victims mocked and ridiculed? To ponder such a question, alas, requires calling into question some of our most fundamental beliefs about the nature of the world we live in—and that is a decidedly unsettling venture.

Perhaps when viewed in the context of a covert, state-sponsored mind control program, some readers can begin to understand not only why there might be those who are motivated to inflict appalling levels of abuse on some of America’s children, but also why so much effort would be expended attempting to discredit claims of horrific abuse if the claims are in fact valid.

Truth be told, the stories told by survivors of ritual abuse tend to be self-discrediting. One of the potential benefits, therefore, of cloaking mind control activity in satanic rituals is that the operations are largely immune to disclosure. Even if an operation is uncovered, the stories told by the children tend to be so outlandish, so far removed from the world that we know, that the claims are easily cast aside as the product of a child’s fertile imagination. In May 2000, however, a report commissioned by the United Kingdom’s Department of Health concluded that Satanic Ritual Abuse was not (as an earlier report ordered by the Conservative government found in 1994, a “myth.” The Independent noted, in anticipation of the report’s release, that a “specially commissioned government report will this week conclude that satanic abuse does take place in Britain. It will say that its victims have suffered actual abuse and are not suffering from ‘false memory syndrome’.”

One of the primary authors of the controversial report was therapist Valerie Sinason, who reportedly had personally treated 126 survivors of ritualized abuse. According to a report in the Guardian, Sinason has said “46 of her patients claimed to have witnessed murder of children or adults during ritual abuse ceremonies that had involved up to 300 people at a time. Some 70% of the reported abuse was carried out by paedophiles and the rest by satanists.” The Independent added that sixteen of the victims had also claimed “they had seen induced abortions or babies killed.” Sinason’s research has led her to conclude that
some children “are born for the purpose of abuse and are not registered on birth certificates.” That claim has been voiced repeatedly by U.S. victims as well.

In a report from February 2000, the Independent revealed that Sinason had photographs documenting “horrific injuries to children and the existence of ceremonial sites with the remains of mutilated animals.” The same article noted that Scotland Yard had begun an investigation. It is unclear where that investigation led, as it is unclear what the official response was to the release of Sinason’s study. Media outlets appear to have dropped the story just before the report was issued. Many readers of the press accounts that preceded the report’s release were no doubt predisposed to dismiss Sinason and her fellow researchers as cranks. Where exactly, readers were left to ponder, was this alleged photographic evidence showing children with horrific injuries? And where is the evidence of ritual murders being performed?

As it turns out, shockingly enough, such evidence is not that difficult to find.

As hard as it may be to believe, especially for readers conditioned to think that all such stories are nothing but ‘urban myths,’ photographic evidence of exactly the sort described by Sinason is being peddled all over the Internet. But even with such compelling evidence being widely circulated, many will still be tempted to discount the stories told by the survivors of such abuse. Sceptics are advised to keep in mind the words of Detective Robert Simandl of the Chicago Police Department: “It’s difficult for us to believe such crimes are occurring, but they are, all over the United States.”

Indeed, all over the world.

“In the early 1950’s the CIA was looking for ‘specially gifted subjects’ to study ‘dissociative states,’ which could be ‘induced and controlled to some extent with hypnosis and drugs.’” — Arlene Tyner, writing in Probe magazine, July/August 2000

1 The term “MK-ULTRA,” while actually just one of many codenames used over the years by the U.S. intelligence community, is commonly used to refer to all CIA-sponsored research on mind control.

2 All of the following books focus directly or indirectly on CIA-sponsored mind control research: Jose M.R. Delgado Physical Control of the Mind (Harper and Row, 1969); Donald Bain The Control of Candy Jones (Playboy Press, 1976); Walter Bowart Operation Mind Control (Dell Publishing, 1978); Peter Watson War on the Mind (Hutchinson, 1978); Peter Schrag Mind Control (Pantheon, 1978); John Marks The Search for the Manchurian Candidate (Times Books, 1979); Martin Lee and Bruce Schlain Acid Dreams (Grove Press, 1985); and Gordon Thomas Journey Into Madness (Bantam, 1989). All of these titles contain pieces of the puzzle, but all contain varying amounts of disinformation as well (as do more recent titles).

3 See William Blum’s Killing Hope (Common Courage Press, 1995) for a detailed look at some of what the intelligence community really does with your tax dollars.

4 Hypnotism is another phenomenon that is regarded with considerable scepticism by both the general public and the scientific community—although there are signs that that is beginning to change. “Despite its long history, scientists have wondered whether hypnotism is a genuine psychological state or a gimmick,” noted the National Post, “But recent research shows it causes measurable changes in the brain.” A number of mainstream media articles in recent years have begun to acknowledge the effectiveness of hypnosis, especially as a means of pain control (Lamaze childbirth techniques, for example, are really just a form of self-hypnosis). Psychology Today noted that hypnosis “is not an all-or-nothing phenomenon, but rather a continuum. Most people can be hypnotized to some degree—the only question is how far.” The same can be said, of course, of the ability to dissociate, which largely determines susceptibility to hypnotism.

5 Dr. Penfield was an associate of the notorious medical torture practitioner, and MKULTRA operative, Dr. David Ewen Cameron.
6 This is a very common form of disinformation that is found frequently in the writings of CIA-affiliated writers: acknowledge that mind control is a real phenomenon, but then blame it all on those godless communists. Other agency-penned manuscripts deny that mind control exists at all, which is another common form of disinformation.

7 The final chapter of Verdier's book, entitled “Benevolent Brainwashing In The Future,” contains the following recommendation: “The process of brainwashing... could be used effectively and economically to solve many of society's pressing human problems which, until now, have seemed virtually unsolvable.”

8 The timing of the report on this landmark study was rather curious. The Independent published the story on April 30, 2000—otherwise known as Walpurgisnacht (Night of the Witches) or Beltane. Along with the summer and winter solstices, Walpurgisnacht is among the most significant of the occult holidays.

Above extract taken once again from the fantastic “Programmed to Kill” by Dave McGowan.

Now remember all the stuff I showed you earlier about paedophilia? Well coincidentally you will also find out that the US govt. and others have been using psychiatrists to try and stem the tide of people coming out with their harrowing revelations on this and other matters. Here's what psychiatrists have come up with to explain all these children plucking up the courage to admit they have been ritually abused. Note who these guys are all connected with i.e. the CIA, also notice that the same individuals seem to be involved in many aspects of this section from start to finish.

'FALSE MEMORY SYNDROME' HOAX

A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE FOUNDING MEMBERS OF THE FALSE MEMORY SYNDROME FOUNDATION

F.M.S.F. EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS: Peter and Pamela Freyd (psychiatrists)

The Freyds were publicly exposed by their own daughter – Jennifer Freyd (professor of psychology) of child abuse and rape.

F.M.S.F. FOUNDER: Ralph Underwager (psychiatrist)

The world's foremost authority on false memory, but in the courtroom – is repeatedly exposed as a charlatan. He is a self confessed paedophile who quotes: It is 'God's Will' adults engage in sex with children.

F.M.S.F. ORIGINAL BOARD MEMBERS: Martin Orn (psychiatrist)

Senior CIA Mind Control Researcher: Experimenting in hypnotic programming, dissolving memory and other mind subduing techniques.

F.M.S.F. BOARD MEMBER: Dr Harold Lief (psychiatrist)

CIA Mind Control Researcher. Experimenting in behavioural modification and hypnotic programming.

REFERENCE FROM: The False Memory Hoax – Psychic Dictatorship in the USA By Alex Constantine.

The CIA, the False Memory Syndrome Foundation & the Politics of Ritual Abuse
The Devil Denuded

The CIA, in fact, has several designates on the FMSF advisory board. They have in common backgrounds in mind control experimentation. Their very presence on the board, and their peculiar backgrounds, reveal some heavily obscured facts about ritual child abuse.

Martin T. Orne, a senior CIA researcher, is an original board member of the Foundation, and a psychiatrist at the University of Pennsylvania's Experimental Psychiatry Lab in Philadelphia. In 1962 his forays into hypno-programming (the elicitation of "anti-social" behaviour, dissolving memory and other mind-subduing techniques) were financed by a CIA front at Cornell University. He was also funded by Boston's Scientific Engineering Institute, another front, and a clearinghouse for the Agency's investigation of the occult.

The CIA and Pentagon have formed a partnership in the creation of cults. To be sure, the Association of National Security Alumni, a public interest veterans group opposed to clandestine ops, considers it a "primary issue of concern" that the Department of Defence has a "perceived role in satanic cult activities, which qualify in and of themselves as very damaging exercises in mind control."

The smoothing over of the national security state's cult connections is handled by academic "experts".

A forerunner of the Foundation is based in Buffalo, New York, the Committee for Scientific Examination of Religion, best known for the publication of Satanism in America: How the Devil Got More Than His Due, widely considered to be a legitimate study. The authors turn up their noses to ritual abuse, dismissing the hundreds of reports around the country as mass "hysteria". Cult researcher Carl Raschke reported in a March, 1991 article that he coincidentally met Hudson Frew, a Satanism in America co-author at a Berkeley bookstore. "Frew was wearing a five-pointed star, or pentagram, the symbol of witchcraft and earth magic," Raschke says. Shawn Carlson, a contributor to the book, is identified by the media as a "physicist". Yet he runs the Gaia Press in El Cerrito, California, a New Age publishing house with a and occult lore. Carlson is also a "scientific and technical consultant" to the Committee for Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal (a promoter of the "false memory" theory of ritual abuse and UFO abductions), publisher of the Sceptical Inquirer.

The FMS Foundation is no less eccentric. Within two years of its founding, it was clear that the Foundation leadership was far from disinterested on witchcraft on the workings of childhood memory, and concealed a secret sexual and political agenda.

FMSF Founder Ralph Underwager, director of the Institute of Psychological Therapies in Minnesota, was forced to resign in 1993. Underwager (a former Lutheran pastor) and his wife Hollida Wakefield publish a journal, Issues in Child Abuse Allegations, written by and for child abuse "skeptics".

His departure from the False Memory Syndrome Foundation was hastened by a remark in an interview, appearing in an Amsterdam journal for paedophiles, that it was "God's Will" adults engage in sex with children.

(His wife Hollida remained on the Foundation's board after he left). As it happens, holy dispensation for paedophiles is the exact credo of the Children of God cult. It was fitting, then, when Underwager filed an affidavit on behalf of cult members tried in France in 1992, insisting that the accused were positively "not guilty of abuse upon children". In the interview, he prevailed upon paedophiles everywhere to shed stigmatisation as 'wicked and reprehensible' users of children.
In keeping with the Foundation's creative use of statistics, Dr Underwager told a group of British reporters in 1994 that "scientific evidence" proved that 60% of all women molested as children believed the experience was "good for them".

Dr Underwager invariably sides with the defence. His grandiloquent orations have graced courtrooms around the world, often by satellite. Defence lawyers for Woody Allen turned to him, he boasts, when Mia Farrow accused her estranged husband of molesting their seven year-old daughter. Underwager is a virtual icon to the Irish Catholic lobby in Dublin, which raised its hoary hackles against a child abuse prevention program in the Irish Republic. He was, until his advocacy of paedophilia tarnished an otherwise glittering reputation, widely quoted in the press, dismissing ritual child abuse as a hysterical aberration.

He is the world's foremost authority on false memory, but in the courtroom he is repeatedly exposed as a charlatan. In 1988, a trial court decision in New York State held that Dr Underwager was "not qualified to render opinion as to where or not (the victim) was sexually molested". In 1990 his testimony on memory was ruled improper "in the absence of any evidence that the results of Underwager's work had been accepted in the scientific community". And in Minnesota a judge ruled that Underwager's theories on "learned memory" were the same as "having an expert tell the jury that (the victim) was not telling the truth".

Peter and Pamela Freyd, executive directors of the Foundation, joined forces with Underwager in 1991, and their story is equally wretched. Jennifer Freyd, their daughter, a professor of psychology at the University of Oregon, openly levelled accusations of abuse against her parents at an August 1993 mental health conference in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

"My family of origin was troubled in many observable ways," she said. "I refer to the things that were never 'forgotten' and 'recovered', but to things that we all knew about". She gave her father's alcoholism as an example. "During my childhood, my father sometimes discussed his own experiences of being sexually abused as an 11 year-old boy, and called himself a 'kept boy'". Peter Freyd graduated to male prostitution as an adolescent.

At the age of 13, Jennifer Freyd composed a poem about her father's nocturnal visits:

I am caught in a web
A web of deep, deep terror

The diaries of her youth chronicle the "reactions and feelings (guilt, shame and terror) of a troubled girl and young woman. My parents oscillated between denying these symptoms and feelings.....to using knowledge of these same symptoms and feelings to discredit me".

"My father," she says, "told various people that I was brain damaged". The accusation was unlikely. At the time, Jennifer Freyd was a graduate student on a National Science Foundation fellowship. She has taught at Cornell and received numerous research awards. The "brain damage" apologia did not wash. Her mother suggested that Jennifer's memories were "confabulations" and faulted therapeutic intervention. Pamela Freyd turned to her own psychiatrist, Dr Harold Lief, currently an advisory board member of the Foundation, to diagnose Jennifer.

"He explained to me that he did not believe I was abused," Jennifer recalls. Dr Lief's diagnosis was based on his belief that Peter Freyd's fantasies were strictly "homoerotic". Of course, his daughter furrows a brow at the assumption that homoerotic fantasies or a heterosexual marriage exclude the possibility of child molestation. Lief's skewed logic is a trademark of the Foundation.
He is a close colleague of the CIA’s Martin Orne. Dr Lief, a former major in the Army medical corps, joined the University of Pennsylvania faculty in 1968, the peak of federally-funded behavioural modification experiments at Holmesburg Prison. Dr Orne consulted with him on several studies in hypnotic programming.

His academic writing reveals a peculiar range of professional interests, including "Orgasm in the Postoperative Transsexual" for Archives of Sexual Behaviour, and an exploration of the possibility of life after death for a journal on mental diseased edited by Foundation fellow Paul McHugh. Lief is a director of the Centre for Sexuality and Religion, past president of the Sex Information and Education Council.

And an original board member of the False Memory Syndrome Foundation. Two others, Jon Baron from Penn U. and Ray Hyman (an executive editor of the aforementioned Sceptical Inquirer), a professor of psychology at the University of Oregon, resigned from the board after Jennifer Freyd went public with her account of childhood abuse and the facetious attempts of her parents and their therapist to discredit her. They were replaced by David Dinges, co-director – with the ubiquitous Martin Orne – of the Unit for Experimental Psychiatry at the University of Pennsylvania.

"At times I am flabbergasted that my memory is considered ‘false’", Jennifer says, "And my alcoholic father's memory is considered rational and sane". She does not, after all, remember impossible abuses: "I was at home a few hours after my second session with my therapist, a licensed clinical psychologist working within an established group in a large and respected medical clinic.

"During that second visit to my therapist’s office, I expressed great anxiety about the upcoming holiday visit with my parents. My therapist asked about half way into the session, whether I had ever been sexually abused. I was immediately thrown into a strange state. No one had ever asked me such a question. I responded, ‘no, but….’ I went home and within a few hours I was shaking uncontrollably, overwhelmed with intense and terrible flashbacks".

Jennifer asks herself why her parents are believed. "In the end, is it precisely because I was abused that I am to be discredited despite my personal and professional success?"

Pamela Freyd published an open letter defending her husband in Ralph Underwager’s Issues in Child Abuse Accusations in 1991. It was reprinted in Confabulations, a book published a year later. Laced with lubricious sentiment, the book bemoans the "destruction of families" brought on by false child abuse accusations, and maligns "cult-like" support groups and feminists, or "lesbian cults". Executive director Freyd often refers to the feminist groups that have taken up the cause of child abuse survivors as "lesbians", after the bizarre Dr Underwager, who claims, "these women may be jealous that males are able to love each other, be comrades, friends, be close, intimate".

Pamela Freyd’s account of the family history, Jennifer insists, is patently false. In an electronic message from her father, he openly acknowledges that in his version of the story

"fictional elements were deliberately inserted".

"Fictional is rather an astounding choice of words," Jennifer observed at the Ann Arbor Conference. The article written by her parents contends that Jennifer was denied tenure at another university due to a lack of published research. "In fact," Jennifer counters, "I moved to the University of Oregon in 1987, just four years after receiving my Ph.D. to accept a tenured position as associate professor in the psychology department, one of the world’s best psychology departments....My mother sent the Jane Doe article to my colleagues during my promotion year – that is, the year my case for promotion to full professor was being considered. I was absolutely mortified to learn of this violation of my privacy and this violation of the truth".
Manipulative tactics are another Foundation imprimatur. Lana Alexander, editor of a newsletter for survivors of child sexual abuse, observes that "many people view the false memory syndrome theory as a calculated defence strategy developed by perpetrators and the lawyers and expert witnesses who defend them".

A legitimising barrage of stories in the press has shaped public opinion and warmed the clime for defence attorneys. The concept of false memory serves the same purpose as Holocaust denial. It shapes opinion. Unconscionable crimes are obstructed, the accused is endowed with the status of martyr, and the victim is reviled.

The emphasis on image is obvious in "How Do We Know We are Not Representing Paedophiles", an article written for the February 29, 1992 FMS Foundation Newsletter, by Pamela Freyd. In it, she derides the suggestion that many members of the group could be molesters because "we are a good-looking bunch of people, grey hair, well dressed, healthy, smiling; just about everyone who has attended is someone you would surely find interesting and want to count as a friend".

People forget things. Horrible things. Here at the Foundation someone had a repressed memory, or what would be called a repressed memory, that she had been sexually abused. – Pamela Freyd, FMS Foundation Founder

FOR A FULL REVIEW ON THE ABOVE REFERENCE: The False Memory Hoax – Psychic Dictatorship in the USA By Alex Constantine.

Messing with Our Minds
CIA mind control experts and accused child abusers- the false memory movement turns blaming the victim into a science

HUSAYN AL-KURDI

A quiet but brutal war is being waged on the victims of child abuse, including sexual and even ritual abuse. The battlefields include academia, the courts, professional groups, and society in general. In some cases, the aggressors are the same people accused of perpetuating the violence. They've banded together, forming networks and support groups, most notably the False Memory Syndrome Foundation (FMSF), which discounts recollections of abuse recovered in later years, making survivors look like complainers and trauma therapists sound like quacks.

Unfortunately, the Foundation has many psychotherapists on the run. Several lawsuits have already ended with judgments in favour of alleged perpetrators, and the resulting chilling effect has dampened the willingness of some mental health professionals to treat victims, especially those claiming ritual abuse.

If you browse the Internet these days, you're apt to find regional or local groups started by survivors of childhood torture and/or abuse. The list includes the International Council on Cultism and Ritual Trauma, based in Dallas, Texas; Mothers Against Sexual Abuse in Monrovia, California; Survivors and Victims Empowered in Lancaster, Pennsylvania; and the San Francisco-based Survivorship. Meanwhile, researchers such as Alex Constantine, Walter H. Bowart, and Dick Farley conduct valuable research on the FMSF. Despite such scrutiny and the seriousness of the problem, however, advocates for false memory (also known as repressed memory) syndrome dominate cyberspace and have received far more favourable coverage in the mainstream media.

Ironically, it turns out that the Foundation itself has extensive connections to another group that has indulged in extensive experimentation on human beings - the Central Intelligence
Agency. Although better known for overseas operations that serve the interests of corporate and financial elites - euphemistically described as protecting "national security" - the Agency also has a sordid history of domestic mind control experimentation. Its interest in this field runs parallel with elite concern about how to control the thinking of US citizens. The fear among policymakers that we might take control of our own destinies is almost as deep as their terror that, without US intervention, people in other parts of the world might go their own way.

It should come as no surprise, then, that long-time CIA and "intelligence complex" operatives turn up on the FMSF Advisory Board. Perhaps the most public member has been Dr. Louis Joylon "Jolly" West, a legendary figure in CIA mind control circles operating out of UCLA. (Remember him, he's the one who was implanting electrodes in the head's of Black and Hispanic people in an earlier chapter) Another is Dr. Martin Orne, an authority on torture who currently works at the University of Pennsylvania's Experimental Psychiatry Lab. While studying the effects of over 16 biochemical warfare agents until the early 1970s, Orne considered the effectiveness of choking, blistering, and vomiting agents, toxins, poison gas, and various incapacitating chemicals. During the same period, he also worked with the Cornell University-based Human Ecology Fund, sharing his findings with Dr. Even Cameron, who was then based at the McGill University Allen Institute in Montreal. At Human Ecology, electroshock, lobotomies, drugs, incapacitants, hypnosis, sleep deprivation, and radio control of the brain were all specialties of the house.

Still another false memory luminary is Margaret Singer, professor emeritus in psychology at the University of California-Berkeley. Long in the research loop of the "military-industrial-intelligence complex," Singer's involvement dates back to her experiments on returning Korean War veterans. Scrutinizing the behaviour patterns of what were described as "collaborators," "non-collaborators," and "active resisters," she noted that the "collaborators showed more typical and humanly responsive reactions" than the other groups, whose members "tended to be more apathetic and emotionally barren and withdrawn."

The latest concoction of this brain trust is false memory syndrome, a highly ideological theory embraced by the Christian Right and other groups that favour male supremacy, not to mention those accused of abusing and/or sexually molesting women and children. Paedophiles and self-righteous "Christians" often turn up in FMS circles.

The movement's official literature describes its so-called "syndrome" as a "condition in which a person's identity and interpersonal relationships are centred around a memory of traumatic experience which is objectively false but in which the person strangely believes." It goes on to explain that, when in the grip of a "false memory," a person "may become so focused on the memory that he or she may be effectively distracted from coping with the real problems in his or her life." Certainly, the movement's leaders should know, since in the realm of memory manipulation they're the experts.

Inducing memory loss has long been a CIA obsession. The initial objectives included closing the minds of agents - in case they were captured - and making sure enemies who were interrogated wouldn't remember they'd been questioned. While receiving CIA funds as part of the notorious MK-ULTRA project, West, an expert in brainwashing, learned how to manipulate memories in various subjects - inducing everything from total amnesia to obsessive-compulsive fixations.

West's most notorious experiment, conducted while at the University of Oklahoma, involved killing an elephant with LSD and tranquilizers. But he also ran a secret CIA mind control lab and "treated" Jack Ruby after his murder of Lee Harvey Oswald. Subsequently, he attempted to launch a Centre for the Study and Reduction of Violence in California, hoping to incorporate treatments such as chemical castration, psychosurgery, and the use of experimental drugs. But the Centre was derailed once its methods became public.
According to false memory proponents like West, the "syndrome" - an iatrogenic (medically induced) malady - is reaching epidemic proportions. But in reality, what has actually assumed such dimensions is the problem the FMS movement seeks to discredit - sexual abuse of women and children. According to recent research, more than one out of four women has been raped. Statistics for incest are similar.

FMS activists crow about inducing those who recall abuse in therapy to recant their "objectively false" recollections. Movement literature perversely claims: "Many describe a sense of relief and comfort with their decision that their memories were false and a sense of well-being that they missed while entrenched in the memory recovery process." Thus, memories of abuse are defined as invalid. But somehow retracted memories aren't.

According to the false memory movement, many victims are actually "borderline" deviants, and the sources of whatever "false" problems they may have conjured up. And how could anyone disagree? After all, as FMSF spokesperson Pamela Freyd explains, "We are a good-looking bunch of people: greying hair, well-dressed, healthy, smiling ... about every person who has attended [an FMSF meeting] is a person you would likely find interesting and want to count as a friend."

Yet, Freyd and her husband Peter founded the movement after their daughter, Jennifer, a Ph.D. psychologist, recalled a range of childhood sexual abuses. Among other memories she recovered was one that involved Peter forcing his little girls to dance around naked with Playboy bunny tails for the amusement of his friends.

Ralph Underwager, an early member of the group's professional advisory board, let the paedophile agenda slip when he told British reporters that, according to so-called "scientific evidence," 60 percent of all women who were molested as children believed the experience was "good for them." Both he and another advisory board member, Hollida Wakefield, have publicly described paedophilia as a positive lifestyle choice. Another movement activist, Dr. Richard Gardner, blames the syndrome on "zealots" who want to "destroy every man in sight."

Supporters such as Gary Cooper, who promotes the Foundation via the Internet, claim that "modern therapy is creating phony victims of child abuse and destroying thousands of families." He describes most memories of abuse as fantasies provoked by greedy therapists, who encourage their patients "to break relationship with the family and work on these phony issues."

Thus far, the Foundation claims to have won 14 court cases, largely through the efforts of movement ideologue Elizabeth Loftus, a psychologist and FMSF advisory board member who garners large fees for testifying as an "expert witness." Loftus has appeared on behalf of over 150 clients, most of them accused paedophiles and murderers such as serial killer Ted Bundy. In that case, a key aspect of her testimony was the inaccuracies in eyewitness identification, similar to her criticism of the recollections of abuse victims. But such inaccuracies don't necessarily mean that abuse didn't happen.

In December 1995, two women filed an ethics complaint with the American Psychological Association (APA) against Loftus, protesting her published statements about two cases involving delayed memories of sexual abuse. Although the APA declined to investigate, Loftus resigned from the association a month later. One of the women who filed the complaint, Jennifer Hoult, was awarded S$500,000 for the suffering caused by her father's incestuous abuse. During the case, her father joined the FMSF.

The movement has been defeated in court more often and more significantly than it cares to admit. Despite its efforts to discredit therapists and blame victims, many people have won civil cases against their parents and other family members on the basis of memories.
recovered in therapy. In addition, Doctor Charles Whitfield has successfully fought a civil suit brought by the Freyds, who were stung by his commentary on their theories and activities.

Research has proven that people who suffer severe abuse often "forget" it. In a "fight or flight" mode, the body produces high levels of neurochemicals that can obliterate conscious memory. While at the Allen Institute, Ewen Cameron looked into "psychic driving" as another way to accomplish the same thing.

Under high stress, the hippocampus becomes inactive and misses its chance to place a memory in the person's timeline or "memory bank." Instead, it's recorded elsewhere or "dissociated." According to Dr. Lenore Terr of the University of California's Medical School in San Francisco, "Survivors - especially those who were repeatedly hurt by people they love - frequently repress the agonizing memories until they are grown up and safely away from home."

In a very real sense, domestic survivors of CIA experimental abuse have much in common with the millions who have suffered what no child or other human being should have to endure. And this is exactly what worries the false memory movement. Fearing imminent exposure, the CIA was forced to abandon the MKULTRA project in the 60s. But the effort to manipulate minds and blame the victims didn't end; it simply moved from public institutions to cults and private foundations, facades less open to public scrutiny. As a result, the Human Ecology Fund has been replaced by groups such as the Human Potential Foundation in Falls Church, Virginia, founded by Sen. Claiborne Pell and lavishly funded by Laurence Rockefeller. In short, the patriarchal old boys network remains intact, just one more aspect of the backlash against women and children.

Husayn Al-Kurdi is a TF contributing writer and President of News International.

CIA CONNECTIONS TO THE MIND CONTROL CULTS
Excerpts from Psychic Dictatorship in the U.S.A. By Alex Constantine

Portland, OR : Feral House, 1995. From Chapter Three: THE FALSE MEMORY HOAX

Scientists in the CIA's mind control fraternity lead double lives. Many are highly respected, but if the truth were known they would be dejected by the public outcry and drummed out of their respective academic haunts. Martin T. Orne, for example, a senior CIA/Navy researcher, is based at the University of Pennsylvania's Experimental Psychiatry Laboratory. He is also an original member of the False Memory Syndrome Foundation's advisory board, a tightly-drawn coterie of psychiatrists, many with backgrounds in CIA mind control experimentation in its myriad forms. The Foundation is dedicated to denying the existence of cult mind control and child abuse. Its primary pursuit is the castigation of survivors and therapists for fabricating accusations of ritual abuse.

Dismissing cult abuse as hysteria or false memory, a common defence strategy, may relieve parents of preschool children. In a small percentage of cult abuse cases it's possible that children may be led to believe they've been victimized.

But the CIA and its cover organizations have a vested interest in blowing smoke at the cult underground because the worlds of CIA mind control and many cults merge inextricably. The drum beat of "false accusations" from the media is taken up by paid operatives like Dr. Orne and the False Memory Syndrome Foundation to conceal the crimes of the Agency.

Orne's forays into hypno-programming were financed in the 1960s by the Human Ecology Fund, a CIA cover at Cornell University and the underwriter of many of the formative mind
control experiments conducted in the U.S. and abroad, including the gruesome brain
washing and remote mind control experiments of D. Ewen Cameron at Montreal's Allen
Memorial Institute. Research specialties of the CIA's black psychiatrists included electro
shock lobotomies, drugging agents, incapacitants, hypnosis, sleep deprivation and radio
control of the brain, among hundreds of sub-projects.

The secondary source of funding for Dr. Orne's work in hypnotic suggestion and dissolution
of memory is eerie in the cult child abuse context. The voluminous files of John Marks in
Washington, D.C. (139 boxes obtained under FOIA, to be exact, two-fifths of which document
CIA interest in the occult) include an Agency report itemizing a $30,000 grant to Orne from
Human Ecology, and another $30,000 from Boston's Scientific Engineering Institute (SEI)---
another CIA funding cover, founded by Edwin Land of the Polaroid Corporation (and
supervision of the U-2 spy plane escapades). This was the year that the CIA's Office of
Research and Development (ORD) geared up a study of parapsychology and the occult. The
investigation, dubbed Project OFTEN-CHICKWIT, gave rise to the establishment of a social
"laboratory" by SEI scientists at the University of South Carolina—a college class in black
witchcraft, demonology and voodoo.

Dr. Orne, with SEI funding, marked out his own mind control corner at the University of
Pennsylvania in the early 1960s. He does not publicize his role as CIA psychiatrist. He
denies it, very plausibly. In a letter to Dr. Orne, Marks once reminded him that he'd
disavowed knowledge of his participation in one mind-wrecking experimental sub-project.
Orne later recanted, admitting that he'd been aware of the true source of funding all along.

Among psychiatrists in the CIA's mind control fraternity, Orne ranks among the most
venerable. He once boasted to Marks that he was routinely briefed on all significant CIA
behaviour modification experiments: "Why would they come to him," Martin Cannon muses
in The Controllers, which links UFO abductions to secret military research veiled by screen
memories of "alien" abduction, "unless Orne had a high security clearance and worked
extensively with the intelligence services?"

To supplement his CIA income, the influential Dr. Orne has been the donee of grants from
the Office of Naval Research and the Air Force Office of Scientific Research. "I should like
to hear," Cannon says, "what innocent explanation, if any, the Air Force has to offer to
explain their interest in post-hypnotic amnesia."

According to Army records, Orne's stomping grounds, Penn U., was a beehive of secret
experiments in the Vietnam War period. The Pentagon and CIA—under the auspices of ORD's
Steve Aldrich, a doyen of occult and parapsychological studies—conferred the Agency's most
lucrative research award upon the University of Pennsylvania to study the effects of 16
newly-concocted biochemical warfare agents on humans, including choking, blistering and
vomiting agents, toxins, poison gas and incapacitating chemicals. The tests were abruptly
halted in 1972 when the prison's medical lab burned to the ground.

Testimony before the 1977 Church Committee's probe of the CIA hinted that, as of 1963,
the scientific squalor of the CIA's mind control regimen, code-named MKULTRA, had
abandoned military and academic laboratories, fearing exposure, and mushroomed in
cities across the country. Confirmation arrived in 1980 when Joseph Holsinger, an aide to
late Congressman Leo Ryan (who was murdered by a death squad at Jonestown) exposed
the formation of eccentric religious cults by the CIA. Holsinger made the allegation at a
colloquium of psychologists in San Francisco on "Psychosocial Implications of the
Jonestown Phenomenon." Holsinger maintained that a CIA rear-support base had been in
collusion with Jones to perform medical and mind control experiments at People's Temple.
The former Congressional aide cited an essay he'd received in the mail, "The Penal Colony,"
written by a Berkeley psychologist. The author had emphasized: Rather than terminating
MKULTRA, THE CIA SHIFTED ITS PROGRAMS FROM PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS TO PRIVATE CULT
GROUPS, including the People's Temple.
Jonestown had its grey eminence in Dr. Lawrence Laird Layton of the University of California at Berkeley, formerly a chemist for the Manhattan Project and head of the Army's chemical warfare research division in the early 1950s. (Larry Layton, his son, led the death squad that murdered Congressman Leo Ryan, who'd arrived at Guyana to investigate the cult.) Michael Meiers, author of *Was Jonestown a CIA Medical Experiment?* scavenged for information on the People's Temple for six years, concluding:

"The Jonestown experiment was conceived by Dr. Layton, staffed by Dr. Layton and financed by Dr. Layton. It was as much his project as it was Jim Jones'. Though it was essential for him to remain in the background for security reasons, Dr. Layton maintained contact with and even control of the experiment through his wife and children." The African-American cult had at its core a Caucasian inner-council, composed of Dr. Layton's family and in-laws.

The press was blind to obvious CIA connections, but survivors of the carnage in Guyana followed the leads and maintained that Jim Jones was "an employee, servant, agent or operative of the Central Intelligence Agency" from 1963—the year the Agency turned to cult cut-outs to conceal MKULTRA mind control activities—until 1978. In October 1981 the survivors of Jonestown filed a $63 million lawsuit against Secretary of State Cyrus Vance and Stansfield Turner, former director of the CIA, currently a teacher at the University of Maryland and a director of the Monsanto Corporation. The suit, filed in U.S. district court in San Francisco, accused Turner of conspiring with Agency operatives to "enhance the economic and political powers of James Warren Jones," and of conducting "mind control and drug experimentation" on the Temple flock.

The suit was dismissed four months later for "failure to prosecute timely." All requests for an appeal were denied.

Ligatures of the CIA clung to the cults. Much of the violence that has since exploded across the front pages was incited by CIA academics at leading universities.

Small wonder, then, that Ted Goertzel, director of the Forum for Policy Research at Rutgers, which maintains a symbiosis with the CIA despite media exposure, should write that the most susceptible victims of "cryptomnesia" (a synonym for false memories) believe "in conspiracies, including the JFK assassination, AIDS conspiracies, as well as the UFO cover-up." The problem, Goertzel says, "may have its origins in early childhood," and is accompanied by "feelings of anomie and anxiety that make the individual more likely to construct false memories out of information stored in the unconscious mind."

This side of gilded rationalizations, the CIA's links to the cults are no manifestation of "cryptomnesia."

Like Jonestown, the Symbionese Liberation Army was a mind control creation unleashed by the Agency. The late political researcher Mae Brussell, whose study of *The Firm* commenced in 1963 after the assassination of John Kennedy, wrote in 1974 that the rabid guerrilla band "consisted predominantly of CIA agents and police informers." This unsavoury group was, Brussell insisted, "an extension of psychological experimentation projects, connected to Stanford Research Institute, Menlo Park."

(She went on to lament that "many of the current rash of 'senseless killings,' 'massacres,' and 'zombie-type murders' are committed by individuals who have been in Army hospitals, mental hospitals or prison hospitals, where their heads have been literally taken over surgically to create terror in the community.")

**DOES THIS NOT ALL SOUND JUST A LITTLE BIT FAMILIAR? DURING THIS WORK I TRY TO LET YOU MAKE ALL THE CONNECTIONS YOURSELF, BUT SOMETIMES THEY JUST JUMP UP AT YOU.**

Remember this quote above for when we get to the serial killer chapter in a little while.
Evidence that the CIA conceived and directed the SLA was obvious. The SLA leadership was trained by Colston Westbrook, a Pennsylvania native. Westbrook was a veteran of the CIA’s murderous PHOENIX Program in South Vietnam, where he trained terrorist cadres and death squads. In 1969 he took a job as an administrator of Pacific Architects and Engineers, a CIA proprietary in Southern California. Three of Westbrook’s foot soldiers, Emily and William Harris and Angela Atwood (a former police intelligence informer), had been students of the College of Foreign Affairs, a CIA cover at the University of Indiana.

Even the SLA symbol, a seven-headed cobra, had been adopted by the OSS (America’s wartime intelligence agency) and CIA to designate precepts of brainwashing.

When the smoke cleared at SLA headquarters in L.A., Dr. Martin Orne was called upon to examine Patricia Hearst in preparation for trial. The government charged that she had participated voluntarily in the SLA’s gun-toting crime spree. Orne’s was a foregone conclusion—he sided with the government. His opinion was shared by two other psychiatrists called to appraise Ms. Hearst’s state of mind, Robert Jay Lifton and Louis Jolyon West. Dr. Lifton was a co-founder of the aforementioned Human Ecology Fund. The CIA contractor that showered Orne with research grants in the 1960s. Dr. West is one of the CIA’s most notorious mind control specialists, currently director of UCLA’s Neuropsychiatric Institute. It was West who brought a score of mind control psychiatrists of the ultra-right political stripe to the UCLA campus. (Same names, same games people)

Drs. Orne, Lifton and West unanimously agreed that Patty Hearst had been “persuasively coerced” to join the SLA. She had been put through a gruelling thought reform regimen. She’d been isolated and sensory deprived, raped, humiliated, badgered, politically indoctrinated with a surrealistic mutation of Third World Marxism. Ms. Hearst was only allowed human companionship when she exhibited signs of submission. Orne and his colleagues assured that attention was narrowed to their psychologising, conveniently rendering evidence of CIA collusion extraneous to consideration by the jury.

Another psychiatrist called to testify at the trial of "Tania" surfaced with Dr. Orne in 1991 on the board of the False Memory Syndrome Foundation. (The FMSF board is almost exclusively composed of former CIA and military doctors currently employed by major universities. None have backgrounds in ritual abuse—their common interest is behaviour modification. Dr. Margaret Singer, a retired Berkeley Ph.D., studied repatriated prisoners-of-war returning from the Korean War at the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research in Maryland (1952-58).

Singer turned up in 1982 on the book jacket of Raven—the CIA’s code-name for Jim Jones—by San Francisco Examiner reporters Tim Reiterman and John Jacobs, a thoroughly-researched account of the People’s Temple that completely side-steps CIA involvement. Co-author John Jacobs was supposedly one of the country’s leading authorities on CIA mind control, a subject he studied at length for a series published by the Washington Post. Reiterman had been the Examiner reporter on the Patricia Hearst beat. Yet both writers managed to avoid obvious intelligence connections. Dr. Singer commended the book as "the definitive psychohistory of Jim Jones." Raven, she opined, conveyed "the essence of psychological and social processes that Jim Jones, the ultimate manipulator, set in motion." The true "manipulators," of course, were operatives of the CIA, and the public disinformation gambit lauded by Dr. Singer was, according to Meiers, in tune with "a concerted attempt to suppress information, stifle investigations, censor writers and manipulate public information."

Here is another “disorder” that always seems to be associated with this seemingly common triad of, paedophilia, mind control and what these people are choosing to call “Satanism”.

**DISASSOCIATIVE IDENTITY DISORDER**
What Is Disassociative Identity Disorder?

Disassociative Identity Disorder (DID) is a severe dissociative disorder that involves a disturbance in both the memory and identity of an individual. The individual uses defence mechanisms involving splitting, idealization, devaluation, denial and/or taking on the personality of another in order to cope with trauma experienced in childhood.

- 9 times more women than men receive therapy for DID
- 97% of the individuals with Disassociative Identity Disorder have been physically and/or sexually abused
- an individual with Disassociative Identity Disorder develops an average of 8 – 13 personalities
- There are three factors which determine if a person has Disassociative Identity Disorder:
  - Two or more personalities exist within the individual – each is dominant at certain times.
  - The dominant personality determines the individual's behaviour.
  - Each individual personality is complex and integrated with its own unique behaviour patterns and social relationships.

What Causes Disassociative Identity Disorder?

Multiple personalities are formed through dissociation. Dissociation occurs when an individual splits with their primary personality (also known as the "host" personality) and develops a secondary personality in their subconscious. The dissociative splitting of the self into two or more personalities usually occurs in childhood due to extreme physical, sexual and/or psychological abuse. In most cases the existence of Disassociative Identity Disorder represents an attempt by the child to deal with overwhelmingly negative events in their life. The ongoing abuse experienced by the child somehow increases their capacity to detach themselves, compartmentalizing life's trauma into autonomous units rather than a blended whole. When a particularly abusive experience becomes unbearable the highly hypnotizable child simply exercises their capacity for self-hypnosis, to go to sleep, as it were, and allow another person to emerge who can handle the situation better. In many ways the altered personality of abused children resemble the imaginary friends that "normal" children describe—externalized versions of cartoon figures, superheroes or animals; however, what begins as a protective fantasy is kept within until the individual with Disassociative Identity Disorder becomes that character.

What Are The Symptoms?

Most people with Disassociative Identity Disorder start to show signs in their 20’s and 30’s.

It is not uncommon for an individual with Disassociative Identity Disorder to experience many of the following characteristic symptoms:

- Auditory or visual hallucinations
- Sense that one's body is being transformed or changed
- Feeling like one is in a daze—going into a trance
- Feelings of confusion and/or disorientation
- Feeling one's thoughts are out of control
- Vocalizing words one did not think or utter
- Difficulty understanding others
- Depression
Multiple suicide attempts
Severe anxiety attacks and/or numerous phobias
An inability to maintain stable relationships
Physically damaging acts such as cutting oneself
Due to the various debilitating symptoms, the "host" personality gets to a point where they feel they need to get some kind of help.

Approaches to Recovery

Despite the complexity and severity of Disassociative Identity Disorder, identifying and diagnosing it is the most difficult obstacle to recovery. It is common for people seeking treatment for their confusion and amnesia to be treated for secondary symptoms like depression and anxiety before a proper diagnosis is made. However, once the individual with Disassociative Identity Disorder is teamed with a specialist who employs special therapeutic techniques, about 80% of the people with Disassociative Identity Disorder recover.

The goal of the therapy usually consists of placing the individual into a self-induced hypnotic trance and reliving, in the character of each of the personalities, the significant traumatic events in his or her life. The therapist guides this process and eventually helps the individual integrate all their memories into a gradually developing central consciousness. The individual does not lose the other personalities; rather they become part of the whole person. Once the individual begins to remember and deal with their history, they no longer need the alternate personality. The process of therapy for adults is long and difficult, often taking 3 - 5 years.

Satanic subversion of the U.S. Military
by Jeffrey Steinberg

Double-Cross.com

On February 5, 1999, in U.S. District Court in Lincoln, Nebraska, an extraordinary hearing occurred in Paul A. Bonacci v. Lawrence E. King, a civil action in which the plaintiff charged that he had been ritualistically abused by the defendant, as part of a nationwide paedophile ring linked to powerful political figures in Washington and to elements of the U.S. military and intelligence establishment. Three weeks later, on February 27, Judge Warren K. Urbom ordered King, who is currently in Federal prison, to pay $1 million in damages to Bonacci, in what Bonacci's attorney John DeCamp said was a clear signal that "the evidence presented was credible."

During the February 5 hearing, Noreen Gosch stunned the court with sworn testimony linking U.S. Army Lt. Col. Michael Aquino (ret.) to the nationwide paedophile ring. Her son, Johnny, then 12 years old, was kidnapped off the streets of West Des Moines, Iowa on September 5, 1982, while he was doing his early-morning newspaper deliveries. Since his kidnapping, she has devoted all of her time and resources to finding her son, and to exposing the dangers that millions of children in American face from this hideous, literally satanic underground of ritualistic deviants.

"We have investigated, we have talked to so far 35 victims of this said organization that took my son and is responsible for what happened to Paul, and they can verify everything that has happened," she told the court.

"What this story involves is an elaborate function, I will say, that was an offshoot of a government program. The MK-Ultra program was developed in the 1950s by the CIA. It was used to help spy on other countries during the Cold War because they felt that the other countries were spying on us.
"It was very successful. They could do it very well."

Then, the Aquino bombshell: "Well, then there was a man by the name of Michael Aquino. He was in the military. He had top Pentagon clearances. He was a paedophile. He was a Satanist. He's founded the Temple of Set. And he was a close friend of Anton LaVey. The two of them were very active in ritualistic sexual abuse. And they deferred funding from this government program to use [in] this experimentation on children.

"Where they deliberately split off the personalities of these children into multiples, so that when they're questioned or put under oath or questioned under lie detector, that unless the operator knows how to question a multiple-personality disorder, they turn up with no evidence."

She continued: "They used these kids to sexually compromise politicians or anyone else they wish to have control of. This sounds so far out and so bizarre I had trouble accepting it in the beginning myself until I was presented with the data. We have the proof. In black and white."

Under questioning from DeCamp, Gosch reported: "I know that Michael Aquino has been in Iowa. I know that Michael Aquino has been to Offutt Air Force Base [a Strategic Air Command base, near Omaha, which was linked to King's activities]. I know that he has had contact with many of these children."

Paul Bonacci, who was simultaneously a victim and a member of the nationwide paedophile crime syndicate, has subsequently identified Aquino as the man who ordered the kidnapping of Johnny Gosch. In his February 5 testimony, Bonacci referred to the mastermind of the Gosch abduction as "the Colonel."

A second witness who testified at the February 5 hearing, Rusty Nelson, was King's personal photographer. He later described to EIR another incident which linked King to Aquino, while the Army special forces officer was still on active reserve duty. Some time in the late 1980s, Nelson was with King at a posh hotel in downtown Minneapolis, when he personally saw King turn over a suitcase full of cash and bearer-bonds to "the Colonel," who he later positively identified as Aquino. According to Nelson, King told him that the suitcase of cash and bonds was earmarked for the Nicaraguan Contras, and that "the Colonel" was part of the covert Contra support apparatus, otherwise associated with Lt. Col. Oliver North, Vice President George Bush, and the "secret parallel government" that they ran from the White House.

Just who is Lt. Col. Michael Aquino (ret.), and what does the evidence revealed in a Nebraska court hearing say about the current state of affairs inside the U.S. military? Is the Aquino case some kind of weird aberration that slipped off the Pentagon radar screen?

Not in the least.

Aquino, Satan and the U.S. military

Throughout much of the 1980s, Aquino was at the centre of a controversy involving the Pentagon's acquiescence to outright Satanic practices inside the military services. Aquino was also a prime suspect in a series of paedophile scandals involving the sexual abuse of hundreds of children, including the children of military personnel serving at the Presidio U.S. Army station in the San Francisco Bay Area. Furthermore, even as Aquino was being investigated by Army Criminal Investigation Division officers for involvement in the paedophile cases, he was retaining highest-level security clearances, and was involved in pioneering work in military psychological operations ("psy-ops").

On August 14, 1987, San Francisco police raided Aquino's Russian Hill home, which he shared with his wife Lilith. The raid was in response to allegations that the house had been the scene of a brutal rape of a four-year-old girl. The principal suspect in the rape, a Baptist
minister named Gary Hambrigt, was indicted in September 1987 on charges that he committed "lewd and lascivious acts" with six boys and four girls, ranging in age from three to seven years, during September-October 1986. At the time of the alleged sex crimes, Hambrigt was employed at a child care centre on the U.S. Army base at Presidio. At the time of Hambrigt's indictment, the San Francisco police charged that he was involved in at least 58 separate incidents of child sexual abuse.

According to an article in the October 30, 1987 San Francisco Examiner, one of the victims had identified Aquino and his wife as participants in the child rape. According to the victim, the Aquinos had filmed scenes of the child being fondled by Hambrigt in a bathtub. The child's description of the house, which was also the headquarters of Aquino's Satanic Temple of Set, was so detailed, that police were able to obtain a search warrant. During the raid, they confiscated 38 videotapes, photo negatives, and other evidence that the home had been the hub of a paedophile ring, operating in and around U.S. military bases.

Aquino and his wife were never indicted in the incident. Aquino claimed that he had been in Washington at the time, enrolled in a year-long reserve officers course at the National Defence University, although he did admit that he made frequent visits back to the Bay Area and to his church/home. The public flap over the Hambrigt indictment did prompt the U.S. Army to transfer Aquino from the Presidio, where he was the deputy director of reserve training, to the U.S. Army Reserve Personnel Centre in St. Louis.

On April 19, 1988, the ten-count indictment against Hambrigt was dropped by U.S. Attorney Joseph Russoniello, on the grounds that, while there was clear evidence of child abuse (six of the children contracted the venereal disease, chlamydia), there was insufficient evidence to link Hambrigt (or the Aquinos) to the crimes. Parents of several of the victims charged that Russoniello's actions proved that "the Federal system has broken down in not being able to protect the rights of citizens age three to eight."

Russoniello would later be implicated in efforts to cover up the links between the Nicaraguan Contras and South American cocaine-trafficking organizations, raising deeper questions about whether the decision not to prosecute Hambrigt and Aquino had "national security implications."

Indeed, on April 22, 1989, the U.S. Army sent letters to the parents of at least 56 of the children believed to have been molested by Hambrigt, urging them to have their children tested for the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), because Hambrigt, a former daycare centre worker, was reported to be a carrier.

On May 13, 1989, the San Jose Mercury reported that Aquino and his wife had been recently questioned by Army investigators about charges of child molestation by the couple in two northern California counties, Sonoma and Mendocino. A 9-year-old girl in Santa Rosa, California, and an 11-year-old boy in Fort Bragg, also in California, separately identified Aquino as the rapist in a series of 1985 incidents, after they had seen him on television.

Satanic subversion of the U.S. Military by Jeffrey Steinberg

Softies on Satan

When the San Francisco Chronicle contacted Army officials at the Presidio to find out if Aquino's security clearances had been lifted as the result of the paedophile investigations, the reporters were referred to the Pentagon, where Army spokesman Maj. Greg Rixon told them, "The question is whether he is trustworthy or can do the job. There is nothing that would indicate in this case that there is any problem we should be concerned about."

Indeed, the Pentagon had already given its de facto blessings to Aquino's long-standing public association with the Church of Satan and his own successor "church," the Temple of Set. This, despite the fact that Aquino's Satanic activities involved overt support for neo-Nazi movements in the United States and Europe. On October 10, 1983, while travelling in West
Germany on "official NATO business," Aquino had staged a Satanic "working" at the Wewelsburg Castle in Bavaria. Aquino wrote a lengthy account of the ritual, in which he invoked Nazi SS chief Heinrich Himmler: "As the Wewelsburg was conceived by Heinrich Himmler to be the 'Mittelpunkt der Welt' (Middle of the World), and as the focus of the Hall of the Dead was to be the Gate of that Centre, to summon the Powers of Darkness at their most powerful locus."

As early as April 1978, the U.S. Army had circulated A Handbook for Chaplains "to facilitate the provision of religious activities." Both the Church of Satan and the Temple of Set were listed among the "other" religions to be tolerated inside the U.S. military. A section of the handbook dealing with Satanism stated, "Often confused with witchcraft, Satanism is the worship of Satan (also known as Baphomet or Lucifer). Classical Satanism, often involving 'black masses,' human sacrifices, and other sacrilegious or illegal acts, is now rare. Modern Satanism is based on both the knowledge of ritual magick and the 'anti-establishment' mood of the 1960s. It is related to classical Satanism more in image than substance, and generally focuses on 'rational self-interest with ritualistic trappings.'

Not so fast! In 1982, the Temple of Set fissured over the issue of Aquino's emphasis on Nazism. One leader, Ronald K. Barrett, shortly after his expulsion, wrote that Aquino had "taken the Temple of Set in an explicitly Satanic direction, with strong overtones of German National Socialist Nazi occultism ... One fatality has occurred within the Temple membership during the period covered May 1982-July 1983."

The handbook quoted 'Nine Satanic Statements' from the Church of Satan, without comment. 'Statement Seven,' as quoted in the handbook, read, "Satan represents man as just another animal, sometimes better, more often worse than those that walk on all fours, who, because of his 'divine and intellectual development' has become the most vicious animal of all."

From 'psy-ops' to 'mindwars'

Aquino's steady rise up the hierarchy of the Satanic world closely paralleled his career advances inside the U.S. military. According to an official biography circulated by the Temple of Set, "Dr. Aquino is High Priest and chief executive officer of the Temple of Set, the nation's principal Satanic church, in which he holds the degree of Ipissimus VI. He joined the original Church of Satan in 1969, becoming one of its chief officials by 1975 when the Temple of Set was founded. In his secular profession he is a Lieutenant Colonel, Military Intelligence, U.S. Army, and is qualified as a Special-Forces officer, Civil Affairs officer, and Defence Attaché. He is a graduate of the Command and General Staff College, the National Defence University and the Defence Intelligence College, and the State Departments' Foreign Service Institute."

Indeed, a more detailed curriculum vitae that Aquino provided to EIR, dated March 1989, claimed that he had gotten his doctorate at the University of California at Santa Barbara in 1980, with his dissertation on "The Neutron Bomb." He listed 16 separate military schools that he attended during 1968-87, including advanced courses in "Psychological Operations" at the JFK Special Warfare Centre at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, and "Strategic Intelligence" at the Defence Intelligence College, at Bolling Air Force Base in Washington, D.C.

Aquino was deeply involved in what has been called the "revolution in military affairs" ('RMA'), the introduction of the most kooky 'Third Wave,' "New Age" ideas into military long-range planning, which introduced such notions as "information warfare" and "cyber-warfare" into the Pentagon's lexicon.

In the early 1980s, at the same time that Heidi and Alvin Toffler were spinning their Tavistock "Third Wave" utopian claptrap to some top Air Force brass, Aquino and another U.S. Army colonel, Paul Vallely, were co-authoring an article for Military Review. Although the article was never published in the journal, the piece was widely circulated among
military planners, and was distributed by Aquino's Temple of Set. The article, titled "From PSYOP to Mindwar: The Psychology of Victory," endorsed some of the ideas published in a 1980 Military Review article by Lt. Col. John Alexander, an affiliate of the Stanford Research Institute, a hotbed of Tavistock Institute and Frankfurt School "New Age" social engineering.

Aquino and Vallely called for an explicitly Nietzschean form of warfare, which they dubbed "mindwar." "Like the sword Excalibur," they wrote, "we have but to reach out and seize this tool; and it can transform the world for us if we have but the courage and the integrity to guide civilization with it. If we do not accept Excalibur, then we relinquish our ability to inspire foreign cultures with our morality. If they then devise moralities unsatisfactory to us, we have no choice but to fight them on a more brutish level."

And what is "mindwar?" "The term is harsh and fear-inspiring," Aquino wrote. "And it should be: It is a term of attack and victory-not one of rationalization and coaxing and conciliation. The enemy may be offended by it; that is quite all right as long as he is defeated by it. A definition is offered: Mindwar is the deliberate, aggressive convincing of all participants in a war that we will win that war."

For Aquino, "mindwar" is a permanent state of strategic psychological warfare against the populations of friend and foe nations alike. "In its strategic context, mindwar must reach out to friends, enemies and neutrals alike across the globe ... through the media possessed by the United States which have the capabilities to reach virtually all people on the face of the Earth. These media are, of course, the electronic media-television and radio. State of the art developments in satellite communication, video recording techniques, and laser and optical transmission of broadcasts make possible a penetration of the minds of the world such as would have been inconceivable just a few years ago." Above all else, Aquino argues, mindwar must target the population of the United States, "by denying enemy propaganda access to our people, and by explaining and emphasizing to our people the rationale for our national interest. ... Rather it states a whole truth that, if it does not now exist, will be forced into existence by the will of the United States."
more accurately addressed as "Behaviour Control;" one leads to the other. Accommodating simplicity and common understanding, the term "Mind Control" will be used as a synonym for "Behaviour Control."

The topic of "Mind Control" has been the subject of university laboratories, Madison Avenue marketing firms, intelligence services, warfare planning (psyops), pharmaceutical developments, electronic experimentation, psychiatry and medical advances. In brief, "Mind Control" is as factual as the TV set; alive, functional and ever-evolving.

The topic of "Mind Control" is understandably complex. Few doubt the effect of simple propaganda, as evidenced in various wars. Unfortunately, one of the success elements of "Mind Control" is the disdain of those who resist thinking about the topic. Yet, with such horrors as the Nazi applications during W.W. II, the topic of "Mind Control" is highly pertinent to the general public. Specifically, the general public repeatedly asks how a civilized people could possibly commit such well-documented atrocities.

Current (2006) American politics and warfare confront the "Mind Control" issue, head-on. Ignorance, apathy and denial are a deadly combination. "Mind Control" is a function of a variety of descriptors and applications. Most commonly, the term 'Psyops' (Psychological Operations) is used.

However repugnant, the history of the W.W. II Nazis is the most common association of the horrors against the human race. The Nazi horrors were not unique in history, simply the most advertised. As an example of Mind Control," Israel, depends on that particular advertisement, for U.S. foreign aid. Yet, the "Nazi" issue remains the best example, by virtue of its popularly known history.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF AUTHORITY AND PERCEPTION, VERSUS RESPONSE

In order to understand the mystery of seemingly blind compliance to authority, there is perhaps no better sample of human nature than the 1961 experiments on "Obedience to Authority," conducted by Dr. Stanley Milgram, (remember him dear reader?) a psychologist at Yale University. His studies were spawned by the recent trial and execution of Adolph Eichmann. The results were posted in Milgram's "Obedience to Authority: An Experimental View" (1974). (I know we have covered this but sometimes it's good to look at stuff again)

Milgram focused on the propensity for obedience to authority, versus the role of personal conscience. His work was in consequence of the rationalizations and justifications for the Nazi acts of genocide – as offered by the accused at the World War II, Nuremberg War Crime trials. The perpetrators' defence was typically based on "obedience" - claiming that they were "... just obeying orders" under the authority of their superiors. However weak the claim may have appeared, it was firmly believed, by the accused. In particular, the Nazi perpetrators were well educated and members of the German aristocracy.

The Eichmann trial stirred the question as to how easy it would be for 'good' and educated (American) people (college degree) to be conditioned to commit even murder – in exchange for simple "acceptance and approval." What if Eichmann, and his accomplices were, in fact, "...just following orders."

More directly, the Milgram study demonstrated the propensity for people to submit to even 'mild,' even "presumed" authority – let alone threat or even internal fears. (Not even notable amounts of money were required.) The psychiatrists of the day forecast that 2% of any population would be compliant – the 'sickos;' the Milgram Study demonstrated 65%!
The setup of the experiment called for so-called "teachers" (unknowing subjects of the experiment) to be recruited by a newspaper ad offering $4.50 for one hour's work. The 'price' is worth noting. The recruits all had college degrees. It is also worth noting that the setup time was remarkably brief; there was no extensive 'conditioning' required. Both of these factors attest to an apparent pre-disposition for submission to "perceived" authority. The experiments would remind most of the TV series, "The Twilight Zone."

The volunteer 'teachers' thought that they were recruited to take part in a psychology experiment investigating memory and learning. The recruits were introduced to a stern looking 'experimenter,' dressed in a white lab coat; as well as an ordinary and pleasant co-subject (actor, in fact) who was presumably recruited via the same newspaper ad. The true subject ("teacher") was assigned to direct the 'learning' of the other 'volunteer; using electric shocks as a learning motivator.

The teacher-recruit was led to believe that he/she had been chosen randomly, to be a scientific 'teacher.'

Both the actor and the 'teacher' were given a 'sample' 45-volt electric shock, to set the realism of the 'stage.' The "teachers" were told that the experiment was designed to explore the effect of punishment, to prompt correct responses for manufacturing learning behaviour.

The 'teachers' were advised that the electric shocks were to be of increased by 15 volts, for each mistake that the 'student' made during the experiment.

The 'teachers' control panel had 3 switches, clearly labelled in 15 volt increments; ranging from 15 volts, up to the maximum of 450 volts. Each switch also had a rating label, incrementing from 'slight shock' to "danger: severe shock". The final two switches were additionally labelled 'XXX'. Thus, the subject could not be the least bit ignorant of the potential consequences of his/her deeds.

The experiment environment had the 'student' in another room; with the 'teacher' made aware of the 'actor-student's' discomfort by poundings on the wall.

The actors ("students") pretended to be stupid, seemingly requiring (deserving) increasing shocks – feigning pain, misery and unconsciousness. The "teachers" abided by the background 'authority' until they were doing the deeds of sadists & murderers – a convincing simulation, of course.

In reality, no further shocks were actually delivered. Again, the 'teacher' was unaware that the 'student' in the study was actually an actor who would use his talents to fake increasing levels of discomfort; as the 'teacher' administered what he/she assumed were increasingly severe electric shocks, for the supposed mistakes made by the 'student'.

The 'experimenter,' with the white lab coat, was in the same room as the 'teacher.' Whenever the 'teachers' asked whether the increased shocks should be delivered, he or she was verbally encouraged by the experimenter to continue.

Amazingly, the test subjects didn't question as to why the 'experimenter' needed a surrogate, in the first place.

Using actors as the student-victims, the actual test subjects ("teachers") were directed to ask questions of a presumed 'student,' sitting in a sealed booth, with the "teacher" delivering increasing electrical shocks, if the 'student' got the wrong answer. A presumed torturous-fatal electric shock was incrementally delivered, by 65% of the unwitting
"teachers," punishing the student to the very end of the 450-volt scale! No 'teacher' stopped before reaching 300 volts!

Worried 'teachers' did question the 'experimenter,' asking who was responsible for any harmful effects. It is worth noting that the primary concern was personal accountability, versus the welfare of the perceived victim. The 'experimenter' assumed full responsibility, with the 'teachers' accepting the response as adequate; then continued shocking their 'student,' even though some of the 'teachers' were obviously extremely uncomfortable with their deeds.

Return to another fact of life – cultures hide the fact that in times of crisis, people have a third choice, beyond 'fight-or-flight; specifically, 'Submission.' (Consider the rape victim!)

In the Milgram study, the test subjects were unwittingly submitting to rather mild coercion of their 'handlers.' They assumed that they were factually torturing – even killing – the 'students,' preferring the acceptance-approval of their handlers, to their basic personal values and even morality, itself. They questioned, but with mild coercion, they complied with 'authority.'

From Milgram's 'The Perils of Obedience' (1974), it is learned that Milgram solicited predictions on the outcome, from various ranges of people; including psychiatrists, faculty in the behavioural sciences, graduate students, college sophomores and even middle-class adults. Those polled reliably predicted that virtually all of the chosen subjects ('teachers') would refuse to obey the experimenter. The psychiatrists, predicted that most subjects would not go beyond 150 volt level, when the actor-victim made the first explicit demand to go free. The psychiatrists expected only 4 percent of the 'teachers' to continue to the simulated 300 volt level, estimating that only a pathological personality (one in a thousand) would administer the highest voltage.

The Milgram Experiment was continued in a number of variable scenarios; such as the 'student' indicating discomfort by way of voice feedback (versus pounding on the walls of his 'chamber') – starting at the "150 volt" level. At that point, the 'actor-victim' requested that the experiment be ended. The 'teacher' was consistently told by the experimenter that - 'The experiment requires that you continue. Please go on.' or verbiage, to that effect. In that scenario, the percentage of 'teachers' who were prepared to administer the maximum of 450 volts, dropped slightly - to only 62.5%. Desperate verbiage, versus pounding on the walls, made little difference.

The environment of the experiment was considered, as well. The surroundings of the experiments seemed to cast an "aura of authority," as well. When the environment of the experiment was conducted in a nondescript office building – versus within the walls of a prestigious and ornate hall on Yale's campus - the percentage of 'teachers' who were prepared to administer the maximum voltage dropped to 47.5%.

Immediate environment also played a key role, demonstrating the 'personal' role of authority "proximity," In one environment, the 'experimenter' was at end of a phone line; versus being present in the same room as the 'teacher. In this scenario, the percentage of 'teachers' who were prepared to administer the 450 volt shock dropped to 20.5%. In another scenario, the 'teacher' could independently elect the magnitude of the shock level; in that scenario, the percentage of 'teachers' who were prepared to continue to the extreme of the scale dropped to 2.5%.

That scenario, in particular, clearly demonstrated the role of "authority," as the major influence over the behaviour of the subjects, given that the test subjects' performance otherwise fell into the predicted range of the psychiatrists.
Return to another idea – that the radical majority of any population lives in response to their "Sacred Illusions." The spouse would NEVER cheat, one’s child could NEVER grossly misbehave. We all have such illusions.

Thus in the Milgram Experiment, the "Sacred Illusion" was that once agreeing to take on the task, the subject was committed/compelled to submit to authority – and not much of it – even to the extreme of presumed sadism/murder.

What is not addressed, to any adequate degree, is the role of "accountability" – factual or 'assumed.' By any account of history, the subservience contained the assumption that ‘authority’ served as a firewall, between the deeds of the performer, versus such accountability as criminal prosecution. The seeming ‘chain-of-command,’ obviously presupposes a ‘chain-of-accountability.’

In particular, in the Milgram experiments, the presumed "authority" to commit sadism and even murder, was a simple verbal assertion, 'I am responsible; you are not.' To the ordinary person, it staggers the imagination that college educated people could be that naïve/compliant. Clearly most are.

Milgram’s experiments tested how much pain an ordinary, well educated, citizen would inflict on another person; upon being ordered to so, by an experimental scientist. In those experiments, 'apparent authority' was tested against the strongest moral imperatives forbidding hurting another.

Even with the ‘teachers' hearing screams of the 'victims,' authority won more often than not – 65% of the time, in optimum conditions. The experiments demonstrated the willingness of ordinary and educated adults to comply with the command of "perceived authority."

Next one must ask what the uneducated person might do, as well as those with a known history of social deviance.

Ironically, the Milgram "obedience to authority" experiments preceded the Viet Nam War, with its bizarre rationalizations, and millions of American soldiers "...just following orders." Tragically, the American soldiers suffered the fate of lepers, when returning home. More tragically, no lessons were learned by the American public, versus the nefarious minds of the American military and related corporate players.

Milgram had plenty of company. The "Milgram Experiment" has been repeated around the world with similar results.

It must be particularly noted that there is an implied risk-reward factor in such cases. 65% of Milgram’s subjects essentially murdered for $4.50!

The significance of that figure indicates implies that money is GENERALLY a minor concern. However, money can be made to be a factor. As starving graduate student may 'hurry-up' if $100 was offered, if the experiment was concluded in ½ hour; with verbal taunting by his ‘experimenter.’ What is the reasonable estimate of an ‘experimenter’ asking, 'Do you want to ask questions, or do you want to get paid – and how much? The clock is ticking.'

Thus, it must be observed that if the ‘65% percentile can be rather easily stirred into sadism & murder, what does it take to get 95% of a given population to submit to the acceptance of propaganda – and a mandate for just ‘silence?’

Where do such experiments lead?
THE STANFORD PRISON EXPERIMENT

Stanford psychology Professor Philip Zimbardo, said to be a high school classmate of Milgram, took the issue of simple "authority" to the level of "power over others," in his 1971 "Experimental Prison" study. (Yep you've been here before too, but now you are actually learning the true reason that I brought it up in the first place).

The essence of that experiment demonstrated the propensity for ‘normal’ people to succumb to primal deviant behaviour. Of particular note is that the director of that experiment, Professor Philip Zimbardo, fell prey, as well. It took his soon-to-be wife, to shock him back to a civilized mindset.

While the ‘experiment’ was intended to be a simple role-playing observation platform; the players - and the researchers - ‘psycho-morphed’ into a deviant mindset, as though passing through a time-warp; into another solar system. Again, the primary mechanism was 'Perception Control.'

In the "Stanford Prison Experiment," the distinction must be made between ‘externally incited’ perception, versus spontaneous self-perception. As with the Milgram experiments, environment played a dominant role.

Zimbardo's stated reason for conducting the experiment was to examine the ‘power’ of such variables as roles, regulations, group identities, symbols and "...situational validation of behaviour," which would probably repulse and disgust the ordinary individual.

In the background of the "prison" experiment, Zimbardo previously conducted research on what he described as "...de-individuation, vandalism and dehumanization:" in an attempt to illustrate how easily that ordinary people could be incited to engage in anti-social acts. The associated environment of the earlier experiments embraced situations where the participating individual felt anonymous, or wherein they could perceive others to be less than 'human,' as 'enemies' or even 'objects.'

In the subsequent/consequent "prison" experiment, 70 young men were "arrested." Most were college students, paid $15 a day for two weeks.

The brief duration of the experiment is highly significant, relative to the noted transformation of character.

The participants volunteered as subjects for an experiment on prison life; advertised by a local paper. They were put through the expected interviews and a battery of psychological tests. Twenty-four of those ‘arrested,’ deemed to be the most normal, average and healthy, were selected. They were assigned randomly, as either ‘guards’ or ‘prisoners’. The "prisoners" were booked at a real jail, blindfolded and driven to the college campus makeshift prison.

Bear in mind, that the players (test subjects) ALL were consciously aware that the mission was role-playing; not reality. Yet, in the fashion of "Lord of the Flies," they devised their own social value system.

The ‘guards’ were issued uniforms; instructed not to use violence. They were told that their job was to maintain control over the prison.

On the second day of the experiment, the ‘prisoners’ staged a revolt. Once the ‘guards’ had crushed the rebellion, the ‘guards’ spontaneously increased coercive aggression tactics, against the ‘prisoners.’ Their tactics included the humiliation and dehumanization of the
‘prisoners.’ In consequence, the college staff had to frequently admonish the ‘guards’ against such tactics.

In particular, the worst noted instances of abuse took place in the middle of the night, when the guards believed that the college staff was not watching over the experiment. The treatment of the prisoners went to such tactics as forcing the ‘prisoners’ to clean out toilet bowls with their bare hands; acting out degrading scenarios. The ‘guards’ also urged the ‘prisoners’ to become snitches. The loss of control caused the college staff to note the extreme stress reactions, forcing the release of five prisoners, one per day, prematurely.

PERSONALITY DIVERGENCE

During the experiment, Zimbardo’s fiancée, Dr. Christina Maslach, began her observation of the experiment, starting the evening of the fifth day. Her role was to conduct subject interviews. In her words, she initially found it “dull and boring.”

During her assignment, she encountered what was described as a pleasant conversation with a "charming, funny, smart" young man awaiting the start his guard work shift. Independently, other researchers had previously advised her that they were watching a particularly sadistic ‘guard,’ nicknamed by both prisoners and the other guards as "John Wayne." Dr. Maslach later discovered that ‘John Wayne’ was the same young man that she had previously talked with.

The "compartmentalization" was extreme. In his "John Wayne" role, the person radically transformed; even speaking with a Southern accent. Even his body motions were different, as was his interaction with the ‘prisoners.’ She said, "It was like [seeing] Jekyll and Hyde. . . . It really took my breath away."

It was clear that this ‘guard’ had gone to the adaptive extreme of inventing his own mythology, even in a known ‘make-believe’ world. His dissociative adaptation served as a firewall, between his actions and his conscience; even in a known time-limited environment. That, in turn, empowered his actions. Again, he was consciously aware that he was in a role-playing experiment – only.

Christina described that several prisoners engaged "John Wayne" in a debate; accusing him of enjoying his job. He claimed that he wasn't really like that; that he was just playing his assigned role. One ‘prisoner’ challenged "John Wayne" on the matter, citing the history that he had tripped him earlier, as he was taking the prisoner down the hall to the bathroom. The ‘prisoner’ addressed the fact that no researchers were around to witness the treatment, indicating that the act came out of "John Wayne's" true character and disposition. "John Wayne" defended himself, insisting (rationalizing) that if he let up, his role wouldn't remain powerful.

Maslach described that she became sick to her stomach, while observing the ‘guards’ marching ‘prisoners,’ with paper bags over their heads, to the bathroom. She reported that her fellow researchers teased her about her reaction. Given the nature of the experiment and the credentials of the researchers, the divergence in ‘professional’ attitude is no small indicator.

After a later emotional encounter with her fiancé, Zimbardo was forced back to reality, becoming aware of the transformation of the researchers, ‘guards’ and ‘prisoners,’ alike. Thus, the experiment was terminated, given Maslach’s illumination of the matter of "professional accountability."

Maslach married Zimbardo in 1972.
Automatically, one’s mind goes to the Iraq Abu Ghraib scandal; questioning how such events could happen, against such well-known studies as Milgram and Zimbardo; let alone the known Nazi horrors of W.W. II. There is a reasonable presumption that such would be far beneath the dignity of American troops.

However, it should not be lost that the deeds were not only admitted by the Pentagon and White House (with extreme reluctance), but were defended, with an insistence that the U.S. forces had a unique "right" to conduct torture, certainly levels of coercion, which clearly violated the Geneva Conventions. The world ignored the Geneva Conventions' prohibition on the military use of penitentiaries; the prison use continued.

It should be noted, also, that Abu Ghraib was not the first, nor the exclusive location of such atrocities. Among other matters, the U.S. forces had bombed an Afghan POW facility, during the Johnny Spann / John Walker Lindh debacle, at Mazir I Sharif. Such was a grievous violation of the Geneva Conventions.

Yet, what does the global public believe?

EXTREME CONDITIONING

Next, go to the study of W.W. I "shell shock" and the near-zombies which that effect produced – as studied by the Tavistock Institute. Next, visit the LSD and amphetamine studies of the CIA's "MKULTRA" project. Move onward, to the sciences of Propaganda, Psychological Operations and "Coercive Persuasion" (Jonestown tactics).

One quickly arrives at the ease of manufacturing a "Manchurian Candidate!" Oswald, Ruby, Sirhan, James Earl Ray, McVeigh; there are plenty of examples in the USA, alone. However, these will be more astutely observed as "Manchurian Patsies."

The suggestion is that a reliable transformation process is available, which begins with the "shock" of hallucinogens; followed by a regimen of amphetamines, hypnosis and reinforcement methods; possibly to the extreme of drug addiction to amphetamines, in particular.

THE ROLE OF "PERCEPTION CONTROL"

"Perception Control = Emotional Control = Mind Control"

"Control" is the operative term. Is information presented with frequent repetition and passion? Or; is information kept totally secret - or prejudicially enshrouded with shame ("A ‘good' person wouldn't go there")?

Is the "controlled" information factual, or has an illusion been created? The American media re-packaged the Muslims in the Balkan region as "Ethnic Albanians," ignoring the Islamic role and their association with both bin Laden and the CIA. No one of prominence questioned the descriptor. Overnight a previously unheard of organization, "The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe" (OSCE) "recognized" new Balkan countries – instantly admitted into NATO. Thereafter, Yugoslavia’s put-down of an internal rebellion was re-packaged as an attack against a NATO member & the Balkan War was on. The "Serbs" were attempting to return to their traditional Balkan homes, in the fashion of Jews returning to modern Israel. The media re-packaged their attempts as some form of invasion & the war progressed against Yugoslavia.
In the end, the 'new' nations borrowed billions from the International Funds & all sins were forgiven. The illusions worked! It was all a matter of "Controlled Perception." The 'new' nations were now 'controlled' through the banking system.

America was content to believe (perceive) that they had rescued the deserving and victimized "Ethnic Albanians," who made a good living smuggling heroin out of Afghanistan. America didn't figure out the last part. By any rational logic, when the Taliban shut down the associated opium production; 9-11 was "on."

"Perception" implies "impressionability;" does factually presented information penetrate the psyche of the intended audience? If American War Crimes are broadcast in Swahili; will the message 'reach' the exposed American audience? Extremely unlikely – even when translated into English.

Perception is also a function of "registration," or "depth of consciousness." Senator Warner reported on "Larry King" that the Afghan high-altitude food drops were practiced for nearly a year, before taking place over Afghanistan. How many spotted the time-line, asking why the drops were practiced for nearly a year PRIOR to 9-11? The presented information didn't "register."

"Perception" is also a function of resistance to 'registration.' - "denial." All the clues in the world point to 9-11 being an inside-job; yet, few on the planet will tolerate the information to penetrate their belief system. Just the suspicion alone, results in global "shell shock" being effected.

The sum of trustworthy post 9-11 information points to American War Crimes, in the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq. The thought is too horrible for most to tolerate – "denial" takes the day; "registration" will be minimal. The elements of 'time,' 'distance' and 'shielding' protect against the exposure to horrible facts.

"Perception Control" also relies on the element of "identification." A tribal leader in Africa commits genocide on a rival tribe – to the tune of millions of deaths. "America" can't 'identify' with the problem; little is said or done. With racial apartheid being reversed in Africa; war, civil war, starvation and the AIDS epidemic deny Caucasian "identification;" Africa has been cleared to die, save some profitable enterprises, benefiting American corporations - whether drug companies, diamond & mineral companies or arms dealers.

Conversely, with the coverage of 9-11, and the associated propaganda, America "identified" with the supposed threat of Saddam Hussein – per the media presentations. The factual non-connection of Saddam to 9-11 made little difference; fear ruled. "Perception Control" and "authority" took command of the American psyche. The UN reported that no viable evidence of Saddam's alleged WMD's could be found. That information came from 'boots-on-the-ground' inspectors. The media didn't report that finding to any appreciable degree; the war was on.

In Hermann Goering's famous description:- "All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked, and denounce the peacemakers for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same in any country." It was all in the "perception" and "authority."

"Perception Control" additionally implies the element of "pertinence" and "regard." If the media reports a tree falling in a forest; does anyone care? If an expose' cites the media for NOT reporting that tree falling, does anyone care?

In the fashion of "...the dog that didn't bark," when something representing a major concern is methodically unreported, what pertinence and regard goes with that non-reporting carry
– if any? Silence can be constructively ‘deafening.’ In the aftermath of 9-11, it was reported that the NSA furnished the FBI with only useless information. With second thought, it is worth asking whether that data, instead, represented the fact that the purported ‘terrorists’ simply didn’t exist, in the first place. Certainly, the last premise is more easily supported, than the ‘official’ version of 9-11.

As of the end of 2005, globally, somewhere around 160 people were killed over three years by the "Bird Flu." The common cold and 'regular' flu' kill radically more, with associated pneumonia. Yet, the American media keeps reporting the "Bird Flu" information, as though it was an airborne variant of HIV. To date, the American public is trying to discover the importance of such a minor killer, oblivious to the fact that the American tax coffers are being drained, as though there was a viable "Bird Flu" threat to America. The media won't track the "research" money, nor report on the low element of "pertinence" to the safety of Americans.

The media does NOT report the associated methodical draining of the U.S. tax coffers by war or other "government" expenses. The Pentagon, alone, hasn't accounted for trillions of dollars – but the media won't report information which is 'pertinent' to the American worker, or allow for adverse 'regard' for that information.

Similarly, the media evades the "pertinence" and "regard" behind the fact that $40 billion American tax dollars haven't rebuilt a single "Katrina" home in New Orleans. Those who got rich on the "Katrina" money come under the 'authority' banner of "Don't ask; don't tell."

"Perception Control" allows "distortion." The media doesn't report the incremental shutdown of the Medicaid and Social Security System – ignoring the fact that the affected Americans PRE-PAID their own benefits. The recipients are, instead, treated as parasites. Imagine being labelled a 'parasite' for collecting on an automobile insurance policy, following a bad car crash.

"Perception" is a function of specific focus (control). In the current time frame, the NSA domestic spying scandal is the "American uproar" – ignoring the fact that the Pentagon had a comparable domestic spying program – both being illegal as hell. With the media being 'focused' on the NSA domestic spying scandal, America is distracted from the most important of the two issues, inadvertently ignoring the Pentagon domestic spying scandal – and the related "Posse Comitatus" law.

Applying "Perception Control," the media authenticated "authority," by relaying the ‘opinions’ of White House Lawyers – one of whom was conveniently made head of the Bush Justice Department. The "perception" is that attorney opinions somehow cancel laws and judicial rulings. America overlooks the fact that attorneys render only ‘opinions;’ courts render interpretations.

Psyops tactics aside, lying with passion in your voice doesn't manufacture truth.

Anything approaching "Gestapo" is as Anti-American as it can get. So, how does one sort out the domestic "spy" business?

1. Attorneys render legal OPINIONS: Courts render legal INTERPRETATIONS. Yet, a team of White House Lawyers is cited as the spying ‘authority’ to bypass the FISA law. Attorneys are constructively enacting laws.

2. The Iraq campaign didn't involve a "Declaration of War." The authority was the "Authorization for Use of Military Force." (AUMF) There is a radical difference between the two. [Note the term "military"]
3. If the AUMF is cited as the "spy" authority, then note the AUMF provision - "... Nothing in this resolution supersedes any requirement of the War Powers Resolution." (15 days, max on warrantless wiretapping.)

4. If the NSA isn't considered to be 'military;' then FISA mandates warrants.

5. If the NSA is considered to be 'military,' then the "Posse Comitatus" statute and the associated military guidance additionally prohibit the "search and seizure" MILITARY authority, that Bush claims.

6. Remember that the Pentagon had an independent and illegal domestic spying program. While the military can legally receive domestic intelligence, as an act of opening its own mail, Title 18 mandates the relay of the information to the appropriate law enforcement agency (FBI). Failure to do so is "Misprision of a Felony," under Title 18.

7. With the White House keeping the Mexican border as wide-open, as possible, how much factual "terror" can there possibly be?

PERCEPTION OF AUTHORITY

In a broader 'perception' horizon, examine Stanley Milgram's 1960s experiments on authority vs. obedience. The key factor being the associated "perceptions," relative to that "authority." Milgram studied the rationalizations and justifications for the Nazi acts of genocide – as offered by the accused at the World War II, Nuremberg War Crime trials. The perpetrators' defence was typically based on "obedience" - claiming that they were "... just obeying orders" under the authority of their superiors. However weak the claim may have appeared, it was firmly believed, by the accused. Such was their "perception."

Certainly, the "Stanford Prison Experiment" elaborated on the matter.

Perception is essentially a trinity – the self perception "...how I think of the matter," the espoused perception, "...how I would like everyone else to view the matter;" and the public perception, "...how the preponderance of the public views the matter."

The idea essentially goes back to the old adage, "There are three sides to every story, yours, mine and the facts."

The difference in the three is a matter of 'filters;' is the matter clear to all? If not; why not? Does anyone even know what actually happened? If not; why not? How is the "perception" filtered and/or directed?

How many times has an airplane disappeared – with no discoverable clue as to what happened? Was it hijacked? Was it stolen, did the pilot get lost, crash into a high mountain glacier, or at sea?

Is the factual information "controlled?" Ron Brown's B-737 was reported to have crashed in the "...storm of the decade." History records that the factual weather wasn't particularly bad. Yet, what did/does the preponderance of America believe? The "Controlled Perception" ruled the matter.

Most importantly, the FIRST presented perception controlled the matter.

Disregarding intense propaganda, there is no viable evidence that a 757 crashed at the 9-11 Pentagon or in Pennsylvania. What does the preponderance of the entire world believe? Thereafter, it's a matter of "Plausible Assertion" or "Plausible Denial."
If one reads the Vince Foster documents, he killed himself with three different weapons, with his ghost later driving his car to the nearby parking lot.

In such cases, one is forced to formulate an estimate of probable history, based on available information, or reasonable assumptions.

"Perception" is obviously sometimes a unique function of "authority." The Christian Crusaders went off to commit atrocities, under the "Church" message, "God wills it!" Nazi Storm Troopers did the same, being advised, "Gott mit uns!" ("God is with us!") The role of "authority" was to serve as a perceived reliable barrier against possible accountability and punishment; even unto God.

However, the "perception" and "authority" have to be credible. George Bush Jr. is more selfish. According to him, God told him, personally, to invade Afghanistan and Iraq. He later stated that God acted through him. Given the media "dropping" the matter (Perception Control), no one cares to talk about those claims. Bush's claims exceeded the assertions of Hitler!

Hitler's Nazis serve as a classic example of the extremes of human behaviour – and how it comes about; how "perception" blended with "authority."

A typically unmentioned part of nefarious deeds is the matter of "accountability." When 'institutionalized' authority takes a wrong turn, where does the issue of accountability fall, relative to time. Had Hitler won, for example, his leaders and soldiers would have had no accounting. Yet, in the immediate time of a nefarious decision-making, the issue of accountability takes on the aura of context, relative to time.

History often frames "context;" convicted criminals are routinely put to death as 'historic' villains – by the "authority" of the State. The Nuremberg trials executed 'deserving' criminals. Many cases of raw street revenge are overlooked, given the 'context' (perception) of history – versus personally estimated probability of accountability.

It is no secret that the Nazi "obedience" was commonly motivated by fear of execution, prison internment; or at least a transfer to the dreaded Russian Front. Few verified the potential consequence of questioning or refusing, versus "...just following orders." The extended concern is the fate of the affected individual's family, for better or worse. One can only ponder what they might do, under similar fear levels. Openly or subtly, "authority" controlled "perception."

The S.S. executioner had to evaluate the effect of time, as a factor in his accountability. If he was certain that his side would win, he proceeded with minimal interference of human conscience. Or, he may have been uncertain of victory, but he may have been quite certain of his own fate on the Russian front, if he disobeyed – or questioned - an order to kill. Add the fate of his family. "Authority" assured him that he was on the winning side.

The 'conscience test' of all time seems to be in the personal estimation of "...what people will say." (AND – the estimate as to whether or not "they" may never find out; or figure it out?)

Another factor which is rarely addressed, is the matter of "stakes;" personal risk or actual expenditure. In current times, the religious zealots are betting their life and their fate in all of eternity, to perform suicide bombings – even against innocent women and children. The implication is that the bombers perversely view themselves as 'holy' martyrs, favoured by God; no sacrifice being too great for God.
There also exists a "personal identification gap" between those who monstrously committed
the Nazi atrocities, of their own accord, and those who did the same, under extreme duress.
The Nazi monsters had their share of conscience-driven suicides.

However unpopular (and little-known) the issue may be, it is also necessary to objectively
observe the history of Jews participating in such organizations as the "Jewish Committees,"
who selected other Jews for the Nazi death camps; add the "Jewish Police" of the Nazi
ghettos. Those participants continued to live amongst their own; their 'authority' was
remote, however reliable. Certainly, they had to think it terms of their fate; and that of their
family.

In modern times, a little-known driver behind the modern corporation is the fact that a high
percentage of employees are as positively responsive to a letter of commendation from
'authority' in their personnel file, as they would be to a sizeable check.

Taking that idea further, the 'value' in such letters is often reduced by 'authority' employing
impotent descriptors as "acknowledge," versus "recognize," "applaud" or "congratulate."

Obviously, pay levels, benefits and retirements are a huge determining factor. 'Authority'
determines whether a military General abides by White House insistence, with an associated
promotion, or retires two pay grades early.

Thus, it is also necessary to observe the dynamic of authority, versus propensity for
subservience.

One of the major lessons of Hitler's Nazism was that the true 'force' behind that monster
was the "perception" of the populace – asking, "What does the Fuhrer want?" The key was in
controlling the associated "perception."

Thinking to the electric battery, what happens when a "political battery" (potential energy –
with positive and negative terminals) of Nazi methodologies is 'hooked-up' to a given
populace?

The world should never forget that Hitler nearly won. Currently, the world is compelled to
think to the forces behind this re-designed version of Nazism, referred to as the "New World
Order."

"Those who refuse to think outside the proverbial 'box' are imprisoned in it; and destined to
be buried in it."

NAME CALLING AND LABELLING –

"Bad names" have always played a tremendously powerful role in the entire history of the
world; as well as in our own personal development. Names have ruined and killed people;
but, they have also stirred men and women to outstanding deeds and accomplishments.
Names and labels have ruined the lives of people and have sent many to prison. Names and
labels have made men angry enough to enter battle and slaughter their fellow men – or to
die for the declared named or labelled cause. Names and labels have been applied to people,
groups, associations, churches, tribes, gangs, colleges, political parties, neighbourhoods,
states, regions of the country, nations, and races. Many tremendous results have been
effected – just with a name or label. In American history, the "McCarthyism" ruined lives of
truly great people, just with the simple implication of "Communist;" no proof required! Even
today, descriptors such as "Commie," "Pinko" and "Leftist" bring a programmed emotional
reaction.
In Current politics, "politically undesirable" has been labelled as "evil" or "terror." Laws have been passed on these elements, as though one could comparably outlaw the darkness of night. Yet, the strategy worked, the draconian laws were passed!

The name-calling technique of the disinformationist usually links a person, or idea, to a negative symbol, of some type. Beyond pure propaganda, the disinformationist crafts the name-calling into a form which has an emotional effect on the targeted audience. The usual style is to inject 'distrust,' into any association with the targeted individual/issue. The disinformationist who uses this technique hopes that the targeted audience will mentally AND emotionally reject the person or the idea on the basis of the negative symbol, instead of objectively looking at the available evidence.

Again, the element of "INTENT" is key. To cite some of Bush’s cabinet members as ‘felons,’ warns the listener, however negative the image is.

The most obvious type of name calling involves generally accepted 'negative' names. For example, consider the following:

Commie
Nazi
Fascist
Pig
Yuppie
Queer
Terrorist
Leftist
Neocon

(My note. you can also add “Wacky Scottish Conspiracy Theorist” to this negative list)

However, the relative position of the name-calling ‘assailant’ or the ‘victim’ is a factor. "Expensive" is bad to a buyer, but wonderful to a seller. A more subtle form of name-calling involves words or phrases that are selected because they possess or create a negative emotional charge.

A responsible Pentagon official may propose specific military budget cuts. Instead of being labelled as "wise" or "fiscally conservative," the official gets labelled as "stingy." Either description can refer to the same behaviour – with an extreme of different connotation. Other examples of negatively charged words include:

politically correct
social engineering
connected
radical

corrupt

cowardly

counter-culture

The name-calling technique leaves the casual observer with the logical mandate to ask intelligent questions when spotting "name-calling." Not all "name calling" is inappropriate or counter-productive. If a female politician cites a colleague or opponent as a ‘sweetheart,’ the connotation isn’t particularly inappropriate or negative. To cite Saddam Hussein as a ‘monster’ is dynamic; although a highly negative imagery. However, subjectivity is important in such matters. Referring to a man as a ‘sweetheart’ may ruin the day of a feminist. Referring to Saddam as a ‘monster’ may stir a Muslim supporter to violence. The appropriate questions:

Is the name calling appropriate?

Would a reasonable person find the name-calling personally tempting?

What is the intention behind the name calling?

What does the name imply?

Does the idea in question have a legitimate connection with the typical association behind the name?

Is an idea or thought process which serves a given person’s or group’s best interests being discounted/dismissed through such name calling?

Omitting the name calling, what are the merits in the remainder of the message?

SPARKLING GENERALITIES –

Almost any culture claims to believe in, fight for and live by "virtuous words." These "words" are normally associated with deeply set attitudes and ideas. In the USA, such words include: civilization, civic, morality, justice, equality, Americanism, God, Christianity, good, proper, right, democracy, patriotism, family, motherhood, fatherhood, science, medicine, health, natural and love.

For the purposes of propaganda/disinformation analysis, call these virtue words "Sparkling Generalities" focusing attention upon the dangerous characteristic that they have: They mean different things to different people; thus they can be used in different ways. The trick being in the controlling of context or association of the generalities.

Disinformationists prey upon the selected words, as we typically understand them or relate to them. Through scientifically styled means/methods/techniques, disinformationists prostitute the cherished words and beliefs and attitudes of unsuspecting people.

When Americans hear the word ‘democracy,’ they typically think of their own definite ideas about democracy, the ideas learned at home and school. "Mom, apple pie and the girl next door" come to mind. The typical reflex is to assume that the term is being used in that particular sense. The ‘virtue word’ lowers the ‘caution threshold,’ deferring any suspicion or
mistrust; particularly when listening about the things 'the United States must do to preserve democracy.'

However, when one hears of ‘democracy’ in 2003 Iraq, the proverbial ‘red flags’ pop into view. The term is the same, the ‘association’ is different; very different. The image of a burning Humvee comes to mind, along with the image of dead or wounded GIs.

In essence, the employment of the "Sparkling Generality" is the reversal of "Name Calling." Name Calling seeks to make us fear and/or reject the cited entity. The intention is for the targeted audience to formulate a judgment to reject and condemn the victim of the name-calling, without bothering to examine the evidence. The Sparkling Generality device, conversely, seeks to make us identify with, approve and accept the generality without examining the evidence.

Exporting American Democracy to Iraq sounds noble to the typical American. However, given the "Patriot Act," what is actually being exported? In examining the "Sparkling Generality Device," all that is said regarding Name Calling / Labelling must also be kept in mind.

The observer should ask:

What image is the ‘virtue’ word intended to convey?

Does the presented idea in question have a legitimate connection with the general/typical meaning of the word?

Is this an attempt to prostitute an idea which does not serve the observer's best interests?

Is it being "sold" or "spun" through its being given an association or name that the typical and reasonable observer isn't likely to buy into?

Omitting the "virtue word," what is contained in the remainder of the ‘message?’

ATTITUDE -

An attitude is an imbedded personal style of dealing with information or events. Think to the common expressions –

"Why should I?" "What's in it for me?" "I could care less!" "Live and let live." "No shame in my game!"

In that context, Americans are routinely conditioned to respond to information and events with a conditioned ATTITUDE. In the ‘first up’ style of the 9-11 presentation, America predictably responded in patriotic fashion. With the conditioning of such horrors as the 1993 bombing of the WTC and the Oklahoma City bombing, the mass media presentations stirred a revenge reflex; America seemingly had suffered enough "terrorism." The ATTITUDE was highly predictable - 'I've had enough! Nobody is going to get away with this!'

EXPECTATIONS -

A popular belief system asserts that it is wrong to ‘lay’ your expectations on another, demanding a specific accommodation. However, a clear mind quickly remembers that there is an animal known as the ‘reasonable expectation.’ For example, fidelity in a relationship or marriage. Reasonable expectations are all around us – but they are quickly being deleted from the American culture.
America regularly witnesses the exporting of the USA critical economic infrastructure. America’s sovereignty is being dissolved faster than Americans can detect the unmistakable pattern. Whatever ‘forces’ may be in operation, Americans are facing lower-paying jobs – if any. Political discussions of job ‘numbers’ evade any discussion of job ‘quality.’ The ‘normal’ job benefits are more routinely being subsidized by the employee – if any benefits are even provided.

The sovereignty of America is discounted, versus a strange and methodical imposition of an American "global responsibility," which routinely excludes the welfare of Americans!

Thus, one of the apparent rules of the ‘system’ is, "...destroy all expectations; reasonable or otherwise."

One of the deadliest of these efforts was the overturn of the American "Equal Protection" clause in the U.S. Constitution. In the Michigan college reverse discrimination case, the ruling hinged on a "compelling interest" in removing the equal-protection provision as the issue pertains to reverse discrimination in school admissions.

What America didn't notice was the ‘style’ of the language; and what that language is destined to mean. Specifically, that phrase "compelling interest," is destined to be applied to the selective enforcement of all American laws. That "selective enforcement" has been a relative norm for quite a while in American society. Now, however, there is essentially a Supreme Court precedent to anchor the debate for the "compelling interest" in enforcing the law only as "Politically Convenient."

In essence, "social obligation" will be openly transferred to political "obligation," in the controlled style of "political creep."

MISLEADING EUPHEMISMS -

When disinformationists use sparkling generalities and name-calling symbols, they are attempting to impress their targeted audience with vivid, emotionally stimulating words. In certain situations, however, the disinformationist attempts to pacify the audience in order to make an unpleasant reality more palatable. This is accomplished by using words that are bland and euphemistic. The brutal is converted into the ‘kinder and gentler.’

For example, America changed the name of the War Department to the Department of Defence. "Queer" became "gay." During war-time, civilian casualties are referred to as "collateral damage," and the word "liquidation" is used as a synonym for "murder." "Suspect" became "person of interest." The U.S. Constitution was almost destroyed by the "Patriot Act." From the Vietnam War, "combat fatigue," or "shell shock" became "post-traumatic stress disorder;" the descriptor being completely disconnected from the reality of war. The "suicide bomber" became the "homicide bomber." The "Muslims" (connected to Osama bin Laden) of the American/NATO Balkan campaign became "Ethnic Albanians."

10 (well nine actually) Modern Methods of Mind Control
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The more one researches mind control, the more one will come to the conclusion that there is a coordinated script that has been in place for a very long time with the goal to turn the human race into non-thinking automatons. For as long as man has pursued power over the masses, mind control has been orchestrated by those who study human behaviour in order to bend large populations to the will of a small "elite" group. Today, we have entered a perilous phase where mind control has taken on a physical, scientific dimension that
threatens to become a permanent state if we do not become aware of the tools at the disposal of the technocratic dictatorship unfolding on a worldwide scale.

Modern mind control is both technological and psychological. Tests show that simply by exposing the methods of mind control, the effects can be reduced or eliminated, at least for mind control advertising and propaganda. More difficult to counter are the physical intrusions, which the military-industrial complex continues to develop and improve upon.

1. Education – This is the most obvious, yet still remains the most insidious. It has always been a would-be dictator's ultimate fantasy to "educate" naturally impressionable children, thus it has been a central component to Communist and Fascist tyrannies throughout history. No one has been more instrumental in exposing the agenda of modern education than Charlotte Iserbyt – one can begin research into this area by reading her book, *The Deliberate Dumbing Down of America*, which lays bare the role of Globalist foundations in shaping a future intended to produce servile drones lorded over by a fully educated, aware elite class. (My Note. This as I have said is covered at length later on in this section).

2. Advertising and Propaganda – Edward Bernays has been cited as the inventor of the consumerist culture that was designed primarily to target people's self-image (or lack thereof) in order to turn a want into a need. This was initially envisioned for products such as cigarettes, for example. However, Bernays also noted in his 1928 book, *Propaganda*, that "propaganda is the executive arm of the invisible government." This can be seen most clearly in the modern police state and the growing citizen snitch culture, wrapped up in the pseudo-patriotic War on Terror. The increasing consolidation of media has enabled the entire corporate structure to merge with government, which now utilizes the concept of propaganda placement. Media; print, movies, television, and cable news can now work seamlessly to integrate an overall message which seems to have the ring of truth because it comes from so many sources, simultaneously. When one becomes attuned to identifying the main "message," one will see this imprinting everywhere. And this is not even to mention subliminal messaging.

3. Predictive Programming – Many still deny that predictive programming is real. I would invite anyone to examine the range of documentation put together by Alan Watt and come to any other conclusion. Predictive programming has its origins in predominately elitist Hollywood, where the big screen can offer a big vision of where society is headed. Just look back at the books and movies which you thought were far-fetched, or "science fiction" and take a close look around at society today. For a detailed breakdown of specific examples, Vigilant Citizen is a great resource that will probably make you look at "entertainment" in a completely different light.

4. Sports, Politics, Religion – Some might take offense at seeing religion, or even politics, put alongside sports as a method of mind control. The central theme is the same throughout: divide and conquer. The techniques are quite simple: short circuit the natural tendency of people to cooperate for their survival, and teach them to form teams bent on domination and winning. Sports has always had a role as a key distraction that corrals tribal tendencies into a non-important event, which in modern America has reached ridiculous proportions where protests will break out over a sport celebrity leaving their city, but essential human issues such as liberty are giggled away as inconsequential. Political discourse is strictly in a left-right paradigm of easily controlled opposition, while religion is the backdrop of nearly every war throughout history. (Old Firm for anyone in Scotland?)

5. Food, Water, and Air – Additives, toxins, and other food poisons literally alter brain chemistry to create docility and apathy. Fluoride in drinking water has been proven to lower IQ; Aspartame and MSG are excitotoxins which excite brain cells until they die; and easy access to the fast food that contains these poisons generally has created a population that lacks focus and motivation for any type of active lifestyle. Most of the modern world is perfectly groomed for passive receptiveness – and acceptance – of the dictatorial elite. And
if you choose to diligently watch your diet, they are fully prepared to spray the population from the above. (Fluoride, Aspartame and more medical issues covered in book three).

6. Drugs -- This can be any addictive substance, but the mission of mind controllers is to be sure you are addicted to something. One major arm of the modern mind control agenda is psychiatry, which aims to define all people by their disorders, as opposed to their human potential. This was foreshadowed in books such as *Brave New World*. Today, it has been taken to even further extremes as a medical tyranny has taken hold where nearly everyone has some sort of disorder -- particularly those who question authority. The use of nerve drugs in the military has led to record numbers of suicides. Worst of all, the modern drug state now has over 25% of U.S. children on mind-numbing medication.

7. Military testing -- The military has a long history as the testing ground for mind control. The military mind is perhaps the most malleable, as those who pursue life in the military generally resonate to the structures of hierarchy, control, and the need for unchallenged obedience to a mission. For the increasing number of military personal questioning their indoctrination, a recent story highlighted DARPA's plans for transcranial mind control helmets that will keep them focused.

8. Electromagnetic spectrum -- An electromagnetic soup envelops us all, charged by modern devices of convenience which have been shown to have a direct impact on brain function. In a tacit admission of what is possible, one researcher has been working with a "god helmet" to induce visions by altering the electromagnetic field of the brain. Our modern soup has us passively bathed by potentially mind-altering waves, while a wide range of possibilities such as cell phone towers is now available to the would-be mind controller for more direct intervention.

9. Television, Computer, and "flicker rate"-- It's bad enough that what is "programmed" on your TV (accessed via remote "control") is engineered; it is all made easier by literally lulling you to sleep, making it a psycho-social weapon. Flicker rate tests show that alpha brain waves are altered, producing a type of hypnosis -- which doesn't portend well for the latest revelation that lights can transmit coded Internet data by "flickering faster than the eye can see." The computer's flicker rate is less, but through video games, social networks, and a basic structure which overloads the brain with information, the rapid pace of modern communication induces an ADHD state. A study of video games revealed that extended play can result in lower blood flow to the brain, sapping emotional control. Furthermore, role-playing games of lifelike war and police state scenarios serve to desensitize a connection to reality. Look at the WikiLeaks video Collateral Murder it should be familiar to anyone who has seen a game like Call of Duty (My Note. Covered in chapter about the Playstation-Plantation coming soon).

My Note: Sorry I haven't included number ten because it talks about future technology, and for that reason I feel it was not as relevant as the other nine points.

Now I will defer to Mr Dave McGowan so we can read all about the disturbing yet still true fact that serial killers are made that way, not born that way.
Chapter Twenty Three - Serial Killing Psychopaths, (As opposed to bicycle lanes that repeatedly murder boxes of Frostie’s or Weetabix, which are Cereal Killing Cycle-Paths)

The cultural occurrence which I am going to cover in slightly more detail now is one which was yet another phenomenon that seems to have materialised in the modern era.

It was what we term as “serial killing” (but also including the massacres that were carried out by individuals against innocent members of the public since the 1960’s onwards).

Up until this point in time this was practically unheard of, (especially here in the UK). When someone went loopy before this point they had nearly always directed their hatred towards authority figures, - now the general public and even children were becoming the targets of this unbelievable new trend. The police and any other “State” representatives certainly didn’t deserve to be treated in this way by these maniacs, but it is at least much more understandable that in the past these nut-cases chose to vent their anger at the nearest representative of the “system” - that had probably driven them bonkers in the first place.

What changed I wonder to enable these deranged individuals to show so much hatred and contempt for the lives of their fellow man and especially those of innocent children? After all these innocent people that were being culled weren’t the ones who had pushed this person into this despicably evil decision in the first place, so why were we now to be the chosen targets, of what is after all, our own hatred? It made no sense to me that this could happen.

The following article discusses this matter in detail, and it is most certainly not the version of events you had believed up to now concerning this pretty modern occurrence. It also proposes (with solid proof and not suggestion) that these people didn’t just appear out of nowhere, instead I feel it shows that many of them were not just allowed to thrive, the truth is even worse than that. Mr McGowan and I both believe (though Dave is smart enough to refrain from actually saying it too much, - he lets you form your own opinion) that many of them are actually coached, trained and controlled BY THE STATE, all for a specific purpose: - FEAR being the primary one.

Both Dave McGowan and myself seem to think (and I think this incredible gentleman’s work quite frankly proves) that many of these people were perhaps “introduced” into our society in order to partially help create an all pervasive, though practically subliminal dread in the back of everyone’s mind that the guy next door “could” be a psycho, I reckon this was “engineered” in part so that we all finish our work, do our shopping, then scurry back home to barricade ourselves in our little dens of safety until the sun comes back up again. - Little realising that all we are doing is cutting ourselves of from society to be programmed by the tools of the system. - We will watch programme after programme amplifying or justifying this fear, or we will watch movies that normalise and even glorify the most sadistic and twisted of psychopaths and psychopathic behaviour. And just to show us that this sort of behaviour is truly rampant, we will also read about this sort of thing every day in a news-rag or hear about these people virtually every night on TV News.

Here is one of my favourite musicians Mr Ian Brown making the point that I just have, - only so much more eloquently than I could ever hope to do (without making you read a telephone directory)

Read every line, then go back and look at the first letter of every word, because this song encapsulates and describes our everyday reality almost perfectly;

On the surface there may appear to be something, but beneath everything there is another thing, - FEAR.
F.E.A.R. by Ian Brown

For Each A Road
For Everyman A Religion
Find Everybody And Rue
Fuck Everything And Rumble
Forget Everything And Remember
For Everything A Reason
Forgive Everybody And Remember

For Each A Road
For Everyman A Religion
Face Everybody And Rue
Fuck Everything And Rumble
Forget Everything And Remember
For Everything A Reason

F.E.A.R.
F.E.A.R.
F.E.A.R.
F.E.A.R.
F.E.A.R.

Finding Eternity Aroused Reactions
Freeing Excellence Affects Reality
Fallen Empires Are Running
Find Earth And Reap

Fantastic Expectations Amazing Revelations
Final Execution And Resurrection
Free Expression As Revolution
Finding Everything And Realising

You got the fear
You got the fear
You got the fear
You got the fear
You got the fear

F.E.A.R. (You got the fear)
F.E.A.R. (You got the fear)
F.E.A.R. (You got the fear)
F.E.A.R. (You got the fear)
F.E.A.R. (You got the fear)

Fantastic Expectations Amazing Revelations
Finding Everything And Realising

F.E.A.R. (You got the fear)
F.E.A.R. (You got the fear)
F.E.A.R. (You got the fear)
F.E.A.R. (You got the fear)

You got the fear
You got the fear
You got the fear
You got the fear

Just to demonstrate my point right from the outset (so that you cannot discount my theory on the grounds that it is a preposterous notion) here is solid proof in just this one example:

Extracts from the excellent book “Programmed To Kill” By Dave McGowan (buy it)
Arthur Shawcross was a brutally efficient assassin who accumulated a career total of over fifty kills, although the first thirty-nine were not considered crimes. And yet they were murders that were every bit as barbaric as those committed by any of the other 'serial killers' discussed—complete with torture, mutilation, cannibalism and necrophilia. One female victim was decapitated and her head displayed on a stake. Shawcross then roasted and ate her thigh—all while another victim was forced to watch. The second victim was then beheaded, strung up by her feet and gutted like a slaughtered animal carcass. How then could these actions not be considered crimes?

Simply put, it was because the victims were all Vietnamese nationals, and Arthur was just doing his job: terrorizing the Vietnamese people into acceding to U.S. demands. It was the same job that everyone else involved in the Phoenix Program was engaged in. Shawcross did not become a criminal until he brought home the skills taught to him by the U.S. military.

Arthur had a rather interesting history, one that likely made him an ideal candidate to serve as an assassin for Uncle Sam. He was born just before the end of World War II in a naval hospital to a naval officer father, who lived a rather shadowy existence, reportedly with a parallel life in Australia complete with another wife and son. Young Art grew up in a multi-generational family whose members all lived within about 100 feet of each other at a place the locals called ‘Shawcross Corners.’ Incest and paedophilia apparently ran rampant within the Shawcross clan. Arthur has claimed that he was introduced to sex by his Aunt Tina, and that his younger sister “allowed him” to sodomize her at a very young age. He also engaged in sexual antics with his cousin and with a young boy and girl who lived down the road. At the age of ten, he also began regularly having sex with a male friend named Mike. Art and Mike were introduced to bestiality by some men who owned a local sheep farm. Sexual partners the pair encountered there included sheep, chickens, a cow, a dog and a horse.

Mike later killed his wife, his kids, and then himself.

Art’s mother occasionally raped her son with a broomstick, once causing severe internal injuries, as confirmed by hospital records. In addition to the sexual abuse, Arthur received frequent beatings with a belt and a broom handle. Little wonder then that Shawcross had a number of imaginary friends as a child and he was known to speak to himself in strange voices.

At the tender age of eight, Shawcross was alone in a room with the father of a friend when the man reportedly died of a heart attack. What he was doing alone in the room with the man at the time is unknown, but it is clear that Shawcross had his first exposure to death while still quite young. By the age of ten or eleven, he was regularly running away from home. By fourteen, he was known to disappear for as long as four weeks at a time, venturing off alone to places unknown. At about that same point in his life, he was reportedly raped by an older man. By the age of fifteen, Arthur was committing burglaries with his friend Mike. He was convicted and he received probation for one such offense in 1963. Two years later, he was again convicted of burglary and again given probation. Not long after that, Shawcross began his military service—service that would soon take him into the jungles of Vietnam and, by his own accounting, transform his life. But before he even left the States, Art reportedly went AWOL, a transgression for which he strangely suffered no repercussions.

Shawcross spent thirteen months in Southeast Asia as a weapons specialist, although his apparently falsified military records indicate that he served as a supply clerk. Sometime in 1968, he was sent to Hawaii for R&R; he later reported that he spent that time champing at the bit to get back to the jungles of Vietnam. After his return, he spent long periods of time alone in the bush, becoming—as he described himself—a “predator” and a “ghoul.” He claimed that he became quite adept at modifying weapons for special purposes. He became, he said, a silent assassin—or as he described it: “I was a ghost in the jungle...one bullet and
no sound.” By the time he came home, he had recorded thirty-nine kills; many of his victims were women and children.

Upon his return from Vietnam, he suffered blindingly painful headaches and he was treated by an Army psychiatrist. He was stationed at Fort Sill, Oklahoma, where he was assigned to train recruits and set up exhibits of weapons for military shows. Uncle Sam apparently thought quite highly of the man who once explained that if you roast human flesh until it is well done, you can then snack on it for several days before it goes bad. Years later, after Art had put his acquired skills to work at home on non-Vietnamese victims, police asked him how he was “able to kill these girls so easily...Where did you learn to do that?” Shawcross responded simply: “Ask Uncle Sam.” Asked where he had learned to butcher bodies so that they would decompose faster, he gave the same response Arthur experienced a bit of a surprise upon his return home from Vietnam when he was informed that he had married a woman named Linda Neary just before he had shipped out. He had no recollection of having done so. Nevertheless, Neary had received and spent all of his service pay checks. Shawcross later said that Neary’s family, which he claimed was into witchcraft, would not allow him to leave.

Not long after his return to the States, Shawcross burned down both a barn and Crowley’s Cheese Company. He then set yet another fire at a paper mill on April 24, 1969. In September of that year, he was tried, convicted and sentenced to serve five years, but he was out in just two, after spending time at both Attica and Auburn prisons. After his release, Art remarried and worked for the Watertown Public Works Department—public works jobs being a popular pastime with many serial killers. He was apparently very popular with the local kids, many of whom he knew. One of those local kids was Jack Blake, a ten-year-old boy who visited with Shawcross frequently and enjoyed fishing with the older man.

On June 4, 1972, Art raped, strangled, mutilated and cannibalized his young friend. He subsequently returned on several occasions to rape the boy’s rotting corpse. Three months after Jack’s disappearance, Shawcross similarly assaulted and killed an eight-year-old girl. He had been reported previously for wrestling neighbourhood boys to the ground and stuffing grass into their pants and mouths. For that he had been fined ten dollars by the parole board. He was also reported by Jack’s mother, Mary Blake, who told police of threats made against another boy. Nevertheless, it took authorities a good while to connect the disappearances of the two kids to Arthur Shawcross. Once caught, he was charged only with the murder of the girl. Despite the fact that he confessed to killing the boy as well, and had led investigators to the body, he was never charged with any crimes in connection with the death of Jack Blake.

He was also never charged with the rape, torture, mutilation, or cannibalization of either victim. Offered an outrageously lenient plea-bargain deal, Shawcross pled guilty to one count of manslaughter and received a twenty-five year sentence; he served just fifteen before being released to kill again. This was just another example of how the law enforcement and judicial communities frequently take actions that seem designed specifically to keep America’s real killers on the streets—while simultaneously meting out draconian sentences to obvious patsies. If that is not the case, then how else are we to explain the incongruously lenient treatment afforded certain killers, particularly in a nation with what is arguably the harshest criminal justice system in the ‘civilized’ world?

Arthur was hardly a model prisoner for the first eight years of his incarceration. He was repeatedly disciplined for such infractions as fighting, possession of contraband, and setting fires. He was also questioned about the deaths of three of his fellow inmates. For the last seven years, however, Shawcross did reportedly become a model prisoner. He was even given a job counselling mental patients, even though he himself was being ‘treated’ by several prison psychiatrists and he complained frequently of hearing voices in his head.
In March 1987, Art was set free. After being chased out of four local communities, the probation department decided to ‘hide’ him in Rochester, the hometown of Hillside Strangler Kenneth Bianchi. Shawcross was purportedly closely monitored and he had very strict conditions placed upon his parole: absolutely no contact with children, no drinking, no consorting with prostitutes, no guns, and an 11:00PM to 7:00AM curfew. Nevertheless, Art was well known in the part of town where the community’s prostitutes plied their trade. He was rumoured to be selling drugs to the working girls, as well as to teenage runaways. On March 25, 1988, he was ticketed for driving without a license and for having two unrestrained children in the car—children that he was not supposed to be anywhere near. He was not charged with a parole violation.

The kids were the grandchildren of Clara Neal, one of many women with whom Art was having affairs. Shawcross was also friends with Clara’s son Donnie (his hunting partner), and he occasionally spent time with her daughter Loretta. Arthur's paramours also included several of his victims. When Art was not servicing and/or killing one of his female acquaintances, he could frequently be found hanging out at the local doughnut shop chatting with the city's police officers. The first victims of the serial killer variously referred to as the 'Rochester Nightstalker,' the 'Rochester Strangler,' or the ‘Genesee River Killer,’ were found in the summer and early fall of 1989. At the time, Arthur was officially under the supervision of the local parole board, mental health workers, and social workers. Most of the victims could be directly linked to Shawcross, a known sex offender and multiple murderer. As he later said: “I knew ’em all, and they knew me.” Nevertheless, eleven women were killed before authorities got around to connecting the murders to Arthur Shawcross.

One of the victims was Dorothy Keller, one of Art’s on-and-off girlfriends who also knew his wife, Rose Shawcross. Prior to her death, Keller was an occasional visitor to the Shawcross apartment. Patty Ives was another victim who was quite well known to her killer, as was June Stotts, a ‘mildly retarded’ friend of the Shawcross family who was a frequent visitor to their home and who was regularly seen with Art at a local eatery. After her death, she was cut open from her neck to her anus, gutted, cannibalized and sexually violated.

None of Art’s victims appeared to have put up a struggle; no defensive wounds were present on any of the bodies and there were no signs that the victims had been physically restrained. Police reportedly marvelled over the killer’s ability to completely control both the victims and the crime scenes. Some investigators speculated that a stun gun might have been used to disable the women.

Law enforcement officials initially assumed that two or three separate killers were at work simultaneously. The manner in which the women were killed varied, not surprisingly, and included beheading, strangulation, bludgeoning, and suffocation/drowning. One victim, Lisa Gibson, was found in another county, many miles away from where the other bodies were deposited. Some of the corpses that were found during Art’s reign were of black prostitutes. One of them, Felicia Stephens, was found in the same park where two of Art’s admitted victims surfaced. Shawcross, however, declined to take credit for the murders of the black victims.

In January 1990, Art was captured and he proceeded to give his captors a full confession after being interrogated without an attorney. Little evidence other than his confession directly linked Shawcross to the killings; the crime scenes had been left remarkably free of any incriminating evidence. Arthur Shawcross had apparently been very well trained. He went to trial in 1991, with his defence counsel claiming insanity. He was said to be suffering from Multiple Personality Disorder. Under hypnosis, he reportedly spoke as a 13th century cannibal named Ariemes, an eleven-year-old boy, and his own mother.

Dr. Dorothy Otnow Lewis concluded that Shawcross had been “severely” sexually abused and had, therefore, “developed a dissociative style of coping with his intolerable situation.” She added: “this kind of phenomenon is characteristic of severely abused children who
eventually dissociate to the point of becoming multiple personalities.” Dr. Park Elliot Dietz of the FBI’s BSU, called as a psychiatric witness for the prosecution, disputed the MPD claims. That is the sort of thing that Dietz makes a career of doing. He can be seen with appalling frequency on the television screen speaking as an ‘expert’ on serial killer cases.

The jury rejected the insanity defence and the claims of a dissociative disorder and convicted Shawcross of ten counts of murder, largely on the strength of his illegally obtained confession. He was sentenced to ten consecutive twenty-five year sentences. There is little question though that Art did indeed have a serious dissociative disorder. He suffered from blackouts all of his life. He reportedly had a strong tendency to “space out,” to such an extent that he sometimes had to be physically shaken to get a response. He also was known to frequently wander off and then find himself in an unknown place with no awareness of how he had gotten there.

Author Joel Norris has written that Shawcross once described the killings to him as occurring in “a kind of dream state in which another person inside of him was reacting in his place.” During those times, the killer was able to completely shut out the world around him, to such an extent that, as Art recalled, he “didn't hear anything around me...I couldn't figure that out...Other times in my life I have had the feeling of leaving my body.” What remained in that body was a highly efficient, emotionless, programmed assassin—one of Uncle Sam's finest. There is little question that Arthur Shawcross committed numerous murders in his life. But where does the real guilt for his crimes lie? With Shawcross, or with those who deliberately and systematically trained him to be a remorseless killer?

So you see these people already exist, pre-programmed and prepared by our own military. Let's see who else the irrepressible Mr McGowan thinks is worthy of our attention.

“There's Something About Henry” again by David McGowan Part I: Sympathy for the Devil

"Henry is an unusual prisoner. He's been given a high security cell and a few special amenities..." —Jim Boutwell, Sheriff of Williamson County, Texas

On June 30th of 1998, Henry Lee Lucas, arguably the most prolific and certainly one of the most sadistic serial killers in the annals of crime was scheduled for execution by the state of Texas. Given the advocacy of the death penalty by Governor George W. Bush, things clearly weren't looking good for Henry at that time.

Bush had not granted clemency to any condemned man in his tenure as governor. In fact, no governor of any state in the entire history of the country has carried out more judicial executions than has Governor George. At last count, the state of Texas had dispatched 130 inmates on Bush's watch.

So Texas was definitely not the place to be for a man in Henry's position. And considering the nature of Henry's crimes, it seemed a certainty that nothing would stand in the way of Henry's scheduled execution. There weren't likely to be any high-profile supporters, a la Karla Faye Tucker (though even personal appeals to Bush from the likes of Pat Robertson failed to dissuade the governor from proceeding on schedule with Miss Tucker's execution). Not likely because Henry's crimes were of a particularly brutal nature, involving rape, torture, mutilation, dismemberment, necrophilia, cannibalism, and paedophilia, with the
number of victims running as high as 300-600 by some accounts - including Henry's own, at times - though this figure is likely inflated.

By all accounts though, Lucas, frequently working with partner Ottis Toole - a self described arsonist and cannibal - savagely murdered literally scores of victims of all ages, races, and genders. All indications were then that this was pretty much of a no-brainer for America's premier hanging governor. But then a most remarkable thing happened. On June 18, just twelve days before Henry's scheduled demise, Governor Bush asked the State Board of Pardons and Paroles, whose members are appointed by Bush himself, to review Henry's case. Strangely enough, eight days later the Board uncharacteristically recommended that Henry's execution not take place.

The very next day, just three days short of Henry's scheduled exit from this world, Lucas became the first - and to date only - recipient of Governor Bush's compassionate conservatism. The official rationale for this act of mercy was, apparently, that the evidence on which Lucas was sentenced did not support his conviction. There was a possibility that Henry was in fact innocent of the crime for which he was convicted. Never mind that many of the 130 death row inmates who did not get special gubernatorial attention prior to their executions had credible claims of innocence that were met with by nothing but scorn and mockery.

Suddenly Little George had developed a keen interest in not executing innocent convicts. Never mind as well that some of those who have been executed despite claims of innocence were - other than the crime for which they were being executed - law-abiding citizens. Whereas Henry was by all accounts a serial rapist, kidnapper, torturer and murderer. And never mind that once Henry was spared, Bush promptly lost this passing interest and began once again rubber stamping every execution order that crossed his desk, including that of a great-grandmother in her sixties who was convicted of killing her chronically abusive husband (Betty Lou Beets, in February 2000).

And never mind that Bush has made no effort in the two years since Henry's commutation to seek a new trial for Henry on one of the murders for which there is conclusive evidence of Lucas' guilt. Neither has he made any effort to extradite Henry to any of the other states in which Henry is wanted for various murders. It seems to me that the last time I checked, there was no statute of limitations for the crime of murder. Why is Law-and-Order George not seeking a new death sentence for Lucas? And why is it that Henry was granted full clemency, rather than a temporary stay during which his case could have been reviewed? This is exactly what Bush has just done in the case of convicted murderer Ricky Nolen McGinn.

Tellingly, the proliferation of press reports on the McGinn case, apparently meant to soften Bush's image somewhat, have made virtually no reference to the governor's earlier actions on behalf of Lucas. Reporting on the McGinn case has avoided the mention of Lucas in one of two ways: by noting that this is the first capital case for which Bush has issued a stay (which is true but deliberately deceptive), or by claiming outright that this is the first death penalty case in which Bush has intervened (which is an outright and absolutely shameless lie).

And what if Lucas was in fact falsely convicted and his innocence was so blatantly obvious that the governor had no choice but to commute Henry's sentence? What then does this say about the Texas criminal justice system and the ease with which it sends innocent men to their deaths? Are we to believe that Henry's case was an isolated one and that none of the other men put to death during Bush's reign had equally credible claims of innocence?

Clearly, there was something more at work then in the Lucas case than simply a question of guilt. There had to be another reason why Bush would take such extraordinary steps to
spare the life of a man who had led a life of such brutality. And this was certainly not the first time that the criminal justice system had shown such extraordinary leniency towards Lucas.

The first big break for Henry came around 1970, when he was released early from a sentence he was then serving following his first murder conviction. Sentenced to 20-40 years, Henry was released after serving just ten. This occurred just after Henry appeared before the parole board and explained to them that he wasn't ready to return to society and would surely kill again if released. As Henry tells it, the questioning went something like this: "Now Mr. Lucas, I must ask you, if we grant you parole, will you kill again?" Henry: "Yes, sir! If you release me now, I will kill again."

Nevertheless, the board decided that ten years was an adequate amount of time to serve for the crime of killing one's mother and then violating the corpse. Fair enough. Within a year, of course, Henry found himself back in prison, this time for attempting to abduct a young girl. Despite his prior record - which began long before killing his mother - Lucas served just four years and was again released early, this time in August of 1975. Shortly thereafter, Henry and his new friend Ottis would commit an untold number of lurid murders spanning the next eight years. Henry would finally be arrested in October of 1982 on suspicion of two murders, only to be promptly released. He was not arrested again until June of 1983, and has been imprisoned ever since.

After his final arrest, Henry was taken on tour, so to speak, by various law enforcement officials around the country, during which time he confessed to some 600 murders in 26 states. There were various charges made at the time that Henry was being used by his escorts to clear troublesome unsolved murders in places he had never even been.

This quite likely was the case. Henry seemed to have a very chummy relationship with his captors, particularly the Texas Rangers, and provided a valuable service for them by taking the rap for an amazing array of murders. This alone, however, does not explain the personal attention given to Henry's case by Governor Bush.

For that, we need to look at some of the more infrequently noted details of Henry's life history, many of them provided by Lucas himself. Henry, as it turns out, has some interesting stories to tell. In 1985, just a couple years into his incarceration, he attempted to tell his story in a book, written for him by a sympathetic author. The book, titled The Hand of Death: The Henry Lee Lucas Story, tells of Henry's indoctrination into a nationwide Satanic cult. Lucas claimed that he was trained by the cult in a mobile paramilitary camp in the Florida Everglades in the fine art of killing, up close and personal. Other training involved abduction and arson techniques.

He further claimed that leaders of the camp were so impressed with Henry's handling of a knife that he was allowed to serve as an instructor. Following his training, Henry claimed to have served the cult in various ways, including as a contract killer and as an abductor of children, who were then taken just over the border to a ranch in Juarez. Henry has said that this cult operated out of Texas and from a ranch in northern Mexico, trafficking in children and drugs, among other nefarious pursuits. In essence, Henry claimed that what appeared to be the random work of a serial killer was in fact a planned series of crimes often committed for specific purposes.

Some of the murders were political hits, according to Henry, including the occasional assassination of foreign dignitaries. This was not true for all of Henry's crimes. Some he did just because that's what he liked to do. And it was the one thing that he was really good at.

The beauty of this arrangement was that it allowed Henry to conceal the true motive for many of his crimes. Those performed as contract hits looked like all of Henry's murders -
senseless and random acts of violence. In Henry's version of events, it was Toole who was responsible for Henry's recruitment and training by the cult and many of the pair's exploits thereafter. Interestingly, in all the standard biographies of the pair, Toole is said to have been Henry's severely retarded junior partner.

It is quite clear from reading an interview granted by Toole to a journalist (of sorts) that he was not by any means retarded. Uneducated, no doubt, but definitely not severely retarded. Toole was in fact able to express himself quite clearly, though perversely, and displayed a substantial level of knowledge about the practices of Satanism. In fact, Toole - prior to his death in 1996- was able to give detailed accounts of him and Henry's activities that largely corroborated Henry's stories about the cult. But beyond the stories told by these two credibility-challenged witness/participants, is there any reason to believe Henry's bizarre tale of being a contract killer?

And what of Henry's other stories, including the one about being a close friend of Jim Jones of the People's Temple? Henry has claimed on numerous occasions that it was he who personally delivered the cyanide to Jones that was used in the infamous Jonestown massacre.

What are we to make of such stories? Could Henry have been telling the truth about being a contract killer? And if so, did the contracts he was receiving have some kind of government connection? Though Henry never broaches the subject in his book, the training camp as he describes it clearly had military connections. And Henry has explicitly stated that the cult included among its members various prominent persons, including high level politicians. Could this be the reason for the actions taken by Governor Bush in June of 1998?

"They think I'm stupid, but before this is all over everyone will know who's really stupid. And we'll see who the real criminals are." —Henry Lee Lucas

"A U.S. Navy psychologist, who claims that the Office of Naval Intelligence had taken convicted murderers from military prisons, used behaviour modification techniques on them, and then relocated them in American embassies throughout the world ... The Navy psychologist was Lt. Commander Thomas Narut of the U.S. Regional Medical Centre in Naples, Italy. The information was divulged at an Oslo NATO conference of 120 psychologists from the eleven nation alliance ... The Navy provided all the funding necessary, according to Narut.

"Dr. Narut, in a question and answer session with reporters from many nations, revealed how the Navy was secretly programming large numbers of assassins. He said that the men he had worked with for the Navy were being prepared for commando-type operations, as well as covert operations in U.S. embassies worldwide. He described the men who went through his program as 'hit men and assassins' who could kill on command.

"Careful screening of the subjects was accomplished by Navy psychologists through the military records ... and many were convicted murderers serving military prison sentences." (Harry V. Martin and David Caul "Mind Control, Napa Valley Sentinel, August-November 1991.)

Anyone familiar with the intelligence community's long-standing obsession with the concept of mind control will immediately recognize what Dr. Narut was describing as an MK-ULTRA project. The existence of this particular manifestation of the project was first reported by British journalist Peter Watson of the Sunday Times, who attended the conference and interviewed Dr. Narut. Narut told him that they looked for candidates who had shown a proclivity for violence.
This was at a time when numerous pseudo investigations of the intelligence community were underway, including the Rockefeller, Pike, and Church Committees. Narut told Watson that he was revealing this highly classified information only because he assumed it was about to surface anyway.

Of course, Narut was mistaken about the interest of the various committees in divulging anything even remotely resembling the truth. Narut promptly disappeared from public view, reappearing only briefly to lamely attempt to retract his prior statements. But it was a little too late.

Watson went on to expand upon this initial research to produce a book, War on the Mind, one of the better books from the late 1970's on the subject of mind control research by the intelligence community. Walter Bowart referenced Watson's work as well, in his nearly impossible to find Operation Mind Control. So this cat, once let out of the bag, proved rather difficult to stuff back inside. The intelligence community, it seemed, was recruiting from prisons to make use of the natural talents of convicted killers to produce the fabled 'Manchurian Candidates' - mind controlled assassins.

This operation involved killers drawn from military prisons, though there is no reason not to suspect that parallel programs were being conducted in civilian prisons as well. Prisons have, after all, provided fertile ground for any number of MK-ULTRA sub projects for decades. As the Napa Valley Sentinel article noted: "Mind control experiments ... permeate mental institutions and prisons." This was particularly true in the 1960's and 1970's. The NATO conference at which Dr. Narut dropped his bombshell was held in July of 1975. Strangely enough, the very next month Henry would be released to begin his eight year reign of terror. (My note. We will cover this case in greater detail in part two of this work.)

Clearly of relevance here is the fact that Lucas, during his prior ten year prison stay, spent four and a half of those years in a mental ward. During this time, he received intensive drug and electroshock treatments. He would later describe this period of incarceration as a "nightmare that would not end." Also during this time, he complained chronically about hearing voices in his head, taunting him day and night (ostensibly the reason for his confinement in the mental ward, though it could well have been the result of his confinement and treatment). Henry would later spend additional time in an institution in 1980, in the midst of his killing spree.

Was Henry recruited and programmed while in prison to be used latter by the so-called Hand of Death cult? The possibility clearly is there. He certainly had shown a voracious appetite for violence, enough so to make him a very attractive candidate. Indeed, Henry is just the kind of man to be considered a valuable asset by the intelligence community.

For anyone who doubts that the CIA (or any other of the numerous interwoven intelligence agencies) would recruit such a man, it is important to remember that we are talking about the same agencies that recruited some of the most bloodthirsty butchers of the Third Reich - men such as Klaus Barbie, Joseph Mengele, Adolf Eichmann, Otto Skorzeny, and Reinhard Gehlen.

Henry's depravity pales in the shadows of men such as these. Henry probably couldn't even hold his own against some of the organized crime figures - such as Lucky Luciano, Meyer Lansky and Santos Trafficante who were likewise recruited by the CIA. Or against the numerous thugs that the spooks have propped up as dictators around the world, men such as Somoza, Pinochet, Duvalier and Pahlavi, to name just a few.

In the company of men such as these, Henry would be just one of the boys. No less valuable an asset than, say, Dan Mitrione, the CIA torture aficionado who was a boyhood friend of Jim Jones. This man, known for having homeless persons kidnapped for the purpose of
giving torture demonstrations to South American security forces in his soundproof underground chamber of horrors, was hailed as a hero and martyr when he himself was tortured and killed. Hell, Frank Sinatra and Jerry Lewis flew into his home town and performed a benefit show to raise money for the widow of this great American. So in the world of spooks, Henry would be in good company. As would his partner, Ottis Toole, who wouldn't even have the distinction of being the only cannibal recruited by the CIA.

As Douglas Valentine writes in The Phoenix Program (Morrow, 1990) - concerning the CIA's assassination, torture and terror program waged against the people of Vietnam - the Phoenix teams consisted of SEALs working with "CTs," described by one participant as "a combination of ARVN deserters, VC turncoats, and bad motherfucker criminals the South Vietnamese couldn't deal with in prison, so they turned them over to us." The spooks were only too happy to employ the services of these men, who "taught [their] SEAL comrades the secrets of the psy war campaign." So depraved were these agency recruits that some of them "would actually devour their enemies' vital organs." All in a day's work for America's premier intelligence agency.

Also included in the CIA rogue's gallery of distinguished alumni, according to a number of researchers, is Lucas' self-described "close friend," the notorious Jim Jones (above). What then are we to make of Henry's professed connection to the tragic People's Temple? It has been documented by numerous investigators that the Jonestown massacre was not by any means a case of mass suicide, as was reported by the U.S. press. It was in fact a case of mass murder. The Guyanese coroner, Dr. C. Leslie Mootoo, concluded that only three of the 913 victims at Jonestown died by means of suicide on that fateful day. All of the rest were executed, some by lethal injection, some by strangulation, and some simply shot through the head.

It is apparent then that if Lucas was in fact at Jonestown at the time of the mass murder, he was quite likely doing considerably more than just serving as a delivery boy. A man of Henry's talents would be an invaluable asset in a clean-up operation of this type. And what was being cleaned up was, of course, yet another MK-ULTRA project, complete with vast stockpiles of drugs, sensory deprivation equipment, and a band of zombie-like assassins who gunned down Congressman Leo Ryan's entourage just prior to the massacre (thus necessitating the clean-up operation.)
Strange that Henry would claim a connection to a man whose operation was notable primarily for being a breeding ground for mind control and mass murder. Of course Henry, being uneducated and illiterate, would not likely have had access to this information.

Even if Henry was literate, he would not have known the story that Maury Terry was to later tell in his book, The Ultimate Evil. Told therein is a tale that chillingly parallels that of Henry and Ottis. What Terry revealed was that the murders attributed to the Son of Sam, the Manson Family, and numerous other interconnected killings (including possibly the Zodiac murders) were not what they appeared to be.

While these killings appeared to be the random work of serial/mass murderers, they actually were contract hits carried out for specific purposes by an interlocking network of Satanic cults (this book has, by the way, recently been reprinted by Barnes & Noble - go figure - and is highly recommended to anyone who questions the plausibility of Henry's story.) In other words, these were professional hits orchestrated and disguised to look like the work of yet another 'lone nut' serial killer. Which is, of course, exactly what Henry claimed his crimes to be, several years before investigative journalist Terry published his convincingly documented work.

Lucas' story then, as bizarre as it may appear to be, is certainly not without precedent. Other events that have transpired since Henry first began telling his tales of The Hand of Death lend further credence to various aspects of his story. For example, there is the issue of the cult-run ranch just south of the border. While this may have sounded rather far-fetched back in the early 1980's, it certainly doesn't today. In 1990, just such a ranch was excavated in Matamoros, Mexico, yielding the remains of over a dozen ritual sacrifice victims. While Ottis Toole - still alive at the time - noted that this was not the specific ranch with which he and Henry were associated, he also mentioned that there were numerous such operations in the area.

So closely did the Matamoros case parallel the stories told years before by Lucas that some law enforcement personnel in Texas chose to take a closer look at Henry's professed cult connections. In fact, Jim Boutwell, sheriff of Williamson County, Texas later told a reporter that investigators had verified that Lucas was indeed involved in cult activities. And a decade later, yet another excavation was begun, this time at a ranch near Juarez, Mexico, which is precisely where Henry claimed it to be. This story made a brief appearance in the American press in December of 1999, until U.S. officials moved in to take over the investigation, after which coverage promptly ceased.

Of course, it could just have been lucky guesses by Henry about the cult-run ranches and the networks of Satanic cults running murder-for-hire operations. And it could just be a coincidence that Toole, who was convicted in the state of Florida, shared with Henry the fate of having his death sentence commuted. Florida is, of course, a state that is also overly zealous in its application of the death penalty. Not zealous enough to execute the likes of Ottis Toole, however. In any event, it's interesting that both of these men had their death sentences set aside in states run by a member of the Bush family.

It's interesting also to take note of the case of the man known as the Railroad Killer, Rafael Resendez-Ramirez. On July 13, 1999, Ramirez was reported to have walked across a bridge from Juarez, Mexico into El Paso, Texas and turned himself in. At the time he was wanted for a string of alleged serial killings. Mirroring the circumstances surrounding Henry's final arrest, Ramirez had been taken into custody several weeks prior by the U.S. Border Patrol, only to be promptly released despite his presence on FBI most-wanted lists and the issuing of alerts to the immigration service, and with a nationwide manhunt under way.
Between this detainment and his surrender, four more victims would be felled by Ramirez (who was, strangely enough, born in Matamoros and raised outside of the home by non-family members, according to his mother). Apparently he still had a little work left to complete. Having done so, Ramirez then made the incomprehensible decision to surrender to Texas authorities. Crossing the border into Texas, Ramirez left a country with no death penalty and entered the execution capital of the western world. The Los Angeles Times, in reporting on his surrender, noted that he was "adamant he wanted to surrender to a Texas Ranger," and that "he had not requested an attorney and was cooperating with detectives."

In the same article, it is noted that authorities say Ramirez is "strikingly intelligent." Strikingly intelligent? Not based on his actions taken on July 13th of that year. But then again, perhaps Ramirez knows something about the Texas criminal justice system that the rest of us do not.

Ottis Toole: I've been meaning to ask you ... that time when I cooked some of these people? Why'd I do that?

Henry Lee Lucas: I think it was just the hands doing it. I know a lot of things we done, in human sight, are impossible to believe.

Ottis Toole: When we took 'em out and cut 'em up ... remember one time I said I wanted me some ribs? Did that make me a cannibal?

Henry Lee Lucas: You wasn't a cannibal. It's the force of the devil, something forced on us that we can't change. There's no reason denying what we become. We know what we are.

Part II: The Myth of the Serial Killer

"At some time I have start(ed) to hear funny voices, like a person calling me, but no one call me."
—Rafael Resendez-Ramirez, in a letter to a reporter in Houston following his surrender to authorities

Most Americans are familiar with what is considered the classic serial killer 'profile.' This was a notion first put forth by the venerable FBI, which coined the term 'serial killer' and pioneered the concept of 'profiling,' in an alleged attempt to understand the phenomenon of mass murder. In truth, as we shall see, the concept of the serial killer profile was put forth largely to disinform the public.

In the case of Henry Lee Lucas, few if any of the elements of the serial killer profile apply. For instance, serial killers are said to act alone, driven to do so only by their own private demons. So far removed from ordinary human behaviour are their actions that they would not, indeed could not, share their private passions with others. In Henry's case, this is a patently false notion. It has been officially acknowledged that Lucas worked with at least one, and at times as many as three accomplices (Toole's pre-teen niece and nephew were frequently brought along to witness - and at times participate in - the crimes of Henry and Ottis).
It is also claimed that serial killers target a particular type of victim, similar in age, gender, race, and other demographic factors. Again, in Henry's case, this simply does not fit the known facts. Henry's victims in fact had little, if anything, in common physically with one another. The victim's ages ranged from children to the elderly. Both genders and all races were also well represented.

It is further claimed that serial killers follow a readily identifiable MO, with the means of obtaining victims and the trajectory of the crime following a well defined pattern. And again, this is clearly not the case with Lucas. Victims were obtained and death inflicted by a variety of means - including bludgeoning, stabbing, strangulation, shooting, and suffocation. Some were killed in their homes, while others were abducted and taken to remote locations. Some were sexually abused, both before and after death, while others were not. Some were cannibalized. Some were left on display - for maximum impact upon their discovery - while others were left so as not to be discovered at all.

In other ways as well, Henry Lee - the consummate serial killer - did not even come close to matching the profile of what he was supposed to be. Strangely though, perhaps the most remarkable aspect of the Henry Lee Lucas story is that it is not actually remarkable at all. In reviewing the case histories of some two dozen other alleged serial killers, it becomes readily apparent that few - if any - fit the supposed profile.

The victims of Resendez-Ramirez, for instance, ranged in age from 21 to 88 years, with a mix of males and females. The cause of death varied as well, with most being bludgeoned, though one was shot in the head, another stabbed, and yet another had a pick-axe buried in her head. Though not readily apparent, all of these weapons used for inflicting death - by both Lucas and Ramirez - had one thing in common: they are what are termed 'weapons of opportunity.' In other words, they are weapons that were acquired at the crime scene immediately before the murders were committed.

Notably, this precisely mirrors the means by which the CIA has historically taught its assassins to kill. A CIA training manual entitled A Study of Assassination advises the would-be killer that "the simplest local tools are often the most efficient means of assassination. A hammer, axe, wrench, screwdriver, fire poker, kitchen knife, lamp stand, or anything hard, heavy and handy will suffice ... All such improvised weapons have the important advantage of availability and apparent innocence ... the assassin may accidentally be searched before the act and should not carry an incriminating device if any sort of lethal weapon can be improvised at or near the site."

The Mafia assassination service known as Murder, Inc. - the brainchild of the Lansky/Luciano syndicate, which had extensive connections to U.S. intelligence agencies - had a similar philosophy. As Jay Robert Nash notes in Bloodletters and Bad Men: "Like most of Murder, Inc.'s assassins, Pittsburgh Phil never carried a weapon in case the local police picked him up on suspicion. He would cast about, once he had selected his murder spot, for any tool handy that would do the job."

(As a brief aside, it should be noted that the man identified above as Pittsburgh Phil, whose real name was Harry Strauss, was credited with killing at least 500 people in this manner from the late 1920's through 1940. This feat should put him at or near the top of any self-respecting serial killer list.)

Henry Lee recounts in The Hand of Death that his training by the cult followed this time-honoured tradition. Of course, the venerable FBI assures us that Satanic cults and Satanic crime do not exist in modern day America. To put this in its proper context, however, it is important to remember that this is the very same FBI that during the reign of Murder, Inc. - and for several decades thereafter - refused to acknowledge the existence of organized
crime in America. It is also the same FBI that for years ignored the resurgence of the Ku Klux Klan.

(The Klan, it should be noted, began as an occult based group formed just after the close of the Civil War by an alliance of Confederate Generals and intelligence operatives. The cult's original charter was drafted by General Albert Pike (above), (My note: much more on him later, Martin.) who had served as the chief of Confederate Intelligence. The point of this digression is that the intelligence community has a long history of spawning occult based groups dedicated to terrorizing society.)

A number of America's other notable serial killers showed a proclivity for utilizing weapons of opportunity as well. The other serial killing Ramirez - Los Angeles' famed Night Stalker - is a case in point. In the majority of the murders attributed to that Ramirez, the victims (who ranged in age from six to eighty-four and were of various races and genders) were stabbed, bludgeoned, slashed, strangled, or electrocuted with weapons acquired at the crime scene. And strangely enough, some were intentionally left alive, as was the case with Resendez-Ramirez as well.

Florida serial killer Bobby Joe Long also showed a preference for inflicting death by a variety of means (shooting, strangling, stabbing), often with weapons of opportunity, and also left some of his victims alive. So too did Ted Bundy, whose most notorious alleged crime - the bludgeoning of four women in the Chi Omega sorority house, was committed with a club acquired on the grounds of the house immediately before his entry. This crime, by the way, was in marked contrast to Bundy's previous alleged murders, which involved but a single victim. Bundy's final murder before his incarceration, the killing of a twelve year old girl, also did not match his supposed MO as put forth by FBI profilers.

As previously stated, this is the rule rather than the exception. Arthur Shawcross, dubbed the Genesee River Killer, also showed no consistency in the targeting of victims. Males and females, young and old, black and white - all were represented on the victim's list of Shawcross. And this pattern, or non-pattern, is evident in the tales of numerous other serial killers:

Charles Ng and Leonard Lake: authorities recovered the remains of seven men, three women, and two babies from their Northern California compound. The causes of death were impossible to determine.

Jeffrey Dahmer: his victims, while all young men, included whites, blacks, Asians, Hispanics and American Indians.

The Hillside Stranglers (Angelo Buono and Kenneth Bianchi): all victims were women, but the cause of death varied, including electrocution, strangulation, lethal injections, and lethal gas (all methods that have been used, strangely enough, to perform judicial executions).

Richard Speck: his eight alleged victims died by a variety of means, including strangulation, stabbing, slashing of the throat and breaking of the neck, all in a single evening.

The Gainesville Ripper (Danny Rolling): his victims included both men and women from various age groups.
The Boston Strangler (Albert DeSalvo): his victims represented a range of ages, races and attractiveness. Though most were strangled, either with materials acquired at the crime scene or manually, some were stabbed, mutilated and/or sexually molested as well. Most were left on display, though one was discreetly covered with a blanket.

The Vampire of Sacramento (Richard Chase): his victim's ages ranged from 20 months to 51 years, both males and females. Causes of death included shootings, stabbings and bludgeonings, with some victims left mutilated, beheaded and/or disembowelled. Some were cannibalized as well.

The Coed Killer (Edmund Kemper): all victims were female, though of various ages and races. Death was inflicted by means of stabbing, strangulation, suffocation, shooting and bludgeoning.

Herbert Mullin: his victims, both male and female, varied in age from children to the middle-aged. Weapons of choice included guns, knives and blunt instruments.

The Manson Family: victims, again both males and females, ranged in age from teen-aged Steven Parent to middle-aged Leno LaBianca. Death came by way of shootings, stabbings and bludgeonings, or a combination of these.

Clearly then there are any number of serial killer cases in which there is no defining Modus Operandi, and in which the deceased don't fit any kind of 'victim profile.' But what of the notion of the serial killer as a lone predator? Was Henry and Ottis' partnership an aberration? Not at all. There are any number of serial killer cases where it is officially acknowledged that there was more than one perpetrator. The Manson Family, of course, is probably the most well known case of multiple perpetrator 'serial killing.' Less well known is the case of the 'Ripper Crew' in Chicago in the early 1980's.

Described by authorities as a four-man Satanic cult, the Rippers - led by charismatic Robin Gecht - killed as many as 17 women in as many months. There could well have been more than four members of this particular murderous cult, however. A few days after the four were arrested, another ritually mutilated body showed up at a location where previous bodies had been left by the Rippers. Below: The Ripper Crew

Then there is the case of Charles Ng (right). Though Ng was the only one to stand trial for his series of killings, it is acknowledged that the crimes were committed with the assistance of Leonard Lake (left), who committed suicide upon his arrest. And evidence strongly suggests that there were others involved as well. Lake's ex-wife was almost certainly involved. Police were well aware that at the very least, she had tampered with - and removed evidence from - the crime scene, including twelve videotapes believed to be snuff films of the murders. And a diary seized by police with a detailed plan to construct a series of bunkers outfitted with supplies, weapons, and sex slaves strongly hinted that there was more than just two individuals involved.
Many other serial killers have worked in pairs as well, such as the Hillside Strangler team of Kenneth Bianchi and Angelo Buono. Working the same Los Angeles area turf just one year after the Stranglers were stopped was the team of Roy Norris and Lawrence 'Pliers' Bittaker. And a few years after they were caught, the team of Douglas Clark and Carol Bundy would be working the same L.A. streets in a series of killings dubbed the 'Sunset Strip Murders.'

The year after they were caught, another serial killer took over the L.A. market - Richard Ramirez, the notorious 'Night Stalker.' According to numerous witnesses - who placed Ramirez back in his home state of Texas at the time of some of the killings - these murders were not the work of a single killer either. Other evidence as well - such as the fact that more than one gun was used in the killings - tends to point to multiple perpetrators.

Then there is the matter of the 'Son of Sam' killings in New York. Though most of the literature available paints Berkowitz as the proverbial lone serial killer, Maury Terry and others have presented a compelling case that the killings were in fact the work of multiple cult members. In other serial killer cases as well, evidence pointing to multiple assailants is ignored or explained away with unlikely scenarios.

The body of one of Bobby Joe Long's victims, for instance, yielded semen showing both A and B blood types, indicating at least two perpetrators. A later victim also yielded semen evidence which did not match that obtained from the previous victim. And none of the samples proved to match the samples taken from their alleged killer.

There has long been speculation that the work of the 'Boston Strangler,' officially deemed to be Albert DeSalvo, was not the work of one man. Most of the officials involved in the investigation, in fact, never believed that a single killer was responsible. Of the eight members of the psychiatric panel convened to develop a 'profile,' seven believed that there were at least two perpetrators.

Even in those cases that seem to come closest to matching the classic serial killer profile, such as John Wayne Gacy and Jeffrey Dahmer, there is a compelling case to be made that there were others involved. That evidence will be examined in the next instalment of this series. Here we will examine the cases of two high-profile alleged serial killers/mass murderers who were said to be acting alone. The first is a very recent case, that of Yosemite killer Cary Stayner. The other dates all the way back to 1966, the year Richard Speck allegedly went berserk in a home filled with young nursing students in Chicago, becoming the first mass murderer of the television age.

"It's more of a shadow than anything else. You know it's a human being, but yet you can't accept it. The killin' itself, it's like say, you're walkin' down the road. Half of me will go this way and the other half goes that way. The right-hand side didn't know what the left-hand side was going to do."

—Henry Lee Lucas, describing how he perceived his victims prior to killing them

In February of 1999, a forty-three year old woman and two teenage girls (one her daughter) were brutally murdered while visiting Yosemite National Park in California. Police originally
suspected a group of men and women with extensive criminal records who were known members of a drug trafficking ring.

At least eleven members of this group were at one time suspected of complicity in the women's deaths. The group was based in Modesto, where one of the victim's billfolds incongruously showed up some time after the murders. One member of the group worked at the hotel/restaurant from where the women disappeared. Another had in her possession the victim's bank account number and ATM password. Yet another made incriminating statements to police and was discovered to have blanket fluff in his vehicle that matched the fibres recovered from one of the victims.

Investigators were building a substantial case against the group - who were being held in custody on unrelated charges - when a fourth victim was discovered in Yosemite. Two days later it was declared that a handyman at the hotel taken into custody, Cary Stayner, was solely responsible for all four murders. Unexplained, then or now, was the evidence that earlier had pointed in the direction of others.

Many of those involved in the case harbour serious doubts that Stayner acting alone could have committed these crimes. Apart from the physical evidence and testimony implicating others, the story concocted to explain how these murders were the work of a single individual is questionable at best. A good number of police and FBI agents assigned to the case believed from the beginning that more than one perpetrator was responsible, based on the physical implausibility of a single assailant. Many doubt that one man acting alone could have gotten the jump, so to speak, on three able-bodied women and bound them all.

They also doubt that one man could have carried the three bodies out to his car undetected, with one still alive and most likely resisting the killer's efforts, aware that her friend and mother had both already been killed. According to the official story though, that is exactly what happened. Stayner then allegedly single-handedly cleaned up the hotel room in which the first two murders occurred before driving for miles to kill the third victim and dump the body. The killer then supposedly drove many more miles to another location to abandon the car, with the other two bodies still in the trunk.

Stayner is next said to have taken a cab back to Yosemite Valley, though he would most likely have been covered in blood at the time. Two days later, he is said to have returned to the car in yet another vehicle and at that time to have set it afire, still with the two bodies inside. After this, he allegedly drove to Modesto to dump the billfold, though why he didn't destroy it in the car fire along with the rest of the evidence is anyone's guess.

Even with this rather convoluted story, authorities have not been able to explain away all of the incongruous evidence. For example, a taunting letter sent by the killer revealing the location of one of the bodies was sealed with saliva that was not that of Stayner. The FBI reluctantly acknowledged that DNA tests had verified that fact. Spokesmen for the Bureau had an explanation, however: their theory was that Stayner had "tricked an unsuspecting male" into supplying the saliva to seal the envelope. How exactly this would be done was left to the imagination. As was why it would be done. If Stayner had the foresight to not want to leave incriminating evidence on the letter and envelope, why not just use ordinary old tap water? It's been known to do the job.

If the available evidence in the Stayner case leaves doubts about the sole guilt of the accused, this is all the more true in the case of the infamous Richard Speck. The official story of what happened to those eight student nurses in the early morning hours of July 14, 1966 is, in a word, preposterous. If veteran criminal investigators are puzzled as to how Stayner was able to subdue three women, then it boggles the imagination how one man was
able to single-handedly subdue nine women, bind them all, and then systematically kill all but one of them.

According to the sole survivor, Cora Amurao (left), it was she who answered the door that night, allowing Speck entry into the home. She claimed he was brandishing a gun, though none of the victims were shot that night and no evidence was ever found indicating that a gun was used at the crime scene. It was claimed that Speck stole the gun from a rape victim on the very day of the slaughter, after which it promptly disappeared.

Speck quickly corralled Amurao and the five other women in the house into a room, where he proceeded to tear up a sheet into strips and tie the women up, one by one. How he was able to accomplish this while keeping all the rest at bay is anyone's guess. Three more women would arrive home that evening and would likewise be subdued and bound by Speck.

Meanwhile, Speck began dragging the women off one at a time and slaughtering them, taking twenty minutes or more with each victim. As he finished with each, according to Amurao, he would wash up and then return for another. This scene played itself out over the course of at least three hours. During this time, the women awaiting their turn tried to hide under the beds, hoping to elude their assailant. They were, of course, found and killed. All, that is, except Cora Amurao who claims she avoided detection by Speck. The suggestion was made that Speck had lost count of his victims and had falsely concluded that all the girls were dead, thereby making the crucial error of leaving a living witness.

This part of the story is problematic in a number of ways. The first question raised is why did the girls remain in the room in which they were bound? If, despite their bindings, they were able to move about within the room - which they clearly were or they would not have been able to get under the beds - then why not leave the room altogether? And once out of the room, why not get completely out of the house? And what was to prevent the women from untying each other?

After all, the pattern was set early on. After the first couple of slayings, it had to be abundantly clear to the women that their lives were about to come to an abrupt end. It also had to be quite clear that there would be twenty minutes to kill (no pun intended) before the killer returned, more than enough time to attempt an escape. And what was there to lose? It is inconceivable that these women would have remained to await their turn with Speck.

And what of the survivor? It should be readily apparent to anyone that an adult human simply cannot successfully hide underneath a bed. This is amply illustrated by the fact that all but one of those attempting to do so were discovered. And yet one survived. How is it possible that these women would have remained to await their turn with Speck.

Clearly if not for the existence of the survivor, the police would have immediately assumed multiple perpetrators. No theorizing was necessary, however, as the witness was on the scene to provide the unlikely scenario that would be refined to become the official story. Even so, the composite drawing of the suspect released by police clearly did not resemble Speck.

Since the entire trial of the man fingered by Amurao hinged on her eyewitness testimony - and little else - this star witness was zealously protected. She was kept incommunicado and prepped extensively for months for the testimony that she was to deliver, but not before she had identified the suspect in a most unusual manner. While Speck was recovering in the
hospital from a failed suicide attempt, Amurao was allegedly sent in dressed as a nurse to observe the suspect. From this encounter, she positively identified him as the killer.

Leaving aside the obvious fact that this was a blatantly illegitimate means of identifying a suspect - which would have invalidated any subsequent attempts by Ms. Amurao to pick Speck out of a police line-up - the real question here is: in what alternative reality would this ever actually happen? What calibre of police official would send a severely traumatized crime victim - who just days before had witnessed the slaughter of eight of her friends and experienced the sheer terror of knowing that she could well be next - into a room unprotected to face the man who had put her through such torture? And what victim would be able to do so, with the memories so fresh? And what guarantee was there that Speck would not recognize his accuser, given that hers was the first face he had seen as he entered the house that night?

At any rate, this was just a warm-up exercise for what was to come. When the time came for Amurao to deliver her critical testimony, she delivered a bravura performance. She recited a meticulously rehearsed version of the events of July 14, and when the time came to identify the suspect in court, she played her trump card. Rising from her seat - allegedly without prompting or rehearsal - she calmly stepped out of the witness box, walked casually over to where Speck sat, stood directly in front of him while looking him in the eye, and told the court: "This is the man." That was the clincher; Speck was found guilty and sentenced to death.

There are indications though that this was not a foregone conclusion. Prosecutors clearly had doubts about their ridiculously shaky case. One indication of this is the remarkable fact that, though the case was moved some three hours outside of Chicago to Peoria, the judge stayed on in the new venue, an unprecedented development. This same judge slapped a gag order on the press, guaranteeing that no news would get back to Chicago - or anywhere else in the country for that matter. Coupled with the blocking of any interviews with Amurao, this action shut the public out from ever learning the weakness of the case against Speck.

But no matter. Authorities and the press had already assured everyone that Speck was guilty. And the public was hungry for a culprit to hang this heinous crime on. Speck would do just fine. But many of the more thoughtful citizens of Chicago are still waiting to learn what really happened in that house on that fateful night.

The most likely explanation? The 'survivor' and star witness was not actually a survivor at all. She was quite possibly an accomplice to a cult of individuals who perpetrated this slaughter. She was, as they say, the inside man. And it was not likely an accident that she was left alive. It was absolutely essential that she remain alive to sell the single assailant scenario and thereby derail an investigation before it ever began.

After all, authorities had noted from the beginning that the house was not highly visible and had immediately assumed familiarity of the killer with the surroundings. Speck did not have this familiarity, though Amurao certainly did. And it is likely not a coincidence that Amurao admitted to being the one to let the killer (or killers) into the house, while ironically becoming the sole survivor.

And what of Speck? He was likely little more than a patsy or fall guy. He may have had some involvement with the killings, though he certainly was not the sole assailant. And he might not have been in the house at all that night. He had no memory of ever leaving the bar that he had been drinking in earlier that evening, though he did remember receiving an injection from a man he didn't know that was supposed to contain speed.

It's possible that, like David Berkowitz, he may have taken the fall to protect the rest of the clan. This would certainly explain the preposterously lax treatment of Speck during his
confinement. Or maybe you didn't catch that little home videotape - produced circa 1988 - that depicted Speck snorting huge piles of cocaine and flashing rolls of money (not to mention sporting a rather large and quite unattractive pair of breasts).

How is it possible that one of America's most notorious killers, while residing in what is reputedly one of the toughest prisons in the country, was able to obtain copious quantities of drugs and money and gain access to video equipment and hormone treatments has never been explained. It could be that Speck was rewarded in prison for being such a stand-up guy and taking the fall. Or it could be, as the right-wing law-and-order crowd would have you believe, that this is yet another indication of how America coddles its criminals.

If you choose this explanation, however, you might consider explaining that fact to the hundreds of thousands of non-violent offenders rotting away in jails and prisons all across this country, many serving longer sentences than some of America's serial killers have served. And you might also ponder why it was that Speck's death sentence was overturned on appeal, leaving him eligible for parole in just ten years.

Footnote: A couple weeks after the Chicago slaughter, Charles Whitman - a former marine who had received training by the Naval Enlisted Science Education Program (NESEP), an intelligence entity - would climb the tower at the University of Texas carrying three rifles, three handguns and a shotgun, and proceed to open fire, killing sixteen. Whitman would leave a note which read, in part, "I don't quite understand what is compelling me to type this note. I have been to a psychiatrist. I have been having fears and violent impulses."

Both of these mass murders occurred, strangely enough, just a few months after Anton LaVey had formally established the Church of Satan and declared April 30, 1966 to be the first day of the Age of Satan. Just a few weeks prior to that, long-time CIA asset Henry Luce's venerable Time magazine had asked its readers the symbolic question: "Is God Dead?" The face of a particularly brutal criminal enterprise, masquerading as a religion, was beginning to emerge from the shadows.

"I must have done it, if everybody says I did." —Richard Speck

Part III: Seven Degrees of Henry Lee

"Can I tell you who really I am, with all the secrecy that's in the family? ... I only have one purpose in life, and that's to express some of my views and some of the views that I have been instructed - anything that can put down Christianity, anything that can put down democracy, anything that can put down freedom."

—Rafael Resendez-Ramirez, delivering his closing argument to a jury in St. Louis, March 1989

Henry's reign of terror had been ended for a mere nine months when another series of violent 'serial killings' began on March 27, 1984 in part of Henry's old stomping ground, the state of Florida (where Resendez-Ramirez also confessed to having committed two murders).
By the time it was over, ten people had met with a gruesome death, allegedly at the hands of Bobby Joe Long. Though rarely mentioned in press accounts of the killings, Long is a distant cousin of Henry Lee Lucas.

It had been just over two years since John Wayne Gacy had been indicted for the murder of thirty-three young men in Chicago when the first of a ‘new’ wave of ‘serial killings’ began terrorizing the people of the Windy City. A year-and-a-half later, seventeen young women had fallen victim to the ‘Ripper Crew,’ led by Robin Gecht. Though infrequently mentioned, Gecht had been one of the young male employees of John Gacy. Seventeen years later, just days prior to the scheduled execution of one of the ‘Rippers’, David Gecht - son of Robin - would be arrested along with three accomplices and charged with committing an act of murder.

The odds that it is merely coincidence that two serial killers worked side by side without either having awareness of - or involvement in - the other's killings are surely astronomical. More likely is that Gecht was a member of a cult led by Gacy and was indeed involved in the earlier series of killings. Well documented is that Gacy surrounded himself with young men and boys, one of whom was Robin Gecht.

Also documented is that Gacy had these boys excavate the twenty-nine graves located directly beneath his house. While it is claimed that the boys were unaware that what they were digging were graves, how credible is this claim? The stench of death permeating the space beneath Gacy's house - and indeed the house itself - was universally described as overwhelming.

It seems entirely possible that those digging the graves - and likely burying the bodies as well - were teen cultists led by Gacy himself. The home was likely used as something of a safe house for the cult, as well as a body drop. Following the arrest of Gacy, the group - now under the leadership of Gecht - was likely forced to take its activities out onto the streets, so to speak.

The change in gender of the victims could be due to one of two factors: a deliberate attempt to disassociate the Ripper killings from the Gacy killings; or simply a reflection of the difference in sexual preference between Gacy and Gecht. At any rate, it is an acknowledged fact that the Ripper Crew was a Satanic cult that killed as a group, much as did the Manson Family. Prosecutors in fact likened Gecht's followers to the Family, who yearned to please their leader and killed on command.

As mentioned in Part 1 of this series, the string of shootings dubbed the ‘Son of Sam’ murders were not - as is generally believed - the work of David Berkowitz acting alone, but were likewise the work of a Satanic cult (this case has been exhaustively researched by Maury Terry and documented in his book, The Ultimate Evil). An offshoot of the Process Church of the Final Judgment, the cult has been referred to as both the ‘Chingon’ cult and the ‘Four-P’ cult.

The Process Church, which set up shop in San Francisco, was itself an offshoot of the Church of Scientology, which was the brainchild of L. Ron Hubbard - an agent of the Office of Naval Intelligence and the son of a U.S. Navy Commander. Before being inspired to create his own church, Hubbard was a close associate and follower of Jack Parsons, rocket fuel scientist and avid follower of the occult, who helped found the prestigious Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, California.
Parsons (above left) was at the time the head of the American chapter of the OTO (Ordo Templi Orientis), a title bestowed on him by mentor Aleister Crowley, a flamboyant occultist, British and American intelligence asset, and avid Nazi sympathizer and propagandist both before and during World War II. (Hubbard above right, LaVey below left the (bald one))

Crowley had assumed the leadership of the OTO in 1922 when founder Theodor Reuss - a German occultist and intelligence asset - had stepped down. The OTO then - along with the various organizations spawned from it - is in a direct line of descent from the German occult-based secret societies that gave rise to the Third Reich, a fact made evident by the ideology and symbolism of the Process Church, whose logo is a modified swastika.

Back in the Bay area, Anton Szandor LaVey and Crowley-enthusiast Kenneth Anger would set about busily organizing the Church of Satan in San Francisco, where LaVey would become something of a celebrity - the clown prince of Satanism. From this church would spring forth both the Temple of Set - led by U.S. intelligence asset and psychological warfare specialist Lt. Col. Michael Aquino - and the Werewolf Order, founded by LaVey's daughter Zeena and Manson-admirer Nikolas Schreck. (My note. more on Mr Aquino later, this man is one very sick puppy - Martin).

Both of these off-shoots embraced an unabashedly fascist ideology. The Werewolf Order was patterned directly after the Nazi-front Werewolf Corps created in post-war Germany to thwart any attempts at denazification. Zeena LaVey and Nikolas Schreck are also notable for holding a public gathering on August 8, 1988 to celebrate the anniversary of the slaughter of Sharon Tate by the Manson Family.

So great is Aquino's admiration for Nazi Germany that he once paid a visit to Wewelsburg Castle - a Satanic holy ground owing to the fact that the castle was lavishly restored by Heinrich Himmler to serve as the headquarters of the Black Order of the SS - to perform a Satanic 'working.' Interestingly, Aquino considers himself to be a homunculus (a being created by magic), the result of a 'working' performed by Jack Parsons and L. Ron Hubbard.
Aquino, (below right) who before splitting with the group was the highest ranking member of the Church of Satan other than LaVey, has said that LaVey secretly forged an alliance with the National Renaissance Party, an overtly racist, neo-Nazi organization. This is not difficult to believe, given that LaVey's writings can best be characterized as 'religious fascism.'

From this primordial stew would arise, in the late sixties, the Manson Family. Much of Manson's ideology was taken directly from the teachings of the Process Church, with whom Charlie was closely connected, as alluded to by Bugliosi in Helter Skelter, and greatly elaborated on by Ed Sanders in The Family (to verify that both Satanic and Nazi imagery and philosophy are integral to the teachings of the Family, pay a visit to the official Family web site, maintained for Charlie by long-time disciple Sandra Good).

LaVey in fact provides one of many connections between killers and victims. He had formed a close association with Roman Polanski shortly before the murders, when he served as the technical consultant for Polanski on his film Rosemary's Baby, in which he also made a cameo appearance as - who else? - Satan. Newspaper accounts at the time of the slayings were rife with claims that the Polanski's were Satanists who hosted drug and sex orgies. But here I digress.

The point is that the Manson Family (below) had numerous affiliations with an array of Satanic groups. In fact, Terry's evidence indicates that the Family was (and is) a Satanic cult itself, a faction of the Process-spawned Chingon cult and a sister group to the New York chapter responsible for the Son of Sam slayings. The Family was, appropriately enough, deeply involved in drug trafficking, as Henry Lee Lucas claimed his cult to be. It's likely not a coincidence that Ottis Toole was known to have paid visits to the Process Church headquarters in New Orleans.

Further evidence presented by Terry indicates that another sister group was in operation in the sixties and seventies in the San Francisco/Santa Cruz area, with this interlocking network quite possibly responsible for the Zodiac murders as well. With all this in mind, we now turn our attention to the Santa Cruz area and the explosion of violent murders that belched forth from that cauldron.
In March of 1967, Charles Milles Manson was released from prison and given transport to San Francisco, where - despite having served virtually his entire adult life in prison - he immediately started gathering followers, many recruited from the various Satanic groups blossoming in the area. In the Spring of the following year, 1968, Manson loaded his new followers into a bus and took them on the road, ultimately settling into the Los Angeles area where he quickly and improbably established numerous prominent contacts in the entertainment business.

In December of 1968, what was thought to be the first of the Zodiac murders rocked the San Francisco area (it would later be learned that the killings actually began in the Los Angeles area on October 30, 1966, shortly after the rampages of Richard Speck and Charles Whitman). Others would soon follow. On August 9th and 10th of 1969, the Manson Family committed two of the most notorious multiple murders in the nation's history - the Tate-LaBianca slayings - victims of which included Sharon Tate, the daughter of Colonel Paul Tate of U.S. Army Intelligence.

Meanwhile, elsewhere in the country, a man named Stanley Baker was convicted in July of 1970 for the murder of a Montana resident. Baker candidly admitted to his arresting officers that he had a little problem - he was a cannibal. As proof, he produced from his pocket a well-gnawed human finger. Baker, as it turns out, liked to talk and candidly admitted his involvement in numerous other murders that he claimed to have committed as a member of the aforementioned Four-P cult. In fact, police were able to conclusively link him to a particularly brutal mutilation murder in San Francisco, thanks to his having thoughtfully left behind a bloody fingerprint. California courts nevertheless declined to prosecute Baker for the homicide with the ridiculous claim that he had been denied a speedy trial.

Despite his confessed involvement in a number of murders, and despite the fact that the murder he was convicted of involved him ripping out the man's heart and eating it, Baker was released from prison after just fourteen years and remains at large today. This was perhaps due to the fact that he had distinguished himself as a model prisoner during his incarceration by starting his own Satanic cult and having no fewer than eleven weapons confiscated by guards (the theme of inexplicably lenient treatment by the criminal 'justice' system, already mentioned in conjunction with Henry Lee, will be more fully explored later).

Just months after the conviction of Baker - in a case closely mirroring the slaughter of the residents of the Tate house - John Lindley Frazier, allegedly acting alone, killed all the occupants of a home in Santa Cruz, including a prominent doctor, his wife, secretary, and two children. As a grand finale, he threw the bodies in the pool (largely cleansing them of forensic evidence) and then lit the house on fire. Frazier, who was known to have a strong interest in the occult, was said to have started his own lifestyle as an Aquarian Age hermit, living in a six-foot-square shack in the woods (can you say Ted Kaczynski - who was, by the way, a subject of MK-ULTRA experiments while a student at Harvard).

Not long after Frazier's rampage, and while the death toll of the Zodiac Killer continued to rise, Edmund Kemper began his bloody odyssey through the streets of Santa Cruz, ultimately leaving eight dead before being stopped in early 1973. Most of his victims were beheaded and dissected, as well as being cannibalized and sexually abused after their death. Just five months after Kemper claimed his first victim, Herbert Mullin began a parallel series of killings in (where else?) Santa Cruz.

Mullin (left) also admitted to having a strong interest in the occult, a fact made evident by the nature of the killings attributed to him. His first victim was killed on Friday the 13th, his second on or about Halloween. His third killing was the stabbing of a Catholic priest in his confessional on November 2 - All Souls Day (this may have been a politically motivated hit;
the victim, Father Henry Tomei, was a hero of the anti-fascist French resistance movement during World War II).

All told, Mullin would be credited with thirteen killings in just four months before being stopped in February of 1973. While awaiting trial on the charges, he was assigned a cell adjoining none other than Ed Kemper. The two were, inexplicably, represented by the same defence attorney - James Jackson - who had not long before represented fellow Santa Cruz mass murderer John Frazier. Even more inexplicably, all three were 'examined' after their arrest by psychiatrist Donald Lunde, who appeared as a witness in all three trials. Apparently, there aren't many defence attorneys or psychiatric witnesses available in Santa Cruz (Mullin attempted to refuse the services of attorney Jackson, but the judge denied his request).

For those who have lost count, that makes six serial killers/mass murderers - Charles Manson, Stanley Baker, John Lindley Frazier, Edmund Kemper, Herbert Mullin, and the Zodiac - all spawned from the Santa Cruz/San Francisco area in a span of just over four years, a rather remarkable geographic anomaly that has never been addressed. These killers were part of the dawn of a new era that would see serial killers become an ever-present part of the American culture.

Prior to 1960, fewer than two serial killers a year were reported nationwide. By 1970, the number had climbed to six per year, and by 1980 had tripled that figure. By 1990, nearly three dozen serial killers a year were being reported. Not surprisingly then, the rash of Satanic murders afflicting California would continue. In 1977, not far from San Francisco, another serial killer began a string of killings.

Richard Chase, (left) dubbed the Vampire of Sacramento, would soon stand accused of six homicides that were laced with Satanic symbolism, including the ritual mutilation of the left breast of one of his female victims and the drinking of his victim's blood (this preoccupation with the left breast of victims was shared by the Ripper Crew, who routinely severed and cannibalized the left breast of their victims. In the Boston Strangler case, one of the victims was found with 18 stab wounds forming a design on her left breast. And Resendez-Ramirez, aside from his killings in the U.S., is suspected in the ritual murders of as many as 187 women in Juarez, Mexico - many of whom had their left breast severed).

Yet another Satanic serial killer was to terrorize California in 1984, the highly publicized Night Stalker - Richard Ramirez (right). Ramirez's involvement in Satanism was so flagrant that it was impossible for the press to ignore. He was routinely referred to as a 'self-styled Satanist,' however, which is clearly not the case. In truth, Ramirez was connected to at least one high-profile Satanic church, and likely to a covert cult as well.

Richard was first introduced to Satanism at a young age by his older cousin Mike in - of all places - El Paso, Texas (or possibly even earlier by his father, a former policeman in Juarez, Mexico). Mike was a decorated Green Beret who had served as a special forces operative in Vietnam. Chances are that cousin Mike was in fact a Phoenix Program assassin, who clearly relished the opportunity that Vietnam gave him to engage in his bloodlust.

Mike had documented some of his assignments in Vietnam by taking graphic Polaroid photos depicting rape, extreme torture, mutilation, and murder. These he shared with his young cousin Richard. There is reason to believe that Mike also got Richard involved with a cult, which certainly don't seem to be in short supply in the El Paso area. Richard left El Paso in 1978 and journeyed to California, where he quickly hooked up with
LaVey's Church of Satan, where he was honoured with a one-on-one meeting with LaVey. It is claimed that he parted company with LaVey's group before his killing spree began, though his interest in Satanism clearly continued, as evidenced by the symbolism attending the Night Stalker crime scenes, including the drawing of pentagrams.

Also described as a 'dabbler' in Satanism was everyone's favourite cannibal, Jeffrey Dahmer. It is likely that Dahmer was much more than just a dabbler, a fact made clear by the detailed plan for constructing a Satanic altar that was found in his apartment, complete with the human skulls he had been collecting. In one of the most bizarre 'coincidences' surrounding America's serial killers, the brother of one of Dahmer's victims was found stabbed to death in March of 1999 - long after Dahmer himself had been murdered - in what was described by police as a ritual sacrifice.

This would tend to indicate that others were involved in Dahmer's murder spree, though it is possible that it was just a coincidence. Given, however, that Satanic crime is said to be so rare in America that it does not in fact exist, one wonders what the odds are of two kids from the same family being murdered under such circumstances. And while we are on the subject of coincidences, what are the odds that the Stayner family would have one son kidnapped as a child and subjected to eight years of torture and sexual abuse, only to have their other son later turn out to be a serial killer? But here again I digress.

Yet another obvious Satanist in the serial killer crowd is the man who was known as the Butcher of Kansas, Bob Berdella (left). By his own admission, Berdella turned to Satanism after the death of his father when he was still a teen. Among the array of macabre artefacts found in his home and place of business (Bob's Bizarre Bazaar) were numerous items fashioned from human body parts, as well as an abundance of occult literature and a Satanic ritual robe. Another rather curious fact about the Berdella case was that following his conviction, a local millionaire named Dell Dunmire bought all of Berdella's belongings, including the house (right) in which the murders were committed and the entire inventory of his home and business. He proceeded to level the house and then sold the vacant lot.

It is quite possible that these actions were taken to hide evidence of the involvement of others, including possibly himself. It will be recalled that Henry Lee Lucas claimed that the upper echelons of the cult he was involved with included the wealthy and powerful. Berkowitz made the same claims of the Son of Sam cult. Journalist Terry was, in fact, able to document the involvement in the cult of such figures as Cotton Club film producer Roy Radin and wealthy art dealer Andrew Crispo. Crispo actually admitted to being present at a ritual homicide, though he denied participating in the grisly murder. Radin, on the other hand, became a victim of the cult himself.

Another acknowledged Satanist was Leonard Lake, and likely his partner Charles Ng as well. Lake's ex-wife admitted that her former spouse had a long-time affiliation with a San Francisco 'witches coven,' and friends recalled that Lake had often claimed membership in a secret 'death cult.'

Besides the killers listed here who have exhibited an overt interest in Satanism, it is tempting to conclude that any murder that includes such elements as cannibalism, ritual mutilation and necrophilia is Satanically inspired. To do so, however, would reek of Christian fundamentalism with its desire to cast all such evil as the work of the Devil.
We will refrain from doing so here. We will also pause here to note that your erstwhile reporter is not, by any stretch of the imagination, a Christian fundamentalist. In fact, he is not a Christian at all, but rather an atheist. He does not believe in God or Satan, though he does believe that both are concepts that are used by the powerful few to promote an agenda.

He also does not believe that those who are at the top of the food chain on either side of the aisle believe in God or Satan, for that matter. They merely exploit the belief systems of their followers to serve their own ends. The main point here is that readers should not conclude that the actions of these killers is influenced or directed by an entity known as Satan, but by mortal men who manipulate the belief systems of others. I'm glad we cleared that up, but once again I digress.

"Satan gets into people and makes them do things they don't want to."

----Herbert Mullin speaking to a Bible study class

We turn now to another of the recurrent themes that runs through the serial killer literature: the inexplicably lax treatment afforded America's serial killers - already noted in reference to Henry Lee Lucas, Richard Speck and Stanley Baker. This trend is all the more remarkable in light of the fact that the U.S. has the harshest criminal justice system in the 'free' world.

So leniently have many of our serial killers been treated that it is hard not to conclude that the actions of America's courts and key law enforcement personnel are often deliberately intended to keep these men on the streets. If this is not the case, then it is difficult to imagine what other explanation would suffice to explain these glaring exceptions to the 'Rule of Law.'

John Wayne Gacy, for instance, was convicted in 1968 of violently raping a teenage boy. For this he was sentenced to ten years, but was released after serving just 18 months. Some years later - during the killing years of 1972-1978 - at least two young men would go to the police with stories of being chloroformed by Gacy and being subsequently tortured and violently raped.

Despite Gacy's record for engaging in exactly that type of behaviour, the complaints were not believed by the police who failed to take any action. Police did finally take action in December of 1978, searching Gacy's home in response to allegations made by yet another young man. They found drivers licenses and jewellery that appeared to belong to some of the missing boys, copious quantities of drugs, a stained rug, handcuffs, a home-made stock, police badges, a syringe and needles, and rope.

Despite the discovery of this evidence - and the fact that the stench of death literally filled every corner of the house as it rose up through the floor boards from the twenty-nine corpses rotting below - the police decided to take no action at that time and left to "further research the case," Gacy would not be arrested for eight more days, and then it was on drug charges unconnected to the murders. This triggered a second search of the house though that resulted in the discovery of the bodies.

In between the first and second searches, Gacy actually invited officers into his home for drinks, and yet again they bafflingly failed to notice the unmistakable smell of decomposition. Police also aided Gacy by steadfastly refusing to list any of Gacy's victims as 'missing,' preferring instead to consider them runaways. It was noted during the search, by the way, that Gacy's house was impeccably neat, as
was that other infamous death house, Jeffrey Dahmer's Milwaukee apartment.

Dahmer (left) also received rather lax treatment from authorities both before and during his killing spree. In 1989, Dahmer had been convicted on molestation charges, for which he received only probation and one year on a work release program. Even this was too harsh though, and a judge granted him early release after just ten months, despite a letter from the prisoner's own father asking that he be held until he received treatment.

Following his release, his probation officer failed to make a single visit to Dahmer's home, which - like Gacy's - reeked of death and decomposition. This would later become the basis of a lawsuit by survivors of some of Dahmer's victims, who plausibly contended that a single visit by the probation department would have put Dahmer out of business.

Even more baffling is the fact that a 14-year-old boy - naked, bleeding and heavily drugged - was seen fleeing Dahmer's apartment by two women who called the police to report the incident. The police, upon their arrival, chose to believe Dahmer's story of a lover's quarrel, despite the fact that the women were still on the scene and angrily tried to inform the officers that they had seen the terror-stricken boy actively resisting Dahmer's efforts to restrain him, and despite the fact that the boy was clearly underage.

Yet more inexplicable, the police claim to have accompanied the pair back to Dahmer's apartment and to have noticed nothing amiss. This despite the fact that there was at the time a three-day-old corpse on the bed with the attendant smell of death, not to mention an abundance of rather morbid artefacts. Nevertheless, the police left and Dahmer promptly proceeded to kill the boy and rape and disembowel the corpse.

The mother of one of the women who had witnessed the boy fleeing called officers back after reading a newspaper story on a missing boy who closely resembled the naked young man, but her concerns were dismissed. Out of despair, she even contacted the local FBI office, but this was also to no avail. The case was considered closed, even though Dahmer was a convicted child molester who was still on probation, and even though the boy who police returned to the killer that night was the brother of the boy Dahmer had previously been convicted of molesting.

The Night Stalker was another who received notably light sentencing. Convicted of rape while still in high school, he was let off without even receiving probation. And his mentor - cousin Mike - was convicted of shooting his wife in the face, killing her in full view of the 13-year-old future serial killer. He was sent to a mental hospital from which he was released in less than five years. Following his release, he again assumed the role of mentor to Richard.

Then there is the case of Bobby Joe Long, Henry's kin. Accused by his girlfriend of rape and battery, he was convicted of the latter. The verdict was set aside, however, when a judge received a letter from Long and, strangely enough, considered it a valid legal motion for a new trial and granted the prisoner's 'motion.' At his new trial, Long was acquitted despite numerous credible witnesses who testified against him. Between the first and second trials, he was also convicted of sending obscene materials and making obscene phone calls to a twelve-year-old girl. For this, he was sentenced to six months probation and two days in jail. Later, he was convicted of attempting to abduct a girl at gunpoint and received a $1,500 fine and three years probation.
How much worse can it get, you ask? Consider the case of Gary Heidnik (above). He was arrested in 1978 when it was discovered that he had a woman chained in his basement. She had been repeatedly tortured and raped. Charged with kidnapping, rape, unlawful restraint and false imprisonment, Heidnik was convicted. He was back out by early 1983. A few years later, six more women would have to endure this same tortuous ordeal. Two of them would not survive.

Or consider the case of Arthur Shawcross (left). Arthur had gone to Vietnam in 1968, and though records indicate he served as a supply clerk, he returned telling lurid tales of rape, torture, cannibalism, mutilation and dismemberment (can you say Phoenix?). Upon his return, he promptly set fire to a local paper mill and a cheese factory - crimes for which he was sentenced to five years in prison. He served less than two.

A year later, Shawcross raped, strangled, mutilated and cannibalized an eight-year-old girl and a ten-year-old boy. He also admitted returning on several occasions to have sex with the boy's rotting corpse. He received a 25 year sentence for the girl's death, but was never even charged with the boy's murder, despite the fact that he had confessed to the crime and showed investigators where the body lay. Shawcross was released just fifteen years later, resulting in eleven more deaths.

Or consider the case of Edmund Kemper. In 1964, young Ed shot both his grandparents in the head. Placed in the custody of the Youth Authority, Kemper was released after serving just five years for the double murder. Richard Speck was convicted of attacking a girl with a knife and nearly killing her in January 1965, just a year before the Chicago mass murder. He served just five months, despite having been arrested some three dozen times in his life prior to the assault. This was attributed to 'bureaucratic error.'

As the trial was set to begin for Hillside Strangler Angelo Buono, prosecutors moved to dismiss all ten murder charges and drop prosecution altogether of Buono as the Strangler. The judge, to his credit, refused to grant the motion and instructed the prosecutors to proceed with the case. Richard Chase was released from psychiatric confinement in 1976 despite protests from the staff that he was dangerous, due in part to his professed belief that he required the blood of others to survive. His killings began the next year, but not before his being found by the police in the desert naked and covered in blood. In his car nearby were guns and a bucket of human blood.

Albert DeSalvo, purportedly the Boston Strangler, was arrested in 1955 and charged with molesting a nine-year-old girl. The charges were dropped. In the next few years, he was twice arrested for breaking and entering. Both times he received suspended sentences. In 1960, he was again convicted of breaking and entering in conjunction with a series of sexual assaults. He served just eleven months.

And consider finally the cases of Charles Manson and Ted Bundy. The LAPD, arguably the most corrupt police department in the country - though there is certainly no lack of competition - couldn't really be bothered with the wealth of evidence that implicated Family members in the Tate and LaBianca murders. The department refused to acknowledge and examine the glaringly obvious connections between the two murder scenes, thus severely hampering the investigation. They likewise refused to explore the connections between the Gary Hinman murder and the other two more high-profile crimes.
The L.A. Sheriffs had solved the Hinman case, no thanks to the LAPD, and had Bobby Beausoleil in custody and knew of his connections to the Family. They were also well aware of the connections between the three crime scenes. Two motorcycle gang members with close ties to the Family - Al Springer and Danny DeCarlo of the Straight Satans - had given them damning testimony concerning the Family's involvement in all the murders.

When the sheriffs passed this information on to the LAPD, they proceeded to do absolutely nothing. Meanwhile, on September 1, 1969, just a few weeks after the Tate murders, a gun was found and turned in to L.A.'s finest. The gun was a rather rare and unique firearm, and just happened to match the description of the weapon suspected of being used in the murders, right down to the broken handle.

Nevertheless, the department tagged and filed away the weapon, where it was promptly forgotten. For months. It took a phone call from the father of the boy who had found the gun to get the department to acknowledge its existence, and even then he was initially told that it had probably been destroyed. It hadn't, and was in fact the weapon used to kill the victims at the Tate house.

Elsewhere, Susan Atkins had been arrested on unrelated charges and was spending some time in the Sybil Brand Institute for Women. While there, she gave detailed confessions of the murders to two fellow inmates. Both of these women tried repeatedly to pass this information along to the LAPD, but were consistently denied permission to do so, despite the fact that one of the women to whom these requests were made was at the time dating one of the Tate case homicide detectives.

In other words, the LAPD had at its disposal the eyewitness accounts of a participant in the crime, the gun used in the crime, the statements of two close associates of the killers directly implicating them in the crime, among other evidence, and yet chose to do nothing for a period of several months.

Ted Bundy (left), on the other hand, had already been taken into custody when his comedy of errors began. The problem was that, in some kind of surrealistic Keystone Cops scenario, they just couldn't seem to keep him there. In 1975, Bundy was convicted of the kidnapping and assault of Carol DaRonch. For this, he was sentenced to 1-15 years with the possibility of parole, meaning that he likely would have been back on the streets in record time.

Shortly thereafter, Colorado police filed murder charges against Bundy, greatly overdue considering that at least five people - including one of Bundy's college professors and, on more than one occasion, his own fiancée - had given the police Bundy's name in connection with a string of killings being investigated in Seattle and elsewhere. This information was filed away and forgotten for years.

Now awaiting trial for murder, and suspected of numerous other murders, Bundy was granted permission to represent himself. Despite being an obvious security risk, he was allowed to do research in the courthouse library, unattended and unrestrained. Luckily for Ted, the library had an open window. Bundy 'escaped' by jumping out the window and casually walking away to freedom.

Recaptured after nearly a week on the lam, Bundy would 'escape' again just months later. This time he was said to have exited his cell through the ceiling space and crawled into the living quarters of a deputy. He then dropped down from the ceiling and strolled casually out the door. If this is in fact the case, then it must be noted that this is a very peculiar design feature for a prison.
Part 4 of this story will look at further similarities in the stories of America's serial killers.

"Like you have a job, I have a job, he has a job. His job is killing people. That's what he was trained to do."
—Cynthia Haden referring to Richard Ramirez (Miss Haden was a juror in the Ramirez trial, and later established a relationship with the condemned man in an effort to understand what drove a person to commit such crimes)

Part IV: Seven More Degrees of Henry Lee

"... draftees were made to kill dogs and vultures by biting their throats and twisting off their heads, and had to watch as soldiers tortured and killed suspected dissidents - tearing out their fingernails, cutting off their heads, chopping their bodies to pieces and playing with the dismembered arms for fun."
—Noam Chomsky describing a deserter's account of the training received by CIA-backed Salvadoran death squads

Most Americans have difficulty accepting the idea of the mind controlled killer, whether it be the lone-nut assassin such as Lee Harvey Oswald or Sirhan Sirhan, or whether it be a serial killer like Henry Lee Lucas or Charles Manson. Yet the fact remains that U.S. intelligence services have devoted a considerable amount of time and money to developing just such an individual.

There is not space here to detail all the techniques and methods that have received attention from the CIA and others. The basic methodology was revealed decades ago by George Estabrooks - a prominent psychologist under contract to the intelligence services - in his book Hypnotism, first published in 1943. Estabrooks candidly acknowledged that his "main interest has always been the military application of hypnosis." While 'Esty' notes that the "intelligent reader ... will sense that much more is withheld than has been told," there is nevertheless enough information given to construct a fairly accurate picture of the fundamentals of mind control.

What is needed is a subject suffering from what used to be termed Multiple Personality Disorder (MPD), and what is now termed Dissociative Identity Disorder (DID). This condition can already exist within the subject or can be created by the therapist. In all cases, however, the condition is created by severe trauma - so severe in fact that the traumatic episode cannot be integrated into the experiences of the core personality.

Far and away the most common cause of MPD is early childhood abuse, usually inflicted by a parent or other adult guardian. As Dr. Frank Putnam stated in 1989: "I am struck by the quality of extreme sadism that is reported by most MPD victims. Many multiples have told me of being sexually abused by groups of people, of being forced into prostitution by family members, or of being offered as sexual enticement to their mother's boyfriends. After one has worked with a number of MPD patients, it becomes obvious that severe, sustained, and repetitive child abuse is a major element in the creation of MPD."

When the abuse is of an extreme nature, the natural human reaction is to build a wall around such experiences, so to speak, by creating a separate and distinct personality to deal with future episodes of abuse. Once the core personality is split, it is then possible to control one or more of the alters that have been created, without the conscious knowledge of the main personality. This, according to Estabrooks, creates the 'Super Spy,' willing to follow orders unquestioningly without even being aware that he is doing so.

Estabrooks only alludes to the severe trauma that is required to create a true multiple, often referring to the trauma euphemistically as a form of hypnolism. At one point, he notes
that "[multiple personalities] are caused by a form of hypnotism in the first place! We will see that emotional shock produces exactly the same results as hypnotism." Later, he comes closer to the grim reality when he states: "multiple personality could be both caused and cured by hypnotism. Remember that war is a grim business. Suppose we deliberately set up that condition of multiple personality to further the ends of military intelligence."

Elsewhere, Estabrooks acknowledges that he himself had written previously that: "everyone could be thrown into the deepest state of hypnotism by the use of what [I] termed the Russian method - no holds barred, deliberate disintegration of the personality by psychic torture ... The subject might easily be left a mental wreck but war is a grim business." Also noted is that children make especially good subjects, given that they "are notoriously easy to hypnotize." Which is to say, children are particularly vulnerable to abuse and have more of a tendency to dissociate traumatic experiences, thereby creating alter identities that can be later exploited and controlled.

This is one of the main reasons that the CIA and other intelligence agencies have played a key role in the creation of 'mainstream' Satanic groups such as the OTO and the Temple of Set, as well as in denying the existence of underground Satanic cults and Satanic crime. These Satanic groups have frequently served as agency fronts for mind-control operations. For when it comes to severely traumatizing children, nothing compares to the stories told by those who have survived what has been termed Satanic Ritual Abuse (sometimes referred to as Sadistic Ritual Abuse). Of course, there has been a concerted effort to discredit all such stories, spearheaded by the False Memory Syndrome Foundation - a group led by a truly vile coalition of CIA affiliated psychologists and accused paedophiles. (I'll cover this later. M)

Also playing a key role in the movement to deny the validity of recovered memories of severe abuse are Paul and Shirley Eberle, authors of the supposedly authoritative book The Politics of Child Abuse, which attempts to blame all child abuse accusations and prosecutions on overzealous prosecutors, therapists and parents. This might be a little more credible if the Eberles themselves were not well known to Los Angeles police as distributors of child pornography, a fact that the media conveniently and consistently ignore while touting the Eberles as authorities in the field of child abuse.

There is not the time or the space here to review the literature supporting the claims of abuse survivors. Suffice it to say that when viewed in the context of a state-sponsored mind control program, we can begin to understand why someone would inflict such appalling levels of abuse on America's children, and why so much effort and disinformation would be put forth to discredit such claims if they are in fact valid.

By cloaking mind control operations in Satanic rituals, yet another purpose is served as well. Even if an operation is uncovered - as was the case at the McMartin Preschool - the stories told by the children are so outlandish, so far removed from the world as we know it, that they are easily cast aside as the product of a child's fertile imagination. But is it really mere coincidence that the very acts that child survivors of ritual abuse all across the country claim to have witnessed and participated in - cannibalism, bestiality, paedophilia, torture, mutilation, dismemberment, etc. - are the same depraved acts that are the stock-in-trade of America's serial killers?

In the previous instalment of this series, the connections between America's serial killers and Satanism were explored. In the next instalment of what has become a considerably longer work than was originally intended, we will explore the overlapping area of mind control. Of course, it is rarely possible to substantiate that a given person has indeed been victimized by CIA mind control procedures. There are clues, however, that when taken together tend to point in that direction. Some of these are:

A history of severe childhood abuse.
A diagnosis of Multiple Personality Disorder, or symptoms indicating the presence of the condition.

The reporting of voices in the head instructing the subject what to do.

Connections to the intelligence community.

Connections to military, prison, and/or psychiatric facilities known or suspected to be involved in MK-ULTRA projects.

Before looking at these factors in the last instalment of this series, we will look here at some other recurrent themes that tend to indicate that there is more to the average serial killer than meets the eye. Specifically, we will focus on:

The suspicious deaths of key players during the trials of various killers, tending to indicate the complicity of others and/or a high-level cover-up.

The suspicious deaths of the killers themselves.

Actions taken by the accused that seem deliberately intended to circumvent a full airing of the evidence at trial, including the giving of voluntary confessions, the entering of guilty pleas, the failure to mount a defence, and the insistence by the accused that they be allowed to serve as their own attorney (such actions, it should be noted, also provide fertile ground for later appeals and sentencing delays).

During the Manson trial for instance, one of the Family's defence attorneys was murdered, Charlie insisted on the right to defend himself, and the defence stunned the courtroom and legal observers by resting their case without calling a single defence witness to rebut the prosecution's case, virtually guaranteeing an easy win for Bugliosi and the state.

Cary Stayner sealed his fate by giving a detailed confession implicating himself - and he alone - in the four homicide charges he was facing, clearing several others who were - unlike Stayner - linked to the killings by hard physical evidence. On September 6th of this year, Stayner and his attorney accepted the terms of a plea bargain agreement that reeks of a cover-up. Stayner professed his sole guilt in the death of Joie Armstrong and was sentenced to life in prison with no possibility of parole, though he was spared a death sentence.

Besides the fact that the guilty plea eliminated the need for a highly publicized trial, the agreement contained a very unusual provision, stating that: "After the entry of judgment in this case until his death he [Stayner] will not speak to anyone, write to anyone, or communicate to anyone about the death of Joie Ruth Armstrong." No one, in other words, will ever hear Stayner's side of the story.

Herb Mullin stunned the court and his attorney by attempting to plead guilty to six counts of first-degree murder. The judge refused to accept the plea given the gravity of the consequences. Ed Kemper, another Santa Cruz serial killer, drove all the way to Colorado after his last killing before inexplicably calling his friends on the force back home and turning himself in, whereupon he gave meticulously detailed confessions to eight brutal murders.

Danny Rolling, the Gainesville Ripper, stunned the courtroom hearing his case by entering guilty pleas and taking sole responsibility for five homicides. He was given the death penalty on all five counts. Included among the evidence indicating that Rolling did not act alone was the fact that one of his victims - who was restrained and tortured prior to his death - was a
6'3" tall, 200+ pound athlete who put up a fierce fight for his life. Rolling, acting alone, was simply not physically up to the task.

Bob Berdella was quite obliging to his captors, giving confessions to six torture murders. He then surprised the court by entering a guilty plea to one count of murder arising from those confessions. Berdella served only four years before dying at the young age of 43, officially of a heart attack. Many suspect the true cause was poisoning. Richard Speck also allegedly died of a heart attack at the relatively young age of 49. Richard Chase served just two-and-a-half years of his sentence before he was discovered dead in his cell, allegedly of a drug overdose. Chase was incarcerated in Vacaville - a hot bed of CIA mind control operations - and was reportedly on 'anti-psychotic' medication at the time.

Jeffrey Dahmer proved to be quite cooperative in captivity, giving highly detailed confessions to seventeen murders. In court, he ignored his lawyer's advice and plead guilty but insane to fifteen counts of murder. Dahmer served just two years before being paired with two homicidal inmates on an unsupervised work detail. Only one emerged alive, and it wasn't Dahmer.

Leonard Lake, partner of Charles Ng, popped a cyanide capsule during an interrogation shortly after his arrest for shoplifting, which he conveniently and rather improbably had hidden in the collar of his shirt. He died without ever regaining consciousness. Ng, who served as his own attorney for awhile, somehow managed to place a phone call to a juror during his trial. One man who Ng had confessed to - who was to be a key witness at the trial - died in a single car crash before he could appear.

Ted Bundy, who represented himself three times - in Utah, Colorado and again in Florida - eventually confessed to being solely responsible for twenty-eight murders. John Wayne Gacy obliged his captors by confessing to thirty or more murders, taking sole credit for all of them. The Night Stalker insisted on retaining two grossly inexperienced and ineffective attorneys to represent him, predictably resulting in nineteen death sentences from the jury, whose deliberations were delayed when one of the twelve was killed in her home in a grisly Night Stalker-style slaying. Nothing unusual about that.

Douglas Clark, the Sunset Strip Killer, insisted on defending himself; his request was granted. His partner, Carol Bundy, had a change of heart on the day she was set to go to trial and pre-empted the proceedings by entering guilty pleas on two counts of murder. But perhaps nowhere was such a concerted effort made to avoid an airing of the truth in open court than in the case of Albert DeSalvo, the purported Boston Strangler. DeSalvo never actually stood trial for the stranglings. No one, in fact, has ever stood trial for the stranglings.

Had DeSalvo (left) stood trial for the killings, he would without question have been acquitted. There was not then, nor has there ever been, a single piece of physical evidence produced tying DeSalvo to any of the slayings. Not a single eyewitness could place DeSalvo at - or anywhere near - any of the crime scenes. This is not to say that there were no eyewitnesses who had seen 'The Strangler.' There were several; none of them could identify DeSalvo as the man they saw.

The public, meanwhile, was clamouring for resolution of the case. Luckily for them, DeSalvo's attorney - F. Lee Bailey - came up with what has to be the most preposterous and unethical defence in the history of American jurisprudence. As Bailey himself has stated: 'I wanted the right to defend a man for robbery and assault by proving that he had committed thirteen murders.' In other words, rather than defending his client against the relatively light charges he was actually faced with, Bailey opted to proclaim his client's guilt on those
charges, but argued that he should be found innocent by reason of insanity based on the fact that he had also committed thirteen murders. Now that's a hell of a defence.

Bailey didn’t bother to cross-examine a single prosecution witness, making no effort whatsoever to rebut the charges DeSalvo was facing. Instead, he presented a ridiculously flimsy case for DeSalvo’s guilt in the Strangler killings, a case that would never have stood up to cross examination. This wasn’t really a concern though, since when it is the defence attorney presenting the prosecution’s case, there isn’t anyone to conduct a cross examination.

The end result was that DeSalvo was found guilty of the robbery and assault charges by the jury, and guilty of the murder charges in the court of public opinion - which is of course exactly what was intended. For this shameless selling-out of his client, Bailey should at the very least have been disbarred, if not brought up on criminal charges himself. Instead, he went on to fame and fortune and a most undeserved reputation as a skilled attorney.

DeSalvo, on the other hand, went on to an early death. He was stabbed to death in the prison infirmary the morning after making an urgent call to Dr. Ames Robey, a prison psychiatrist who had spent a considerable amount of time with the prisoner. DeSalvo had told Robey that he wanted to meet with the doctor and a reporter early the next day. Robey recalls what happened next:

"He was going to tell us who the Boston Strangler really was, and what the whole thing was about. He had asked to be placed in the infirmary under special lockup about a week before. Something was going on within the prison, and I think he felt he had to talk quickly. There were people in the prison, including guards, that were not happy with him ... Somebody had to leave an awful lot of doors open, which meant - because there were several guards one would have to go by - there had to be a fair number of people paid or asked to turn their backs or something. But somebody put a knife into Albert DeSalvo's heart sometime between evening check and the morning."

Bailey had convinced DeSalvo to sign an agreement with author Gerold Frank to pen the disinformational The Boston Strangler. The book, which argued that DeSalvo had indeed been solely responsible for the killings, became a best seller and further reinforced in the public's mind the notion that the killings had been solved. Bailey, by the way, pocketed the advance money that was supposed to go to DeSalvo, prompting Albert to file complaints with the state bar association, though these were ignored.

We conclude this instalment with the case of another 'serial killer' that never quite made it to court. Consider the unusual case of one Herb Baumeister of Indianapolis, Indiana. Herb's strange tale stands as a rather blatant example of how the 'serial killer' label is applied as a cover-up for a much larger criminal enterprise.

Herb (left) was the son of a prominent doctor who secreted his young son off to 'mental examinations.' Shortly after dropping out of college - where he had been an anatomy major - he spent two months in a psychiatric hospital where he was diagnosed as having two or more personalities. As a young man - and a member of the Young Republicans (as was Ted Bundy) - he opened a successful business in conjunction with the Children's Bureau of Indianapolis, which gave him ready access to, naturally enough, children.

Exactly what Herb's business with the children actually was is a matter of conjecture. It was certainly profitable though, allowing Herb to purchase a sprawling, secluded 18.5 acre estate dubbed 'Fox Hollow Farms.' Police would soon discover thousands of human bones,
bone fragments and teeth on the heavily wooded estate, many scattered about in plain sight. How many more were buried will probably never be known.

Baumeister was away at a lake with his son when the search of his property began. Two days into the search, police paid a visit to Baumeister at the lake, where they removed his son from his custody. They did not, however, take Baumeister into custody - or even question him. This, mind you, after investigators had just spent two full days excavating Baumeister's eighteen acre graveyard!

Herb promptly disappeared after the police left. He reappeared a few days later in Ontario, where police found him sleeping in his car. The officer on the scene noted that there was a stack of videotapes in the passenger area of the car. The next day, Herb was again found in his car, this time with a .357 magnum bullet hole in his head. The death was ruled a suicide; the tapes were nowhere to be found.

These tapes were believed by investigators to be snuff films of some of the killings. A semi-hidden video camera had been discovered strategically placed at the estate. The tapes were never recovered or accounted for. Around this same time, Baumeister's older brother was found dead in a Texas whirlpool in a case that has never been solved.

What was really going on at Fox Hollow Farms and how many people were involved? That may never be known. No one ever stood trial for the murders, and it was impossible to even estimate a victim count. Herb was declared to be solely responsible for the deaths of the four victims who could be identified, all local gay men reported missing.

These were four of at least ten local men reported missing after frequenting area gay bars over the previous three years, a fact that the police had consistently ignored. With the exception of the local gay press, the media had turned a blind eye as well. After the discovery of Herb's bone-yard, the media disparaged the victims - referring to them as "male prostitutes" - while continuing to routinely laud Baumeister as a local "businessman" and "landowner," rather than what he was - a suspected mass murderer.

It does not seem unreasonable to conclude that many of the bones found on Herb's property could have been those of children acquired from the Bureau who would not be missed and were likely never reported missing. Equally reasonable is the possibility that these children, prior to their ultimate fate as stars of kiddie snuff films, were used for child pornography and/or child prostitution.

Of course we all know that the existence of snuff films is the stuff of urban legends. But there are those persistent reports of a thriving underground market for just such films, a market that is said to include many of wealth and power. Former Nebraska State Senator John DeCamp, for example, gives an appallingly detailed account of one such film in his self-published book, The Franklin Cover-Up.

Ed Sanders concludes in The Family - based on a number of witness statements - that the Manson clan was involved in the production and distribution of snuff films (as well as child pornography). Maury Terry reaches the same conclusion about the Son of Sam cult in his book The Ultimate Evil. And then there is the case of Charles Ng and Leonard Lake.

Their Northern California ranch was tailor-made for the production of snuff films, complete with a bunker containing hidden rooms with one-way viewing windows and hidden cameras. The compound also contained an incinerator for disposing of the bodies - one reason that a final body count was never achieved, though evidence indicated that as many as 25 people were killed and disposed of.
As previously mentioned, Lake's ex-wife managed to get to the compound shortly before police and remove an unknown number of videotapes from the property. Though authorities claim these tapes were later returned, there is no way of verifying that the tapes returned were the same ones that had been removed, or that all were returned.

Even so, an abundance of photographic and video evidence was found to document the reign of terror by the pair. Though the tapes stopped short of showing the actual killings (by most reports, anyway; some have claimed otherwise), many investigators were of the opinion that such tapes did, in fact, exist. For now, though, there is mostly just speculation.

There is no speculation about the existence of still photographs detailing the exploits of serial killers, however. These undeniably exist. Jeffrey Dahmer, for one, had a collection of Polaroid’s of his handiwork. So, for that matter, did Edmund Kemper, Bob Berdella and - as just noted - Leonard Lake. These would, I'm sure, make a nice addition to the photo album of Richard Ramirez's cousin Mike.

"It's hard for me to believe that a human being could have done what I've done, but I know that I did it."
—Jeffrey Dahmer

Part V: The Mind (Control) of a Serial Killer

"I'm going to teach you the beauty of pain and you're going to be my slave for the rest of your life."
--Viola Lucas to her son Henry Lee

When it comes to early childhood abuse, there are few parents of future serial killers who can compare to Viola Lucas. So severe was her physical abuse of young Henry that he once slipped into a coma for a day following a particularly brutal beating. On another occasion - due to a combination of violent abuse and neglect - Henry lost one of his eyes. Sidekick Ottis Toole suffered abuse as well, at the hands of both his father and his grandmother.

Viola was, as is the case with the mothers of several serial killers, a prostitute. She routinely entertained her customers in the presence of Henry, who was compelled to watch. Viola took it one step further, however, dressing young Henry up as a girl and prostituting him out to her customers for them to indulge their depraved paedophile fantasies.

Henry's cousin, Bobby Joe Long, was likewise born the son of a prostitute, and also had to witness his mother's sexual activities throughout his childhood. Until the age of thirteen, young Bobby shared a bed with his mother. Ted Bundy's mother was also an abusive young prostitute who entertained her customers in Ted's presence. Charles Manson was likewise born the son of a teenage prostitute. He suffered abuse throughout his childhood, both at the hands of his mother and in a series of reform schools and penal institutions. From the age of eight, Manson spent the vast majority of his life institutionalized, including a stint in Boy's Town - identified in the aforementioned The Franklin Cover-Up as a hot-bed of paedophilic mind-control activities.

John Wayne Gacy's father was a violently abusive alcoholic, as was Leonard Lake's father and Richard Speck's stepfather (whose name was, strangely enough, Carl August Lindbergh). Danny Rolling's father was abusive as well, while Richard Chase's was said to be a 'strict disciplinarian.' DeSalvo's father was also violently abusive towards young Albert, as was Richard Ramirez's father. Ramirez was also the victim of severe sexual abuse, as was Arthur Shawcross - whose mother was known to rape her son with a broomstick handle. Ken Bianchi was severely abused as a child as well.
Charles Ng's father would routinely chain and beat the young boy, while both of Carol Bundy's parents were abusive. Her mother died suddenly and rather mysteriously at a very young age. Her father, who thereafter sexually abused Carol and her siblings, would later hang himself. Herb Mullin's father, decorated World War II hero Martin William Mullin, liked to entertain his son with graphic war stories, and taught the young man that violence was natural. Herb would later tell anyone who would listen that his father was a mass murderer, responsible for a number of unsolved killings. No one took Herb seriously, of course.

None of this should come as much of a surprise to most readers. That serial killers have suffered an abusive childhood has become almost a cliché. This generally acknowledged fact is mentioned here only because, as previously stated, it is a factor in identifying victims of mind control when considered in conjunction with other characteristics and experiences later in life.

In the dark and ugly nether world where serial killers and mind-control operations bisect, there appears to be two general categories of mass murderers: those who are merely controlled, and those who are both controlling and controlled. There is a third category as well that occupies the gray area between these first two - those killers who are obsessed with the notion of controlling others, but who appear to have fallen short of attaining that goal.

First on the list of what we will call 'controllers' is, of course, Charles Manson. That Charlie had an uncanny ability to control his followers is a well established fact. Yet more remarkable is that Manson has maintained that same level of control from inside a prison cell for thirty years now. In fact, it was that very control that was the sole basis for Manson's murder convictions.

The fact of the matter was that Manson did not personally participate in the Tate/LaBianca murders. He was not even present at the crime scenes when the slayings took place. He merely told his followers what to do, and they robotically followed his commands. In order to convict Manson, it was necessary for the prosecution to convince the jury that the actual killers were virtually powerless to disobey their leader. It was not enough to merely show that Charlie had given the order to kill. This does not, by a long shot, constitute first-degree murder.

If I ask you, the reader, to break the law - and you comply - you are the criminal, not I. Following orders is no excuse for breaking the law, and certainly no excuse for committing mass murder (except, apparently, in the military). So in order to garner convictions against Manson, it had to be proven that this was an order that the recipients were incapable of not acting on.

For this reason, the Manson trial had no precedent in American history. What the Manson case demonstrated was that it could be proven in a court of law that a person could be compelled to act against his will. This had already been established by a Danish court in a landmark case recalled by Estabrooks in Hypnotism: "An amateur hypnotist named Nielsen had induced an hypnotic subject named Hardrup to commit a murder ... Nielsen, the hypnotist, got a life sentence, the maximum penalty in Denmark, whereas Hardrup, the actual murderer, received a two-year sentence on the basis of temporary insanity."

The Manson case had a slightly different outcome: both the controller and his followers received the death penalty. Legally and logically, this verdict makes no sense. For if Manson's control was so complete that the killers were powerless to resist his commands, then they should not have been held legally responsible for their actions. And if Charlie did not, in fact, wield such power, then he should not have been held responsible for the actions of others.
Bugliosi does not address this inherent contradiction in his prosecution strategy in Helter Skelter. He does ponder, albeit briefly, how Manson gained such control, concluding that this "remains the most puzzling question of all." Indeed. After spending just a few pages briefly summarizing some of the techniques Manson employed on his followers, Bugliosi surmises: "I tend to think that there is something more, some missing link that enabled him to so rape and bastardize the minds of his followers that they would go against the most ingrained of all commandments, Thou shalt not kill, and willingly, even eagerly, murder at his command."

While pondering the question of how Manson was able to exert such control, Bugliosi largely overlooks an even more important question: where did Charlie learn the techniques that he was obviously so skilled at? Bugliosi notes only that: "It may be something that he learned from others," which is, of course, only stating the obvious. The question not asked, either in the book or at trial, is: who were these others?

Another question not asked by Bugliosi, nor by any number of CIA affiliated writers who have written on the subject of mind control, is: how is it possible that a man of limited education who has spent the majority of his life in prison acquired these skills, while the intelligence agencies - which have invested countless millions of dollars employing the best and the brightest scientific minds in the country for decades in pursuit of attaining this very same goal - have allegedly met with nothing but failure. The answer is, of course, that it is not possible.

It is unfathomable that men such as Manson (and Jim Jones, David Koresh, etc.) have stumbled upon a secret that the CIA has yet to discover. It is a patently absurd notion. And yet, this is exactly what we are supposed to believe. We are also supposed to believe that Charlie, while controlling others, was himself acting on his own free will.

This is highly unlikely. If Charlie was in fact controlling the Family, the logical question to be asked at trial was: who was controlling Manson? Was Manson himself a puppet, as well as a puppeteer? This question was, naturally, never raised and so remains unanswered to this day. Perhaps Bugliosi felt this question unimportant, given that, according to his book, "The Manson case was, and remains, unique." This is also an absurd notion.

Illustrative of this is the case of Douglas Clark, the Sunset Strip killer and another controller. Clark's involvement in the intelligence community began at birth, when he was born the son of a Naval Intelligence officer (though the 'CIA' has become something of a generic term for the intelligence community, the ONI - Office of Naval Intelligence - is the oldest and quite possibly the largest and most powerful of the U.S. intelligence entities).

A decade after Doug's birth in 1948, father Franklyn - then a Lt. Commander - allegedly retired from Naval service to join the private sector, a common ploy to provide cover for ongoing intelligence activities. Shortly after, Franklyn relocated eleven-year-old Douglas and the rest of the family to an atoll in the Marshall Islands to take a 'civilian' position with the Transport Company of Texas - an obvious intelligence front.

In the early 1960's, the family returned briefly to the U.S., taking up residence in San Francisco, which was soon to become the home turf of an array of serial killers, as previously noted. The family soon relocated again, this time to India. Around this time, young Douglas began attending Ecolat, the international school in Geneva attended by the son's of UN diplomats, European and Middle Eastern Royalty, and international finance capitalists.

Following his attendance there, Doug next attended the prestigious Culver Military Academy in Indiana, while father Franklyn moved first to Venezuela and then to Australia as he continued to pursue his 'civilian' career. In 1967, Doug himself enlisted in the Air Force,
where he was assigned to, not surprisingly, radio intelligence. In short order, Doug was given an early discharge, albeit under honourable conditions and with full military benefits. Clark soon after hooked up with Carol Bundy, who was - as a jury was to later note - just one of several women over whom Clark exhibited a remarkable level of control in the ensuing years.

Clark was not the only man to exert such control over Bundy. Jack Murray - who may well have been involved in at least some of the crimes attributed to the pair, and at the very least had knowledge of the murders that he chose not to act on - also exerted such control over Bundy. He would ultimately become a victim of the pair.

Clark liked to exert his control over children as well, involving an eleven-year-old neighbour girl and the son of another of his girlfriends in sexual activities, and possibly in the killings as well. Bundy's own children suffered sexual abuse at the hands of both Doug and Carol. All told, Clark had a number of women and children to do his bidding, sexually and otherwise. At least one of them eagerly killed for him as well. Clark also claimed to have Mafia connections. In fact, he described one of his early killings as his initiation into a Mafia 'hit group.' In classic Mafia fashion, the victim was found stuffed into the trunk of a Rolls Royce.

Gary Heidnik was yet another 'serial killer' who falls into the controller camp. Heidnik attended the Staunton Military Academy in Virginia, but left after visiting a psychiatrist for reasons which are unclear. He then joined the army and was sent to a West German field hospital where he was prescribed a heavy tranquilizer normally used for the treatment of severely psychotic individuals, though he was not diagnosed as having such a condition. In short order, he was sent back to the U.S., where he was released early from military service on unspecified medical grounds with a full disability pension. In 1971, Heidnik formed his own 'church,' recruiting institutionalized black women who were said to be 'retarded' (which is how Jim Jones began his 'church' as well).

Four years later, Heidnik opened a stock account - allegedly using the money from his meagre military pension - which was soon valued at well over a half-million dollars. All the while, Heidnik was in-and-out of a number of mental institutions and made several suicide attempts (as did his brother; their mother succeeded in killing herself with poison). Heidnik eventually had his own mind-control program going in the basement of his house, where he kept six women chained as sex slaves. Heidnik, who was prone to race-war diatribes (a la Charlie Manson), inflicted severe torture on the captive women, resulting in the deaths of two of them, one by electrocution - a favoured form of torture.

The women who were not lucky enough to survive were ground up and fed to the still-captive women to supplement the dog food they had previously been receiving. The girls were routinely forced to have sex both with each other and with Heidnik. It is unclear through all this how much control Heidnik ultimately attained over the women. When he was ultimately brought to trial, the defence specifically argued that Heidnik should not be held accountable for his actions due to LSD experiments he had been subjected to during his early 1960's military service in West Germany. The jury, which doubtless had no knowledge of the extent
or nature of MK-ULTRA experiments carried out by the military/intelligence sector, discounted this argument. They did not feel that such experimentation could account for Heidnik's actions. They may well have been mistaken.

John Wayne Gacy appears to have been a controller of sorts as well. He also exhibited clear signs of having a multiple personality disorder, although he was not diagnosed as such. Gacy was a widely respected businessman, the JCs Man-of-the-Year, a great neighbour who threw parties for the whole neighbourhood, and was well connected and active in Democratic Party politics, at one point meeting and being photographed with First Lady Rosalyn Carter.

On the other hand, he has the distinction of being convicted of more first-degree murder counts than any man in U.S. history. How are we to reconcile these two images of John Gacy? Men such as he are usually said to be sociopaths, lacking any morals or conscience. Their personality that is presented to the public is said to be an act, an emotionless facade. I would argue that it's just as likely, if not more so, that the public self is, in fact, a legitimate personality separate and distinct from the one that does the killing. As Detective David Hackmeister said: "His (Gacy's) personality could change in a split second." Does this represent the facade slipping, or an alter personality emerging? Or is there any difference? Is a 'sociopath' not, in fact, a person with multiple personalities?

At any rate, Gacy made a habit of surrounding himself with young boys - whether entertaining them as a clown or employing them as a contractor. One of these boys was Ripper Crew leader Robin Gecht, who would later be diagnosed as a multiple himself. His personalities included a small child, a teenager, and a businessman.

Angelo Bouno, of Hillside Strangler fame, was also likely a controller, both of partner Kenneth Bianchi and of the stable of young women and girls that surrounded him. He was known to run a teen prostitution ring, and was said to be a magnet for teenage girls, despite being not a particularly attractive man. Partner Bianchi - who fraudulently set up shop as a psychiatrist himself, renting space from a legitimate therapist - was diagnosed as MPD by as many as five psychiatrists who examined him while in custody, and was said to have frequently lapsed into trance-like states as a child.

The prosecution brought in their own expert to prove that Bianchi's multiple personality disorder was nothing but fakery, which he allegedly succeeded in doing. This might be more convincing though if the 'expert' that denounced the diagnoses had been someone other than Martin Orne, one of the most notorious of the CIA-funded 'psychiatrists' (who was assisted in this case by yet another CIA-funded psychiatrist, Margaret Singer).

Leonard Lake and partner Charles Ng clearly had their sights set on being controllers as well, but fell short of their goals. Their master plan, which they dubbed 'Operation Miranda,' called for a network of bunkers across the country staffed with mind controlled sex slaves. Both had military connections. Lake had gone to Vietnam as a Marine, completing his first tour and beginning a second. This was cut short, however, when he was deemed to be suffering from 'unspecified medical problems.' Back in the states, he was discharged on medical grounds and entered a VA hospital for 'psychological problems.' Partner Ng was a former Marine as well, and their compound was stocked with an amazing array of weapons and military equipment, in addition to the snuff-film studio and incinerator.

Another notable wannabe was Jeffrey Dahmer. He had joined the army in 1979 but was, alas, discharged early. Jeff was obsessed with gaining control over his victims. His preferred means of doing so - and of disposing of the bodies accumulating from his failed experiments - was with chemicals, likely a skill acquired from his father, Lionel Dahmer, Ph.D., a prominent research chemist. Dahmer was working on perfecting a home lobotomy technique, which consisted of drilling a hole in the forehead and then adding various
chemicals. Other chemicals were used to dissolve the three corpses found in a 55 gallon acid vat that Dahmer inexplicably got into his apartment.

Dahmer was likely afflicted with MPD as well. He was universally described as a normal sounding, intelligent, even eloquent young man who did not appear at all menacing, yet he was also a mass murderer, cannibal and necrophile. When he was killed, spooky dad Lionel waged a macabre battle with Dahmer's mother over preserving Jeffrey's brain for study.

Yet another would-be controller was Bob Berdella, the Butcher of Kansas. Like Gacy, Berdella spent his life surrounded by young men and boys. And, again like Gacy, Berdella was quite the torture aficionado. Berdella, however, had made something of a science of the art of torture. He had designed and built his own custom torture bed, and kept a meticulously detailed log of the tortures inflicted upon his victims. These included beatings, electrocution, and the injections of a wide variety of drugs and chemicals into various parts of the body, including the injection of Drano into the throat. While awaiting trial, Berdella was held in isolation in what was described as a 'private area' of the sick bay.

Of those killers who lack the desire to control others, and seem to function purely as controlled assassins, Herb Mullin makes a good case in point. Herb was known to consume large quantities of LSD, and had 'Legalize Acid' tattooed across his stomach (Manson's drug of choice for his followers and the CIA's drug of choice for MK-ULTRA projects) and was institutionalized five times in the years preceding his killing spree. One of those times was at a mental institution in Hawaii operated by the U.S. Army. He complained constantly of voices haunting his thoughts, frequently telling others that he was receiving messages.

One of the voices in his head was that of his World War II hero father, commanding him to kill. Despite all this, Mullin passed a psychological exam to enter the Marines shortly before the end of his killing spree. Shortly thereafter he was arrested, at which time he refused to talk to investigators, choosing instead to repetitively chant the word 'silence.' Following his arrest, Mullin claimed to be receiving messages instructing him to kill himself, though he refused the commands. He was diagnosed as a clear case of MPD, with his alter personalities including a Mexican labourer, an eastern philosopher, and - strangely enough - columnist Herb Caen (I couldn't possibly make this shit up).

Arthur Shawcross is another interesting case study of a controlled assassin. Born in a Naval hospital to a Naval officer father, Arthur grew up in a multigenerational family at what was dubbed 'Shawcross Corners.' As a child, he had a number of imaginary friends and spoke in strange voices. His father led a very spooky existence, with another wife and son in Australia. As a boy, Shawcross injured his legs in a fall into a river, and was subjected to brain scans and a variety of other tests that, shall we say, seem a bit odd as treatment for a leg injury. As a young adult, Shawcross was sent to Vietnam, where he apparently served as a Phoenix operative, as previously noted.

During his incarceration for the double child homicide discussed previously, he was treated by several prison psychiatrists, and also improbably began himself working as a counsellor with his fellow inmates. Diagnosed as MPD, his alters included an eleven-year-old boy, a 13th century cannibal, and his own mother.

Finally we come to the case of Albert DeSalvo, who was not so much a programmed assassin as he was likely a programmed patsy. DeSalvo had served in the Army from 1948-1956, stationed for most of that time in West Germany, which is where Gary Heidnik would be subjected to MK-ULTRA experimentation some years later. There DeSalvo mastered the art of hand-to-hand combat and became a boxing champion, skills which would not benefit him when he was killed in his prison cell years later by unknown assailants (according to DeSalvo's brother, he may have been drugged the night he was killed).
DeSalvo, as previously noted, was not charged with the Strangler murders for which he is officially credited, but was rather arrested in conjunction with a string of unconnected rapes, assaults and robberies. He was sent to Bridgewater State Hospital where he fell in with a convicted murderer named George Nassar, who was alleged to have committed more than a dozen murders during a period of gang warfare in Boston.

Nassar is frequently described as a genius and a 'master manipulator.' So tight was his control over DeSalvo that Albert's own family was unable to visit him without Nassar being present. It was Nassar who first obtained a 'confession' from DeSalvo and relayed this information to his attorney, F. Lee Bailey. Bailey quickly became DeSalvo's attorney as well, procuring from him a recorded confession which was promptly turned over to police, thereby beginning the process of railroadng his own client which was earlier discussed.

Aiding and abetting Bailey in this endeavour was noted CIA hypnotist William Jennings Bryan, whose 'questions' to DeSalvo while under hypnosis were loaded with detailed information about the crimes. Bryan would later be connected to two others who are widely believed to have been under the influence of mind control. One of these was Sirhan Sirhan, purported assassin of Robert Kennedy, whom Bryan was known to have 'treated.'

Oddly enough, throughout Sirhan's diaries was the name of the purported Boston Strangler written repetitively, in what appeared to be a display of a hypnotic phenomenon known as 'automatic writing.' And like other players in this sordid cast, Sirhan was reportedly connected to the Process Church of the Final Judgment.

Bryan was also linked to Candy Jones, the famous model who would tell her tale of being a mind controlled courier (and possibly assassin as well) in The Control of Candy Jones (see recommended reading list). Not long after publication of the book, Bryan was publicly linked to the Candy Jones case by journalists investigating her claims, and he soon thereafter turned up dead in a Las Vegas hotel room.

Before concluding this odyssey, a few comments are in order to address the question of why the U.S. intelligence infrastructure would deliberately create programmed serial killers, as well as creating the concept of the 'serial killer.' A couple of reasons have already been given: to cover-up the existence of Satanic crime in 20th century America, and to disguise the true motive of some contract killings. But there are a few other valuable services that serial killers provide for the state as well.

First and foremost is the rather obvious fact that serial killers scare the hell out of people. With the possible exception of school/workplace shootings, nothing better serves to facilitate the promotion of a 'law-and-order' agenda than the palpable fear aroused by the spectre of the marauding serial killer, dividing the population into an every-man-for-himself mentality. Anyone, after all, could be a serial killer hiding behind a mask of civility: a co-worker, a friend, a neighbour, even a family member.

Another function that serial killers serve is in disposing of those members of society who are the most marginalized. For most serial killers, when they aren't killing for a more covert purpose, tend to target those people that Hitler termed the 'useless eaters' of society: prostitutes, runaways, junkies, and skid-row alcoholics. In a sense, serial killers are the agents of a rather harshly implemented eugenics program.

A final purpose served by the serial killer profile is that it provides a framework to set up a system of early detection and weeding out of 'violence-prone' individuals. This, of course, assumes the existence of recognizable biological causes and early warning signs. Far more likely is that the serial killer's signature skills - torture, murder, and mutilation - are ones that have been acquired through the teachings of others, and are not attributable to any sort of brain irregularities.
This series was based on a review of some of the literature that has been published on the subject of serial killers. This review was by no means exhaustive and no primary research was done to supplement the existing literature. It is hoped that others will be inspired to look more closely at the cases of individual ‘serial killers,’ as Maury Terry did with the Son of Sam in The Ultimate Evil and Ed Sanders did with the Manson clan in The Family.

It is my belief that a much different profile of the ‘serial killer’ will emerge - a profile of the controlled assassin conditioned and programmed by a variety of intelligence fronts, including military entities, psychiatric institutions and Satanic cults. For while serial killers may well be driven by their own internal demons, they are likely not demons of their own making.

It is my belief also that the Satanic underground has largely replaced the Mafia's Murder Incorporated as America's premier nationwide murder-for-hire organization. Researcher and author Michael Newton has written precisely that, in Raising Hell (Avon, 1993). He states that the 'Black Cross,' a faction of the Four-P cult (which is itself a faction of the Process Church), functions specifically as a "Satanic Murder, Inc."

Consider the case of Thomas Creech (left) of Idaho, who in 1975 admitted to performing contract killings over an eight year span on behalf of a national biker gang heavily involved in drug trafficking and cult rituals. Creech claimed that his forty-two killings earned him only eighth place among the gang's contract killers, and that many of them had been performed as 'ritual human sacrifices.'

Or consider the case of Bernard Hunwick of Dade County, Florida. Upon his arrest for a series of murders in 1981, he confessed to authorities that he was the leader of a "hit squad" that had committed at least a hundred additional contract killings. Are these merely men suffering from delusions of grandeur? Or are they men who have given the country a peek into a world that few dare to imagine exists in modern-day America?

"... a Mephistophelean guru who had the unique power to persuade others to murder for him, most of them young girls who went out and savagely murdered total strangers at his command ..." —Vincent Bugliosi describing Charles Manson

"You don't understand me. You are not expected to. You are not capable of it. I am beyond good and evil. Legions of the night, night breed, repeat not the errors of the Night Prowler and show no mercy." Richard "The Night Stalker" Ramirez

"There are other 'Sons' out there - God help the world."
David "Son of Sam" Berkowitz

"What about your children? You say there are just a few? There are many, many more coming in the same direction. They are running in the streets - and they are coming right at you!"
Charles Milles Manson

We will be utilising much more of Mr McGowan´s work as we progress because it is not only fascinating, but also thoroughly researched and excellently presented, it is also information that you really NEED to know if you ever wish to understand the modern phenomena of serial killing (Unless you are one of those dumb fucking animals like a wildebeest that just sits there when a pack of lions run at them - generally cause they are so dumb they are thinking “I don’t need to run I’m also a big fucking lion too, In fact I’m going to just sit here because I’m so positively convinced of it being true, - Hmm, Why is that other lion now
chewing on my leg?!) – Unless you are one of those types of people, take it from me you really need to know this.

Now let’s see what Dave turned up about the people who are “supposedly” chasing these guys.

From Chapter 18 Programmed to Kill

The Profiler and the Patsy

“After the use of the hypnotic drug I had the strange compulsion to take the blame for all the charges pressed against me. It must have been a post-hypnotic influence.” —William Heirens

The FBI’s Behavioural Sciences Unit, which gave the world the ‘science’ of ‘criminal profiling,’ first began taking shape around 1969, the year that the Manson Family first captured national headlines. The new unit did not really take off though until 1972, when the FBI Academy opened in Quantico, Virginia. Robert Ressler joined the BSU team in 1974 and, along with John Douglas, he became one of the most well known of the unit’s profilers, and one of the most prolific of its chroniclers. At the time that he joined, the unit had no operational functions; it existed solely for the purpose of teaching the principles of profiling. Ressler was taught by the pioneers of the ‘science’: Howard Teeten and Pat Mullany.

In 1977, a pilot program was begun to study the rapid proliferation of what were soon to be dubbed “serial killers.” The program included such notable members as Robert Ressler, John Douglas, Ann Burgess and Ralph D’Agostino. In 1978, Ressler spearheaded the operational unit of the BSU. At around that same time, he was credited with coining the now ubiquitous term “serial killer.” During his fabled career, Ressler sat down to chat with a number of the high-profile criminals whose stories have been told in the pages of this book. He was among the first to interview Ted Bundy, and one of the last to talk to John Wayne Gacy. He held court with Charles Manson, Sirhan Sirhan, Richard Speck, Ed Kemper, Jeffrey Dahmer, and many others. He also served as the first Program Manager for VICAP, the Violent Criminal Apprehension Program that Ann Rule so tirelessly campaigned for. Ressler once gave an interviewer the following capsule history of criminal profiling:

The original profilers pretty much emanated from the behavioural science work at Quantico, and it spread from law enforcement to the academic. By bringing in Dr. Park Dietz and others like him, we started spilling it over into the professional community, and where psychiatry had initially been at odds with the FBI approach, a lot of mental health professionals then got on board. Over the years, the forensic community has pretty much accepted what we were doing in behavioural science and absorbed it.

In other words, in the last 25–30 years the FBI has managed, despite initial resistance, to thoroughly co-opt the fields of law enforcement, academia, mental health, and the forensic sciences. In doing so, the FBI’s profilers have successfully moulded public opinion and firmly ingrained in the mind of the average American the concept of the ‘serial killer.’ This effort has been so successful that it has become all but impossible to question whether the contemporary view of violent crime is at all accurate.

In August 1990, Ressler ostensibly retired from government service, though he has spent his retirement years introducing VICAP to Japan, South Africa, Poland, and several other countries. Since his retirement, he has served as the director of an entity called Forensics Behavioural Services International. One of the primary goals of the enterprise, according to one of Ressler’s associates, Dr. Christine Kokonos, is a complete and seamless merging of the fields of law enforcement and psychology.
Robert Ressler's bio reads as though it was lifted off the pages of a Hollywood screenplay. He grew up in Chicago—with a boy whose name may be familiar from a previous chapter: John Wayne Gacy. Bobby and John lived on the same street and were Boy Scouts together in the same scout troop. It was the classic story of two boys whose lives took radically divergent paths...at least by outward appearances. Ressler later returned to Chicago to assist in investigating the Gacy case, and still later helped to prepare the prosecution case against his childhood acquaintance.

Ressler claims that his first foray into gaining an understanding of the criminal mind came as a young boy, when he started his own private investigation firm. The agency was founded specifically to look into the case of William Heirens, who allegedly stalked the streets of Chicago long before Richard Speck, John Wayne Gacy or Robin Gecht walked that beat. You could say that the Heirens case provided Ressler with his first opportunity to try his hand at 'profiling.'

William Heirens was, according to the official narrative, the country's first post-war serial killer. His alleged crimes were committed during a period in America's history when crime rates were soaring all across the nation, particularly in the big cities. The year was 1945. World War II had just ended and tens of thousands of young men desensitized to extreme levels of human brutality were coming home.

The city of Chicago recorded 109 robberies, 265 burglaries, 109 stolen cars, four rapes, and eight murders in just the first ten days of December 1945. Those were staggeringly high numbers in those days. It is interesting then that three particular murders stunned not just the city of Chicago, but the entire country. The first of the three occurred in June 1945, just weeks after the United States had declared “Victory in Europe.” The last, and by far the grisliest, was in January 1946. All three were ultimately attributed to William Heirens, who was just sixteen years old at the time of the first murder.

Heirens was born in November 1928 to a mother and father who were known to have frequent violent arguments. Young Bill reportedly developed a habit of leaving the house by himself, so as to avoid the violent confrontations. Not surprisingly, he was often described as a loner. Heirens first ran afoul of the law at the age of thirteen, when he was found to be in possession of a loaded gun at school. Eight more weapons were found stashed in his home. As punishment, he was sent to the Catholic-run Gibault School in Terre Haute, Indiana. The year was 1942. Heirens had barely walked out the door of the institution when a new student arrived at the Gibault School: Charles Milles Manson.

Shortly after his release, Heirens managed to get himself arrested once again. That time he was sent to the Benedictine monk-run St. Bede’s Academy in Peru, Illinois. Following that, he was urged to take a test for admittance to a “special learning program” at the University of Chicago. He was reportedly an exceptionally gifted student. Soon he discovered girls, however, and his grades began to slip. That was when, purportedly, he decided to go on a killing spree. He also reportedly developed a fondness for dressing in women's clothes and an interest in Hitler and the trappings of Nazism.

The first of the victims was Josephine Ross, a forty-three-year-old, thrice divorced woman who was said to be on a quest for husband number four; she was known to visit psychics and fortune-tellers to assist in attaining that goal. Ross was found sprawled on her bed in a room heavily splattered with blood. Her throat had been slashed multiple times and her bloodied head was wrapped in a dress. There was blood on the walls, the floor, the drapes and the furniture. Bloody water and clothes were left in the bathtub, where the body had been washed. No fingerprints could be found anywhere at the scene.

About four months later, on October 5, 1945, a prowler allegedly entered the apartment of an Army nurse. Surprised by the occupant, the intruder hit her and fled, leaving behind
fingerprints and an eyewitness. The prints were allegedly later identified as belonging to William Heirens. Strangely though, the prints were not initially identified at all, despite the fact that Heirens’ prints were on file with the police. Authorities never explained why the alleged ‘serial killer’ chose not to attack the victim.

Two months later, on December 10, a former U.S. Army WAV named Francis Brown was brutally shot and stabbed to death. Her nude body was found sprawled over her bathtub, her head wrapped in pyjamas. There was a butcher knife buried in her neck and a bullet in her head. A blood trail led from the splattered bed to the bathroom. As in the Josephine Ross case, the home had been thoroughly searched, though nothing appeared to be missing. A bloody fingerprint was allegedly left behind on a doorjamb, but it was only belatedly ‘discovered.’ A man described as being 35–40 years of age was reportedly seen leaving the property. Heirens was less than half that age.

A local butcher named George Carraboni confessed to murdering Francis Brown, but police discounted his confession, claiming that Carraboni’s story kept changing. Carraboni was at that time already under investigation in Cleveland for thirteen murders involving beheadings and mutilations.

On January 7, 1946, the six-year-old daughter of an official with the Office of Price Administration disappeared from an occupied home in a kidnapping/murder case that seemed to borrow heavily from the infamous Lindbergh kidnapping. There were two families living in the home from which Suzanne Degnan vanished, and yet no one living there reportedly saw or heard a thing. After she was reported missing, the house immediately filled with police. A note was found that no one had previously noticed, purportedly because it was mistaken for a discarded tissue. Outside the home, a seven-foot ladder was found that, naturally, was just tall enough to reach to the girl’s bedroom window. The alleged kidnapper demanded $20,000 from the Degnan family for Suzanne’s return, but no amount of ransom money was going to bring her back; she had already been skillfully chopped up (by a trained butcher, authorities initially suspected) and then scattered in the city’s sewers. Initially arrested for the murder was the sixty-five-year-old janitor of a nearby apartment building named Hector Verburgh. Police confidently announced to the press that they had their man. They then spent the next two days tirelessly torturing their suspect—before quietly admitting that they had the wrong man. Verburgh was paid $20,000 (a not insignificant amount of money in the 1940s) to settle his claim against the city.

Heirens was arrested on June 26, 1946, nearly six months after the last murder, on burglary charges. The arrest, which followed a botched break-in, was facilitated by an off-duty officer who just happened to be on-hand to smash a few large flowerpots over Heirens’ head. Bill was not in custody long before his captors began accusing him of the murder of Suzanne Degnan. However, he was not initially accused of either the Ross or Brown homicides, which had no known connection to the Degnan kidnapping and murder. He was though accused of another homicide, which was also unrelated to the Degnan case. Police eventually realized that they were not going to be able to make that murder charge stick, since Heirens had been in school in Indiana at the time.

Shortly before Heirens had been arrested, a man named Richard Thomas confessed to the murder of Suzanne Degnan. Thomas had been in Chicago at the time of the Degnan slaying, working near the Degnan home. At the time of his confession, he was awaiting sentencing in Phoenix, Arizona for the crime of molesting one of his own children. He had previously been convicted of attempted extortion in a case involving a ransom note that threatened the kidnapping of a young girl. A handwriting expert in Phoenix determined that Thomas’ writing was a close match for the writing on the Degnan ransom note. Chicago police were duly dispatched to Phoenix to interview the suspect, but their mission was quickly preempted when Illinois State’s Attorney William Tuohy publicly announced that William Heirens was the party responsible for the girl’s death, even though no evidence existed at that time to support that charge and Heirens was steadfastly denying the allegations.
To elicit a confession from young William, who was not yet an adult, his captors subjected him to what can only be described as severe torture. He was beaten repeatedly for the first few days of his incarceration, and deprived of food, water and sleep. Then he was injected with sodium pentathol, a hypnotic ‘truth’ drug, and moved to solitary confinement. On his fifth day of custody, he was administered a spinal tap—an exceedingly painful surgical procedure for which there was no medical justification. He was given no anaesthesia. Just fifteen minutes after the procedure was completed, he was yanked from his bed and taken, quite literally, for a rough ride on cobblestone roads. Then he was administered a lie-detector test. At no time during his ordeal was he allowed access to counsel.

Heirens, nevertheless, remained a remarkably uncooperative patsy. He ultimately took the fall only, as he later explained, because he had reason to fear for his life.

It was claimed that Heirens confessed to the crimes while under the influence of a hypnotic drug. He purportedly spoke of an alter-identity named George whom he blamed for the murders. In all the decades that have passed since the confession was allegedly obtained, however, no transcript of the interview has ever been produced. Prosecutor Tuohy initially claimed that the transcript was not yet ready for release, but he then later denied that an interview had ever been conducted with the aid of drugs. A number of witnesses recalled that Tuohy had personally attended that interview. One man who had attended, a Dr. Grinker, admitted in 1952 that, despite the allusions to an evil alter ego, Heirens never directly implicated himself in any crimes during the interview. As for the lie-detector test, Tuohy claimed they it was “inconclusive.” The inventors of the particular test that was administered to Heirens, however, published their analysis of the results in a 1953 textbook: “‗Heirens‘ response on the card test clearly establishes him as an innocent person.”

A renowned handwriting expert by the name of George Schwartz was summoned to attempt to match Heirens’ handwriting to that on the ransom note and on a message that had been scrawled in lipstick at one of the crime scenes. Schwartz concluded that the “individual characteristics in the two writings do not compare in any respect.” Undeterred, the state brought in another expert: Herbert J. Walter, who had aided the state in manufacturing a case against Bruno Richard Hauptmann for the kidnapping of the Lindbergh baby. Walter concluded that Heirens was the author of both the note and the lipstick message, contradicting the opinion that he himself had expressed before being brought onto the case. Many experts have subsequently rejected Walter’s conclusions. At one point in the Heirens investigation, police enlisted the services of Frank San Hamel, a Chicago Daily News artist, to ‘enhance’ the writing on the ransom note. San Hamel claimed that he discovered what he dubbed “hidden indentation writing,” and that that purportedly hidden writing conclusively linked Heirens to the note. No one ever bothered to explain what ‘hidden indentation writing’ actually was or how it linked Heirens to the crime.

Fingerprint evidence allegedly irrefutably established Heirens’ guilt, but that evidence was dubious at best. A print supposedly recovered from the ransom note was reported to be a match for Heirens, but the print actually matched on only nine points while the FBI's fingerprint manual specifically required twelve points for a positive identification. More troubling is that the print seems to have surfaced out of thin air. Chicago police initially announced that no prints were present on the note. Analysts at the FBI lab, however, uncovered two prints, but neither of them had been left by Heirens. It was not until years later that the print linking Heirens to the crime was allegedly found on the back of the note. To this day it remains a mystery exactly when that print was found, and by whom. The fingerprint that was purportedly left prominently displayed at the Brown home was also announced to be a match for William Heirens, despite the fact that Police Captain Emmett Evans had previously announced that the print did not match Heirens’ prints. More troubling was that the print had full left and right margins, which is possible only if the
finger has been carefully rolled on the surface, as occurs when someone is being fingerprinted, but generally not when a print is inadvertently left at a crime scene.

No blood evidence was ever produced in the case. Nor was any hair or fibre evidence. And no witnesses, initially at least, could link Heirens to the victims or the crime scenes. George E. Subgrunski, a soldier on furlough, had witnessed a man leaving the Degnan residence. He had described the suspect as a 35-year-old man. He was unable to identify Heirens from photos, but he did manage to do so as a spectator in the courtroom. According to the Centre for Wrongful Convictions, Subgrunski “proved to be a publicity-seeking fraud.”

The state’s case was, needless to say, far too shaky to present in a public trial. Prosecutors Tuohy and Wilbert Crowley met behind closed doors with Heirens’ defence attorneys and offered their client a single life prison term in exchange for guilty pleas to all three counts of murder. No details of the deal were released to the press. The defence team did not bother to conduct any semblance of an independent investigation of the state’s evidence before agreeing to the deal. Heirens, however, was still resisting the state’s efforts to extract a confession and guilty pleas. But then a most remarkable thing happened: a reporter for the Chicago Tribune named George Wright drafted a completely bogus confession, which he attributed to anonymous “unimpeachable sources.” The Tribune ran the fraudulent story on the front page of their July 16 edition, touting it as an actual confession from William Heirens. All of the newspaper’s competitors promptly did likewise. Shortly after that, Heirens was compelled to author a confession, using Wright’s fabricated confession as a script. In other words, he retroactively legitimized what had been an entirely fictional account of the crimes.

A date was then set for Heirens to publicly confess to his alleged crimes and enter his plea. There was a very large turnout for the much-anticipated event; public officials and the press came out in droves to see the show. But the star had not yet been sufficiently coerced to play his part in the charade and he pointedly refused to confess and enter a guilty plea. Both the state’s attorneys and Heirens’ own defence lawyers were livid. The prosecutors’ offer was immediately revoked and a new one proffered: three life terms in exchange for the guilty pleas. A new date was set and September brought Heirens his second chance for a public confession. Mary Jane Blanchard, the daughter of victim Josephine Ross, was there for that second public spectacle. She told the press that she thought Heirens had been framed.

After an excruciating pause, Heirens reluctantly entered his guilty pleas. Audible sighs of relief could be heard from the bench and throughout the courtroom. He was duly sentenced to serve three life sentences. Nearly sixty years later, he is still serving those sentences, and he is still steadfastly proclaiming his innocence. He now has the rather dubious honour of being the longest-serving inmate in the history of the state of Illinois. He has never been given parole consideration, despite the fact that his attorneys told him that he would be afforded such consideration as part of the plea-bargain deal. During his lifetime behind bars, Heirens has distinguished himself by becoming the first inmate in the state’s history to graduate college, and he has become an accomplished painter, a skilled tailor, and a talented jailhouse lawyer.

In April 2002, the UK’s Guardian revealed that a “man who has spent 56 years in jail in what his lawyers describe as ‘one of the grossest miscarriages of justice in the history of the US’ could finally be freed.” The report continued: A new investigation into the case of the man known as the Lipstick Killer indicates that the evidence against him was fabricated by detectives... His case has been taken up by the Northwestern University Centre on Wrongful Convictions which has a high success rate in having suspect verdicts overturned...The new investigation indicates that neither the ransom note nor the lipstick confession were written by Heirens. A fingerprint found in Brown’s apartment is alleged to have been placed there by police.
The investigation referred to in the Guardian article was conducted by a team led by Chicago attorney Jed Stone. Stone’s team discovered that the entire case against Heirens was a product of outright fraudulence. Among the conclusions reached by the team, based on a thorough examination of the evidence, were all of the following:

- The ‘hidden indentation’ writing allegedly uncovered by Chicago Daily News artist Frank San Hamel was a fraud and a hoax.
- The handwriting on the Degnan ransom note was not Heirens. In fact, several independent experts say it was Richard Thomas’s.
- The much-publicized lipstick message on the Brown wall was not in Heirens’ writing and was not written by the same person who wrote the Degnan note.
- The purported Heirens fingerprint originally said to have been on the ‘face’ of the Degnan note later was said to have been on the back, and its existence is not confirmable.
- The so-called ‘bloody fingerprint’ found on a doorjamb in the Brown apartment appears to have been a ‘rolled’ fingerprint like those seen on fingerprint cards in police stations—and unlike those most often found at crime scenes.
- Analysis of the confessions revealed 29 inconsistencies between the confessions and the known facts of the crimes—a signature element in false confessions.

Heirens was wrong about basic facts about the crimes, including locations, times, and related events.

And so it goes as, decades later, police, courts, attorneys and the media continue to work in lockstep to manufacture cases against designated patsies. As for Ressler, he formally began his law enforcement career in 1962, when he served as an agent supervisor for the U.S. Army’s Criminal Investigations Division. He claims that he was first approached by the FBI, by a man who later became the assistant director at Quantico, while he was attending graduate school at Michigan State University. After spending nearly three decades of his life purportedly working to bring violent criminals to justice, one of his first actions after his retirement was to go to work on the Dahmer case—on the side of the defence.

From Chapter 19 Programmed to Kill: Conclusions

“It’s hard for me to believe that a human being could have done what I’ve done, but I know that I did it.” —Jeffrey Dahmer

With the possible exception of school and workplace shootings, nothing better serves to facilitate the promotion of a ‘law-and-order’ agenda than the palpable fear aroused by the sociopathic killer—a fear that propels the population into an every-man-for-himself mentality. Anyone, after all, could be a serial killer, hiding behind a mask of civility: a co-worker, a friend, a neighbour…even a family member.

The Phoenix Program has been referenced a number of times in past chapters, and its relevance to this discussion cannot be overstated. Phoenix was, by design, a psychological warfare operation. Its goal was, quite literally, to scare the hell out of the Vietnamese people—to such an extent that their will would be broken and they would accede to the demands of their would-be oppressors. The techniques employed were barbaric. Victims of the program were not merely assassinated; they were frequently raped, tortured, mutilated, dismembered and left posed in grotesque displays for their fellow villagers and family members to find. The crime scenes of the Phoenix Program were, in other words, indistinguishable from the crime scenes of America’s serial killers.

In What Uncle Sam Really Wants, Noam Chomsky described the type of training given to U.S.-backed Salvadoran death squads, which were modelled after the Phoenix Program’s death squads (which in turn were modelled after the Nazi Einsatzgruppen death squads active during World War II): ...draftees were made to kill dogs and vultures by biting their
throats and twisting off their heads, and had to watch as soldiers tortured and killed suspected dissidents—tearing out their fingernails, cutting off their heads, chopping their bodies to pieces and playing with the dismembered arms for fun.

Chomsky also quotes Jesuit Priest Daniel Santiago, who described the tragic results of such training: People are not just killed by death squads in El Salvador—they are decapitated and then their heads are placed on pikes and used to dot the landscape. Men are not just disembowelled by the Salvadoran Treasury Police; their severed genitalia are stuffed into their mouths. Salvadoran women are not just raped by the National Guard; their wombs are cut from their bodies and used to cover their faces. It is not enough to kill children; they are dragged over barbed wire until their flesh falls from their bones, while parents are forced to watch.

Chomsky described one particularly macabre scene staged by the U.S.-trained Salvadoran National Guard. A peasant woman returned home to “find her three children, her mother and her sister sitting around a table, each with its own decapitated head placed carefully on the table in front of the body, the hands arranged on top ‘as if each body was stroking its own head.’” Finding it hard to keep the head of the woman’s youngest child in place, the assassins had taken the 18-month-old baby’s decapitated head and “nailed the hands onto it. A large plastic bowl filled with blood was tastefully displayed in the centre of the table.”

The goals of psychological warfare are no different here at home than they were in Southeast Asia or Central America: to scare the people, in this case the American people, into willingly surrendering their rights and accepting ever increasing levels of repression; and to desensitize the people to horrendous levels of interpersonal violence. The ultimate goal, and one that we are rapidly approaching, is the destruction of all social bonds and the obliteration of any remaining sense of community—the complete atomization of society.

Famed ‘conspiracy’ researcher Mae Brussell made a telling observation nearly three decades ago, in 1974: “What we are now experiencing is the importation of the dreaded ‘Operation Phoenix’ program into the United States...Through various created and manipulated acts of violence, the only ‘solution’ to ‘chaos, anarchy, and senseless violent acts’ will be a police state...We can expect the planned terrorization of the U.S. population to escalate rapidly.”

That terrorization has indeed escalated rapidly since the early 1970s. ‘Serial killers’ are now an accepted, and frequently glorified, part of American pop culture. They have spawned a number of successful Hollywood movie franchises and their biographies crowd the shelves of America’s bookstores. Sensational workplace shootings have become so cliché that the media now move effortlessly from one to the next. And the police state, needless to say, has advanced markedly in the last few decades.

Since we began this saga in the state of Texas, and since we have revisited that state repeatedly, it seems only fitting that we should end there as well, especially since the current laws of that state, which are by far the harshest of any in the country, are due directly to the state’s use of a ‘serial killer’ to manipulate public opinion. The man's name was Kenneth McDuff, and his story begins on August 6, 1966, when he and an eighteen-year-old accomplice abducted and murdered three high school kids, one of whom was brutally raped and tortured. The triple murder was committed, strangely enough, just five days after Charles Whitman’s rampage in nearby Austin, Texas. In November of that same year, McDuff was convicted and sentenced to die in the state’s electric chair.

Over the next six years, McDuff won a few stays of his scheduled execution, and then had his death sentence commuted to a life term in 1972 when the Supreme Court called a halt to all judicial executions. In 1987, legal action brought against the Texas prison system forced the state’s courts to set limits on prison populations, to ease the outrageously overcrowded and grossly inhumane conditions. State authorities responded by seeking a massive infusion of funds to simply build more prisons. Those efforts were stymied by voters. As a result, the state was forced to grant early parole to a substantial number of
inmates. In a ridiculously unlikely scenario, one of those inmates was former “dead man walking” Kenneth McDuff, who walked away a free man on October 11, 1989. State officials apparently failed to notice the literally tens of thousands of nonviolent drug offenders who were clogging up the prison system when they claimed that they had run out of prisoners who could be offered parole. McDuff returned to Rosebud, Texas, not far from Waco, where it did not take him long to become the most reviled man in the Lone Star State.

Just nine months after his release, he was arrested for pulling a knife and physically threatening a group of young black kids. That offense should have earned him a ticket back to prison for the remainder of his life sentence. Instead, the former death row inmate was released yet again just a few months later. Following his re-release, he repeatedly violated his parole by, among other things, consorting with prostitutes and buying, selling and using drugs.

A number of the other killers profiled here were the beneficiaries of that Supreme Court decision as well. In California, those beneficiaries included Sirhan Sirhan, John Lindley Frazier, and Charlie and his girls. inexplicably chose to let him operate without any meaningful supervision, even though the parolee was obviously someone who needed to be closely monitored. In October 1991, McDuff, working with an accomplice, committed the first of a series of brutal torture murders of girls in the Waco/Austin area. The first two victims were prostitutes, both of whom were seen with McDuff by witnesses shortly before their disappearances. One of the victims was reportedly in his vehicle when he ran a police roadblock. Nevertheless, police opted not to burden McDuff with any serious questions about the girls’ disappearances. Unhindered by either the police or his parole officer, McDuff killed at least three more girls before he was apprehended in May 1992 following one of the largest manhunts in the state’s history. He was brought to trial in February 1993 and once again convicted of capital crimes. The conviction was assured when McDuff opted to take the stand in his own defence, thus allowing his prior convictions and death sentence into evidence. For his efforts, he received a new death sentence (capital punishment had been reinstated in Texas just two years after its use was discontinued). The next year he received another.

Kenneth McDuff ’s luck had run out. Just after 6:00 PM on November 17, 1998, he became one of the 152 inmates executed during the tenure of Governor George W. Bush. By that time, the condemned man had been credited with permanently changing the Texas criminal justice system. The ‘profile' of ‘serial killers’ that has been presented in this book is obviously one that is quite different from the one that has become a part of our collective conscience. Rather than the profile of a lone predator, driven by his own internal demons, we find instead a profile of controlled assassins and controlled patsies, conditioned and programmed by a variety of intelligence fronts, including military entities, psychiatric institutions, and satanic cults.

There is a very real possibility that an underground network of satanic cults has largely replaced the Mafia’s “Murder Incorporated” as America’s premier murder-for-hire organization. Researcher and author Michael Newton has drawn that conclusion; in Raising Hell, he charges that the 'Black Cross,' a faction of the Process-spawned Four-P cult, functions specifically as a “Satanic Murder, Inc.” Consider the case of Thomas Creech, a member of a nationwide biker gang that was heavily involved in drug trafficking and cult rituals. In 1975, Creech admitted to forty-two contract killings committed on behalf of the gang. Many of the murders had been performed, he said, as ritual human sacrifices. According to Creech's account, his forty-two ‘hits’ only qualified him for eighth place among the gang’s contract killers. Consider also the case of Bernard Hunwick of Dade County, Florida. Following his arrest in 1981 for a series of murders, he confessed to police that he was the leader of a “hit squad” that had committed at least 100 additional contract killings.
Are these merely deranged men suffering from delusions of grandeur? Or are they men who have given anyone willing to listen to their stories a peek into a world that few dare to imagine exists in modern-day America? The question is a disturbing one, but one that nonetheless begs for an answer.

Although the serial killer stories told herein vary considerably from the accounts usually told about these men, the vast majority of the information presented herein was derived from mainstream media sources, including newspaper and magazine articles, television documentaries, books released by ‘reputable’ publishers, and ‘true crime’ web sites. The primary difference between this book and others in the genre is that the anomalous facts that invariably accompany the stories of serial killers have not been downplayed and explained away, but rather have been emphasized to illustrate that what are almost universally presented as trivial irregularities are, in fact, patterns that weave their way through the stories of America's most feared criminals. While it is relatively easy to ignore or dismiss such oddities in the cases of individual serial killers, it is much more difficult to do so when those oddities form connecting threads.

The vast majority of serial killer chroniclers are, at best, misguided. Some are undoubtedly peddling deliberate disinformation. Some writers, like some law enforcement officials, seem to have devoted their entire careers to misrepresenting the true nature of serial murder, mass murder, assassination, and other high profile crimes.

Seeming to fit that profile is author Gerald Posner, who recently penned a grossly disinformational piece on the Boston Strangler case for Talk magazine. Posner's article came directly on the heels of a joint press conference held by the relatives of both Albert DeSalvo and his last purported victim, Mary Sullivan. The families were demanding that the investigation be reopened and the long-suppressed police files released. Posner's article reads very much like an effort at damage control. His quick entry into the fray signals that the true nature of the Strangler case will continue to be covered up. Posner's past accomplishments include writing 'exposés' of the JFK assassination (Oswald did it), the Martin Luther King assassination (James Earl Ray did it), and Nazi doctor and Project Paperclip-recruit Joseph Mengele.

The most prolific of serial killer chroniclers is undoubtedly Ann Rule, the former employee of the Seattle Police Department. Rule is best known for her first book, an account of the alleged crimes of Ted Bundy entitled The Stranger Beside Me. The veteran crime writer had a unique perspective on the Bundy case, given that she was not writing about some enigmatic figure, but rather someone whom she had “cared for for ten years”...someone she referred to as “my friend, Ted Bundy.”

Perhaps it is just a bizarre coincidence that the investigative journalist working on the biggest story of her career happened to be a friend and sometime co-worker of the man who would ultimately be held responsible for the six-year string of killings that she was researching. Even Rule though has acknowledged the long-shot odds of such a coincidence occurring: “Logically, statistically, demographically, the chance that Ted Bundy and I should meet and become fast friends is almost too obscure to contemplate.” Equally bizarre is that the two lived strangely parallel lives. Rule acknowledges that, even before the time that she claims they first met, she and Ted had “lived in the same states at the same time—not once but many times.”

When they did allegedly meet—in 1971, a few years before the killings began—it was while both were working as counsellors at the Seattle Crisis Clinic. Interestingly, a number of cult defectors/survivors have claimed that such services are frequently infiltrated by cult members, so that they may be used as cult recruitment tools. Not surprisingly, those contemplating suicide are particularly vulnerable to recruitment by cults, given that they have essentially given up hope on all other possible solutions to their problems. What then
are we to conclude from the fact that Rule had almost as many connections to the victims as Bundy did?

“[W]hatever supernatural force guides our destinies, it has brought us together in some mind-expanding situations. I must believe this invisible hand will pour more chilled Chablis for us in less treacherous, more tranquil times to come. Love, ted.” —Ted Bundy, writing to Ann Rule

After all, the killing of a child in this country is certainly not an uncommon occurrence, nor is it normally an event deemed worthy of national media attention. As the Village Voice reported in 1997, the United States has, per capita, the highest rate of child homicide in the world. None of the world’s people slaughter their children more frequently, or more cavalierly, than do Americans.

America’s closest ally, the United Kingdom, seems to have its sights set on catching up. In January 2002, the Independent reported that a “record number of children [were] murdered in Britain last year.” The rate of child homicides had risen 40% in just one year. England’s child homicide rate is now “thought to be the highest in Europe.”

Epilogue

“I need not look beyond this courtroom to see all the liars, the haters, the killers, the crooks, the paranoid cowards...We are all expendable for a cause. No one knows that better than those who kill for policy, clandestinely or openly, as do the governments of the world which kill in the name of God and country.” —Richard “The Night Stalker” Ramirez, addressing the court

Jean-Bedel Bokassa was, like all Western-supported ‘Third World’ dictators, a fascist thug who allowed his country’s rich natural resources to be ruthlessly exploited while his countrymen starved. Under his rule, The Central African Republic, a French satellite, was one of the twenty poorest countries in the world. Bokassa was reportedly orphaned at the age of six, when his father was murdered and his mother allegedly committed suicide just a week later. At the age of eighteen, he joined the French Colonial Army and served throughout World War II. He remained in the army after the war and later served in the First Indochina War (aka Vietnam) and then in Algeria (two of the bloodiest and most brutal colonial occupations in recorded history). In 1961, Jean-Bedel left the French Army holding the rank of captain. A few years later, he was appointed by his cousin, President David Dacko, to head the army of the Central African Republic. Just one year after taking the post, he took control of the country from his cousin. Lt. Col. Bokassa assumed the presidency on January 1, 1966, four months before the reputed commencement of the ‘Age of Satan.’ By December 1977, Bokassa had decided that ‘president’ was not a lofty enough title, so he declared himself Emperor Bokassa I of the re-christened Central African Empire. As the country’s self-appointed dictator, he had a very close relationship with French President Valery Giscard d’Estaing. The two leaders were frequently photographed together and Giscard was reported to have several relatives in positions of influence in the Bokassa regime and within the Empire’s business community.

In May 1979, it was reported that Bokassa had personally ordered the massacre of 100 (more, by some reports) schoolchildren. The children had been suffocated, stabbed, and beaten with nail-studded clubs. Some eyewitnesses to the carnage claimed that the emperor himself had not only personally killed nearly forty of the victims, but had cannibalized them as well. The Bokassa regime, of course, denied the reports. The atrocity was confirmed though by Amnesty International, and in August 1979, a five-nation team assembled to investigate the incident determined that Emperor Bokassa was indeed personally responsible. Bokassa responded by ordering the executions of forty witnesses who had offered testimony to the investigating board. The next month, Bokassa was overthrown in what was described as a ‘coup.’ In truth, it was merely a quick facelift to ward off the
popular uprising that was brewing in the wake of the revelations. The ‘coup’ merely put Bokassa’s cousin back in power. French troops were on hand to oversee the transition. Bokassa fled the country, taking with him hundreds of millions of dollars looted from the national treasury, and ultimately settled in France. He had, however, left a few things behind. As the Associated Press later reported, prosecutors at his trial noted “Bokassa's old palace was filled with evidence of atrocities, including the frozen body of a schoolteacher hanging on a freezer hook and mounds of human flesh prepared for roasting.” Other evidence of atrocities included, according to author Janet Street-Porter, a Dahmer-esque refrigerator full of butchered human remains and a crocodile pond on the palace grounds that contained the partial remains of some forty additional bodies.

Bokassa’s former cook testified at trial that he had regularly served up dishes prepared from human flesh, and that Bokassa had consumed them “with relish.” The Associated Press reported that Bokassa enjoyed serving up his critics and political enemies at state dinners honouring visiting dignitaries and heads of state. It has been claimed that at Bokassa’s coronation as emperor—an ostentatious affair financed by the French government to the tune of tens of millions of dollars—guests unknowingly dined on human flesh.

Bokassa’s first stop after fleeing his country was in Libya, where he visited with Muammar al-Qaddafi, with whom he had close ties. Ugandan dictator Idi Amin, also ousted in 1979 from the leadership post he had attained with Western support on February 2, 1971 (Candlemas on the occult calendar), likewise fled to Libya amid widespread reports of cannibalism. It is claimed that Amin ate one of his own sons and murdered and dismembered one of his wives. He was also known to publicly praise Adolph Hitler. After eight years of exile, Bokassa returned to his homeland in 1987, despite the fact that he had been sentenced to death in absentia. He was arrested, tried, convicted, and once again sentenced to death, but the sentence was shortly thereafter commuted to a twenty-year prison sentence. In 1993, Bokassa was granted amnesty and he walked away a free man, returning to his home village of Berengo. On November 3, 1996, he died of a heart attack at the age of seventy five and was given an official state funeral befitting a former president.

Or is there any difference?

Dave’s work is truly exceptional isn’t it?

These next few articles say more about the prescience of Dave’s work than I could, so once again I’ll defer...

Anatomy of a School Shooting by David McGowan

On May 15, 2000, the Jefferson County Sheriff’s Office released the official report on the shooting deaths of fifteen people at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado. Not surprisingly, the report confirmed the version of events that had been reported ad nauseam for the past year by the US press.

The official story (for those who are just emerging from a coma or for some other reason inexplicably missed the saturation coverage of this event) goes something like this: Two disaffected teenagers named Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold, acting alone with no assistance in the planning or execution of this crime, entered Columbine High on the morning of April 20, 1999, armed to the teeth, and promptly began shooting up the place, leaving twelve fellow students and one teacher dead before turning their guns on themselves.

As with all the “big stories” flogged by the American media, the various avenues of the US press quickly fell in line behind this story, deftly avoiding any evidence that would tend to
cast doubt on the official version of events. So while there has been some minor quibbling over insignificant details of the story (e.g. did the gunmen target athletes, blacks, and/or Christians?), few serious journalists have questioned the central thesis that the carnage at Columbine High that day was the work of Harris and Klebold acting alone.

Yet strangely enough, both the Denver Post and the Denver RockyMountain News, the newspapers serving the greater Denver area (of which Littleton is a part), have provided coverage which has been consistently ignored by the media in general.

For the benefit of those living outside the Denver area, presented here you will find a few facts about the tragedy at Columbine of which you may be unaware and which tend to be at odds with the official report.

Take, for example, the issue of how long the rampage lasted. One reporter on the scene wrote that:

“The bloody rampage spanned four hours... By 3:45 p.m., shots still rang out inside the school (as) more than 200 law enforcement officers and four SWAT teams tried to stop the gunmen and evacuate wounded high school students” [Denver Post, April 21, 1999].

Another quoted Jefferson County Sheriff John Stone, one of the first officials on the scene, as saying:

“We had initial people there right away, but we couldn’t get in. We were way outgunned” Associated Press, April 20, 1999.

Echoing this sentiment was Terry Manwaring, commander of the Jefferson County SWAT team, who claimed:

“I just knew the killers were armed and were better equipped than we were.” The SWAT teams, therefore, made no effort to confront the killers [Playboy, March 2000].

The official report, meanwhile, contends that the “lunchtime rampage...ended after 45 minutes,” and that, “Sometime after noon the killers stood near the library windows and turned their guns on themselves” [Los Angeles Times, May 16, 2000].

Strange then that there would be shots ringing out some three-and-a-half hours later.

Stranger still is the notion that two teenagers with limited firearms training and armed only with shotguns and 9mm handguns would be able to outgun a veritable army of law enforcement officers, many with advanced paramilitary training and weapons. And you would think that the fact that the two were already dead would at least have slowed them down a bit.

Then there is the issue of the bombs strategically placed throughout the school prior to the shootings. Some of those involved in the investigation of the case were openly sceptical of the notion that the two boys could have transported and placed all the explosive devices that were found. One report noted that:

The 20-pound bomb found inside the Columbine High School kitchen suggests the two teenage suspects were aided by others in their plot to blow up the school, police said Thursday. Packed inside a duffle bag with a wired gasoline can—and surrounded with nails and BBs for maximum killing power—the propane barbecue tank-bomb points to a wider conspiracy, police said. [Denver Post, April 23, 1999]

Likewise, Jefferson County District Attorney Dave Thomas was quoted as saying:
“It is obvious to me that they couldn’t have carried them all in at the same time, plus the four weapons” [Denver Post, May 5, 1999].

And sheriff department spokesman Steve Davis added that:

“From day one we’ve always felt like there was a very good possibility that more people were involved” [Associated Press, May 14, 1999].

Ultimately recovered, according to the final report, were “95 homemade explosive devices,” including two bombs fashioned from propane cylinders [Los Angeles Times, May 16, 2000].

Picture, if you will, two teenagers strolling unnoticed into a high school, each carrying two firearms, a propane tank-bomb, and some 50 other explosive devices, as well as an abundant supply of ammunition.

Picture them then proceeding to carefully place each of these 95 bombs throughout the school, still unnoticed and undisturbed by faculty or other students. Nothing unusual about that. Just an average day at an American high school. Yet the possibility is clearly there that there may have been more people involved. Many of the witnesses, at any rate, clearly think so:

Jefferson County Sheriff John P. Stone raised the spectre of a third Columbine High gunman anew Tuesday, saying some students have named another suspect. “There was quite possibly one other person shooting,” Stone said. “We do have witness statements.” The statements came from “students who were witnesses at the scene when this was going down,” and they agreed on the third person’s identity, he said. [Denver Post, May 5, 1999]

In fact, one initial report from Littleton began: “Three young men in fatigues and black trench coats opened fire at a suburban Denver high school Tuesday...,” and also noted that a “third young man was led away from the school in handcuffs more than four hours after the attack, and student Chris Wisher said: ‘He’s one of the ones who shot at us’” [Associated Press, April 20, 1999].

This third suspect has, oddly enough, never been identified or even mentioned again by the press.

In a televised interview, the mother of a student who had escaped the attack quoted her daughter as saying that she “looked up and saw a gunman in a black trench coat with a very huge gun.... He had dark brown hair, thick bushy eyebrows, and was very ugly,” a description that clearly did not fit either Harris or Klebold. When asked if the gunman was a student, the mother replied that: “She didn’t recognize him as a student. No. Not as a student” [KUSA-TV, April 20, 1999].

Even more disturbing is a report that, “Dozens of witnesses interviewed by police after the crime claimed that from five to eight individuals participated in the shooting that left 15 people dead, including the killers, and more than 20 injured” [Denver Rocky Mountain News, July 29, 1999].

Five to eight individuals?

Dozens of witnesses?

Something definitely seems to be a bit peculiar here.

It is certainly understandable that some witnesses could have trouble recalling some of the details of the attack. In a situation of this nature, extreme levels of fear and confusion can
cloud one’s recollection. In the ensuing chaos, some witnesses could easily be confused about the number of shooters.

Nevertheless, there is a considerable difference between two gunmen and eight gunmen—the latter being pretty much a small army. Is it really possible for dozens of eyewitnesses to be mistaken about the additional three to six gunmen?

This issue could possibly be cleared up by examining the autopsy reports of the various victims.

Unfortunately, that isn’t likely to happen. It seems that:

The autopsy reports on the Columbine High School victims will not be released to the public, a Jefferson County judge ruled Friday.... Chief District Judge Henry E. Nieto rejected arguments by 18 news organizations.... The coroner's office, district attorney and the family of killer Dylan Klebold joined the 12 families in getting the documents sealed. [Denver Post, May 29, 1999]

Another question that could be cleared up by the release of the autopsy reports is the alleged suicides of the two shooters, seeing as how “Klebold was shot once in the left side of the head, apparently by one of two 9 mm weapons... [T]he wound's location puzzles some investigators. They believe that if the right-handed Klebold had shot himself, the wound should have been on the other side” [Denver Rocky Mountain News, June 13, 1999].

Very clever, those investigators. Clever enough, in fact, to come up with an explanation for this anomaly. Some authorities now believe (or claim to, anyway) that Harris shot Klebold before shooting himself.

It seems just as likely, however, that a third party shot Klebold, and perhaps Harris as well.

Moving on to what is perhaps the most bizarre aspect of the case, we come now to the infamous videotape. You know, the one that was made in 1997, two years before the actual assault, and which “depicts gun-toting, trench coat-wearing students moving through Columbine's halls and ends with a special-effects explosion of the school.”

The one that was co-produced by “the son of the FBI’s lead agent in the investigation” [Associated Press, May 8, 1999].

There’s certainly nothing unusual about that. It’s actually standard FBI procedure to have your son shoot a training film for a high school slaughter a couple of years beforehand. It’s also standard procedure to have your other son on hand to eyewitness the crime.

Which is why “[Agent Dwayne Fuselier's] youngest son, Brian, was in the school cafeteria at the time and managed to escape after seeing one of the bombs explode” [Denver Post, May 13, 1999].

It should also be noted that another “student who helped in the production of the film [was] Brooks Brown...” [Associated Press, May 8, 1999].

For those not fortunate enough to be home on the day of the shooting watching the live cable coverage, Brooks Brown was the student enthusiastically granting interviews to anyone who would stick a microphone in his face.

He claimed to have encountered Harris and Klebold as they were approaching the school, and to have been warned away by the pair from entering the campus that day. According to his story, he heeded the warning and was therefore not present during the shooting spree. Fair enough, but let's try to put these additional pieces of the puzzle together.
First, we have the son of the lead investigator, who was obviously a member of the so-called Trenchcoat Mafia, involved in the filming of a pre-enactment of the crime. Then we have a second son of the lead investigator being at ground zero of the rampage. And finally we have a close associate of both the Fuselier brothers and of Harris and Klebold (and a co-filmmaker) being in the company of the shooters immediately before they entered the school, this by his own admission.

And yet, strangely enough, none of them was connected in any way to the commission of this crime, according to official reports.

Not even Brooks Brown, who should have, if nothing else, noticed that the pair had some unusually large bulges under their trench coats on this particular day. At the very least, one would think that there might be just a little bit of a conflict of interest for the FBI's lead investigator.

This does not appear to be the case, however, as “FBI spokesman Gary Gomez said there was ‘absolutely no discussion’ of reassigning Fuselier, 51, a psychologist, in the wake of the disclosures in Friday’s Denver Rocky Mountain News. ‘There is no conflict of interest,’ Gomez said” [Denver Rocky Mountain News, May 8, 1999].

And as no less an authority than Attorney General Janet Reno has stated: “It has been a textbook case of how to conduct an investigation, of how to do it the right way” [Denver Post, April 23, 1999].

So there you have it. There was no conspiracy, there were no accomplices. It was, as always, the work of a lone gunman (OK, two lone gunmen in this case). But if there were a wider conspiracy, you may wonder, what would motivate such an act? What reason could there be for sacrificing fourteen young lives? Many right-wingers would have you believe that such acts are orchestrated—or at the very least rather cynically exploited—as a pretext for passing further gun-control legislation. The government wants to scare the people into giving up their right to bear arms, or so the thinking goes. And there is reason to believe that this could well be a goal.

It is not, however, the only—or even the primary—goal, but rather a secondary one at best. The true goal is to further traumatize and brutalize the American people. This has in fact been a primary goal of the State for quite some time, dating back at least to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy on that fateful day in Dallas on November 22, 1963.

The strategy is now (as it was then) to inflict blunt force trauma on all of American society, and by doing so to destroy any remaining sense of community and instil in the people deep feelings of fear and distrust, of hopelessness and despair, of isolation and powerlessness.

And the results have been, it should be stated, rather spectacular.

With each school shooting, and each act of “domestic terrorism,” the social fabric of the country is ripped further asunder. The social contracts that bound us together as a people with common goals, common dreams, and common aspirations have been shattered. We have been reduced to a nation of frightened and disempowered individuals, each existing in our own little sphere of isolation and fear.

And at the same time, we have been desensitized to ever-rising levels of violence in society. This is true of both interpersonal violence as well as violence by the State, in the form of judicial executions, spiralling levels of police violence, and the increased militarization of foreign policy and of America’s borders.

We have become, in the words of the late George Orwell, a society in which “the prevailing mental condition [is] controlled insanity.”
And under these conditions, it becomes increasingly difficult for the American people to fight back against the supreme injustice of twenty first century Western society. Which is, of course, precisely the point.

For a fractured and disillusioned people, unable to find a common cause, do not represent a threat to the rapidly encroaching system of global fascism. And a population blinded by fear will ultimately turn to “Big Brother” to protect them from nonexistent and/or wholly manufactured threats.

As General McArthur stated back in 1957: “Our government has kept us in a perpetual state of fear...with the cry of grave national emergency. Always there has been some terrible evil at home or some monstrous foreign power that was going to gobble us up if we did not blindly rally behind it....”

Perhaps this is all just groundless conspiracy theorizing. The possibility does exist that the carnage at Columbine High School unfolded exactly as the official report tells us that it did. And even if that proves not to be the case, there really is no need to worry. It is all just a grand illusion, a choreographed reality. Only the death and suffering are real.

Postscript

As the dust settled over Columbine High, other high-profile shootings would rock the nation:

At schools, in the workplace, in a church, and—in Southern California’s San Fernando Valley—at a Jewish community centre where a gunman quickly identified as Buford Furrow opened fire on August 10, 1999. This man, who later would claim that his intent was to kill as many people as possible, had received extensive firearms and paramilitary training, both from the US military and from militia groups.

Shooting in an enclosed area that was fairly heavily populated, Furrow fired a reported 70 rounds from his assault rifle. By design or act of God, no one was killed and only a handful of people were injured, including three children and a teenager. None of the injuries was life-threatening, and all the victims have fully recovered.

With a massive police dragnet descending on the city, Furrow fled, abandoning his rolling arsenal of a vehicle. Not far from the crime scene, he stopped to catch up on some shopping and get a haircut.

Along the way, his aim having improved considerably, Furrow killed a postal worker with a single headshot, for no better reason than because he was Asian and, therefore, “non-white.”

At about this same time, Furrow car-jacked a vehicle from an Asian woman. Though this woman—besides being obviously non-white—was now a key witness who could place Furrow at the scene and identify the vehicle he had fled in, she was left shaken but very much alive.

Having taken great risks to obtain her vehicle, Furrow promptly abandoned it, choosing instead to take a taxi.

In an unlikely turn of events, this taxi would safely transport Furrow all the way to Las Vegas, Nevada. Having successfully eluded one of the most massive police dragnets in San Fernando Valley’s history (which had the appearance of a very well-planned training exercise), and having made it across state lines to relative safety, Furrow proceeded directly to the local FBI office to turn himself in.

No word yet as to whether Dwayne Fuselier was flown in to head up the investigation.
Meanwhile, in Littleton, Colorado, the death toll continued to mount. On May 6, 2000, the Los Angeles Times reported that a Columbine High student had been found hanged. His death was ruled a suicide even though, “Friends were mystified, saying there were no signs of turmoil in the teenager’s life.” One noted that he had “talked to him the night before, and it didn’t seem like anything was wrong.”

The young man had been a witness to the shooting death of teacher Dave Sanders.

His was the fourth violent death surrounding Columbine High in just over a year since the shooting, bringing the body count to nineteen. Very little information was released concerning this most recent death, with the coroner noting only that:

“Some things should remain confidential to the family” [Los Angeles Times, May 6, 2000].

On February 14, 2000, two fellow Columbine students were shot to death in a sandwich shop just a few blocks from the school. The shootings, which lacked any clear motive, have yet to be explained.

In yet another incident, the mother of a student who was shot and survived “walked into a pawnshop in October, asked to see a gun, loaded it and shot herself to death” [Los Angeles Times, May 6, 2000].

Unexplained was why the shopkeeper would have supplied her with the ammunition for the gun.

Perhaps she brought her own, though if she had access to ammunition, chances are that she would also have had access to a gun.

Such are the mysteries surrounding the still-rising death toll in Littleton, Colorado.

Endnote

1. The KUSA-TV interview was also broadcast on MSNBC. A transcript is posted at the Konformist Website <www.konformist.com/1999/colorado/notstudent.htm>.

Inmate: James Holmes Told Me He Was ‘Programmed’ To Kill by “Evil” Therapist


An alleged inmate of ‘Batman’ massacre culprit James Holmes claims the shooter told him that he was “programmed” to carry out the massacre by an “evil” therapist.

The shocking story has gone virtually unnoticed after appearing in a blog post on the Denver Westword website last week.

After failing to interest the Arapahoe County District Attorney’s Office in his account of what happened, 38-year-old Steven Unruh has now gone public. Unruh was booked into the Arapahoe County Sheriff’s Office Detention Facility just hours before the ‘Batman’ massacre unfolded and says that he was still in the booking area when Holmes was brought in. Unruh then claims that he was able to communicate with Holmes from a nearby cell and that Holmes appeared to show remorse for what had happened.

The most explosive element of what Unruh claims Holmes told him could – if true – shed an entirely different light on the circumstances behind the Aurora theatre shooting. “He says that Holmes told him “he felt like he was in a video game” during the shooting, that “he wasn’t on his meds” and “nobody would help him.” He says Holmes also mentioned NLP —
presumably, neuro-linguistic programming, a much-scorned and outmoded approach to psychotherapy — and claimed to have been “programmed” to kill by an evil therapist.”

“When he got out to his car, he wasn’t programmed no more,” Unruh says. “It sounded kind of crazy. He was trying to run it by me, basically.”

Unruh was also given a phone number that Holmes asked him to call which connected to a bereavement counsellor who says she has no acquaintance with Holmes or Unruh.

“They’re going to try to discredit my story,” Unruh told writer Alan Prendergast. “But I was able to have a four-hour talk with him. I talked him out of suicide.”

Prendergast notes that although jail authorities doubt Unruh would have had an opportunity to speak to Holmes, “certain elements of the story” ring true, including, “a description that resembles the headbanging routine that sent Holmes to the hospital last week.”

Stories about infamous killers being brainwashed into carrying out murders are almost commonplace. The most well known is probably Sirhan Sirhan, Robert F. Kennedy’s alleged assassin.

As the London Independent reported in 2005, evidence strongly indicates that Sirhan was a Manchurian candidate, a victim of mind control who was set up to be the fall guy for the murder. Sirhan was described by eyewitnesses as being in a trance-like state as he pulled the trigger. (My Note. The shots were fired from behind his head while Sirhan stood in front of him! It was obviously his bodyguard who was standing behind Kennedy and was the only other person in the room with a gun, who was in the position to shoot him behind the ear.)

“There was no way Sirhan Sirhan killed Kennedy,” said (Sirhan’s lawyer Larry) Teeter....He was the fall guy. His job was to get busted while the trigger man walked out. He wasn’t consciously involved in any plot. He was a patsy. He was unconscious and unaware of what was happening – he was the true Manchurian Candidate.”

The CIA’s use of mind control to create killers is a matter of historical record. MK-ULTRA was the code name for a covert, illegal CIA human research program, run by the Office of Scientific Intelligence that came to light in 1975 through investigations by the Church Committee, and by a presidential commission known as the Rockefeller Commission. 14-year CIA veteran Victor Marchetti insists that the program is ongoing and has not been abandoned.

According to his lawyers, Sirhan Sirhan “was an involuntary participant in the crimes being committed because he was subjected to sophisticated hypno programming and memory implantation techniques which rendered him unable to consciously control his thoughts and actions at the time the crimes were being committed,” and served only as a diversion for the real assassin. (My Note. Remember that then Sirhan was “treated” by Joly West!)

The parallels between Sirhan Sirhan and James Holmes are alarming. Both were described as behaving as if in a trance or under the influence of drugs, both cannot remember any of the details of the shootings, and in both cases eyewitnesses reported more than one gunman at the scene.

In both the RFK and ‘Batman’ shootings, eyewitnesses described other shooters, dismantling the “lone wolf” narrative. According to Nina Rhodes-Hughes, another man was shooting at RFK and the authorities tried to alter her account of what happened. “What has to come out is that there was another shooter to my right,” Rhodes-Hughes said in an interview with CNN. “The truth has got to be told. No more cover-ups.” Sirhan’s lawyers also presented evidence that “two guns were fired in the assassination and that Sirhan’s revolver was not the gun that shot Kennedy.”

Similarly in the case of Holmes, eyewitnesses described two shooters, noting that one of the gas canisters was thrown from the opposite side of the theatre to where the killer was
standing. It has also been suggested that Holmes had an accomplice. Eyewitnesses described the killer talking on a cellphone before the shooting and then standing in the emergency exit and beckoning someone else over.

Holmes, a neuroscience student, was also fascinated with mind control. During his time at Salk Institute of Biological Studies, Holmes designed a computer program to alter mental states using flicker rates. Arizona shooter Jared Lee Loughner was also obsessed with mind control.

While there is no way to confirm Unruh’s account, he seems to have little motive in making it up out of fresh air. Added to the other unexplained inconsistencies surrounding the ‘Batman’ massacre, the story will only serve to bolster the view amongst some that the full story about the tragic events of that night has not yet come to light.

Confession: James Holmes Tells Inmate He Was Programmed To Kill

Posted by: liberating elder Posted date: November 25, 2012 Secrets of the Fed.com

Colorado inmate Steven Unruh is having a hard time convincing anyone that he spent hours talking to Aurora theatre shootings suspect James Holmes shortly after his arrest last July. Jail officials say there’s no way that Unruh could have had that kind of access. Yet certain elements of the story — which includes a description that resembles the headbanging routine that sent Holmes to the hospital last week — have been attracting attention from law enforcement and even families of the shooting victims.

“They’re going to try to discredit my story,” Unruh told Westword in a recent interview at the jail. “But I was able to have a four-hour talk with him. I talked him out of suicide.”

Unruh insists the sporadic conversation continued even after Holmes was moved to another cell in the area. He says that Holmes told him “he felt like he was in a video game” during the shooting, that “he wasn’t on his meds” and “nobody would help him.” He says Holmes also mentioned NLP — presumably, neuro-linguistic programming, a much-scrorned and outmoded approach to psychotherapy — and claimed to have been “programmed” to kill by an evil therapist.

“When he got out to his car, he wasn’t programmed no more,” Unruh says. “It sounded kind of crazy. He was trying to run it by me, basically.”

See the complete Westword article by Alan Prendergast

James Eagan Holmes (born December 13, 1987) is the suspected perpetrator of a mass shooting that occurred on July 20, 2012 at a movie theatre in Aurora, Colorado. He had no known criminal record prior to the shooting.

On May 22, 2012, Holmes purchased a Glock 22 pistol at a Gander Mountain shop in Aurora, and six days later bought a Remington Model 870 shotgun at a Bass Pro Shops in Denver. On June 7, just hours after failing his oral exam at the university, he purchased a Smith & Wesson M&P15 semi-automatic rifle, with a second Glock 22 pistol following on July 6. All the weapons were bought legally. In the four months prior to the shooting, Holmes also bought 3000 rounds of ammunition for the pistols, 3000 rounds for the M&P15, and 350 shells for the shotgun over the Internet. On July 2, he placed an order for a Blackhawk Urban Assault Vest, two magazine holders and a knife at an online retailer.

On June 25, less than a month before the shooting, Holmes emailed an application to join a gun club in Byers, Colorado. The owner, Glenn Rotkovich, called him several times throughout the following days to invite him to a mandatory orientation, but could only reach his answering machine. Due to the nature of Holmes’ voice mail, which he described as
“bizarre, freaky”, “guttural, spoken with a deep voice, incoherent and rambling,” Rotkovich instructed his staff to inform him if Holmes showed up, though Holmes neither appeared at the gun range nor called back. “In hindsight, looking back — and if I’d seen the movies — maybe I’d say it was like the Joker — I would have gotten the Joker out of it...It was like somebody was trying to be as weird as possible,” Rotkovich said

On July 20, 2012, police arrested an unresisting Holmes next to his car behind the Century 16 theatre, moments after the 2012 Aurora shooting, in which Holmes allegedly set off several gas or smoke canisters and then opened fire on the theatre audience, killing 12 and wounding 58. The responding officers recovered several guns from inside the car and the theatre. According to two federal authorities, Holmes had dyed his hair red and called himself “The Joker”.

Once apprehended, Holmes told the police that he had booby-trapped his apartment with explosive devices before heading to the theatre. Police later confirmed the presence of explosives in the apartment.

Detention and court appearance

Holmes was initially jailed at Arapahoe Detention Centre, under suicide watch. He is being held in solitary confinement to protect him from other inmates, a routine precaution for high-profile cases.

Overwhelming Evidence Mounts Indicating Colorado Shooting Staged

Infowars.com July 28, 2012

It is now clear the Colorado shooting is a staged event. It mirrors previous shootings, including the assassination of Robert Kennedy blamed on the drugged patsy Sirhan Sirhan.

Recently produced evidence reveals that Sirhan was not the shooter and he was framed. In a federal court last November, lawyers argued that Sirhan “was an involuntary participant in the crimes being committed because he was subjected to sophisticated hypno programming and memory implantation techniques which rendered him unable to consciously control his thoughts and actions at the time the crimes were being committed,” according to court papers.

Holmes’ Psychiatrist Worked for Pentagon

New damning details on the Colorado shooting now surface on a daily basis. The latest is that the highest honors neuroscience student James Holmes was seeing a psychiatrist. Holmes was a patient of Dr. Lynne Fenton at the University of Colorado. Fenton worked for the Air Force in Texas and was known for dispensing dangerous pharmaceutical drugs, according to the Washington Post.

The doctor’s background came to light after the corporate media reported Holmes allegedly mailed a notebook “full of details about how he was going to kill people” to her before the attack. “Among the images shown in the spiral-bound notebook’s pages were gun-wielding stick figures blowing away other stick figures,” Fox News reported.

This is an obvious attempt to hastily arrange a backstory on Holmes and portray him as a murderous psychopath. It is a key element in the narrative portraying him as a lone wolf, which is the preferred government story when it conducts false flag operations for political gain and to manipulate public opinion.

Mind Control and MKUltra
Supposed Oklahoma City bombing mastermind Timothy McVeigh was under the “care” of Dr. Louis Jolyon West of UCLA’s Neuropsychiatric Institute following his arrest. “Dr. West is a sinister creation of the [CIA’s] mind control fraternity. Among other totalitarian projects, he has studied the use of drugs as ‘adjuncts to interpersonal manipulation or assault,’ and employed pioneers in the field of remote, electronic mind control experimentation at UCLA,” writes Alex Constantine.

“The CIA’s use of mind control to create killers is a matter of historical record. MK-ULTRA was the code name for a covert, illegal CIA human research program, run by the Office of Scientific Intelligence that came to light in 1975 through investigations by the Church Committee and by a presidential commission known as the Rockefeller Commission. 14-year CIA veteran Victor Marchetti insists that the program is ongoing and has not been abandoned,” Paul Joseph Watson wrote on Friday.

Judge Imposes Gag Order to Prevent Release of Information Contradicting Official Narrative
The judge presiding over Holmes’ case has imposed a gag order in the courtroom. District Court Judge William Blair Sylvester has also ordered the University of Colorado not to release his school records after the media filed a request for the documents. The gag order was issued after video from the courtroom showed an obviously drugged James Holmes. The order “bars attorneys from publicly commenting on matters including evidence, whether a plea deal is in the works or the results of any examination or test,” the AP reported.

The effort is an attempt to prevent the media and researchers from discovering the obvious – James Holmes is a patsy and possibly the victim of mind-control. He does not fit the profile of a mass murderer who understands weaponry and paramilitary equipment. “He’s not on anybody’s radar screen — nothing,” a police officer told the New York Times. “This guy is somewhat of an enigma. Nobody knows anything about him.”

Shooter or Shooters Obviously Military
Following reports that the shooter resembled the Joker character from Batman, witnesses said he “was in full riot gear... He looked like he was from a SWAT team” and “was dressed from head-to-toe in SWAT gear... with Kevlar. He looked like one of the cops. That’s what was really confusing to us.”

Following criticism of the official narrative that the unemployed former student could not have possibly afforded to buy expensive weapons and paramilitary equipment – it is said the weapons and ammunition alone cost around $15,000 — the corporate media floated the story that he was the recipient of grant money from the National Institutes of Health. The NIH explained the grant included a “$21,600 stipend per year in 12 monthly installments to help defray living expenses while they pursue their academic research training experience.”

Millions of Americans Do Not Believe Official Narrative.
The Colorado shooting story is unraveling like the Fast and Furious story before it. Millions of Americans do not believe the official narrative and find the explanation that a shy neuroscience student suddenly turned into a mass murderer implausible.

Many also find it suspicious that the event occurred as the globalists at the United Nations are putting finishing touches on a treaty that will eventually ban all firearms and effectively disarm every American.

10 Facts Revealing Conspiracy Behind Aurora Shooters From ATS 8-3-12
1. James Holmes had no job, was earning unemployment but was able to purchase close to 10k in weapons, explosives, and tactical equipment, and this all happened within 2 months. The chances that Holmes could afford to finance this on his own is highly unlikely. Someone helped finance this attack, follow the money and we will find the masterminds.

2. The testimony of 2 key eye witnesses totally contradicts the official story of there being one shooter, with no accomplice in the attack. One witness testified that the tear gas canisters came from both sides of the theatre, a second witness testified that before the movie began he saw someone sit down in the front row, and shortly after sitting down his phone rang and instead of walking into the main lobby to take the call, he walked over to the emergency exit to the right side of the theatre opened the door and looked to be signalling someone outside the theatre. Shortly after the shooter made entrance through the emergency exit and commenced his attack.

3. Evidence photos - Evidence photos have surfaced of a gas mask outside of the emergency exit of theatre 8, police reported that when they arrested the shooter in the white Hyundai outside of theatre 9 he was wearing a gas mask, that would make 2 gas masks that were recovered. Also photos show the AR-15 propped up against the wall opposite of the fire exit door of theatre 9, police radio communications reported that night that the rifle was found inside the theatre, and even if the AR-15 was discarded outside the theatre do you think the gunman was going to take the time to set the weapon down? The Hyundai - why was the window missing? I thought he put up no resistance as he was being taken into custody?

4. Radio communications from the night of the attack -

*First report of suspects was two men fleeing the theatres both wearing back packs, what happened to these two suspects??

*Reports of three people dragging an unknown individual into a non descript vehicle and speeding off

*the majority of injured and witnesses were not given access to ambulances, they were to be transported by other vehicles to the high school. WHY?

* Police radio that one of the shooters may be wearing blue and plaid shirt

"Magazine and AR-15 dropped in theatre

5. Pool of eye witnesses - It was reported that the theatre had over 300 people in it, there have been less than 10 eye witnesses with a only a few taking most of the spotlight i.e. Jennifer Seeger. The KEY eye witnesses seem to have very well rehearsed testimony but have not given much sense to whether there testimony is actually plausible - Jennifer Seeger has consistently given a description of the shooter, that miraculously matches James Holmes to a T, even though she has told reporters that she was face down in the aisle, and surrounded by tear gas/gas obstructing her view. Seeger also described the gas canisters down to the colour, personally I believe this was impossibility in that scenario. She also mentioned that hot shell casings were hitting her in the forehead as the gunman was spraying the theatre, how is this possible? She was on her front was she not? Another point that should be noted is that for an event that involved 300 people, there has been a surprisingly low amount of postings on youtube, facebook, and Twitter. No one who was involved in this event is talking about it, beyond that small group of witnesses that have been talking to national media outlets.

6. Holmes booby trapped apartment - How are we to believe that a 24 yr old, former camp counsellor, gaming nerd, science rock star, Neuroscience PHD had the skill set to set up a system of explosive devices and booby traps that would have the FBI bewildered for almost
two days?? How are we to believe that?? There is no way this maze of death was the work of one neuroscience student. It's BS.

7. Rumours of Holmes's Neuroscience program being funded by DARPA - Neuroscience + DARPA + MKULTRA the perfect marriage

8. Anti-gun agenda - Didn't anyone notice how quick public officials were ready to talk to the media about antigun legislation? Bloomberg publically called out Obama and Romney to do something about the lack of gun control in the US, excellent timing seeing as the UN has legislation on the table to ban small arms globally.

9. The fact that Holmes allegedly bought the guns legally, to me this is the biggest smoking gun that this attack is being used as sounding board for the anti gun/disarmament agenda, think about it...most intelligent people who were planning an attack like this would do everything they could to stay off of the radar, buying the guns legally doesn't allow one to do that. What they are trying to do is demonize the legal gun owner, saying hey Holmes wasn't a criminal he was a normal guy who went crazy, and due to his ability to legally buy these firearms he was able to pull off these attacks.

10. The roommates - The initial reports were than Holmes was living with two other people, but once people started asking who these roommates were, the story had changed to no roommates that he lived by himself. The roommate story had to change because everyone was asking the same thing, if Holmes had roommates where are they? Are they in the apartment with all of those explosive materials? It makes no sense!!! I don't think there were any explosives in Holmes residence, I think that they were buying time to construct this BS story.

Anyway those are my 10, feel free to debunk or add your own commentary.
Edited on 25-7-2012 by Wewillallbefree because: spelling correction

There are TWO videos at this page


This chapter was to demonstrate the power mind control can exert over individuals. The next chapter deals with mind control over large groups. I use two of the most shocking occurrences of the 20th Century to do so. The first will demonstrate what a small group can be coerced to do. Then I'll use the “best” demonstration of “Reesien” Tavistock shock tactics being used perfectly in order to scare an entire nation to give up their weapons without a single shot being fired in protest. -

Imagine if these same people where ever going to come into conflict with their government in the near future, how much serious resistance could they mount in the face of let’s say brutal and oppressive tyranny, when they are totally unarmed do you think?
Chapter Twenty Four

In this chapter we matter of factly cover two of the craziest occurrences of the 20th Century.

Jonestown Jenocide” by Robert Sterling

On November 18 1978, 913 people died in Jonestown, a small compound carved out of the jungles of Guyana, a small country on the northeast coast of South America.

The media at the time reported that it was a fanatical group of followers of the Rev. Jim Jones, lead to the jungles of South America to get away from the oppression of life here in America. They also reported that his followers willingly followed their leader into the great beyond by sipping on some cyanide cocktails, laced with purple Kool-Aid.

In fact, the notion of a mass suicide at Jonestown has been repeated so many times that it is accepted as fact, and the association is so strong that when most people hear "Jonestown," the first thing which pops in their head is "Kool-Aid."

This association is false.

The source of the "Kool-Aid Suicide" stories was the U.S. State Department, which presented the story immediately after the "suicides" were reported as though it was the only obvious truth.

A U.S. Army spokesman pronounced with complete authority, "No autopsies are needed. The cause of death is not an issue here." The bodies were then allowed to rot in the jungle.

Despite the (supposed) lack of need for autopsies, Dr. C. Leslie Mootoo, the top Guyanese pathologist, was at Jonestown hours after the deaths, and, refusing the assistance of U.S. pathologists, accompanied the teams that examined the bodies.

His conclusions? - Dr. Mootoo found fresh needle marks at the back of the left shoulder blades on 80 to 90 percent of the victims. Others had been shot or strangled.

A surviving witness stated that those who resisted were forced by armed guards to comply.

Dr. Mootoo's opinion, and that of the Guyanese grand jury investigating Jonestown, was that all but three (only two of which were suicides) were murdered by "persons unknown."

WHEN THE BODIES WERE SHIPPED BACK TO AMERICA, THERE WERE NO AUTOPSIES DONE, THEY WERE BURIED, AND THE FAMILIES WERE NOT ALLOWED TO SEE THEM

The suicide hoax is merely the beginning of the deception. The original death count was 408 (an odd number to use if the number was an estimate), with the added claim that 700 had fled into the jungle. The final total was changed to 913.

To explain this rather minor difference in arithmetic, American authorities first explained that those backward ignorant Guyanese "could not count."

Perhaps because the first "official" explanation of the bad math was so insulting, it was then proposed that they (had somehow) missed a pile of bodies, as if a pile of (500 plus) dead bodies is something that is easily overlooked.

Finally, the official explanation that settled the whole question was presented:

Bodies were stacked on top of each other.
Of the 150 photos taken of the massacre, not one shows any body lying under any others.

Those who first worked on the bodies, to release the gasses of decay, had to puncture the dead, making it unlikely that they missed anyone. These facts aside, one must wonder how 408 bodies – 82 belonging to children – could cover 505 others. Talk about bad math. With minor exceptions, pictures show the dead were found in neat rows, face down. The pictures also show drag marks leading to the bodies, indicating that victims were murdered elsewhere and placed there by someone else.

These facts have lead to a more likely conclusion: 408 was indeed the correct original body count. The other 505 were hunted down and slaughtered, then dragged back.

But who would do such a thing, and why? Furthermore, why were American officials giving such deceptive answers about Jonestown?

To answer these questions, one must unravel the mystery of a man named Jim Jones. Jones became a Bible-thumping "faith healer," using wet chicken livers as evidence of cancer which he removed by "divine powers."

He adopted eight children, some black, some white. Already the stench of criminal activity surrounded him, and his landlady referred to him as "a gangster who used the Bible instead of a gun." Fortunately for Jones, the local police chief at the time was Dan Mitrione, a friend from childhood. Mitrione kept him from being arrested or run out of town. Mitrione would later enter the International Police Academy, a CIA front for training counterinsurgency and torture techniques.

Despite having few sources for known funds, Jones found enough money to travel with his wife and family to Brazil in 1961. Coincidentally, Mitrione was there as well, having advanced quickly in the IPA. Mitrione had honed his skills at torture and assassination by practicing on kidnapped beggars. He himself was later kidnapped and murdered by guerrillas in Uruguay, an incident which became the basis of the Costa Gavras film State of
Siege. Jones made regular trips to Belo Horizonte, site of CIA headquarters in Brazil – and Mitrione's town of residence.

Apparently, this wasn't the only curious intelligence link to Jones. He told some of his neighbours that he was involved in the U.S. Office of Naval Intelligence. The U.S. embassy provided Jones with transportation, groceries, and a large home. Considering his dear friendship to Mitrione and the funding of "ministries" in Latin America by the CIA, the theory that Jones was a U.S. intelligence asset makes quite a bit of sense. In any case, according to his neighbour, Jones "lived like a rich man."

Soon after the JFK assassination, Jones returned to the states with $10,000. In 1965, he formed the first People's Temple in Ukiah, California, and set up Happy Havens Rest Home. Without trained personnel or proper licensing, Jones' camp drew in prisoners, the elderly, people from mental institutions, and 150 foster children, many of whom were transferred by court order. Among those who contacted him: "missionaries" from World Vision (an international evangelical order that often fronts for the CIA); the local chapter head to the John Birch Society; and leaders of the Republican party, for whom his "church" members conducted voter organization and fund-raising activities for the Dick Nixon '68 campaign. Jones' advisors included a mercenary from UNITA, the CIA-backed Angolan army. Also jumping on board was the Layton family, whose patriarch, U.C.-Berkeley chemist Dr. Laurence Laird Layton, had worked on the Manhattan Project. Dr. Layton was also chief of the Army's Chemical Warfare Division in the early 1950's. (Mrs. Layton was the daughter of Hugo Phillips, a German banker/stockbroker who became rich representing Siemens & Halske and I.G. Farben, two notorious Nazi Holocaust profiteers.)

Despite his rather right-wing background, Jones suddenly declared himself a liberal socialist – in fact, he called himself a dual reincarnation of both Jesus Christ and Lenin. At this point, a cloud of suspicion began to gather around his church, which was staffed by jack-booted armed thugs who dressed in black uniforms.

Jones took everything he could from his followers, much of it in the form of welfare and social security checks, using blackmail, extortions, and any other available means. The local press reported about seven mysterious deaths of those who attempted to leave the "church" due to conflicts with Jones. Accusations of kidnapping, beatings, and sexual abuse began to circulate. To escape controversy, Jones moved to San Francisco and became an important fundraiser for the Bay area political establishment. Soon, he was schmoozing with the liberal and radical elite, meeting with (among others) Rosalynn Carter and Angela Davis.

Jones was rewarded by being put in charge of the city Housing Commission, and key followers were awarded jobs in the Welfare Department. The bulk of Jones' flock came from the unemployed and dispossessed people found there. The cult preyed on the poor and helpless, going out of its way to enlist women, children and minorities. Many members were recruited directly from San Francisco mental hospitals. However, the move to San Francisco did little to quiet the controversy surrounding his "church," and a 1977 expose put Jones on the defensive. He then moved his Utopia to Guyana, aided once again by the U.S. Embassy.

After receiving complaints lodged by relatives of cult members, Congressman Leo Ryan visited Jonestown on November 18, 1978 to investigate allegations of human rights abuses. Congressman Ryan, a noted CIA critic, had authored the Hughes-Ryan Amendment, which
would have required the CIA to disclose to Congress – in advance – details of all covert operations. The State department offered Ryan no answers or assistance, despite numerous inquiries. He arrived with U.S. embassy official Richard Dwyer, as well as some journalists. Among the reporters was Tim Reiterman, who had covered the Patty Hearst story for the San Francisco Examiner.

In all likelihood, Ryan already suspected what was really going on at Jonestown. That was when all hell broke loose.

At the airstrip, Leo Ryan soon became the first congressman to die in the line of duty, along with four reporters. (The Hughes-Ryan Amendment was killed in Congress soon afterwards.) The assassins were described by witnesses as "glassy eyed," "mechanically-walking zombies," and "devoid of any emotion." Dwyer and Reiterman were also shot. Soon after that, the mass slaughter began. A plausible explanation for the events that unfolded is that Jim Jones (or someone else) ordered the murders after Ryan's unexpected visit threatened to expose what was happening. In the chaos that followed, a mass extermination was carried out.

Just who were the zombie assassins? Well, besides the 913 dead, 167 survivors returned from the camp. All news reports concede that there were at least 1100 individuals at the camp (and most reports place the number at 1200.) Who are these 200 or more people unaccounted for? The survivors report that there was a special all-white group that was well-armed, well-treated and free to exit the compound. These guards were never accounted for by any news reports.

Perhaps it is these same guards (assuming the total population was 1200) whom a congressional aide was referring to in an Associated Press quote which stated, "There are 120 white, brainwashed assassins out from Jonestown awaiting the trigger word to pick up their hit." Of course, they may have had a little help. Over 300 U.S. Green Berets – trained for CIA covert assassinations – were in the area at the time. So were nearly 600 British Black Watch soldiers, who were in Guyana conducting a "training exercise." Suddenly, the death toll seems relatively low.

The killings didn't stop in Guyana. Nine days later, San Francisco Mayor George Moscone and Supervisor Harvey Milk were slain by Dan White, who was either a "disgruntled police agent" or someone who was "angry about gays." These explanations were supplied to explain his utterly irrational behaviour during the killings; sure enough, he was described as being in a bizarre "zombie state." During White's trial, his lawyers came up with the inventive but deservedly mocked "Twinkie defence," in which they claimed he went insane during a sugar high induced by eating too many sweets. Moscone and Milk received substantial financial backing from Jim Jones during his stay by the Bay; afterwards they were both investigated in connection to missing funds from the People's Temple. That is, until a "lone gunman" took them out.

Michael Prokes, a Jones aide, held a press conference and stated that the CIA and FBI were withholding an audiotape of the massacre. He also stated that he was an FBI informant. Right after that, he went to the restroom... and never left.

His death was proclaimed a "suicide."

In Georgetown, several more Temple members were killed following the Guyana massacre. The man charged with the murders, Charles Beikman, was an early follower of Jones who had become an "adopted son." Beikman was also a Green Beret.

Jeanne and Al Mills, who were writing a book on Jonestown, were bound and shot to death at their home. In Detroit another survivor was killed near his home, and yet another was involved in a mass murder of school children in Los Angeles. Ironically, the dead may not have included Jim Jones himself. The body alleged to be his didn't show his tattoos in the
photographs. Fingerprints had to be checked twice, and his dental records were never
looked at. He was known to use doubles.

As the massacre unfolded, Jones can be heard on a tape recording yelling, "Get Dwyer out of
here!" Richard Dwyer was later found at the airstrip, methodically washing his hands. In
1968, Dwyer was listed in the publication Who's Who in the CIA. When asked if the
allegation was true, he replied, "No comment."

Of course, Dwyer wasn't the only link to the CIA in Guyana. Besides those previously
mentioned, U.S. ambassador John Burke and another official named Richard McCoy were
both heavily involved with the intelligence community. The U.S. embassy in Georgetown also
housed the Georgetown CIA station. At the time, Guyana had a socialist government, and
thus was a likely target for covert operations. Dan Webber, sent to Guyana after the
massacre, was also with the CIA. The "official" attorney for the survivors, Joseph Blatchford,
was involved in a scandal involving CIA infiltration of the Peace Corps.

Then we have the missing money that just "disappeared" after the slaughter. Conservative
estimates place the amount at $26 million. Others place it at $2 billion. At the time, a major
international money laundering operation was headquartered in Italy, involving the Vatican
and a fascist quasi-Masonic lodge known as the P-2, or Propaganda Duo. (This operation
probably led to the murder of Pope John Paul I -- but that's another conspiracy.) The CIA-
linked P-2 had a major operation located in Panama, not too far from Jonestown.

Add in the FBI files on the Black Panthers and Weathermen found at the site, an attempt to
lure Mark Lane (JFK assassination critic and James Earl Ray lawyer, among other things)
and Donald Freed (Lane's sometime JFK collaborator and recent Simpson case investigator
who has linked the Brentwood murders to Mafia in the L.A. underworld) to Guyana (which
succeeded in having Lane witness the airstrip murders after Jones hired him as a lawyer),
and a bizarre plot to kidnap Grace Walden Stephens (a key Martin Luther King assassination
witness) and smuggle her to Jonestown, and you have the makings of a full fledged spook
operation.

One of the strangest CIA connections to Jonestown was the previously mentioned World
Vision, an evangelical order which often fronts for the CIA. They performed espionage work
for the CIA in Southeast Asia while Operation Phoenix (the murderous project that left
40,000 people dead) was in full effect. In Honduras, they maintained a presence at CIA
contra recruiting camps in the war against the Sandinistas. In Lebanon, the fascist
Phalange butchered Palestinians at World Vision's camp. In Cuba, their refugee camps
hosted numerous members of the anti-Castro terrorist group Alpha 66 of Bay of Pigs fame.
After the Guyana massacre, World Vision developed a scheme to repopulate Jonestown with
CIA-linked mercenaries from Laos. Laos, of course, was where the CIA was running its
"secret war" during Vietnam, which for the most part was a smokescreen for a widespread
opium trafficking operation.

One particularly important World Vision official was John Hinckley, Sr., an oil man, reputed
CIA officer, and friend of George Bush. You may have heard of his son.

Less than four months before Hinckley Jr. became known as Jodie Foster's biggest fan,
another member of the World Vision order, Mark Chapman, gunned down John Lennon in
what may have been a practice run for the bigger hit on President Reagan.

One of the policeman who found him was convinced that he was a mind-controlled assassin.
Chapman was clutching a copy of the novel Catcher in the Rye, which was also owned by
John Hinckley Jr.

(The book was written by J.D. Salinger, who worked in military intelligence with Henry
Kissinger during World War II.) Before going to trial, Chapman plead guilty after a voice in
his head (which he attributed it to God) commanded him to do so.
Considering the history of World Vision and what went on previously in Guyana, it is possible that the real purpose behind repopulating Jonestown was to create another breeding ground for brainwashed zombies like Chapman and Hinckley.

Nearby Jonestown there was a place called Hilltown, a compound of 8,000 blacks that followed cult leader Rabbi David Hill, who held his flock with an iron fist. Hill had so much power that he was referred to as the "vice prime minister" of Guyana. There was also another place in Guyana called "Johnstown," as well as similar operations in the Philippines and Chile. It appears that Jonestown (and World Vision's later attempt) is hardly the exception to the rule of using obscure locations in Third World nations as laboratories for covert cult operations. The Jonestown site in Guyana was originally a Union Carbide mine, and was loaded with an abundance of precious natural resources. It is very likely that the site was chosen to exploit these resources with cheap labour – and cheap labour was plentiful.

Members of Jim Jones' "church" were bound and gagged immediately after landing in Guyana and taken to the compound. They were pumped with drugs, which were available in vast amounts at Jonestown – enough to drug 200,000 people for more than a year. Among the drugs found there: Quaaludes, Valium, morphine, Demerol, Thorazine (a dangerous tranquilizer), sodium pentathol (a truth serum), chloral hydrate (a hypnotic chemical agent), thallium (which confuses thinking), and, of course, cyanide. Jonestown residents lived in cramped quarters and ate meagre rations of often spoiled food. They were then forced to give 16 to 18 hours of slave labour per day. When they weren't working, they were required to stay up day and night listening to Jim Jones lecture.

Among the charming punishments the flock endured were forced druggings, sensory deprivation in an underground box, physical torture, and public sexual rape and humiliation, not to mention your average ordinary beatings and verbal abuse.

All of the drugs and environmental conditions forced upon Jonestown residents were also employed in the CIA's notorious MKULTRA program, which was implemented to test and implement brainwashing and mind control techniques. A 1974 government report admitted that certain "target populations" were used, namely blacks, women, prisoners, the elderly, children, and inmates of psychiatric wards. The Centre for the Study and Reduction of Violence, using the research of Strangelovian doctors Jose Delgado and Louis "Jolly" West, drew guinea pigs from the "target populations" to test drugs, implants, and psychosurgery techniques at an isolated military missile base in California. The dead at Jonestown were 90% women, 80% black, and included 276 children.

Which leads us back to Auschwitz and the ultimate deja vu. Auschwitz, after all, was not just a death camp: It was also a slave labour camp for Nazi military-industrial monolith I.G. Farben. There, the outcasts and refuse of society who no one cared about faced similar abuses, while an elite few profited from their misery. The brains behind the Final Solution became the brains behind MKULTRA. The MK is often said to stand for "Mind Kontrol" – representing the Germanic origins of the project. Going the full ten yards, however, it is possible that MK merely stands for "Mein Kampf".

Congressman Ryan probably suspected that Jonestown was a front for sinister covert activity. In 1980, Ryan aide Joseph Holsinger received a paper entitled "The Penal Colony," which explained that CIA MKULTRA operations did not terminate in 1973, as officially proclaimed, but instead continued in public hospitals, prisons, and religious cults which were used as fronts.

Holsinger later stated at a San Francisco psychology forum on Jonestown that he believed the CIA worked with Jones to perform medical and mind control experiments at People's Temple. If Congressman Ryan had not been killed – a big if – many skeletons in the CIA's closet may have been exposed.
Michael Meiers, author of "Was Jonestown a CIA Medical Experiment?" had this to say: "The Jonestown experiment was conceived by Dr. Layton, staffed by Dr. Layton and financed by Dr. Layton. It was as much his project as it was Jim Jones's." Layton, remember, was head of the Army's Chemical Warfare Division. Former Temple member Joyce Shaw wondered if Jonestown was "some kind of horrible government experiment, or some sort of sick, racist thing... a plan like that of the Germans, to exterminate blacks." In October 1981, Jonestown survivors filed a $63 million lawsuit against Jonestown-era Secretary of State Cyrus Vance and CIA director Stansfield Turner. The suit stated that the State Department and CIA conspired to "enhance the economic and political powers of James Warren Jones," conducting "mind control and drug experimentation" there. The suit was dismissed four months later for "failure to prosecute timely," and all requests for appeal were denied. (Turner would become a director of Monsanto, now best known for providing the world with the brain-damaging, cancer causing poison bearing the innocuous moniker "NutraSweet").

All this, of course, is forgotten in official accounts of the events at Jonestown. Instead, the more palatable -- but less accurate -- version of the Jonestown story blames the victims, echoing the ignorant grunt uttered by Pete Hamill, who dismissed the dead as "all the loose change of the sixties." Hanging over Jonestown was a mocking sign that proclaimed, "THOSE WHO DO NOT REMEMBER THE PAST ARE CONDEMNED TO REPEAT IT." One of the most elegant slogans of Holocaust survivors is "Never forget." Jonestown makes it clear that, no matter how well meaning, all these slogans are but words. Never forget? We obviously already have. That Jonestown could unfold before our eyes without the realization of precisely what was going on says volumes. Certainly the blame falls partly at the feet of a powerful military-industrial complex that feels no shame for its deeds, and certainly partly at a Korporate Media that has become the witting mouthpiece (and collaborator) for this same cabal.

But ultimately, the blame falls at the feet of the people, their brains dulled by sitcoms and soap operas, their reality gradually drawn within the boundaries of the cathode ray tube. By the time the Guyana massacre rolled around, the masses were too ignorant and apathetic to know or care about the truth. Instead, they swallowed the official version and waited obediently for the next big lie.

What's worse, the truth itself has become untenable. Instead of outrage and calls for justice, attacks are most often levelled at those who openly question the official account of the Jonestown massacre. Witness the treatment of Gary Webb (of CIA/contra/crack fame) by his editors and fellow journalists. Or try bringing up Jonestown in polite company and see the kind of response you get.

Could the Holocaust happen again? It already has, and will continue to happen. One wonders if it ever really ended.

Now we will look at the events that transpired one March morning in 1996 in a sleepy wee Scottish town called Dunblane. I wanted you to have looked at the whole mind control angle a bit more before laying this stuff on you, otherwise it would have been too deep for you.

Now I feel you are ready...

Dunblane update: Police involved in paedophile ring

Rigorous Intuition Sunday, June 05, 2005

Most of the children in this next photo were killed.
How many stories like this do we have to see, before most people see these stories? How many more dots need connecting, before they blacken the page?

Maybe you remember Dunblane. Suspiciously, there's a 100-year ban on the police report into Thomas Hamilton, who murdered 16 primary schoolchildren and their teacher in Dunblane, Scotland on March 13, 1996. According to The Guardian in 2003, "there have been allegations that the lengthy closure order was placed on the report after it linked Hamilton to figures in the Scottish establishment, including two senior politicians and a lawyer."

Also in 2003, NATO's Lord Robertson sued The Sunday Herald over speculation that he had used his Masonic influence to procure a gun licence for Hamilton, and was himself a member of an elite paedophile ring run by Hamilton.

Now, from the Daily Telegraph:

Police, killer in child sex ring

EDINBURGH: Police were involved in a paedophile ring that covered up abuse allegations against the man responsible for the infamous Dunblane school massacre.

The astonishing claim was made by former paramedic Sandra Uttley, who is going to the European Court of Human Rights to demand a new inquiry into the tragedy.

The 45-year-old, who dealt with the aftermath of the killings in her job as a paramedic, said: 'There are glaring anomalies in the inquiry, inconsistencies in witness testimony, incorrect information given on oath and the absence of vital witnesses.

'It is also blatantly obvious that Central Scotland Police, who were chosen to investigate the background to the murders, should never have been involved in a so-called independent inquiry. They were implicated in the events under scrutiny and continually provided Hamilton with renewals of his gun licence despite long-term and repeated warnings that this should not happen. It was known that Hamilton had friends in the police force, including one highly placed officer.

'I believe that Hamilton was a major provider of pornographic photographs and videos to a ring of men prominent in Central Scotland, including police officers who protected him from numerous allegations of physical abuse at boys' camps and clubs he ran. They protected themselves after the massacre which conveniently ended in his suicide."
Last year Ms Uttley's former partner, Mick North, whose five-year-old daughter Sophie was killed, said he was "convinced" of a cover-up.

Lord Cullen, who led the inquiry and imposed the 100-year ban, was asked to recuse himself if he was a Freemason. (Hamilton, reportedly, was himself a lodge member.) Cullen denied that he held membership. Cullen was then asked "to instruct every witness to the Inquiry to declare if they were Masons." Cullen declined. Since the inquiry, Cullen has been found to be "Number 1702 on the membership list of the ‘Speculative Society of Edinburgh’, which is an exclusive off-shoot of Freemasonry. In fact, Masons from Lodge Canongate Kilwinning No 2, founded the ‘Speculative Society’ in Edinburgh in 1764."

From Dunblane Unburied website:

My Mission: The Truth

The murder of children has to be investigated and exposed at all costs.

It is our moral duty to do so.

It is vital for the future welfare of all children.

I hope this website will inform and educate you about the massive cover-up of the truth about the cold-blooded killing of sixteen 5-year-old children at Dunblane Primary School on 13 March 1996.

When you begin to understand the reasons why the Dunblane massacre happened, I imagine you will be very angry, very angry indeed.

Please inform and educate yourself. I will do my utmost to help you on that painful - very painful - journey.

THE CASE FOR A NEW PUBLIC INQUIRY

This site has been created to call for a new Public Inquiry into the events of 13 March 1996 at Dunblane Primary School, and an investigation into Central Scotland Police and their dealings with Thomas Hamilton. A new and independent police investigation into what led up to the terrible tragedy is urgently needed. Please lend your support. It is time now to honour the dead with the truth.

We aren't meant to say Thomas Hamilton's name. After the Dunblane Massacre it was decided that mentioning the murderer's name only served to glorify him. What rubbish. We mustn't forget Thomas Hamilton. I know Dunblane was a one-off tragedy, but there was a background to what happened that has been conveniently wiped out...

A lot of people ask how a conspiracy on the scale I allege could have been covered up, when so many people had to have been involved. Let me explain. Immediately after the massacre happened, there was inevitably a lot of media coverage and a lot of probing questions were asked. Then a curb was put on media reporting by the Crown Office and Lord Cullen. It was said this would prejudice the evidence of witnesses called to the Dunblane Inquiry.

In an article in the Scotsman (5 April 1996) Ian Bell explained: “Scotland’s most senior law officer threatened editors with proceedings for contempt if they continued to investigate the circumstances of the Dunblane massacre. As though to sharpen the point, the Crown Office said the remarks of Lord Mackay of Drumadoon, the Lord Advocate, were themselves “not for publication or broadcast”. The curb on reporting is not to be reported”. So all went quiet for a few months until the Inquiry began.

At the Inquiry, there was the Crown representing the Crown: that is the Lord Advocate,
Mr Campbell and Ms Dunlop represented the families of the deceased children, the families of the injured children, the children absent from class, Mrs Harrild and Mrs Blake.

Mr Gibb represented Mrs Mayor (deceased) and the Educational Institute of Scotland.

Mr Stephen represented the Association of Head Teachers in Scotland and Mr Ronald Taylor.

Mr Jones represented Stirling Council and “others”.

Mr Taylor represented Central Scotland Police.

The Dean of Faculty and Mr Kavanagh represented individual officers of the Scottish Police Federation and Lothian and Borders Police.

Mr McEachran represented the Scottish Target Shooting Federation and Mr Scoggins the British Shooting Sports Council.

Who represented the public? Well, the Crown of course. Who organised the cover-up of the truth? The Crown.

Central Scotland Police carried out the investigation for the Inquiry and thus, even if the Crown Office was not involved in the cover-up, Central Scotland Police was given carte blanche to withhold any witness statements they didn’t wish to be seen, for whatever reason.

This material was passed to the Crown who then summarised it and passed it on to the above named representatives, who in turn passed it on to their clients (or at least they passed on some of it). These documents were not released to the press, and nor did Lord Cullen read any of this preparatory material. There were a total of 1,655 witness statements taken, from a total of 1,240 witnesses. Only 171 witnesses gave evidence at the Inquiry, thus the evidence of 1,069 witnesses was never heard.

Lord Cullen wrote his report on the basis of the oral testimony of just 171 witnesses. The fact that some of these witnesses, police witnesses included, lied on oath, was therefore not known to him (or was it?)

All the evidence prepared for the Inquiry was then locked away for an astonishing 100 years, until the Crown Office released some of the documents in October 2005. It was almost impossible to ascertain WHAT had been released, and what withheld.

It was only through making a total of 60 requests for information to Central Scotland Police under the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002, that I started to discover just how much material had still been held back by the Crown.

So, on 19 December 2005, I made a Freedom of Information request to the First Minister (who, I discovered, is not exempt from the FOISA). I asked for details of the number of statements that are available at the National Archives of Scotland and the number that have been held back. Mr McConnell passed my request on to the Crown Office. Over two months later, on 22 February 2006, the Crown Office replied as follows: “I can confirm that your request is receiving attention and we will respond to you further as soon as possible”. Why is it such a difficult question to answer? It is now December 2006 and I never did get an answer to this question.
So how did they cover-up the truth on the day? Remember that in the gym nearly all the children were dead or critically injured. Their teacher was dead. One child who did not sustain any injury obviously told her parents something of what she saw in the gym, and this was then relayed by her parents to their solicitor. I repeat, they state that they saw two bullet holes in the south wall of the gym, about 2 inches apart and just 6 inches from the ground. Their statement continues, “There were no other bullet holes in that wall and I noticed that there were quite a few bullet holes in the other walls which would confirm my (words are blanked out here...............) that he fired into the walls at the bottom end of the gym where Hamilton had entered the gym”. So, WHO fired into the walls at the bottom end of the gym when Hamilton (re-entered) the gym through the fire exit door at the south end?

The injured teachers and some of the less critically injured children were hiding in a storeroom off the gym. They weren’t fully aware of what was happening outside that room. However, Eileen Harrild testified that someone entered the gym BEFORE the gunman stopped shooting, and Mary Blake thought the gunman might have surrendered. Basically – and understandably so – they had no idea what was going on.

The people that we know for certain entered the gym immediately after Hamilton’s death were the headteacher, the student teacher, the janitor and the off-duty police officer. Of these four people only the headteacher gave evidence at the Inquiry. We know the names of the student teacher (David Scott) and the janitor (John Currie). Through my own private investigations I ascertained the name of the off-duty police officer (Grant McCutcheon) and obtained a copy of his statement from Central Scotland Police under the FOISA. It is astonishing that this statement was withheld from the Inquiry. Mr McCutcheon should have been called as a witness at the Dunblane Inquiry because his evidence contradicts that of the janitor John Currie and the Scene of Crime Officer Malcolm Chisholm. ALL the evidence should have been examined. The Inquiry was set up under the 1921 Tribunals of Inquiry (Evidence) Act to find out the full truth about an event that had caused serious public concern and enormous distress.

On the day itself, the bereaved parents were locked away in a staff-room for up to five hours before being told their children were dead. Central Scotland Police claimed this was to ensure the identity of all the children before telling the parents. However, all of the children bar one had been identified by midday. It is much more likely that the scene of crime was being tampered with during those five hours, in order that the police and the Crown got their story straight, i.e. that Hamilton had turned the gun on himself after a three minute shooting spree.

If the truth is – as I believe – that Hamilton was shot and killed on scene, far too many uncomfortable questions would have been asked about how the person who killed him got there so fast. Indeed, the question needs to be asked: was Hamilton's murderer the same person who committed the massacre? Was Hamilton simply the patsy?

At the Inquiry, a picture emerged of wholesale incompetence by Central Scotland Police in their handling of Thomas Hamilton and his firearms applications. DCC McMurdo took the flak. All the representatives damned the maladministration of firearms procedures at Central Scotland Police. Who would dare to make further criticism when certain officers had already been excoriated?

Well, further criticism is necessary, because it is possible that illegal activity was going on in Central Scotland Police – and Central Regional Council for that matter – during Hamilton's long years of gun ownership and access to boys. In her summing up on Day 25 of the Inquiry, Ms Dunlop said, “He described himself to particular individuals, for example Mr Moffat, as a gym teacher. He referred to himself as having qualifications in gymnastics when the evidence discloses in fact the only qualification he'd had was that of an assistant coach and..........”
Lord Cullen tried to stop her there, with “Under supervision”, to which Ms Dunlop replied, “Under supervision of adult females”. This had been carefully concealed throughout the previous 24 days of the Inquiry, but Ms Dunlop at least saw to it that it was mentioned in her summing up. However, Lord Cullen chose to ignore this in his final report. The fact is, that in the original inquiry papers, the truth about Hamilton’s gymnastic qualifications was detailed for all to see, and the truth is that Central Regional Council had known he wasn’t qualified to teach boys or to teach them unsupervised.

How much influence Hamilton’s local councillor Robert Ball – a lecturer at Stirling University – brought to bear on this can only be guessed at. Given how strong an advocate he was for his constituent though, Mr Ball could be said to have assisted Thomas Hamilton in getting lets of school premises for his clubs, when Hamilton was in no way qualified to train boys in gymnastics.

But I digress. In her summing up, Ms Dunlop refers to the extent to which the events of 13 March 1996 were planned. Although there was evidence of Hamilton having quizzed a small boy about arrangements at Dunblane Primary School and had stockpiled ammunition, she continued, “it may be thought that there was a degree of compulsiveness about the location”. Highly unlikely if the massacre was pre-planned and Hamilton was being primed in his role for the previous two years... As Ms Dunlop concludes, “The evidence in this area is perhaps in some respects contradictory”. But bear in mind that Hamilton had quizzed a former police officer about whether all stations kept firearms and was informed that only those that were manned 24 hours a day did. Thus Dunblane Police Station would not have kept firearms. This would all still fit with him being groomed for his part on 13 March 1996 for the previous two years.

The CCTV sightings of Hamilton’s van on the morning of 13 March 1996 show him exiting the Burghmuir Roundabout on to the Kerse Road. Kerse Road is NOT the exit that leads “on to the road to Dunblane”. It leads to Bannockburn. Why did Hamilton take that exit? Was he meeting with someone? I don’t know, because the Crown Office refuses to answer my question about why DC Capes was allowed to give wrong CCTV evidence. After 2 years the Crown Office conceded that DC Capes had ‘made a mistake’ about the times. When I then questioned why DC Capes would lie about the direction Hamilton took, the Crown Office simply refused to answer my question. There was no more prevarication or ridiculous excuses. Just a simple refusal to answer a perfectly reasonable question.

Did Hamilton plan to flee after what went down that day? (Remember, if Hamilton was not the gunman, but the patsy, he wouldn't have a clue what it was he was really getting involved in that day). Hamilton attempted to pay for the hire van in advance. He also bought some new shirts. Does this indicate an intention to commit suicide, or something else? As Ms Dunlop concludes, “It is difficult in fact to make much of the evidence about the shirts given that there was in fact the purchase of new shirts at all”. And what did he do with all these new shirts? In the Property Register of the search done on Hamilton’s house on 13 March 1996, the only item of clothing found was a jacket. She continues, “There is also evidence of his having booked the school for the Easter camp...and there is evidence of his attempt to book the minibus for the 14 and 19 March”. No, it is clear that Hamilton didn't anticipate for one minute that he was going to die on 13 March 1996.

Mr Campbell, in his summing up, states “What appears to have happened is that isolated incidents were considered on their own and then forgotten or at least ignored when further incidents occurred. In this regard, sir, I note, and indeed Mr McMurdoo agreed with this, that the bulk of what is now known about Hamilton after this whole Inquiry was known to the police before the 13 March”.

The bulk of what we discovered about Hamilton after 13 March WAS ALREADY KNOWN by Central Scotland Police before 13 March 1996. This is a very important point. Was a friend – or friends? – of Hamilton’s diligently removing items of criminal intelligence on him all that time? Keeping his firearms file clean? It is certainly a possibility. Hamilton had friends within Central Scotland Police, as Clive Wood testified to in his evidence on Day 4 of the Inquiry.

Mr Wood himself was not asked any particularly probing questions. As an STV cameraman, he regularly visited Hamilton in his STV logoed car. Outside of Hamilton’s friends within Central Scotland Police, Clive Wood was Hamilton’s longest standing associate. They had known each other since about 1981. Mr Taylor, representing Central Scotland Police, obviously wished he had asked further questions of Clive Wood, given that Wood in his evidence made reference to Hamilton’s “police friends”.

On Day 25, in his summing up, Mr Taylor states, “Clive Wood, for example, was never asked to comment on the quality of his relationship. He might well have given valuable evidence in this regard. When Mr Wood was in the witness box it was not known to the parties that there was an intent to use the information on character as a basis for analysis by a psychologist and psychiatrist. Generally when witnesses applied labels they were not asked to explain what they meant”. The man representing Central Scotland Police was obviously a little piqued that he hadn’t had the chance to question Clive Wood more about his friendship with Thomas Hamilton, when Wood himself had referred to Hamilton’s friends within the police.

It is hard to avoid the conclusion that the public inquiry headed by Lord Cullen in the summer of 1996 was conducted improperly. Many guilty people walked free. It was always the case that they would. The Inquiry was not a criminal prosecution – it was a show trial. An attempt at justice being “seen to be done”.

On the whole, it was cleverly conducted, including a weeping Deputy Chief Constable (Douglas McMurdo), an unflappable witness who refused to have words put into her mouth (Doreen Hagger), a varied selection of Thomas Hamilton’s friends who were desperate to tell us what a boring man he was (which obviously explains why they spent so much time with him), some extremely insignificant witnesses who testified to train tickets being bought, and some vital witnesses such as the staff of Dunblane Primary School who were caught up in this horrific tragic incident. There were certain witnesses who were notable by their absence, for example, the student teacher David Scott, whose statement was read out at the Inquiry by DCS Ogg. And the off-duty police officer who was first on the scene...

October 2005 I’ve always thought it very sad that the Scottish Legal Establishment managed to orchestrate the cover-up right under the noses of the parents and all the journalists at the actual Inquiry. It is more than sad, it is tragic, that they put the finishing touches to the cover-up in such a public way.

Even without reading the material that is now available at the National Archives of Scotland, glaring inconsistencies are evident from reading the Transcript of the Inquiry, which has been available on the internet since early 2001. How many people have read and studied that? Doreen Hagger and I spent many months tearing apart all the evidence and isolating the lies and inconsistencies. We did this in the comfort of our own homes, and consulted each other by email, instant messaging and telephone repeatedly throughout the day whenever we isolated an obvious problem in all the material we were viewing. There is just no way that anyone viewing the documents at the Archives would be able to do this kind of work sitting in a library reading through reams and reams of papers on their own, with nothing to compare them with. Furthermore, it is piecing together LOTS of information that leads to the possibility of Hamilton being part of a paedophile network, the possibility that Hamilton was being
tailed that morning, and the possibility that he was shot and killed on scene and did not commit suicide. Nothing is stated that makes this obvious. I'm sorry, but the documents weren't sealed for 100 years for nothing. They slapped a 100 year ban on the lot out of laziness, when there were only selected sections that actually gave the game away.

In my correspondence with Lord Cullen and the Crown Office over the last few years, I have asked some very direct questions and received very few replies. However, in one letter dated 11 September 2003, the Clerk to the Inquiry, Glynis McKeand, replied to me on behalf of Lord Cullen, “... it was open to those representing parties to the Inquiry... to cross-examine the witnesses who were called, and also to seek leave to call witnesses. Copies of all the documents available to the Inquiry team, such as witness statements, were also available to the representatives of the parties to the Inquiry, so as to ensure that they were in a position to make informed decisions about how to cross-examine witnesses and about whether to seek to lead any further evidence”. This is tantamount to saying to the bereaved families – “tough, you had your chance for justice and you blew it”.

In my reply to Lord Cullen on 26 September 2003, I wrote “…I wish to clarify that I was writing on my own behalf”. Further on in my letter I said, “...I appreciate that copies of all the documents were made available to the representatives of the parties to the Inquiry... and it is of great concern to me that so many questions that should have been asked by these representatives were not. However, that is a separate matter. I am writing to you again because you were the person responsible for an independent investigation into an event which has caused considerable public concern”.

All my concerns have been repeatedly ignored. Ms McKeand again replied on behalf of Lord Cullen on 10 October 2003. Again she invited me to “make a complaint or an allegation about improper conduct on the part of any person in connection with the Inquiry”. Good, I thought, I will. However, the second part of the sentence contains the sting. My complaint “should be addressed to the Crown, and in particular the Deputy Crown Agent at the Crown Office, so that it can be investigated”. As I know there has been a cover-up of the truth and I know that the Crown Office masterminded it, why would I expect them to carry out an open and thorough investigation now?

**Dunblane: The unanswered questions**

News of the World, 22 June 03 & 13 Feb 05 Exclusive by David Leslie Sunday June 22, 2003

Shocking claims as duo demand a second probe

A NEW inquiry should be held into the Dunblane massacre because dozens of questions about the tragedy remain unanswered, according to two concerned campaigners.

The pair have spent months drawing up a detailed dossier about the horrific shootings.

And they claim that there are discrepancies between the official inquiry, presided over by Lord Cullen, and statements from witnesses at the time.

One woman, Sandra Uttley, was a local ambulance worker.

The other, Doreen Hagger, gave evidence at the Cullen inquiry.

They believe there may have been a cover-up. Questions they now want answered include:

WHO did killer Thomas Hamilton meet and talk to on the way to Dunblane primary school?

WHO was the off-duty police officer at the scene and why has his identity been concealed?
WHY have Hamilton's post mortem results been kept secret?

WHY ambulance service records are not being made public, and WHY was there confusion over the number of guns Hamilton had at the school?

The women - who have drawn up a 50-point, 5,000 word dossier on the affair - are furious that many of the official reports are being kept under wraps.

Government ministers have ruled that much of the evidence about the tragedy should not be made public for 100 years.

Last night Uttley said: "A new inquiry is now urgently needed."

"There may be other individuals who should face prosecution."

The horror unfolded on March 13, 1996, when 43-year-old misfit Hamilton gunned down 16 pupils and teacher Gwen Mayor at the Stirlingshire school.

The atrocity shocked the nation and an official probe was launched under Lord Cullen.

But Uttley and Hagger believe too many mysteries remain.

They point to the statement of one local, Cathleen Boswell Kerr, who said she'd seen the killer standing beside - or climbing from - a large grey saloon car before he travelled to the school.

It was parked outside his Stirling home sometime between 8am and 8.40 on the fateful day.

According to Kerr, Hamilton looked cheerful. He waved as the grey car left, then walked to his white hire van.

But Kerr DIDN'T give evidence at the Cullen inquiry.

And the two women want to know what steps were taken to trace Hamilton's mystery visitor.

Mum-of-six Hagger helped out at a children's camp organised by the oddball loner who went on to become Scotland's worst mass murderer.

Her daughter Vikki, then seven years old, was one of the youngsters who attended.

Both were concerned about his behaviour and complained to cops about him. Though he had already come to the attention of Central Scotland Police after official complaints about his camps and the clubs he ran for boys, Hagger believes her warnings about him went unheeded.

She told us: "I was overwhelmed with a feeling of guilt that I had not done more to stop Hamilton."

"We still have a lot of work to do and much evidence to cover."

"But I feel everyone has been robbed of justice."

Vikki later wrote to Lord Cullen to tell of her nightmare over not being taken seriously.

Her mum also appeared before the judge at his inquiry in Stirling.

Cullen's intensive probe lasted from May 29 until July 10, 1996.
But, according to Uttley and Hagger, his investigation FAILED to reveal the identity of the off-duty police officer they believe to have been first on the scene.

The man followed the primary school's headteacher Ron Taylor into the gym where the carnage had taken place.

He then warned the headmaster, and the school janitor John Currie, not to touch a gun which lay next to Hamilton's body on the gym floor.

But despite his key role, the officer's name has never been released to the public. And the two campaigners want to know WHY his identity has been concealed.

They also want to know why the public hasn't been given access to the results of a post mortem carried out on Hamilton.

Uttley explained: "We know that a full dissection was carried out.

"Pathologist Anthony Busuttil said the cause of death was gunshot injury.

"But this does not explain the manner of Hamilton's death.

"Some sources suggest his body was discovered lying close to a wall in which there were TWO bullet holes, six inches from the floor and a couple of inches apart.

"But what did the wounds on Hamilton's body show?

"The post mortem results would surely clear up this point and explain whether or not he suffered other gunshot injuries that were not fatal."

Uttley could have been one of the ambulance staff who raced to the scene, just minutes after Hamilton's killing spree ended.

She was on a day off from her job at the ambulance station in nearby Callander and only learned of the horror from a friend.

She was called in to work later that day.

The crew she relieved had raced several of Hamilton's young victims to hospital, and were traumatised as a result.

But Uttley and Hagger claim the role of the ambulance service has been obscured.

They claimed: "Lord Cullen said in his report the ambulance service arrived at the school at 9.57 and the police at 9.50 am.

"Our own sources suggest ambulancewoman Alison Irvine made a statement indicating that when she and colleague Leslie Haire arrived at the school at 9.57am there were NO police cars or police officers there - just the mystery man who claimed to be an off-duty policeman.

"Ron Taylor met them and said they were the first to arrive.

"The ambulance staff then radioed their control room to say they were dealing with a major incident.

"Police witnesses said at the inquiry they arrived at the primary school at 9.50am. "But the Accident and Emergency Department at Stirling Royal Infirmary received notification of a shooting incident at Dunblane at 9.48am. Who from? We want to know why
details about the ambulance service's role should be hidden for 100 years."

The two women are also puzzled by the confusion over the number of weapons found at the scene.

Uttley - the former partner of Dr Mick North, whose daughter Sophie died that day - added: "Some witnesses suggest Hamilton had two guns at the primary school, others say he had four.

"Malcolm Chisholm and David Gould, the ammunition and bomb disposal experts, also differ over their examination of the guns.

"Why were these vital issues not properly clarified at the inquiry?"

Some of the discrepancies, they claim, might have been cleared up by the Scene Of Crime report.

But they added: "It's been hidden away until 2096. Why?"

Uttley and Hagger also want to know why photographs of the crime scene weren't taken until late afternoon - though Hamilton ran amok shortly after the school first opened.

Hagger added: "There were concerns that Hamilton's body might be booby trapped.

"Why then was the bomb disposal centre not alerted until 2.30pm? And why on earth were there people present in the gym when the bomb disposal expert arrived?"

"The gym was supposed to have been evacuated at noon because of concerns about a booby trap."

Among the other queries raised by the couple's dossier is the question of where Hamilton went between leaving his home and arriving at Dunblane primary school.

Uttley revealed: "A policeman said CCTV cameras picked up Hamilton's van leaving Stirling on the morning of March 13, 1996 at 8.44 and 8.46.

"The journey to Dunblane school would normally take just 15 minutes.

"Yet Hamilton did not arrive there until 9.30. Where did he go in the half hour that's unaccounted for?"

The pair are also intrigued by the matter of Hamilton's finances.

Hagger told us: "Some sources suggest he obtained two credit cards and spent freely at the end of 1995 and the beginning of 1996.

"But he was unemployed - and this has never been fully explained."

The duo say they are determined to battle on until they win a fresh inquiry into the horror.

Uttley - who has written a series of articles about male violence and guns - began work on her dossier in December last year.

In February, she wrote to Hagger asking for her help. They claim they have examined and cross-referenced every word of the Cullen report since then.

Uttley told us: "I will never give up on this until we get to the truth." And Hagger added: "This
has caused us a lot of stress.

"Some of what we've uncovered makes me despair.

"Yet I think it is only right that people should know about this and decide for themselves whether or not a new inquiry is merited."

But last night the officer who headed the Dunblane investigation was adamant that Central Scotland Police left no stone unturned.

Detective Chief Superintendent John Ogg, who has now retired from the force, told us: "I can reassure you that the investigation into the Dunblane incident was absolutely thorough, and we covered every angle.

"I don't subscribe to any of these allegations at all."

And he added: "I have no idea why someone would wish to come up with theories like these."

Speaking from his home in Perthshire, Mick North told us: "I have been asked by Sandra about what happened on the day, and have answered her questions. There are areas that I feel could do with better explanation, but I am not prepared to go into specifics.

'I think it's most unlikely that the conspiracy goes as far as is being alleged.'

During the investigation, it was claimed that student teacher David Scott witnessed Hamilton kill himself. However, Scott did not himself give evidence, and when asked if he did see the killer commit suicide, he refused to make any comment at all.

He told the News of the World: "I have not spoken about this before, and have no intention of doing so."

Headmaster Ron Taylor blasted the pair's findings and said he could not understand why they would wish to open up old wounds.

He added: "It is rubbish. There is no substance to it at all.

"Hundreds of statements were given, and only a select few were actually used for Cullen, to spare those affected by the incident the trauma of going through it again.

"Every single person who was in the school on the day gave a statement to the police.

"Only a few people gave verbal evidence to the Cullen Inquiry.

"The vast majority of the report was about the police. There is no cover-up."

Dunblane made us all think about gun control ... so what went wrong?

By Ian Bell - Sunday Herald 25 Feb 2007

ALMOST 11 years now. Kids grow up, life changes, leaves rot on the branch, and all memories decay. Stuff happens. Almost 11 years ago, on the morning after, I told myself that I had sworn off the vampire habit. You know the sort of thing. Something vast and terrible and inexplicable happens. The journalist dusts down his purple prose and sets out, consciously and deliberately, to feel everyone's pain. Inexcusable, really.

For example: they gave me a prize for Dunblane. To this day, I have never understood why I am the only person I know who finds the fact unsettling. WH Auden, born a century ago last
week, said famously that poetry makes nothing happen. He should have tried journalism.

Facts: In mid-March of 1996 Thomas Hamilton, 43, warped, morally crippled, dead in his soul, certainly disgusting, the suicide-in-waiting who should have done us all a favour in the privacy of his own nightmare, went into the precincts of Dunblane primary, and into the gym class, with all his precious sex-toy handguns.

He killed 16 infants, then their teacher, then himself. He accomplished all this with four weapons, in three short minutes. Lots of official things - never adequately explained, for my money - had gone wrong before the event. Somehow that ceased to be the point. Half the world was staggered, but Scotland went into a state of near-clinical shock. The human ability even to begin to pretend to comprehend was defeated.

All over the country, people did irrational things, knowing them to be irrational. They turned up at schools, 100 miles from the scene, just to convince themselves that their own infants were safe. They called home from work, or called people at work, simply to prove that sanity still prevailed. Many could not face the idea of the working day. Strangers in the street, caught unawares by the news, were in tears. If you happen to be too young to remember, trust this: I'm not making it up.

Explanation and analysis, journalism's default responses, were worse than pointless. Those rituals, too, seemed insulting. Joining the world's media on the streets of Dunblane to ask people "how they felt" was worse than ghoulish: I refused that request. To their credit, nobody pressed the point. There was still the usual column to be written, however.

In fact, over the days and weeks that followed, there was more than one. I allowed myself two simple, possibly simplistic, strategies. First, I was not ever going to attempt to "explain" Hamilton: the bereaved deserved better. Secondly, in my small way, I was going to take on anyone who failed to support the banning of handguns.

There was a lot of American comment, predictably, and much of it abusive. The clichés appeared as if by return of post. "Guns don't kill people," they wrote. "People kill people." So why - this struck me almost as the definition of self-evident - did Thomas Hamilton feel a need for four of the damnable things?

Then the Duke of Edinburgh, and the field sports people, and the target shooters entered the fray. The royal consort, with his usual sensitivity, expressed the view that things were getting out of hand, and that a more considered response was required. I can clobber royals in my sleep.

The most troubling questions came, instead, from those who answered my simplicities with one of their own. They didn't oppose a ban, as such. They merely wanted to know why I was so sure that legislation would work.

That seemed obvious. It even seemed faintly stupid to think otherwise. No guns, no gun-kilings. Remove the threat: wasn't that one of the jobs of government?

Sceptics were more subtle than I allowed. What they meant was that it is easy to impose laws on the law-abiding. Criminals, by definition, don't take much interest in well-meaning legislation. If they chose to arm themselves while the rest of society was, in effect, disarming, outraged newspaper commentators and their quick fixes might merely make matters worse.

I'm still not convinced, or not entirely. A rueful young man in Los Angeles told me once that his city boasted more cars than people, and more guns than cars. "Current population?" he added. "Eleven million, give or take." To him, the notion of a country patrolled by unarmed police officers was a kind of fantastic dream. To him, equally, the fact that nice kids could
lay hands on the family pistol - bought for "self-defence" - and die while simply messing around in the back yard was not an example to be envied, or copied.

"You know what guns do?" he asked. "They go off. You know what guns are for? To kill. That's their purpose. Only the rhetoric is harmless."

Back then, I believed every word. America had, and has, too many of the instruments that Thomas Hamilton found so alluring. Yet almost 11 years on, what do I read, and what do I say?

I read of three London teenagers murdered in the space of 11 days. I read of firearms "incidents" spreading like an epidemic across our cities. I read of Tony Blair holding a Downing Street summit on a crisis that seems - call me naive - a greater threat to many communities than any terrorism.

What I say then becomes obvious: my idea didn't work. In fact, I begin to thread certain fears together, like links in a chain. Here's one: if even London teenagers can provide themselves with the means to kill 15-year-old Billy Cox in his bedroom, guns have become commonplace, so commonplace that every would-be terrorist worth his salt must be armed to the teeth. Bans have failed utterly.

That's a nightmare for another day, however. We can worry about what might happen after we think of what is actually happening.

David Cameron's Tories argue the issue is societal, a problem of parenting and family breakdown. John Reid, home secretary, speaks of people "working together" for a gun-free world while he hints at new laws. Menzies Campbell, of the Liberals, says we need more and more effective policing.

Each of these opinions may have some value. I'd like to think so. Yet why do they sound like the words of men who have only the faintest idea of what life might be like in Harlesden or Moss Side? It is entirely proper to talk of youths who have become detached from society. You may, however, need to qualify the statement with a question: who is detached from whom?

A weapons fetish escalates for a fairly obvious reason. Many things may have changed since my working-class youth, but I am certain that one piece of logic persists. If he is armed, you had better be armed too. Knives become swords, swords become pistols. Status, respect and "security" follow. If you live. Having a father in the household, or access to a youth club, or hopes of a decent education can seem minor, by comparison, on a dark Saturday night.

Saying so solves nothing, obviously. Perhaps journalists, far less politicians, should make that confession now and then. We could all demand a better world - preferably by tomorrow lunchtime - but always bear our fallibility in mind. It goes back to the question I refused to attempt almost 11 years ago. If I could not explain Thomas Hamilton any more than I can explain the killers of Billy Cox, perhaps I have nothing useful to say about anyone's desire to kill.

I can guess, for all that, that there is something unreasonable, even bizarre, about declaring a youth crisis if teenagers are simply as we have made them. It's Tony Blair's fault, if you like. It's my doing, if you prefer. It's schools, or a lack of discipline, or insufficient policing, or new sets of laws, or just society.

If that last word still means anything, however, then we are all, in fact, culpable. Who turned Thomas Hamilton into a beast? God isn't talking. That leaves the rest of us. I cling, nevertheless, to one near-instinctive conclusion from 11 years ago. Guns breed guns. When they enter a society they multiply like a pestilence.
Let’s concede that all the bans have failed. That doesn’t mean we should also fail to ask a practical question. Britain has become a security state in recent years. Nobody strolls unmolested through customs these days. There are terrorist suspects, so they say, at every turn. So why, precisely, are handguns still getting into this country?

William Scott’s letter to all politicians

Tel/Fax: 01620 892489 W.W.Scott, e-mail: w.w.scott@amo-probus.demon.co.uk

24/10/06

Dear

A similar letter to the one you are now reading has been sent to all Members of both Houses of Parliament and to all Members of the Scottish Parliament.

In the past some have signified their support for establishing a new inquiry into the Dunblane Tragedy without wishing to personally instigate proceedings. I should like to move forward. If after reading this letter you are of the view that there is a case for setting up a fresh inquiry please let me know. I shall then endeavour to arrange meetings between interested parties. I assure you that none of the names forwarded to me will be made public before the setting up of a new inquiry is announced after which disclosure will of course be inevitable.

My interest in this subject began in November 1999 when I was informed that Lord Burton had requested that a report to the Cullen Inquiry into the Dunblane Tragedy be placed in the House of Lords library. Lord Sewell refused the request as the report was subject to a 100 year closure order. I thought this unusual so started to make enquiries. Correspondence continues to this day.

The Crown Office claimed that the closure was to protect the identity of children. It is now known that tens of thousands of pages were subject to closure and it is beyond belief that each and every one could contain the names of children. Why could a felt tipped pen not be used? This has now been done to allow the release of some of the papers. Why were they closed in the first place?

Lord James Douglas-Hamilton in a written Commons reply, confirmed by Lord Cullen, stated that “There was in fact very little evidence of any acts of indecency on the part of Thomas Hamilton. So far as can be established no incident amounting to sexual interference with male children was reported to the police while Hamilton was alive.” Who are the children whose identity needs to be protected? Are there other reasons for the closure?

A Police Inspector Keenan assured a very concerned parent that he had evidence from other boys who said the same as her son and that Thomas Hamilton would be prosecuted. Why did this not happen and why were Lord James Douglas-Hamilton and Lord Cullen not aware of Inspector Keenan’s findings or if they were why did they conceal the fact?

The legality of the closure is open to question. The Lord Advocate and Crown Office officials write profusely to all those who enquire about the closure. Usually they receive a standard letter which commences with a detailed account of how the Inquiry was set up. This is irrelevant information that was never asked for. There follows a description of the guidelines and criteria followed in the administration of closure orders but nowhere any mention of where the authority came from to permit closure.

The following comments should be of interest.

Colin Boyd Q.C. when Lord Advocate wrote on many occasions that “I have provided Mr. Scott with an explanation as to how the decision was taken to impose a closure period of
100 years on the documents to the Dunblane Inquiry.” An explanation as to how the decision was taken in no way explains where the authority came from to allow closure of these documents.

The decision to impose the closure order was taken at a meeting on 13th January 1997. At that meeting was the Clerk to the Inquiry and representatives of the Scottish Records Office, the Police and the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service. Lord Cullen informed me by letter that those who attended that meeting did not have the authority, individually or collectively, to impose a closure order.

The Police were represented at that meeting on 13th January 1997 by Detective Chief Superintendent Ogg of Central Scotland Police. At the time, as widely reported in the press, many considered it wrong that Central Scotland Police undertook the investigation of the massacre when it was conceivable that their incompetence or mis-judged favouritism was ultimately influential in permitting the Tragedy to occur. This may just be coincidence but it has been alleged that Mr. Ogg was in some way involved with the salvage of a cabin cruiser owned by Thomas Hamilton. It certainly seems wrong that a senior member of the Police Force which was severely criticised a few months earlier should have been in a position to close for 100 years documents that that might damage the careers or reputations of some of his colleagues.

The Lord Advocate, now retired, was content to allow the widespread belief that there was legal authority for the closure until he was forced to admit that there was no statutory basis for the 100 year closure. He had no other option after the Keeper of the Records of Scotland informed me that there was no statutory basis for the closure.

In a letter to a Member of the Scottish Parliament Colin Boyd Q.C. admitted that there was no document to give authority for the closure. It is strange that papers can be hidden for 100 years without some form of written authority.

Ms. Lynda Clark Q.C. when Advocate General for Scotland wrote that “under Scots law there is no legislation which provides for a hundred year closure.” She further wrote “that understanding of the way in which closure of public records is operated is not the same as legal authority.”

Mr. Leolin Price Q.C. wrote “in recent years guidance, guidelines and the like are issued by departments and treated as if they are law; but they are not.”

I realise that you may consider the matter of the closure academic and not worth troubling about. If this is so consider this; at present the situation is that bureaucrats, free of any parliamentary control, can hide documents which may contain evidence of their incompetence or criminal activity for 100 years.

The fact that the closure is most probably illegal makes a strong case on its own for holding a fresh inquiry but there is much more than that.

At the time of the shooting there was an off-duty police officer in the school. He did not give evidence nor was his statement presented to the Inquiry. When I queried this the Lord Advocate stated that his presence was not required as a student teacher saw Hamilton shoot himself. The student teacher was not called to give evidence either although parts of his statement were read out at the Inquiry. Nowhere in the evidence given to the Inquiry did the student teacher state that he saw Hamilton shoot himself.

You may be wondering why I have brought up the subject of how Hamilton died since the majority no doubt consider the way of his going of little consequence. I bring it to your attention because it raises the very serious question as to the truth of what was put before the Inquiry and ultimately the findings of Lord Cullen.
It was intended that the statement made by the off-duty police officer be hidden for 100 years but was released under the terms of the Freedom of Information Act. He recounts in great detail his movements after arriving at the school and the people he met on his way to the gymnasium so his description of the situation in the gym should not have been ignored. Was there a reason for this?

The off-duty officer said that Hamilton had one holster, that there were two pistols and that he was wearing a black boiler suit. The scene of crime officer giving evidence to the Inquiry said that Hamilton had four holsters, that there were two pistols and two revolvers and that he was wearing black corduroy trousers. Was one lying or were they both telling the truth?

There seems no reason why either of them should lie so how could they both be telling the truth? They could both be telling the truth if the body had been tampered with.

Was the body moved? There is evidence to suggest it was.

Dr. J. Beattie, then Consultant Paediatrician at Stirling Royal Infirmary, at a press conference on the evening of 13th March 1996 informed the journalists present that he did not see Thomas Hamilton's body. When giving evidence at the Inquiry he stated that there were a number of dead and injured children and one dead adult in the gym. He confirmed that the dead adult was the teacher Mrs Mayor. Where was Hamilton's body?

In an attempt to resolve the matter I wrote to Dr. Beattie at Yorkhill Hospital where I believed he was now working. I asked if he could confirm that Thomas Hamilton’s body was not in the gymnasium of Dunblane Primary School at 10.15am on 13th March 1996. I did not receive a reply so not knowing if he had received the original I sent a copy. Still no response. As I was not really sure that he was at Yorkhill I sent an e-mail to the Hospital with a request to whoever opened it to please inform me if Dr. Beattie was on the staff. This produced a response but not one I should have expected from a member of the so-called caring profession. I received a most aggressive e-mail from Dr. Beattie who threatened to have me charged with harassment if I or any member of my group contacted him again. I wonder what gave him the impression that I was part of a group. I exchange information but in no way can that be described as being part of a group in the sense that Dr. Beattie used it. He said that he was not going to reply as he would not add to conspiracy theories which of course is exactly what he did. If he had stated that the body was in the gym and explained his previous statements that would have been the end of the matter.

I wrote to Mr. Haire who was a member of the first ambulance crew to arrive at the school. He phoned me and we had a long friendly conversation but at the outset he told me that his boss had informed him that he could give me no information about events of 13th March 1996 due to the Data Protection Act. He gave me the name and address of a senior officer in Stirling who he thought might be able to assist me. Before I could write to Stirling a letter arrived from Mr. G. Gordon, General Manager of the Scottish Ambulance Services based in Dundee. He requested that I made no further attempt to contact Mr. Haire or any other member of the Ambulance Service. I pointed out that he only employed Mr. Haire; he did not own him. Mr. Gordon admitted that this was the case and that Mr. Haire was free to talk to whosoever he wished in his own time. Mr. Haire did not reply to a further letter. Why should a letter from me to a member of the Ambulance Service in Callander land on the desk of the General Manager in Dundee?

I wrote to the student teacher who according to the Lord Advocate saw Hamilton shoot himself. He did not reply.

Finally I wrote to a local G.P. who had attended the school on the morning of 13th March 1996. He did not reply.

Naturally if Thomas Hamilton's body was moved it has to be asked why.
If it was suicide then there would have been no need to move him. On the other hand if it was suicide why so much secrecy?

Did somebody shoot him? If so why was that person not hailed as a hero? Could the reason be that he did not wish his identity known?

SKY News showed a bullet hole in a glass door. Experts suspected that the bullet was fired from outside the gym. They have been unable to confirm this as SKY will not release the film to enable it to be examined closely.

Was Thomas Hamilton a blackmailer? He certainly appeared to be living above his means.

Was there a previous attempt to kill him when his boat caught fire and sank in Loch Lomond? This is the same boat that DCS Ogg was involved with.

There are other matters that the Cullen Inquiry did not fully investigate.

On the morning of 13th March 1996 Thomas Hamilton was seen talking to a man in a grey car. That man was never traced.

The Inquiry was told that Hamilton left Stirling on the road to Dunblane and that he took 45 minutes to reach the Primary School. He did not leave Stirling by the direct route to Dunblane which is supported by the fact that he took 45 minutes to reach his destination whereas it is normally a 15 minute drive. Where did he go and who did he meet in that time?

Hamilton had many visitors arriving in expensive cars. Who were these people and why were they visiting Hamilton? Why were they never identified?

Hamilton appeared to have connections with Queen Victoria School. A housemaster was forced to resign after notifying his superiors of his concerns for the young people he was responsible for. Why was this not investigated?

It is clear that there are real concerns over the investigation, conduct and findings of the Cullen Inquiry which can only be satisfied by the holding of a fresh inquiry.

I realise that there are those who believe that the matter should be allowed to rest and that nothing should done that might cause more anguish to the bereaved parents but they more than anyone should surely wish to know the truth about events prior to and on that dreadful morning of 13th March 1996.

A properly conducted fresh inquiry is required to look into all aspects of Hamilton’s life, associates and finances and in particular the conflicting evidence, the witnesses that were not called and Hamilton’s movements on the morning prior to the shooting. This would once and for all answer the questions that have been posed since Lord Burton made a simple request to have a police report placed in the House of Lords library many years ago.

I trust you will support the call for a fresh inquiry and that I can look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely, William W. Scott

Although this letter was sent on 24 October, William has had only two respondents who have shown any interest in establishing a new inquiry - one peer and one MSP.

The Murder of Thomas Hamilton

I remember years ago of reading the Novel, ‘The Godfather’ of the planning to murder a bent police captain who was working with the opposition. It was the statement that ‘people will not look at the gunman’.
In the Port Arthur Massacre which occurred 6 weeks after the Dunblane Massacre, most of the people inside the Broad Arrow Café did not look at the gunman once the shooting started. Those that did died. You see, once the shooting started and people realised what was happening they sort the only cover available. People inside the café part of the building left their chairs and laid prone on the floor. Any movement was noticed by the gunman who then simply walked up to that person and shot them through the head. There were thirteen people who were executed in that manner within the Broad Arrow Cafe, which can be garnished from the report written in the American Wound Ballistics Review by Sergeant Gerard Dutton.

I believe a similar situation would have occurred at Dunblane. None of the survivors would have been able to obtain a good viewing of the gunman. Most of those that did see the gunman would have immediately associated him with the figure of Thomas Hamilton that lay dead within the gymnasium after the massacre. That is the way the mind works.

One of the first items that comes to mind within the context of the shooting at Dunblane is that there were two different types of shooting that took place within the school gymnasium.

Type (1) the gunman enters the gymnasium and starts shooting at the children and teachers. Those children who were shot and fell to the floor were then executed by the gunman walking up to them, placing a foot on their body to hold them still and then shooting them in the head.

It was noted that the gunman murdered far more girls (11) than he did boys (5) and this to me suggests that the gunman deliberately targeted the young female pupils. If there was a similar ratio with the wounded pupils, then I believe that would enhance my belief in this matter.

It is stated within the Tayside Police report on the Dunblane Primary School report No. FSL 1010/96 that the gunman was equipped with 25 extended box type magazines capable of holding 20 rounds each. That is 500 rounds of ammunition for the Browning pistol that was used to murder the pupils and teacher, and wound many others inside the gymnasium.

Of these magazines, 4 were found to be empty, and another three were partially empty. The actual pistol used in these murders when found by the police was devoid of any magazine, but still had a round in the firing chamber. In other words, the gunman had removed the magazine prior to using all the ammunition within the magazine. There was no indication that I could find to tell me whether the safety switch of this pistol had been placed on.

At this stage, we have a gunman whose apparent intent is to murder as many school children as he can. At the end of his shooting within the gymnasium he is still in possession of 13 fully loaded magazines, and three partially loaded magazines. There is nothing to stop the gunman from now going from classroom to classroom killing more children, if that was his intent.

However towards the end of the shooting incident, the gunman changes his shooting style.

Type (2) the gunman now instead of targeting the pupils within the gymnasium, now replaces his magazine with a full magazine, moves to the fire exit door and fires upon the adjacent buildings. One witness, a Mrs Currie, I believe was also fired upon at this stage, but was not wounded. The gunman then retreated but into the gymnasium.

My belief is that the gunman carried out this procedure a second time, that is reloaded his pistol with a full magazine, moved to the fire exit door, and fired at the adjoining buildings.

With this type of shooting it is obvious that the gunman was not endeavouring to murder any pupil or teacher, so what was his endeavour in carrying this type of shooting?
Any student in the adjourning building who may have heard the noise from the discharge of the pistol would have become curious as to what was happening and would have been looking in the direction of the gymnasium. When the gunman stepped out from the ‘fire exit’ door and fired in the directions of the adjourning buildings, any such student or teacher looking would have immediately ducked for cover. They would no longer be watching that area.

A second similar action would have discouraged any pupil whose curiosity got the better of them. All students and teachers are now huddled on the floor of their classrooms, and are totally oblivious to what is about to happen.

The gunman returns to the gymnasium ejects the third magazine from his pistol and then exits the gymnasium via the fire exit door, as his escape route has been made ‘safe’ for him to leave unseen.

That can be the only reason why there was a change in the type of shooting that occurred at Dunblane.

If the gunman was intent on murdering as many pupils as possible, then there is no reason why he couldn’t have traversed from classroom to classroom, and murdered many more children. Why did the gunman choose to commit his murders in a gymnasium where there was plenty of space for the children to run, and places to hide? It would have been far easier to enter a classroom and murder entire classes with much more ease than shooting the pupils in the gymnasium.

If the gunman was bent on suicide after his massacre, then why choose the more difficult area of the gymnasium over a far easier grouping of children in their classrooms? If the gunman was also knowingly going to commit suicide at the end of his killing spree, the classrooms would have been the perfect choice, but the gunman chose the gymnasium where there was an escape route.

The gunman then prepared his escape route by firing at the adjourning buildings and then left unseen and unnoticed.

We now come to the second part of the massacre. The children and their teacher hiding in the storeroom heard somebody enter the gymnasium. There was mention that they believed the gunman may have been convinced to give himself up. There was also a mention of witnesses hearing the gunman scream just before he shot himself.

This would be a first in recorded suicides where the gunman screamed just prior to putting his .357 Smith & Wesson revolver into his mouth and pulling the trigger. However, if somebody shoved a Smith & Wesson revolver into your mouth, would you not scream?

According to information that came to light after the Cullen Inquiry, Thomas Hamilton died from two bullet wounds fired into the roof of his mouth, one bullet exiting above the left ear, and another through the top of his head.

There were two bullet holes in the wall behind Thomas Hamilton's body in line with where such two bullets would have travelled if Thomas Hamilton had been shot whilst being held down.

Once it was established that Thomas Hamilton had been shot twice, then that rules out all possibility of suicide, and means that Thomas Hamilton was murdered. However the deduction that Hamilton was murdered does not rest solely on this piece of evidence. It is supported by evidence from the witnesses.

Consider what the teacher and the children tell us, when they state that they heard somebody enter the gymnasium and that they believed that the gunman may have been convinced to give himself up.
Alright, how do you expect the gunman who has just murdered 17 persons and wounded several others to react if somebody unexpectedly entered the gymnasium? You would expect the gunman to start shooting at these people as well. There is no record of any person admitting to such an event.

In other words, the gunman must have been expecting somebody to enter the gymnasium, while the murders were still taking place, or at the end of those murders. And all this time, the gunman is still in possession of his Browning pistol. There is no evidence at this stage of the .357 Smith & Wesson revolver. All the shooting up to this date is by the Browning pistol.

There is at this stage a conversation that takes place. How do we know a conversation took place? The teacher and the children thought that the gunman may have been convinced to give himself up. Such a belief can only come about because these witnesses heard people talking.

It is my belief that at this stage the gunman exited the gymnasium. How do I make this assumption? Because the Browning pistol was made safe, by ejecting the box magazine and I would believe engaging the safety switch, because there was still the unfired cartridge in the firing chamber.

Now just how could the gunman do this if he had exchanged the Browning pistol for the Smith & Wesson revolver? He couldn't complete this action with safety, unless another person was holding the Smith & Wesson revolver.

So, how many people do we have involved in the conversation heard by the teacher and the children? We have the gunman, who departs as soon as possible, and I believe before the death of Thomas Hamilton. We have Thomas Hamilton. We have the person holding the Smith & Wesson revolver and I believe there would be one other person as well.

If Thomas Hamilton was escorted into the gymnasium by a person holding the .357 Smith & Wesson revolver, there was still the possibility that even a coward like Hamilton would make an unexpected move. There would have to have been another person besides the person armed with the Smith & Wesson revolver to ensure that things went according to plan.

Also there would have to be a person to throw Thomas Hamilton to the floor of the gymnasium and to hold him there whilst the person armed with the Smith & Wesson placed the revolver in Hamilton's mouth and then pulled the trigger.

It was at this stage that Hamilton emitted the scream that was heard by some of the witnesses. And Hamilton did struggle, even though he was being held. He moved the only part of his body that was not constrained. He moved his head, and moved it to the right just as the gunman with the Smith & Wesson pulled the trigger. It was this shot that exited above the left ear. It was the second shot that exited at the top of the head and took with it Hamilton's brain, which the policeman McCutcheon saw separate from the body.

Constable Grant McCutcheon, the off-duty policeman who was the first policeman to enter the school gymnasium gave us some vital clues to the Dunblane massacre. McCutcheon stated: "I also saw, at the same time as all this, that the gunman was gurgling and breathing heavily."

What this means is that Constable Grant McCutcheon had entered the gymnasium before Hamilton's body had completed its death sequences, or in other words within under a minute of Thomas Hamilton being murdered.

McCutcheon also saw the school janitor John Currie at the body of Thomas Hamilton, and saw Currie moved one of the two pistols that were near the body. Then there was the student teacher, David Scott who in his witness statement said that he saw Thomas Hamilton put a handgun up near his mouth.
I believe we now have sufficient evidence to question just exactly what involvement in the murder of Thomas Hamilton that the witnesses John Currie and David Scott played. I further believe that these two witnesses would also be able to name the gunman who murdered the 16 children and one teacher and wound three teachers and another twelve children.

Andrew S. MacGregor

Was Thomas Hamilton supposed to be Mahakala?

The official police line in regard to the Death of Thomas Hamilton is unique in all of the murder investigations that I am aware of.

In fact every member of SAGBNI should have immediately picked up on this glaring oddity, but instead the SAGBNI forum has submerged to the depths of in-fighting and character assassination, than dwell on the realities that just may have saved their sport.

You see according to The Cullen Inquiry, which adopted the evidence of ‘Scene of Crime’ Investigator, the former Strathclyde police Sergeant, Malcolm Chisholm, Thomas Hamilton had to have been the living form of the Hindu God, Mahakala.

Thomas Hamilton couldn’t have been Vishnu, as Vishnu had only four arms, and Thomas Hamilton’s deeds, according to Malcolm Chisholm, were superior to even Vishnu. Just what exactly do you mean, you will ask? Well it’s really quite simple, and every shooter will confirm this observation.

Malcolm Chisholm stated, and it was accepted by the Cullen Inquiry that Thomas Hamilton was found wearing four holsters. Around his body were found four handguns, to wit, two Browning pistols and two Smith & Wesson revolvers, along with a certain amount of magazines for the two Browning pistols loaded, and unloaded and other spent cartridges.

Malcolm Chisholm stated emphatically that the evidence had not been touched. That being the case, Thomas Hamilton could not have been Vishnu! Thomas Hamilton had to have been of a higher deity, and that means Mahakala.

You see a mere mortal armed with four handguns, and shooting targets, would have carried three of those handguns in their holsters, and used two hands to aim, shoot, and change over magazines, once the magazines became empty. Ordinary mere mortals would also have holstered the Browning pistol after shooting all the targets, and then producing the Smith & Wesson revolver in which to end the facade by killing himself.

Thus, armed with four handguns, and needing an extra hand to steady the handgun, cock, unload and reload, Thomas Hamilton would have required at least five hands. There are no five armed deities, even in Hindu, which simply means that Thomas Hamilton would have required six hands and arms.

Had Thomas Hamilton been a mere mortal shooter, then three of his firearms would have been in their holsters. Even to exchange firearms, the first would have been replaced back in its holster and then the next firearm would have been produced.

But apparently Thomas Hamilton according to Lord Cullen was not a mere mortal. Thomas Hamilton then could only have been Mahakala of the 6 arms, a Hindu God, a God of Death and Destruction; Mahakala.

Andrew S MacGregor

A FOOTNOTE FROM ANDREW MACGREGOR

By using such focuses as Mahakala, it should make it obvious to any shooter that what happened, or rather what we were told happened, is absolute rubbish. Most honest
shooters would have been aware that they had been 'done in', but wouldn't know how or by whom. Now after reading the above, they would definitely know. I hope!

You see, what they did at Dunblane was to put the focus on the handguns, for virtually a visual effect. Even though all the children and teachers were shot with the one handgun, they wanted as many guns as possible to enhance their picture. They also wanted to overpower any suggestion that Dunblane was a one in a million occurrence.

What you also had at Dunblane was Malcolm Chisholm (Scene of Crime Officer), who was outside the constabulary, controlling everything. That is why Grant McCutcheon (the off-duty police officer) had to be forgotten very quickly.

You know, if SAGBNI had been doing its job properly from the start, then most of these anomalies would have been exposed.

Since they weren't, then either SAGBNI was run by very incompetent men, and they're not, or they had to be fifth columns.

Hamilton linked to paedophile ring

The Sunday Telegraph 17 March 1996 (4 days after the Dunblane Massacre)

Hamilton linked to paedophile ring (by Gordon Hay)

Friends of the Dunblane mass killer Thomas Hamilton have been interviewed by police investigating possible links with an international child sex ring.

Quantities of computer software and photographs of half-dressed boys have been removed from Hamilton's groundfloor flat in Stirling, eight miles from the primary school where he carried out last Wednesday's killings. The possibility that Hamilton had an Internet link is also being investigated.

Evidence recovered from Hamilton's flat led police to those questioned last week. Two of those interviewed about the suspected paedophile ring are known to have been in regular contact with Hamilton* - with some calls lasting as long as 25 minutes - in the run-up to the primary school tragedy. The last call came a few hours before the massacre.

(" Evidence from the Dunblane Inquiry suggests the last people Hamilton spoke to on the telephone were William MacDonald, former police officer with Central Scotland Police, and his son David MacDonald, financial adviser and former student at Stirling University, where Thomas Hamilton had a lot of connections...)

Police are also believed to be investigating possible links to the homosexual community in Edinburgh, 40 miles from Dunblane. Hamilton was cautioned by Lothian police 18 months ago after being found in a compromising position with a man in the Scottish capital.

Central Scotland Police refused either to confirm or deny details of their investigations into the secret life of the 43-year-old bachelor and his obsession with young boys.

But pressure was growing yesterday for tighter safeguards against the activities of paedophiles. Plans to introduce a national database of convicted child sex offenders will be debated at the annual conference of the Scottish Police Federation next month. The idea is likely to receive unanimous backing from officers, many of whom will have been involved in the Dunblane horror.

Police superintendents in England and Wales are also demanding that convicted paedophiles be forced to notify the authorities when they change their name or address so they cannot slip back into society under an assumed identity and subject other youngsters to abuse. Officers acknowledge that Hamilton would not have been included on any
paedophile register because he was never convicted of any sex offence. But the number of complaints made to police by worried parents in and around Dunblane about his unhealthy interest in young boys could have been logged and suspicion aroused.

Chief Supt Brian Mackenzie, president of the Superintendents' Association, said: "No amount of legislation would stop someone like him, intent on killing himself and taking others with him, but officers and other authorities could be made aware of concerns about his tendencies and his unsuitability for being with children, tabs could be kept and he could be prevented from working in youth environments, paid or voluntary.

"The civil liberties of children must come before the civil liberties of paedophiles. These people plot their conquests against vulnerable people. We don't want a witch-hunt but we need urgent action to stop children being scarred for life".

*Thomas Hamilton was undoubtedly operating as a supplier of child pornography from the early 1970s. He continued as a supplier throughout the 1970s, 1980s and right up to the mid 1990s. By which time he was obviously getting involved in the Internet... Did this threaten several of his clients??? The potential for blackmail increased enormously once we were into the Internet era....*

**The Untouchables**

1 October 2006 MOIRA MURDER CONFESSION A HOAX

Exclusive: Sunday mail recovers hidden dossier about child sex abuse ring

By Marion Scott

A SECRET dossier naming members of a paedophile sex ring responsible for the murder of Moira Anderson can today be exposed as a cruel hoax.

The 26-page file lists notorious killers Robert Black, Fred West and Thomas Hamilton as members of the SAME child sex ring as judges, senior advocates and police officers.

And it lists a dead Scots Tory MP and Labour MP and murdered SNP activist Willie Macrae as being part of the evil "club" known as The Untouchables.

It also includes claims about the identity of 60s killer Bible John. Moira disappeared aged 11 in 1957 during a blizzard in Coatbridge, Lanarkshire, and her body has never been found.

Although no one was jailed over her disappearance, Sandra Brown - the daughter of convicted paedophile Alexander Gartshore - is convinced her father murdered Moira.

Last night, Moira's family reacted with fury after the document was handed to the Sunday Mail - and dismissed as a hoax by a senior policeman.

Moira's sister, Janet Hart, who lives in Australia, said yesterday: "This is a bombshell because we were putting a lot of weight on what was in this dossier. "This has come as a big, big shock." Campaigners - including Moira's family - have been fighting to get the dossier released under the Freedom of Information act since it was handed over to police in 2003.

But the scrawled deathbed "confession" by paedophile James Gallogley was dismissed by the police chief investigating the case.

Superintendent Alan Buchanan said the only name missing was Yorkshire Ripper Peter Sutcliffe.
The document was written by paedophile Alexander Keil - who claims he was a prison pal of Gallogley - six months AFTER Gallogley died in Peterhead, in April 1999.

Keil has tried to tout the full dossier for £20,000 - but handed it to a Sunday Mail reporter last week without any money changing hands.

Janet added: "We were hoping the information Keil had in his file was going to take Moira's case forward.

"I am very disappointed." I'm very shocked about this.

"At the beginning, I suspected he was in it for money. But, after hearing about the first 15 pages, it seemed quite feasible and raised our hopes.

"This is 10 steps backwards. It is such a long time ago now but I'd hoped facts would come to light to locate my sister's remains. But time is against us.

"We know Alex Gartshore did it but I do believe he was not the only one involved. There had to be more than one and the sighting at the time said there were two men involved.

"As far as I'm concerned, Keil is the lowest of the low."

The "confession" amounts to a collection of politicians' and killers' names but no hard facts. It claims:

Moira was killed by Gartshore and Gallogley and abused by Fred West.

A Tory MP "club" member was caught with an underage girl in a top hotel but the incident was hushed up.

Dunblane killer Thomas Hamilton went to sex parties in Perth with a police inspector and regularly acted as a driver for members of the ring.

Gallogley killed a girl and dumped her body at Ibrox stadium while it was being redeveloped.

The Sunday Mail can detail the dossier's contents for the first time. Keil, 58, of Boat of Garten, near Inverness, insists it was transcribed immediately after speaking to Gallogley in Peterhead.

Gallogley says in the document he and Gartshore, the last man seen with Moira, were responsible for the murder.

But, in an exclusive interview with the Sunday Mail, the senior detective responsible for the investigation into the dossier dismissed it as lies.

Strathclyde Police Superintendent Alan Buchanan said: "During our investigation, we received information from a paedophile who was a known friend of Gallogley in Peterhead Prison.

"He said when Gallogley received a letter from Moira Anderson's sister asking if he knew anything about the case, Gallogley denied involvement.

"Gallogley told him nothing that wasn't already in the public domain -either from newspaper reports or Sandra Brown's 1999 book - that a person he used to work with, Alex Gartshore, was responsible.

"We'll never know if Gallogley and Keil ever had a conversation in respect of Moira Anderson or any others."
"But Keil's credibility is severely in question when you consider he tried to sell his story for what we believe to be £20,000."

The superintendent said during inquiries into whether Gallogley could have "confessed" to Keil, prison officers and other prisoners dismissed any close friendship between the two.

Superintendent Buchanan said: 'I asked Mr Keil why Gallogley hadn't written the document himself and he claimed Gallogley was too ill.

"I know for a fact that Gallogley wasn't too ill to write to his family."

Gallogley "confessed" Fred West had killed a number of women and children, secreting body parts in jars. The dossier said West's first wife - bus conductor Rena Costello, from Coatbridge - was killed after finding them.

But West was only 16 years old when Moira disappeared in 1957 and Gloucestershire Police say there is no evidence to suggest Fred West was in Coatbridge before November 1962.

Superintendent Buchanan said: 'We know Fred West had an association with Coatbridge, but not at the time of Moira's disappearance.

"We can find no link between West, Gallogley and Gartshore.

"Nor can we find any link between some of the other high-profile cases mentioned in this so-called confession.

"The only person who hasn't been named, it seems, is Peter Sutcliffe.

"My concern is that these sorts of allegations will cause great distress to the families of the victims named and described.

"We spoke to Moira's sister at length about this issue as we were concerned she was being given false hope.

"Clearly, if Moira's disappearance had been an incident happening today, Gartshore would have been a prime suspect. But there would also have been other lines of inquiry."

Keil - who served six years at Peterhead - claims to be "afraid" for his life because of the high-ranking judges, Scottish and Crown Office officials, advocates, police and social workers named in the dossier.

He claims others were killed "because of what they knew".

He said: "James Gallogley was the most devious, cunning person. I had nightmares over what he told me.

"I know he got two letters about the wee girl's death (Moira Anderson). It haunted him."

Keil claimed Gallogley told him at least three people were killed because they threatened The Untouchables.

Threatened

The dossier details Gallogley saying he and Gartshore abducted and abused 11-year-old Moira.

Gallogley, jailed for 10 years in 1997 for abusing five little girls, allegedly said of West: "We became good friends."
"Fred was always talking about a group of people who were into sex and things like making films.

"They called themselves The Untouchables because of their work.

"Fred reassured us these people we had met were from the Scottish and Crown Offices.

"If anything came up about us, we would be looked after and would never end up in court, that was a promise."

The credibility is stretched further when Keil claims to know the identity of serial killer Bible John - who has never been linked to underage sex.

Last night, Keil insisted he was not involved in a hoax. He said: "The police would say that - they're covering up.

"I spent many days speaking to Gallogley in the medical centre and that was what he told me. Those papers were written while I was still in jail."

He also claimed he had been offered £20,000 for the dossier, not asked for it.

Keil could produce no documents with Gallogley's handwriting or signature on but said: "I did have Gallogley's signature. I don't know who has taken it."

But Superintendent Buchanan added: "If the Freedom of Information Commissioner rules the dossier has to be made public, it will be a big disappointment to those pursuing it because there's nothing there and no line of inquiry that we can pursue.

"If there had been anything at all we could have taken from this document, we would have acted upon it.

"We would like nothing better than to be able to give Moira's family answers about what happened to her."

MICHAEL MILL – EX POLICE INSPECTOR

CENTRAL SCOTLAND POLICE

In his evidence at the Inquiry (Day 8, Friday 7 June 1996), Michael Mill states that he first knew of Thomas Hamilton around 1980-81, when he was stationed at Stirling. Asked in what connection he knew him, he replies, "He had a Do It Yourself shop in Cowane Street, Stirling". Mill says he was a customer.

However, in one of the (original) hidden documents (Chapter L, Vol 1) it states that “during the mid 1970s, Hamilton met and formed relations of sorts with members of the police diving team, police witnesses Anthony Bushnell and Michael Mill”. This was in the summer of 1976.

Other retired officers are asked the date when they left the force. Michael Mill is not asked this question. At the time of the investigation into the massacre, post 13 March 1996, he is described as a “serving police officer” in the hidden documents. By June 1996, he is a “former police officer”... I wrote to Central Scotland Police to ask the date Mill retired and my letter was passed on to Stirling Council's legal department. Principal solicitor Peter Farquhar wrote, “I can advise you that under the terms of the Data Protection Act 1998, you are not entitled to information which you request in relation to ex Chief Inspector Mill”.

At the Inquiry Mill is asked, “Did you know something of his ownership and use of boats on Loch Lomond?” – Yes I did. “How was it you came to know about that?” – I was a member of Central Scotland Police Force Underwater Unit and we trained up at Loch Lomond on training exercises on a weekly basis".
Michael Mill was not prepared to admit at the Inquiry that this is how he first came into contact with Hamilton – 5 years earlier than he states.

When asked about Hamilton’s boats, Mill provides a very detailed reply: “I was first aware he had one, a speed boat, it was a small boat and it was called Lady Sheila and he then purchased another boat which was a large cabin cruiser and that was called Tropical Winter”.

Mill was also aware that Hamilton had summer camps in the area. He is asked “When were you first aware of this?” – Probably about 1980, 1981; as I say we visited Loch Lomond on a weekly basis, we knew of the person at the boatyard and they knew Hamilton as well.

Above, he says his first contact with Hamilton was in 1980, 1981 – as a customer, not through his police work. His answer at Point 7 would suggest that Hamilton was already well known to him by 1980.

Mill is then asked about the 1988 police investigation into one of Hamilton’s camps. By 1988, Mill was sub-divisional officer at Dunblane Police Office.

He is asked, “Is it a fair summary of the position that Hamilton on a number of occasions tried to plead with you to say something, I suppose in his favour, in the course of this investigation?” – I don’t know if he was pleading with me….  

“Did he visit you regularly?” – Yes, he did.

“Was he pleading his case?” – Yes he was.

“Did you get the impression he hoped it would filter through from you into other police officers’ ears?” – Yes.

Why did Hamilton consider Mill the best person to plead his case to?

Mill is then asked if he was directly involved in the investigations.

He replies, “No, in view of Hamilton's letters to the Chief Constable I was directed to do a preliminary investigation just into events but not to go to the camp”.

Mill spoke to Hamilton about his complaints against police officers George Gunn and Donna Duncan.

Under cross-examination by Mr Taylor, the solicitor for Central Scotland Police, he is later asked, “Did you become aware that he had taken matters up with the Deputy Chief Constable?”

Mill says he was not aware of this at that particular time.

“I didn’t think he had spoken with the Deputy Chief Constable or the Chief Constable”.

But Mill DID know that Hamilton had written letters to the Chief Constable...

Mill is asked if following that camp (in 1988) he went in later years to see what the camp was like?

He replies yes.

However, Hamilton never got the use of Inchmoan Island again after 1988.

Mill states that he went to the Milarrochy Bay camp in 1990 and that this was the first time he had gone on to one of the sites.

His answer is confusing.
The question had been asked about him visiting the Inchmoan camp.

Mill is asked if the visit he made to the camp was the subject of any police intelligence input into the system.

He replies, “Not that I am aware of; I probably would have spoken with my Chief Superintendent but on an informal basis”.

**Why was he at the camp then?**

Hamilton had extended an invitation to the police to visit his camps *in response to the Gunn and Duncan investigation – that investigation had ended by 1989 – so why was Mill visiting Hamilton’s camp in 1990?*

Asked how he came to have knowledge of Hamilton’s dissatisfaction, Mill says that he visited him at Dunblane Police Office about the middle of August when the camp had finished.

Mill himself was just back from leave at the beginning of August.

He claims that because he was “responsible for that particular area” he was briefed by his officers.

Yet it is my understanding that Drymen or Balfron Police Offices would be responsible for Loch Lomond, not Dunblane.

Mill confuses matters further by later saying, “At that time I was aware also it was Strathclyde Police area, and the Strathclyde Police were dealing with the matter”.

*This is a very grey area at the Inquiry.*

*One witness believes that Inchmoan Island is within Strathclyde (George Gunn, Balfron station) whilst another says Central (Mill).*

*At the beginning of his evidence, Mill states that he had been involved in moving Hamilton’s boat that caught fire and sank.*

*It caught fire on the Strathclyde side of Loch Lomond.*

*After the fire the boat drifted over towards Balmaha Bay and sank just off the island.*

*Presumably he is implying that Balmaha Bay is in Central Scotland Police area and that is why he was asked to help remove the boat?*

Hamilton visited Mill the week after his return from camp (the camp finished on 14 Aug, so this would have been approx 21 Aug).

He started sending him letters, indicating the type of things that he was doing at the camp.

He sent receipts to show the type of food he was buying.

Mill had already been briefed by his officers at the beginning of August, when he returned from leave.

He knew about the problem long before Hamilton turned up in his office the last week of August.

**Did Hamilton actually send letters from the camp to Mill?**

Police Constable George Gunn (Balfron) had received a complaint of assault on 17 July 1988.
He visited the island on 20 July with Donna Duncan.

The next he heard was when his inspector told him an informal complaint had been made against him.

He is asked, “Who was your Inspector?” – Michael Mill.

Gunn was required to give an explanation to Mill.

Hamilton had not just made an oral complaint.

He was writing letters to Mill and other officers.

Mill was aware of the whole situation from the very beginning.

He would not have been on leave at the end of July.

He was still at work at this point and in a position to speak to Gunn about Hamilton’s complaints.

Gunn states that he received a phone call from a parent whose child had been at the camp.

Bonomy, unhappy with this response, says “Well, was it a parent on the phone to Balfron or was it another policeman?”

His new answer is, “I believe it was actually another policeman.

The parents had called at Drymen Police Office and he was relaying the message to ask us to call over at Drymen Police Office”.

This does not make sense. Balfron is further away from Loch Lomond than Drymen.

Why didn’t the Drymen officer investigate the child’s complaint?

Michael Mill – despite being on leave – clearly knew about Hamilton’s complaints against Gunn and Duncan long before he returned to work.

Where did Michael Mill holiday that summer?

Did he have a boat on Loch Lomond?

At the Inquiry, Mill is asked if he contacted anyone in Strathclyde Police.

He replies yes, Detective Chief Inspector Hay.

He contacted Hay at the end of August.

He asked Hay for information about conditions, clothing of the boys, etc.

Hay said there were no complaints of abuse.

THIS IS A LIE.

George Gunn states in his evidence that he had received complaints from children.

He was asked if he considered this as assault and states yes.

He also confirms that he reported this to DCI Hay.

So far then we have 2 investigations into Hamilton’s complaints.

The last one ended 11 Oct 1988.
This was sent to the Chief Superintendent of A Division (Gunn?)

Both investigations were carried out by Mill – the first investigation for the Chief Constable was during Hamilton’s camp, according to Mill.

Enter James Keenan, who is called in to investigate an informal complaint that has already been investigated for the DCC and the CC by Mill.

The result of Keenan’s investigation is that there are no grounds established for disciplining either of the two officers.

The decision was taken by DCC McMurdo.

Yet DCC McMurdo had already made that judgement on Mill’s report, so why bother with another investigation?

If Hamilton originally sent letters to the Chief Constable on this matter, surely that suggests he made a “formal” complaint from the outset?

We are told that Hamilton only made his complaint “formal” in the first week of December.

The informal investigation by the Chief Constable (carried out by Mill in July) and the informal investigation carried out by Mill in August, were then superseded by a formal investigation carried out by Keenan.

It is our belief that Mill had not spoken to either the Chief Constable or the Depute Chief Constable.

We allege that Mill knew about the complaints against Hamilton because of his personal involvement with him.

Hamilton visited Mill the week after the camp finished (anywhere between 15 and 21 Aug).

He made references about the officers who went to his camp.

These were Mill’s officers.

He was their Inspector.

Mill spoke to Hay before McBain’s report was sent to the P.F. at Dumbarton.

McBain sent summonses and full statements to the P.F (a summons specifically means “an official order to appear in court”).

The complaints specifically included allegations of physical assault etc.

However, Mill in his evidence at the Inquiry states that Hay told him there was no report of abuse of any nature.

So who is lying?

Doreen Hagger was present at the 1988 summer camp for approx 3 weeks.

Her time at the camp came after the visit by Gunn and Duncan.

Mrs Hagger had constant arguments with Hamilton about providing food for the children.

She did 2 or 3 shops during the time she was at the camp, and handed over the receipts to Hamilton. Her final fall-out with Hamilton was regarding food for the children. The receipts she gave to Hamilton were forwarded to Mill.
We believe that Mill got the letters and receipts whilst Hamilton was still on the island.

Mill was on holiday at that point.

We believe that Mill tipped off Hamilton about the Chief Constable's investigation.

Doreen Hagger states that there was a visitor to the island one evening who did not wish to be seen.

However, Steven Williams, David Smith and Sam Davie all knew who this man was.

Was it Mill?

Hamilton, The Boat & Sex

I was child sex victim of monster Hamilton; Boy's ordeal on boat trip

Daily Record (Glasgow, Scotland)

Pervert killer Thomas Hamilton subjected a 12-year-old boy to a terrifying sex attack during a boat trip.

The lad lay "frozen stiff with fear" as the monster made him lie face down on a bed and abused him.

His young victim - who is now grown up - told of his ordeal in a written statement to the Dunblane Inquiry.

The revelation is the first evidence to show that Hamilton was a paedophile.

The man said he first met Hamilton when he went to his Rovers Club at Bannockburn, Stirlingshire.

The youngster was picked to go on a trip to Loch Lomond trip with seven other boys in the early 80s.

The man said sick Hamilton terrified the boys by throwing them off his cabin cruiser into the freezing loch.

He said: "Hamilton was tying ropes around us one at a time and threw us off the boat and then pulled us back in."

The little boy was so frightened that he hid in the cabin and refused to take part.

But that night, Hamilton summoned him to the cabin where he slept.

He was holding a telescopic pointer for maps in his hand when the little boy went in dressed only in his underpants.

He said: "He began to touch me between the legs and private parts. I was very scared and started to cry.

"He told me to stop crying or I would be hit by the pointer."

The beast stripped off his own shorts after he forced the terrified youngster to lie face down on the bed.

The man said: "At one point I was crying and he banged the pointer at the side of my face. It didn't touch me but it hit the pillow."

Hamilton then told the lad to stand up and face the wall.
The boy was allowed to go after his horror ordeal.

He phoned his mum the next day and begged her to take him home but she lived too far away and he had to wait to leave with the rest.

He said Hamilton's boat - Tropical Linda - blew up a week after he went home.

He added: "I didn't tell my mum what Hamilton did to me.

"I do agree that what he did to me should be known about. It has affected me badly and has always troubled me."

The inquiry continues.

The Patsy

Thomas Hamilton.... how much more do we need to know about him?

He was a homosexual paedophile, and was protected by friends in high places for well over 20 years. These included his local councillor Robert Ball (lecturer at Stirling University), Police Inspector Michael Mill, and police officers William MacDonald and John Smith Baird Wilson. Worst of all, he was protected by his MP, Michael Forsyth (former Secretary of State for Scotland and friend of former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher).

He was also protected by his friend Clive Wood (STV cameraman), his typist Ina Mack (who also worked at Stirling University, along the corridor from Mick North's office) and an assortment of other people (all detailed in my book).

We were told at the Inquiry that Hamilton had been planning the Dunblane massacre for at least 2 years. I think, given what we now know, Hamilton was being 'groomed' for his role as the patsy for at least 2 years...

Thomas Hamilton was 43 when he was murdered.

Steve Walker has expressed an interest in what further information I might uncover about Thomas Hamilton. I don't think I need to know anymore. See "Jeremy Earls & Thomas Hamilton" in the 'Spooks' thread * (this article has been removed for safekeeping and for legal reasons).

How Lies Beget Lies

The following is the simplest explanation I have been able to come up with about the Missing Tape and the question mark re Ron Taylor's emergency call. They - Central Scotland Police and the Scottish Crown Office - were trying to hide McCutcheon's non-999 call, as we weren't ever meant to know about the existence of Grant McCutcheon (because his evidence tells us the truth of the scene of crime IMMEDIATELY post massacre). So the times are all wrong and they didn't get their story straight on this. DCS John Ogg said it wasn't a 999 call, but he slipped up - he shouldn't have mentioned McCutcheon's call at all.

With the Cullen Inquiry into the Dunblane Massacre there were areas that could never be properly explained. Things that occurred, even simple things like a telephone call that initiated the actions of the Police were suddenly devoid of explanation.

For example, the telephone call made by Constable Grant McCutcheon to Stirling Police HQ. McCutcheon had been completely ‘air-brushed’ out of the picture of the Dunblane Massacre because of the vital evidence he had to disprove the media hype on the massacre. This time line for this part of the massacre would be something like this:

0930   Gunman enters gym and starts shooting pupils and teachers.
Teacher informs Headteacher Ron Taylor of shooting in the gym

Taylor makes his 999 call for police re shooting

Message conveyed to Sgt Goldie and Constable Sneddon (Dunblane Police) to attend

McCUTCHEON (off-duty police officer) at school is informed of shooting and heads to gym

McCUTCHEON arrives at gym, and then speaks with Taylor

McCUTCHEON attends office and telephones Stirling Police HQ

Stirling Police initiate tactical response for CSP

McCUTCHEON to front gate

Sgt Goldie and Constable Sneddon arrive at school.

So here we have two telephone calls made in regard to the initial response for the Dunblane Massacre. The first call, the 999 call made by Taylor apparently goes missing, and is not produced at the Cullen Inquiry.

However, Taylor is cross-examined in regard to the call that he made with the implied belief that it was Taylor that made the second call direct to the Dunblane Police Station. Taylor naturally denied any possibility of making that call.

Now it is also procedures for incoming calls to stations to be monitored, and the second call, made by Constable McCUTCHEON must have been logged as well, but it was Taylor that was held responsible for making that call.

In other words, both of these calls were ‘lost’.

This ‘loss’ can only be attributed to the fact that Constable McCUTCHEON was not part of a ‘script’ that had been prepared prior to the massacre.

The fact that the first police witness at the Dunblane Massacre was totally ‘air-brushed’ out of any police evidence for the Cullen Inquiry or any other possible source of information on the massacre demonstrates that people within the Central Scotland Police had to be involved with the cover-up of mass murder and all the other murky deeds that preceded the Dunblane Massacre.

Andrew S MacGregor

The Case of the Two Off-Duty Police Officers

In the Sunday Express on 2 October 2005 - by which time it was perfectly clear to all and sundry that I was the one who had been interested in the presence of an off-duty police officer at the scene (as I had been informed about this by my ambulance service colleague, Alison Irvine - without this information from Alison direct to me, NONE of us would ever have known about this off-duty cop- he was completely airbrushed out of the picture at the Cullen Inquiry) - this is what Mick North had to say to the press (and this is from just ONE article in the SIX newspapers where he rubbished all my claims).

How closely did North read the statement of Grant McCUTCHEON, the police officer who was dropping off his child at nursery? Didn't he notice that the off-duty cop made observations significantly different to the Scene of Crime Officer who attended a few hours later?

Or did he choose to ignore these differences?
Only North can answer this, and as this is a public forum, he is perfectly free to log on to my website to offer his explanation (more than I could do when he defamed ME in the mainstream press by rubbing all my research so very publicly a year ago).

THE CASE OF THE TWO OFF-DUTY POLICE OFFICERS

SUNDAY EXPRESS Sunday October 02, 2005

CONSIDERABLE interest centred on the presence of an off-duty police officer at the school at the time of the shootings, though he was never identified or called to give evidence after he played a significant part in the immediate aftermath.

Conspiracy theorists suggested police were tipped off that an armed man was heading for Dunblane and that officers were dispatched, and even that Hamilton had not taken his own life but was shot by police.

But Dr North said the truth was far simpler: "There were actually two off-duty officers at the school, simply because they were dropping their own children at the nursery, which didn't start until 9.30am.

"One of them left and returned home, although he went back almost immediately on hearing there had been an incident to check his child was safe.

"The other officer was elsewhere in the school when he heard the disturbance. He went to see what had happened and was one of the first into the gym. The headmaster and the janitor had entered before him.

"He saw the janitor kick a gun lying close to Hamilton's body away from him and called to him not to move anything else as he understood the importance of preserving the scene. All that information was in statements to the Inquiry and presumably was not contentious so there was no obvious need to call him. However, I have to say I consider his evidence to be important enough that he should have been called."

North obviously studied the statement of Grant McCutcheon (the off-duty police officer who entered the gym within a minute of Hamilton being shot) with meticulous probity.

* McCutcheon said Hamilton was wearing a black boilersuit (Cullen said black corduroy trousers).
* McCutcheon said Hamilton had one holster (later changed to 4 holsters by the time of the Scene of Crime Officer entering the gym).
* McCutcheon said there were no revolvers, just two pistols (no sign of the revolver Hamilton 'killed himself' with). * McCutcheon said there were just 2 guns, not 4.

Did North contact McCutcheon to ask him for an explanation of these differences with the official report provided by the Scene of Crime Officer? Obviously not.

Dunblane Tragedy - it's not yet over

Below is Mr Scott's challenging commentary on the Dunblane Tragedy

My interest in the Cullen Inquiry into the Dunblane Tragedy began in November 1999 when I read that Lord Burton had requested that a report to the Inquiry by a Sergeant Hughes be placed in the House of Lords library. He was informed by Lord Sewell that this was not possible due to it being subject to a 100 year closure order. This exchange is recorded in Hansard. I thought that 100 years was rather a long time since Cabinet papers are only sealed for 30 so I wrote to my MP, Mr. John Home Robertson. He wrote to the Lord Advocate on my behalf. After five months and repeated reminders the Lord Advocate informed Mr.
Robertson that the closure was imposed to protect the identity of children. He accepted this explanation but I could not see why a felt tipped pen could not have been used to blank out the names of children mentioned in the report as was the case with the Lawrence inquiry and the Waterhouse Inquiry 'Lost in Care'.

The Lord Advocate in the same letter stated categorically that the closure was proposed by the Scottish Record Office and that other documents were also subject to the 100 year closure. I asked my M.P. who was responsible for the closure since Lord Sewell claimed it was Lord Cullen and the Lord Advocate said it was the Scottish Record Office. I further asked since the plural was used how many other papers were included in the closure and why was it not possible to use a felt tipped pen to blank out the names of children.

The fact that Thomas Hamilton legally held a firearm certificate also troubled me so I wrote the following to Mr. Robertson:

"Mr. Thomas Hamilton held a firearm certificate at the time of the Tragedy although from press reports after the shooting it would appear many people considered him to be an unstable character unsuitable to hold such a certificate. There was also believed to be a police report confirming that he was indeed unsuitable. Is it public knowledge who signed the documents to allow Thomas Hamilton to legally own handguns or is that information covered by the 100 year closure? Surely the matter of how an application for a firearm certificate from such a person as Thomas Hamilton was successful must have been put before Lord Cullen and considering the magnitude of the misjudgement it seems only right and proper that the public should know the facts."

I concluded by asking if he would prefer that I wrote to the Crown Office direct. Mr. Robertson ignored all my questions and replied that he understood the fundamental reason for the 100 year restriction was to protect the identity of children. He added that I should feel free to write to the Crown Office. I wrote to the Lord Advocate putting the same questions as I had to my M.P. He replied with legal jargon to confuse the matter of Sergeant Hughes' report but was emphatic that it was the Scottish Record Office that proposed the 100 year closure.

Further correspondence produced the address of the National Archives of Scotland (new name for the Scottish Record Office) and continued insistence that the closure was to protect the identity of children. My next move was to communicate with the Keeper of Records at the National Archives of Scotland regarding his imposing of the 100 year closure.

His reply left no room for misunderstanding. He informed me that he had no responsibility whatsoever for the imposition of closure periods and that it was entirely a matter for the body responsible for the creation of the records. He further went on to explain that there is no statutory basis for the closure of records created by Scottish public bodies. The Public Records Act 1958 specifically excludes anybody which is wholly or mainly concerned with Scottish affairs, or which carries on its activities wholly or mainly in Scotland.

I of course made Mr. John Home Robertson aware of this information provided by the Keeper of the Records of Scotland and requested that he assist me in obtaining access to Sergeant Hughes' report. He wrote in reply that he noted that there may be different accounts of how the closure was initiated but the key point seemed to be the fact that the decision was specifically confirmed by Lord Cullen. He went on to say that he thought it was entirely appropriate to protect children and that he could see no good reason to support my request for disclosure.

My next letter to Mr. Robertson pointed out that I was surprised that he was not concerned that the Crown Office provided him with false information. I put it to him that the next time he made an enquiry on behalf of a constituent how could he be sure of the accuracy of the
reply. I went on to suggest that the "good reason" might be found in the report, might well be in the public interest and only by the reading of it could it be judged whether the closure was justified or not. I also thought he would want to know why the Crown Office and others had given the impression that the closure order is backed by law when this is not the case. I asked him to reconsider his position.

Mr. Robertson replied that if Lord Cullen was satisfied there were good grounds for the closure order he would be reluctant to question his judgement. It did not seem to occur to Mr. Robertson that "good grounds" to Lord Cullen might be something quite different from the protection of the identity of children which he seemed so passionately to believe in.

At last, 16 months after I first wrote to my MP the Crown Office admitted that "the Public Records Acts are not applicable to Scotland." The letter stated that officials recommended to Lord Cullen that a 100 year disclosure be put on the papers but it did not state what department these officials belonged to.

The letter closed with the following:-

"If you are able to set out reasons why you consider it necessary to have access to the report, I will, however, consider the matter further."

I never was of course permitted access. To quieten public fears of a cover-up to protect the identity of important persons was not considered a 'necessary' reason. However this proved beyond doubt that there was no legal closure. If there had been I could not have been offered access under any circumstances.

The Crown Office sent me off on a wild goose chase by suggesting that much of the information I sought could be found on the internet. Fortunately I did not waste much time on this as it was obvious that information they wished to hide would not be freely available on the web. Since it had been established that there was no statutory authority for the closure I wondered from where the Lord Advocate derived the right to deny access. Mr. Robertson wrote to the Lord Advocate on my behalf. The reply was a typical lawyer's letter with much that was irrelevant.

However he wrote the following after referring to the England and Wales Public Records Act 1958:-

"Although there is no similar statutory obligation on Government departments in Scotland, the same practice is followed administratively."

Followed administratively hardly explains the authority to either allow or deny access to the documents. My question about the authority to deny access has never been answered but I was sent a paper entitled Guidelines on Extended Closure which I suppose they hoped would satisfy me. After studying the criteria detailed I could not find one that covered the plans of Dunblane Primary School nor Thomas Hamilton's autopsy report. I pointed out to my M.P. and the Lord Advocate that since the Guidelines had been sent to assist me I should be grateful if they would inform me which criterion covered the two examples mentioned. I have not had a reply and in fact the Lord Advocate has stated that he will not respond to any further letters from me. After fruitier correspondence Mr. Robertson closed a letter with the following:-

"My understanding is that Lord Cullen imposed the closure and that the Crown Office is implementing that decision."

Apart from Lord Sewell nobody at any time has suggested that the idea for closure came from Lord Cullen. The general consensus is that the proposal for a 100 year closure was put to him by officials unknown and he agreed.
In October 2002 my MP wrote

"If you can let me have one good reason why the identity of children who are referred to in the Dunblane Inquiry should be disclosed to you, I might be prepared to take this matter further."

I have never at any time made a request to know the identity of children and indeed on numerous occasions suggested the use of a felt tipped pen to blank out their names. It must be tedious reading what has been written and the replies received but felt that it was necessary to provide the background to my struggle to uncover the truth and to show how it became much more difficult when my elected representative refused to help. He may not see it that way as he dutifully forwarded my letters to the Lord Advocate and passed on his replies but the fact of the matter is that he acted as post box and nothing else.

It turned out that the other documents mentioned earlier were 105 productions apart from Sergeant Hughes' report amounting to tens of thousands of pages and taking up 20 feet of shelf space. That there were 106 productions on the closed list was known quite early on but the quantity held only came to light when the Lord Advocate gave it as an excuse for the delay in cataloguing all the material. As with most of the information released by the Lord Advocate or the Crown Office it just raised more questions. How was such a vast amount selected for closure? How can they justify claiming for so long that the closure was intended only to protect the identity of children when it is ridiculous to suggest that each and every one of these pages contains the name of a child?

Lord Cullen stated that there was no evidence of criminal behaviour on the behalf of Thomas Hamilton prior to the shooting but of course he may not consider the abuse of children a criminal offence. So who are the children named in the productions? If they were not abused by Hamilton who was guilty of interfering with these children? I bet they are now wishing that they had only imposed a 30 year closure as, if that had been done, it is unlikely anybody would have shown interest.

Even now the Lord Advocate is only agreeing to release some of the papers since there are some, he says, that are too sensitive to be made public. He claims that police reports are routinely closed, the identity of witnesses as well as children must be protected, the Data Protection Act must be considered and distress must not be caused but none of these conditions surfaced until after it was discovered that there was no statutory basis for the closure order.

I asked how many of the productions were police reports but of course as usual never received the information requested. What can be so sensitive that it cannot be made public for 100 years? I realise that in some cases witnesses have to be protected for their own safety but it is difficult to see how this is relevant in this instance. Witnesses were not called who could have provided crucial evidence. There are others who have more information on this than me however I know of two. A police officer was in the school at the time of or shortly after the shooting. He advised the first ambulance crew to arrive that it was safe to enter the gym as Hamilton was dead. On a matter as serious as this a police officer would have confirmed the facts himself before advising the ambulance crew so he had definitely been in the gym. Here is an officer present at the scene, trained to observe and give evidence so why was he not called to give evidence to the Inquiry?

When I raised this point the Lord Advocate in an attempt to minimise the importance of the police officer's non-attendance informed me that a trainee teacher had seen Hamilton shoot himself. This only made me more suspicious as the trainee teacher was not called to give evidence either. An injured schoolboy is alleged to have said that he saw the "bad man" (Thomas Hamilton) being shot so a lot of questions remain unanswered.

It is now possible to understand why the off-duty police officer was not called to give
evidence as his statement has come to light and it contradicts the evidence given to the Inquiry by the scene of crime officer. His statement was one of those documents considered too "sensitive" for release and must remain closed for 100 years.

Either through sheer incompetence or a genuine desire to comply with the Freedom of Information Act the off-duty police officer's statement was issued after a request to Central Scotland Police.

Crucially the officer stated that there were two pistols at the scene and that Hamilton had a tan coloured leather holster around his waist on the left side and was wearing a black boiler suit. The scene of crime officer in his evidence to the Inquiry said that there were two pistols and two revolvers at the scene and that Hamilton had four holsters strapped to him and that he was wearing dark corduroy trousers.

There is even doubt as to how Thomas Hamilton died. The gun that it is claimed he used would it is alleged have just about have blown his head right off. His body was speedily removed from the scene and was quickly cremated which of course makes it now very difficult to discover exactly what happened in the last minutes of his life. The authorities have complicated matters further by attempting to have part of Thomas Hamilton's autopsy report hidden for 100 years. What on earth can be in an autopsy report that requires it be kept secret for 100 years?

Is it normal for autopsy reports to have closure orders placed on them and is it common practice to remove items from a crime scene and arrange cremation so quickly?

Many might say it is of little consequence how he died and that it is good riddance. However if he was murdered it has to be asked why and by whom and for what reason?

Did somebody already try to do away with him? It is alleged that a senior police officer provided him with an expensive launch that he certainly could not have afforded to buy himself.

Why would he be given such a generous gift?

Was it for services rendered?

He was on board that boat when it blew up and sank. He survived. Why was there no investigation?

The police, I believe, salvaged the boat at taxpayer's expense and claimed it was a training exercise. The more I have delved into this matter the more frustrated I have become and due to the evasive answers I have received I am now totally convinced that there has been a cover-up. I cannot say of what since I have no proof but the Cullen Inquiry seemed to raise more questions than give answers. Surely an inquiry is set up to make clear exactly what happened, who was involved and why it happened. The only certain fact is that sixteen children and a teacher died on that dreadful morning in March 1996.

The handgun ban was a result of the Inquiry and there is no doubt that many people genuinely felt that ownership of guns should be banned however the outlawing of owning these guns did not reduce crime. The number of crimes involving the use of guns has risen every year since 1996 and only this year has a slight decrease been recorded. It was almost unknown for legally held weapons to be used to commit a crime but unfortunately due to the almost hysterical campaign the spotlight fell on law abiding sportsmen and women instead of on the incompetence shown or, more seriously, on the favours given to Thomas Hamilton by the police. The campaign did of course divert attention from the question as to why a serious investigation was not carried out into all aspects of Thomas Hamilton's life including his associates.
How different from the inquiry into the killing of two little girls in Soham which even forced the resignation of a Chief Constable. No serious attempt was made to discover what drove Hamilton to commit such a crime, if his friends had an influence on him or to find out where he was and who he met on the morning before he arrived at the school. A housemaster at Queen Victoria School alleged that Thomas Hamilton had access to the facilities at the school and that there were other unauthorised visitors.

He reported his suspicions to his superiors but instead of being praised his flat was raided by the police, his computer confiscated and he was forced to resign. A very strange string of events which it would appear require to be investigated. This creates a difficulty as it would seem that the action taken by the police would have to be part of any investigation. However I believe Strathclyde Police have been given this task. Will they do their job or become part of the cover-up? Given that it is taking years to prepare the papers for release and that some will remain closed I do not believe anything of importance will be found in the pages the public will be allowed access to.

Only a fresh inquiry will be able to establish who is being protected and why. It could have started with something as simple as a small lie to protect the identity of someone in the public eye who at one time had known Thomas Hamilton but now did not wish that innocent acquaintanceship to become public knowledge. Of course more lies have to be told to cover the original and the whole process snowballs. On the other hand there could be a paedophile ring operating and that is much more serious. However as I said I have no proof of why the authorities are being so obstructive but their actions have convinced me that they are certainly trying to hide something.

WW Scott

**A Dunblane Housemaster's story**

The ex-housemaster Glenn Harrison's synopsis of events about physical and sexual abuse at Queen Victoria School (QVS) as related to a journalist in 2003.

Personal and in confidence to Davy R about QVS.

"I am convinced it was a Masonic conspiracy, Ministry Of Defence (MoD), Her Majesty's Schools Inspectorate (HMI), and Her Majesty's Commissioners (HMCs), military top brass and others. The matter was a cover-up to protect people in high office in Government."

I know nothing of the conditions inside the school as it is now. I can only describe to you my beliefs and feelings about the school as it was 12 years ago. I have had contact from reporters and journalists time and time again. I have had enough. All they want is a story; "here today and gone tomorrow". There is nothing new here. This is not a revelation. I do not have videos, written statements or lists of names or secret documents. Everything I know is here printed below. I cannot tell you everything. It would take too long and I am trying to forget it now.

Until Robbie [the Pict] phoned about six weeks ago and introduced me to Tom Minogue it was all gone and past. All of the letters/literature I wrote is lost now. I had to give it up; my wife pleaded with me to forget the past and just get on with life. I am lucky to have a job at all.

The background

In order to get a true picture of QVS we need to go back to the 19th century, the old colonial days of Gordon Kitchener, Rhodes and Baden Powell. Where Eton and Harrow were templates of all good schools that bred young men fit to rule an empire. Where bullying and survival of the fittest was the order of the day - Tom Brown eat your heart out!
QVS begins in the later days of the colonisation of Africa. The year 1899 saw the Boer war and if you look on any war memorial for that war the bulk of the names are Scottish. Most of the soldiers killed were Scottish and in 1900 there were so many orphans in Scotland a petition was sent to the Queen. As a result she set up a Royal charter for the school, to care for the sons of Scottish Servicemen. It was indeed a noble cause. In 1902 the building started and the school officially opened in 1908. There is also a sister school in Dover called the Duke of York and both schools operated on the same lines.

In WW2 both schools operated together in Dunblane where it was safe from bombs. But originally QVS was not a school, it was an orphanage, and boys were taught trades and raised as prospective soldiers for future wars or military conflicts. Boys who would become men, "young men fit to rule or serve an empire". Here a young man would have a golden opportunity of being provided for by the state. Imagine a poor boy from the poor areas of Glasgow (in the Edwardian times) being financed through private military school! There were many applicants and long waiting lists. In 1990, it costs almost twice as much to send a pupil through QVS as Eton!

Each boy would have standard issue, boy-size clothes. In 1990 a single kilt alone cost over £350.00 each. From socks to vests and underpants and full military dress boy-size uniforms, English redcoat-red. They would be able to follow in the footsteps of their fathers, learn a trade, basic literacy and learn the pipes, drums or both. It was a school for the sons of squaddies, not officers, but always to strive for the same standards on the sports field and military fetes. He would learn how to lead, be tough, strong, how to use and assemble weaponry of all kinds, and most of all be trusted with secrets.

But there was something else - going to QVS meant joining a brotherhood that spans decades, and old boys association and was/is very strong. QVS was/is a regiment in its own right, with its own colours and traditions, and each boy wears his father's regimental insignia on his uniform and pipes. The sound of the pipes would send shivers down the spine, little soldiers in bright red tunics with hunting Stuart kilts would march in perfect formation, their Glenn Garry tassels blowing in the wind and their shoes so polished you could use them as a mirror.

What could be more perfect? Much of the school business was shrouded in secrecy and was protected behind the Official Secrets Act (OSA). Even the finances were often hidden and many of the traditions were unwritten and rituals were common, trials of strength and stamina run by the older boys who endured suffering themselves as young boys and felt duty bound to continue the tradition. Fagging was common, young boys treated brutally by older boys which was tolerated by the staff. Bullying is good for you! Teachers would teach boys and boys teach other boys and so ad infinitum.

The sound of boots marching and sergeant majors screaming commands and boys obeying: "Yes, Sa!" "No, Sa!". Black cars with official insignia arrived. Officers with Sam Brown and stick under their arms visited the school, saluting and almost goose stepping around the place, were held in great reverence. Boys saluted saying, "Sa!". On Parents’ day, with parades, the parents were almost afraid of the staff and very submissive, especially the mothers. The children were taught not to complain, never to tell because this was weakness and who knows you might break down under interrogation by the enemy one day, so do not tell anything, "we are training you up for this". How easy it is to fool young boys.

Father: How are you son?
Son: Fine. But dad they ...
Father: Stand up straight, son.
Son: But dad they ... they ...
Father: Never complain, son. A real man doesn't complain, never complain.

Son: Yes, dad, OK.

Father: A good man doesn't complain son, right! That's life son, that's the way it goes.

Mother: And your father may be promoted to major soon and think of the pension when he retires!

Son: ... well ... errrr ... well, I guess I must be OK then.

The parents rarely knew of the secret horrors that awaited their sons. Broken bones, which happened when they fell down the steps, or an "accident" in rugby. Rugby! Haaa! There's an excuse! A bully's paradise and the teachers just turned a blind eye - part of school tradition. We must not interfere. They have to learn to be tough.

Several staff were ex-Navy sub-mariners and commanders. Boys had no one to speak to, to pour their hearts out to. I was approached in the early hours of the morning by boys. I was horrified and afraid of what they told me. There were no guidance teachers, advisors. Matrons were just skivvies and trained to get on with their work and keep their mouths shut. It was like stepping back in time! QVS was/is an anachronism.

I was to learn that many teachers were Masons, as was the head teacher and another housemaster, and, of course, so was the man who ran the show: the Brigadier.

Boys were told that women were there to obey and you had to behave or be beaten by bigger, stronger men. Full-time women teachers only came in after 1992. Housemasters and teachers, having signed the Official Secrets Act (OSA), were loath to discuss personal problems. Pensions were at stake, promotions and futures. We had to write reports and 99 per cent of complaints were filed in the bin. Parents, usually serving military, were loath to complain lest their promotion or pension prospects were endangered. Dealings were mainly through their COs.

Housemasters used to be army majors but then they brought in civvies in the 70s, to cope with increasing academic challenges. When I was originally interviewed for the job, I told the head teacher that nothing stands still or it stagnates, that my intention was to keep abreast of modern education developments to bring the school out of the 19th Century and into the 90s and prepare for a new 21st Century. He seemed to like that and I got the job based on my experience after five years previously working in a boarding school in Shropshire.

I was in for a shock! Older boys were allowed to use younger boys as slaves. Naughty boys were given to older boys to punish (fagging). I was told this was traditional - an unwritten code and I would not understand their ways because this was Scotland and I was English. I strongly objected and started to question the older boys, to write reports objecting to these traditions.

As time went by, more and more boys opened up and told the most dreadful and appalling stories. I fell into disrepute among staff. The Brigadier and military contingencies (the real rulers of the school) wanted me out. (The head teacher gave me an excellent reference before I left, by the way!)

I was in for a shock! One of the main problems was who do you complain to? There was no clear complaints procedure. There were official looking bodies of people called HMCs - who spoke with posh, authoritative English accents - who would pretend to be considering your written complaints, in mock complaints meetings. They took months to answer a single letter with no real answer at all! They even posed as a committee representative to appear sympathetic and take notes as you spoke, then, when you had gone, tear it all up and throw
It in the bin. I was told this had gone on for years! Meanwhile, I would be fooled into thinking the procedures were being followed, but never a word came back. I found out later the reports were never filed and recorded at all and the HMCs mysteriously gone, non-existent.

It all started when I refused to go to tea with a prince. "You fool," other staff said. "You have ruined a great career and a good pension!" I was alarmed at the brutality, and, if it was the last thing I did, I would stop it once and for all - job or no job. I was naive to think it would be all so easy. My wife and I refused to go to our places by the side of Prince Andrew at the mess meal table, in protest at the many unheard voices and suffering of young boys. I told the Brigadier to stop playing soldiers and "get his act together". No one had ever spoken like that to him before. Some of the stories the boys told me were horrifying and I found myself fighting for the child's right to complain and be heard, and be happy, to grow up in a caring, family atmosphere of trust.

I recalled the poet's words: "For we can house their bodies but not their souls - for their souls dwell in the house of tomorrow where you cannot come, not even in your dreams."

(Children from The Prophet by Khalil Gibran).

I said on several occasions that some day, I believe, one of these boys will pick up a machine gun, which he was trained to use at QVS, and murder innocent people in a shopping mall or public place, because he was abused and deeply disturbed as a child at QVS. "When?" they ask: I don't know! It's a time bomb, the results of when secret organisations and people are allowed to act with impunity.

We all have an accounting and a responsibility to these lads! They do not belong to the Ministry of Defence they are our responsibility, they are the seeds of tomorrow and they have a right to be happy and grow up in a disciplined and caring environment, whether it's Scotland or anywhere else on earth.

I told the police, the social service, child-line, Esther Rantzen and others, NSPCC, and dozens of agencies. All of them ignored me. I eventually wrote to parents and told them that their children did not belong to the MoD, but to them, and the children's welfare was all that mattered. Their children have a right to be here and be happy. That joining the army is not the only career and that it's OK if they like poetry and literature and hate rugby, because we are all different; that there are many battles in life and not all of them are won with guns and brutality.

I told the head teacher, this was no way to run a school in the 90s and that the MoD were not genuinely concerned with the educational process or care of the young. But, alas, the powers were above him. He was more of a figurehead, a puppet ruler under command of the Brigadier. There was confusion between the culture of secrecy and genuine confidences that are in place to protect the innocent.

As housemaster, I saw myself acting in loco parentis and I wanted to know where the boys were, what they were doing and whether they were happy, or otherwise. Boys would go away on weekend military camps, and with the Brigadier to his home, or to homes of top brass or HMC or high-society Perthshire people, fiscals, sheriffs, police officials. They had to take their kilts and clean underwear and I was not given a contact address. What went on at these parties was secret but some boys were very disturbed. Older boys with younger boys, I became disturbed too, screams in the dorm at night, empty beds, rituals in dark places, and used warm, filled, condoms hurriedly abandoned. There was fear throughout every age group and the teachers knew about it.
I complained but was ignored. I was advised to get out. What was I supposed to do? I had no pastoral training, and no one to talk to. I told the police and social services but to no avail. The staff cut me off, missiles were thrown at my window, and I was warned to keep my mouth shut. I was living dangerously in a Mason stronghold. I picked the phone up one day and was growled at, as though a bear was on the other end. I was fuming mad to say the least! Eventually the police came and bashed down the door of my home and took House cash and House records, then arrested me. I was taken to Dunblane Police Station where I was interviewed for over an hour by special detectives brought from Edinburgh. Never from that day to this have I had any explanation for that action.

In 1993/94, I took the sword again and found I was totally blocked and alone. They owe me a lot more than an explanation. I wrote to Andrew Mellor in 1992/3, Scotland's guidance advisor at the time and he was appalled and showed a determination to help me. Then suddenly, out of the blue, he was promoted to Chief Bullying Officer and the communicating stopped.

Thomas Hamilton's friend, fellow housemaster and primary teacher, Ben Philip (a Mason), died aged 44 in some freak accident in the school hall in December 1993. I think Philip's death was suspicious, to say the least. I think he was a man with a conscience and about to crack. A brother Mason surgeon filled in the death certificate with an appropriate bogus cause of death. If I had stayed at QVS I would have been dead too. Jim Wallace helped me as my MP, but said he hit a brick wall.

The MoD threw the Official Secrets Act at me, Her Majesty's Inspectorate virtually ignored me. Shame on them! But Wallace forced them ('94) to send me a progress report to show the details of changes that had been brought in the school since I left. A female AHT has been appointed, and the introduction of individual rooms instead of dorms, and last but not least, girl pupils!

So here we have the stage set which led to 16 children and a teacher lying needlessly dead in a Dunblane graveyard. What possible connection is there? Two dead men, a gun club, vulnerable little boys, and a nest of Masons. These deceitful men have been hiding behind a screen of apparent respectability for decades, centuries even, high-ranking respectable persons preying on young boys who were conditioned to remain silent, thinking they were heroes by not telling. Not all boys were abused and these were often the abusers and bullies themselves, and will be in a hurry to defend the honour of the school.

In the HMI's report I was accused of exaggerating, but they never interviewed me or spoke with me at all, nor did they send me a report. It was as if I did not exist.

There were serious reports of abuse in the fifties that never made it out of the QVS gates! Paedophilia is not new, it was and is today a huge problem, a cancer in society. All hidden behind the Official Secrets Act! Even Dickens tried to expose it and we can see some of the characters like Oliver Twist and the Beadle. Dickens was told that he would not have sold his books if he told too much. This is what I firmly believe but cannot prove, try as I will. QVS was a perfect cover for institutional physical and sexual abuse.

At first it was orphan boys. On and off, over decades, QVS has supplied children (with sealed lips) for abuse: "Where the carcass is, there the eagles gather." They were accessible to
"eagles" like top brass military, politicians, police officials, sheriffs, fiscals and successful business people in Perthshire. And fools like me could be squashed, swallowed up or sent to some island somewhere. They all gather at the water hole.

Outrageous, you say? There are similar stories from Wellbeck college and Duke of York, where names of the famous are well known associations, including famous Statesmen. The link is Masons, masters of secrecy and deception. Which is where Hamilton comes in to the story. The weak link in the powerful chain of abusers. Here we have a perfect situation where boys, sworn to secrecy, and parents under orders to keep quiet, helpless to complain. Hamilton was unbalanced and had power by knowledge. This is why he was allowed to have guns. He was in on the secret and knew names of those other paedophilia members.

If those names get out even now after 12 years, there will be a riot and the press will have a field day! Lives and careers will be ruined! Is this why Hamilton's file went missing only hours after the killings? Is this why Lord Cullen, who I believe was a QVS Commissioner, was appointed to preside over the Hamilton investigations? This is how Masons operate. They control everything and their allegiance is to each other. No wonder they want a 100-year embargo on the Hamilton case!

HMC were invited into Office, not appointed by interview, and included head teachers, police, top military brass (retired), fiscals and generally rich, high society people. Ian Lang was chief Commissioner of QVS in 1990/91. After I complained in 1991, these HMCs suddenly disappeared into thin air. But I got nowhere. I am just a foolish teacher, Mr Nobody, who they squashed like a fly, the proverbial fool on the hill, "the man with a thousand voices talking perfectly loud, but nobody ever hears him, they know he's just a fool" (Beatles 1967). Yet I spoke out long before Hamilton committed his crime.

The Police knew this man had an unhealthy interest in little boys and guns and that he was a friend of the police, and a frequent visitor to the QVS shooting range. I saw him but I had no idea who he was at the time. I was never a member of any gun club, just a teacher doing my job caring for boys. I am most angry at the HMI. I confided in them with details. My allegations were never investigated except by the police, and their file remains closed to all, including Wallace, my MP. But the HMI betrayed a teacher. They never interviewed me - no one ever did - I did not exist! They interviewed pupils and parents, who were briefed by the MoD and known to be loyal to the QVS management. QVS was under their auspices. They failed the community and destroyed their own credibility.

The English HMI were frozen into disbelief when I copied the material to them in London in 1994, and the GTC, of which I am a registered member, were equally helpless. In 2000, at the inspection of Baltasound Junior High School, I called them to a private meeting; the HMI were positively uneasy with me and "bit my head off" when I referred to QVS.

I did some research some years ago and found that Masons are not only an anachronism but are powerfully implicated in nearly all cases of institutional abuse of orphan children going back over years in England, Wales and Scotland, Dickens' Beadle lives! Even if they are not direct perpetrators of abuse, they hide or disappear vital files that prevent the matter from going to court, appoint bogus fellow Mason investigators like Lord Cullen - and all to protect their brethren and their own reputations.

Biblical language is the only way I can think of aptly describing Masons: "this brood of serpents", "these whitewashed graves full of dead men's bones". Secret societies bring shame to Scotland. Circles and windmills! Why don't old boys, now men, complain? Because they are invited into the "care" of "the Mason-fold" with all its privileges - wheels within wheels, windmills and circles? This is the way secret societies perpetuate themselves. Would you want people to know how you were treated at QVS if you had a young wife and a family? The old boys association is very, very strong and Mason-controlled. Not all boys were
abused, maybe only a relatively small percentage. Expect hundreds to rally to the defence of QVS who will say how wonderful were their days at QVS.

The most precious resource is people! How can we raise up a new nation, as part of a cancerous system based secret societies? Scotland is a new nation full of talent and tremendous natural resources. The young are the seeds of tomorrow, our scientists, lawyers, all kinds of professionals, a responsible electorate - the young people - the Scotland of tomorrow? Somebody has got to stop Masons!

My wife once described me as a general going into battle - with no army. Yes, I would like justice to be done and Masons discredited, but I have done my bit. Maybe someday someone will have the courage (and good luck) to tear down that barrier and expose secret societies who hide behind respectability and use their fellow human beings to satisfy their own gratification and desire - and then further abuse their power to cover it all over for 100 years, when they will be safe, long gone from the scene, and not accountable any more. Is it any wonder they want their membership of the lodge to be a secret! They may say: "Who is this man who says such terrible things? Let him stand in a court of law and prove it! I can't, not now. I am just an ordinary teacher, not even promoted. Who am I to stand up against the might of the MoD who have sent countless men to their deaths in war, or tell the proud Cullen that he is corrupt and shames his countrymen? If I received help all those years ago, and responsible agencies had seen the proverbial "red light for danger", AND INVESTIGATED MY ALLEGATIONS THOROUGHLY, then maybe Thomas Hamilton could have been stopped, blacklisted and disarmed by a responsible Central Police Force. And maybe, just maybe, those wee graves in a cold Dunblane graveyard would be green grass. Maybe there would be still another dedicated teacher like Gwen who died so bravely, and maybe, just maybe another 16 twelve year-olds, like the pride of Scotland's youth, paused ready to be launched into their lives as a new nation is born!

I have climbed the great mountain and crossed the wide river. I have put my job and life on the line - I can do no more. I've had enough and my family have suffered too. Now I want to go home to myself. For my sins, I have settled in my exile on this most northerly Isle; I have fought the battle and lost, and now I want to tend my oysters in peace. Let others fight the battle. I've had enough. I cannot answer any more question, give names or details, videos.

If you want answers to the Hamilton killings then QVS is the place to go and DIG. I would like to be left in peace. I can do no more now. GH

There you go folks. That's the end of the chapter's on the actual science of Mind Control.

I know Dunblane will still be a rather sensitive subject for many of my fellow Scot's but facts are facts. And until ALL the facts concerning the events of that fateful day are in the public domain we (in my opinion) are dishonouring all of those little angels.

Now we will look at how these people took their mass insanity into your living room.
Chapter Twenty Five

Television is the most powerful weapon of psychological warfare in history and yet it is a member of the family in most households. The programming that we are constantly assaulted with conditions us to a particular worldview. This fake reality changes our behaviour making us less active and more compliant with society's shortcomings. Since television is controlled by a small handful of powerful corporations, viewers will never witness informing, truthful news and entertainment. As political and corporate power unite at an ever increasing rate, being informed is more important than ever. People need to seek out independent and alternative unbiased sources on the internet for their information or we will continue to be manipulated by the corporate controlled media.

Jordan Maxwell: The bottom line is that the government is getting what they ordered. They do not want your children to be educated. They do not want you to think too much. That is why our country and our world has become so proliferated with entertainments, mass media, television shows, amusement parks, drugs, alcohol, and every kind of entertainment to keep the human mind entertained so that you don't get in the way of important people by doing too much thinking. You better wake up and understand that there are people who are guiding your life and you don't even know it.

Steven Jacobson: Television is the most powerful weapon of psychological warfare in history. The programming that we are constantly assaulted by throughout our lives conditions us. It programs us to a particular worldview. Now, we may consider it normal because we were born into this system of lies and deception. And because we were born into this situation and our parents were born into it and have suffered from it, we don't know any better.

Aldous Huxley: What I may call the messages of Brave New World, but it is possible to make people contented with their servitude. I think this can be done. I think it has been done in the past. I think it could be done even more effectively now because you can provide them with bread and circuses and you can provide them with endless amounts of distractions and propaganda.

George Carlin: But there's a reason, there's a reason. There's a reason for this. There's a reason education sucks and it's the same reason it will never ever ever be fixed. It's never gonna get any better, don't look for it. Be happy with what you got, because the owners of this country don't want that. They don't want a population of citizens capable of critical thinking. They don't want well informed, well educated people capable of critical thinking. They're not interested in that.

A few choice quote's from Howard Beale (remember from chapter one?) They are once again taken from the fantastic film “Network”:

We know things are bad, worse than bad. They're crazy. It's like everything everywhere is going crazy so we don't go out anymore. We sit in the house and slowly the world was living in is getting smaller and all we say is please at least leave us alone in our living rooms. Let me have my toaster and my TV and my steel belted radios and I won't say anything, just leave us alone. Well I'm not going to leave you alone. I want you to get mad! I want you to get up now. I want all of you to get up out of your chairs. I want you to get up right now and go to the window, open it and stick your head out and yell, I'm as mad as hell and I'm not going to take this anymore! You've got to say, I'm a human being God damn it, my life has value!

Right now, there is a whole, an entire generation that never knew anything that didn't come out of this tube. This tube is the gospel, the ultimate revelation; this tube can make or break presidents, popes, prime ministers; this tube is the most awesome goddamn propaganda
force in the whole godless world, and woe is us if it ever falls into the hands of the wrong people... When the 12th largest company in the world controls the most awesome goddamn propaganda force in the whole godless world, who knows what shit will be peddled for truth on this network?

The last one by Howard is in my opinion the best one...

You're beginning to believe the illusions we're spinning here, you're beginning to believe that the tube is reality and your own lives are unreal. You do. Why, whatever the tube tells you: you dress like the tube, you eat like the tube, you raise your children like the tube, you even think like the tube. This is mass madness, you maniacs. In God's name, you people are the real thing, WE are the illusion.

Our problem is that we have forgotten our real history, we because of what TV tells us only live for the here and now as well, when both these points are combined it basically means we that we are living in a permanent cognitive dissonance where our only connection to our past is the bullshit peddled to us all through a thoroughly corrupt media, as Howard Beale pointed out, WE ARE THE REALITY, TV is an illusion, yet as he also pointed out, it is us who are trying to conform to TV, it's utter madness. History is being re-written on that horrible contraption perpetually. And you believe it all. You think they wouldn't lie to you? You're nuts. I'm rather ashamed that a man from my country, from a part of my land, (so close in fact that I can see it just out the window across the water from where I am typing this) created this monstrosity.

How could this decent Scottish man have known the Frankenstein he'd unwittingly create? I am glad that he never realised that he had a hand in the birth of the world's most efficient weapon of mass distraction. (Of course it wasn't his fault, this wasn't his idea by any stretch of the imagination; he thought and hoped he'd done something useful for all.)

Instead of doing us a service though, what he actually done was he created a device that was hijacked and utilised for the overthrowing of the whole of humanity. And unlike any other weapon that was used before, his one left no visible marks. It made an A bomb look like lighting a fart. This thing devastates whole civilisations!

You didn't even realise that it was a weapon. You still think it's merely entertainment!! Trust me friend it's killed more people than cancer, drug's, and AIDS combined. Right now your letting your country (I take it most readers will be in UK, USA, etc) slaughter untold millions of (black/brown/any colour apart from white actually) people in countries all around this planet because of it, and you have probably never even realised it.

When you think about it though, it was television that showed you what all those nasty terrorists have just done wasn't it? It's also the box which tells you why we have to invade somewhere (for their own good), where all your savings have disappeared to, why your investments are now worth hee-haw (Jockanese for worthless), whose good, whose bad,
whose a nutter, who is telling you the objective truth, etc. etc. etc. Think about it, for most of you a vast portion of your reality is defined from a slab of electronics stuck on your wall. There ironically used to be a kids show I remember that summed it up perfectly called “Why don’t you” I can remember that it used to point out in its starting sequence – “Why don’t you just switch of your television set, go outside and do something less boring instead” I couldn’t have put it better myself, (but you’ll maybe still have your doubts about me, so, will the fact that I have already pointed out the fact that the it was actually the TV that said it make you think it was more truthful?) - Either way do it!

Learn to read again, find your own facts. Make your own mind up. Make your own decisions. Use my theory as a sort of TV guide for the internet, I've “conveniently” been giving you a copy of whole articles as we have progressed, (look them up for yourself if you have to). (Having a copy in case it's been deleted too was also a coincidence) Dig deeper, get to the bottom of all the things that play a part in your life. Be yourself again. Learn. Take back your life, or...

Keep watching a box that will perpetually keep you feeling poor, unsuccessful, inadequate, fearful (on command), (and petrified if required), dumb, ignorant, and most importantly, compliant for the rest of your days while the world turns to utter shit around you. –

The choice my dear friend is of course entirely yours.

All I will say in order to make my case is this: How many of the things that you are currently reading about have you seen being put before you in the manner that I presented them?

(This is on any subject I have covered)

How many of these issues have you seen being discussed on your TV, or have been mentioned in any of your newspapers?

C'mon I'm no genius, these facts were in large parts written by the same people I am saying should be aware of them for god's sake, there's no way I'm the only one putting all of these pieces together.

So who is being honest with you, them or me?

I rest my case. - Read on...

As I said at the start of the section, you think TV portrays life as it happens, when the truth has always been that we all conform to the fantasy that is TV. - It in fact defines our reality.

How Television Controls And Programs Minds - Turn Off Your Television By L. Wolfe 3-14-5

The subconscious is powerful. It is aware of every particle and detail around you. But it doesn't know the difference between fact or fiction and acts on all information passing through the conscious mind as fact, and responds to it. So what do you think happens when you watch silly, moron, goofy commercials and television programs? They are training your thought processes.

Hey buddy, I'm talking to you. Yes, you, the guy sitting in front of the television. Turn down the sound a bit, so that you can hear what I am saying. Now, try to concentrate on what I am going to say. I want to talk to you about your favourite pastime. No, it's not baseball or football, although it does have something to do with your interest in spectator sports. I'm talking about what you were just doing: watching television.

Do you have any idea about how much time you spend in front of the television set? According to the latest studies, the average American now spends between five and six
hours a day watching television. Let's put that in perspective: that is more time than you spend doing anything else but sleeping or working, if you are lucky enough to still have a job.

That's more time than you spend eating, more time than you spend with your wife alone, more time than with the kids. It's even worse with your children. According to these same studies, young children below school age watch more than eight hours each day. School age children watch a little under eight hours a day. In 1980, the average 20-year-old had watched the equivalent of 14 months of television in his or her brief lifetime. [That's 14 months, 24 hours a day.]

More recent figures show that the numbers have climbed: the 20-year-old has spent closer to two full years of his or her life in front of the television set. At the same time, the researchers have noted a disturbing phenomenon. It seems that we Americans are getting progressively more [stupid]. They note a decline in reading and comprehension levels in all age groups. Americans read less and understand what they read less than they did 10 years ago, less than they have at any time since research began to study such things.

As for writing skills, Americans are, in general, unable to write more than a few simple sentences. We are among the least literate people on this planet, and we're getting worse. It's the change—the constant trendline downward—that interests these researchers. More than one study has correlated this increasing stupidity of our population to the amount of television they watch.

Interestingly, the studies found that it doesn't matter what people watch, whether it's The Simpsons or McNeil/Lehrer, or Murphy Brown or Nightline: the more television you watch, the {less literate, the more stupid} you are. The growth in television watching had surprised some of the researchers. Back a decade ago, they were predicting that television watching would level off and might actually decline. It had reached an absolute saturation point.

They were right for so-called network television; figures show a steady drop-off of viewership. But that drop is more than made up for by the growth of cable television, with its smorgasbord of channels, one for almost every perversion. Especially in urban and suburban areas, Americans are hard-wired to more than 100 different channels that provide them with all news, like CNN, all movies, all comedy, all sports, all weather, all financial news and a liberal dose of straight pornography.

The researchers had also failed to predict the market penetration of first beta and then VHS video recorders; they made it possible to watch one thing and record another for later viewing. They also offered access to movies not available on networks or even cable channels as well as home videos, recorded on your own little camcorder. The proliferation of home video equipment has involved families in video-related activities which are not even considered in the cumulative totals for time Americans spend watching television.

You might not actually realize how much you are watching television. But think for a moment. When you come home, you turn the television on, if it isn't on already. You read the paper with it on, half glancing at what is on the screen, catching a bit of the news, or the plot of a show. You eat with it on, maybe in the background, listening for a score or something that happens to a character in a show you follow.

When something you are interested in, a show or basketball game, is on, the set becomes the centre of attention. So your attention to what is on may vary in intensity, but there is almost no point when you are home, and inside, and have the set completely off. Isn't that right? The studies did not break down the periods of time people watched television, according to the intensity of their viewing.
But the point is still made: you compulsively turn the television on and spend a good portion of your waking hours glued to the tube. And the studies also showed that many people can't sleep without the television turned on! Brainwashing Now, I'm sure you have heard that watching too much television is bad for your health. They put stories like that on the evening news. Bad for your eyes to stare at the screen, they say. Especially bad if you sit too close. Well, I want to make another point.

We've already shown that you are addicted to the tube, watching it between six and eight hour a day. But it is an addiction that brainwashes you. There are two kinds of brainwashing. The one that's called hard brainwashing is the type you're most familiar with. You've got a pretty good image of it from some of those old Korean war movies. They take some guy, an American patriot, drag him into a room, torture him, pump him full of drugs, and after a struggle, get him to renounce his country and his beliefs. He usually undergoes a personality change, signified by an ever-present smile and blank stare.

This brainwashing is called hard because its methods are overt. The controlled environment is obvious to the victim; so is the terror. The victim is overwhelmed by a seemingly omnipotent external force, and a feeling of intense isolation is induced. The victim's moral strength is sapped, and slowly he embraces his torturers. It is man's moral strength that informs and orders his power of reason; without it, the mind becomes little more than a recording machine waiting for imprints. No one is saying that you have been a victim of hard brainwashing. But you have been brainwashed, just as effectively as those people in the movies. The blank stare? Did you ever look at what you look like while watching television?

If the angle is right, you might catch your own reflection in the screen. Jaw slightly open, lips relaxed into a smile. The blank stare of a television zombie. This is soft brainwashing, even more effective because its victims go about their lives unaware of what is being done to them. Television, with its reach into nearly every American home, creates the basis for the mass brainwashing of citizens, like you.

It works on a principle of tension and release. Create tension, in a controlled environment, increasing the level of stress. Then provide a series of choices that provide release from the tension. As long as the victim believes that the choices presented are the only choices available, even if they are at first glance unacceptable, he will nevertheless, ultimately seek release by choosing one of these unacceptable choices. Under these circumstances, in a brainwashing, controlled environment, such choice-making is not a rational experience. It does not involve the use of man's creative mental powers; instead man is conditioned, like an animal, to respond to the tension, by seeking release.

The key to the success of this brainwashing process is the regulation of both the tension and the perceived choices. As long as both are controlled, then the range of outcomes is also controlled. The victim is induced to walk down one of several pathways acceptable for his controllers. The brainwashers call the tension-filled environment social turbulence. The last decades have been full of such social turbulence-economic collapse, regional wars, population disasters, ecological and biological catastrophes. Social turbulence creates crises in perceptions, causing people to lose their bearings.

Adrift and confused, people seek release from the tension, following paths that appear to lead to a simpler, less tension-filled life. There is no time in such a process for rational consideration of complicated problems. Television is the key vehicle for presenting both the tension and the choices. It brings you the images of the tension, and serves up simple answers. Television, in its world of semi-reality, of illusion, of escape from reality, is itself the single most important release from our tension-wracked existence. Eight hours a day, every day, through its programming, you are being programmed. If you doubt me, think about one important choice that you have made recently that was not in some way influenced by something that you have seen on television. I bet you can't think of one. That's how controlled you are. Who's Doing It But don't take my word for it.
Ten years ago we spoke to a man from a think tank called the Futures Group in Connecticut. Hal Becker had spent more than 20 years of his life manipulating the minds of the leaders of our society. Listen to what he said: I know the secret of making the average American believe anything I want him to. Just let me control television.

Americans are wired into their television sets. Over the last 30 years, they have come to look at their television sets and the images on the screen as reality. You put something on television and it becomes reality. If the world outside the television set contradicts the images, people start changing the world to make it more like the images and sounds of their television.

Because its influence is so great, so pervasive, it has become part of our lives. You lose your sense of what is being done to you, but your mind is being shaped and moulded. Your mind is being shaped and moulded. If that doesn't sound like brainwashing, I don't know what is. Becker speaks with the élan of a network of brainwashers who have been programming your lives, especially since the advent of television as a mass medium in the late 1940s and early 1950s.

This network numbers several tens of thousands worldwide. Occasionally one appears on the nightly news to tell you what {you} are thinking, by reporting the latest opinion polls. But for the most part, they work behind the scenes, speaking to themselves and writing papers for their own internal distribution. And though they work for many diverse groups, these brainwashers are united by a common world view and common method. It is the world view of a small elite, whose financial and political power rests in institutions that pass this power on from generation to generation.

They view the common folk like yourself as little better than beasts of burden to be controlled and manipulated by a semi-feudal international oligarchy, whose wealth, power and bloodlines entitle them to rule. One of the oligarchy's institutions for manipulation of populations is located in a suburb of London called Tavistock. The Tavistock Institute for Human Relations, which also has a branch in Sussex, England, is the mother for much of this extended network, of which Becker is a member. They are the specialists in both hard and soft brainwashing.

The Tavistock Institute is the psychological warfare arm of the British Royal household. The oligarchs behind Tavistock, and similar outfits in the United States and elsewhere, are determined that you should be a television addict, sucking up a daily dose of brainwashing from the tube; that is how they control you. Like his fellow brainwashers, Becker prides himself in knowing the minds of his victims.

He calls them saps. Man, he told an interviewer, should be called homo the sap. Soft brainwashing by television works through power of suggestion. Television watching creates a state of drugged-like oblivion to outside reality. The mind, its perceptions dulled by habituated viewing, is ready to accept any new illusion of reality as presented on the tube. The mind, in its drugged-like stupor of television watching, is prepared to accept that the images that television {suggests} as reality {are} reality. It will then struggle to form fit a contradictory reality into television image, just as Becker claims. Another Tavistock brainwasher, Fred Emery, who studied television for 25 years, confirms this.

The television signal itself, he found, puts the viewer in this state of drugged-like oblivion. Emery writes: Television as a media consists of a constant visual signal of 50 half-frames per second. Our hypotheses regarding this essential nature of the medium itself are:

1) The constant visual stimulus fixates the viewer and causes the habituation of response. The prefrontal and association areas of the cortex are effectively dominated by the signal, the screen.
2) The left cortical hemisphere—the centre of visual and analytical calculating processes—is effectively reduced in its functioning to tracking changing images on the screen.

3) Therefore, provided, the viewer keeps looking, he is unlikely to reflect on what he is doing and what he is viewing. That is, he will be aware, but unaware of his awareness....

In other words, television can be seen partly as the technological analogue of the hypnotist.

The key to making the brainwashing work is the repetition of suggestion over time. With people watching the tube for 6 to 8 hours a day, there is plenty of time for such repeated suggestion. Some Examples. Let's look at an example to make things a bit clearer. Think back about 20 years ago. Think about what you thought about certain issues of the day. Think about those same issues today; notice how you seemed to change your mind about them, to become more tolerant of things you opposed vehemently before.

It's your television watching that changed your mind, or to use Becker's terms, shaped your perceptions.

Twenty years ago, most people thought that the lunacy that is now called environmentalism, the idea that animals and plants should be protected on an equal basis with human life, was screwy. It went against the basic concept of Christian civilization that man is a higher species than and distinct from the animals, and that it is man, by virtue of his being made in the image of the living God, whose life is sacred.

That was 20 years ago. But now, many people, maybe even you, seem to think otherwise; there are even laws that say so. This contrary, anti-human view of man being no more than equal to animals and plants was inserted into our consciousness by the suggestion of television. Environmental lunacy was scripted into network television shows, into televised movies, and into the news. It started slowly, but picked up steam. Environmental spokesmen were increasingly seen in the favourable glow of television. Those who opposed this view were shown in an unfavourable way. It was done over time, with repetition. If you weren't completely won over, you were made tolerant of the views of environmental lunatics whose statements were morally and scientifically unsound. Let's take a more recent example: the war against Iraq. That was a war made for television. In fact, it was a war organized through television. Think back a year: How were Americans prepared for the eventual slaughter of Iraqi women and children? Images on the screen: Saddam Hussein, on one side, Hitler on the other.

The images repeated in newscasts, backed up by scenes of alleged atrocities in Kuwait. Then the war itself: the video-game like images of smart weapons killing Iraqi targets. Finally, the American military commander-in-chief Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf, conducting a final press briefing that was consciously orchestrated to resemble the winning Superbowl coach describing his victory.

Those were the images that overwhelmed our population. Only now, months later, do we find out that the images had nothing to do with reality. The Iraqi atrocities in Kuwait and elsewhere were exaggerated. Our smart weapons like the famous Patriot anti-missile system didn't really work.

Oh, and the casualty figures: it seems that we murdered far more women and children than we did soldiers. Hardly a glorious victory. But while it might have made a difference if people knew this while the war was being planned or in progress, polls show that Americans no longer find the war or any stories about it interesting.'

Looking at the question more broadly, where did your children get most of their values, if
not from what they saw on television? Parents might counteract the influence of the infernal box, but they could not overcome it. How could they, if they themselves have been brainwashed by the same box and if their children spend more time with it than them? Studies show that most of television programming is geared to a less than 5th grade comprehension level; parents, like you, are themselves being remade in the infantile images of the television screen. All of society becomes more infantile, more easily controllable.

As Emery explains: {We are proposing that television as a simple constant and repetitive and ambiguous visual stimulus, gradually closes down the central nervous system of man.} Becker holds a similar view of the effect of television on American's ability to think:

{Americans don't really think--they have opinions and feelings. Television creates the opinion and then validates it.}

Nowhere is this clearer than with politics. Television tells Americans what to think about politicians, restricting choices to those acceptable to the oligarchs whose financial power controls networks and major cable channels. It tells people what has been said and what is important. Everything else is filtered out. You are told who can win and who can't. And few people have the urge to look behind the images in the screen, to seek content and truth in ideas and look for a high quality of leadership.

Such an important matter as choosing a president becomes the same as choosing a box of laundry detergent: a set of possibilities, whose limits are determined, by the images on the screen. You are given the appearance of freedom of choice, but that you have neither freedom nor real choice. That is how the brainwashing works. Are they brainwashed by the tube, said Becker to the interviewer.

It is really more than that. I think that people have lost the ability to relate the images of their own lives without television intervening to tell them what it means. That is what we really mean when we say that we have a wired society. Turn It Off! That was ten years ago. It has gotten far worse since then.

In coming issues, we will show you the brainwashers' vision of a hell on earth and how television is being used to get us there; we will discuss television programming, revealing how it has helped produce what is called a paradigm shift in values, creating an immoral society; we will explain how the news is presented and how its presentation has been used to destroy the English language; we will discuss the mass entertainment media, showing who controls it and how; we will deal with America's addiction to spectator sports and show how that too has helped make you passive and stupid; and finally, we will show where we are headed, if we can't break our addiction to the tube.

So, after what I just told you, what do say, buddy? Do you want to stay stupid and let your country go to hell in a basket? Why don't you just walk over to the set and turn it off. That's right, completely off. Go on, you can do it. Now isn't that better? Don't you feel a little better already? You've just taken the first step in deprogramming yourself. It wasn't that hard, was it? Until we speak again, try to keep it off. Now that will be a bit harder.

From New Federalist V6, #29.

Comment From Ted Twietmeyer 3-14-5 Regarding

http://www.rense.com/general63/traid.htm this article from rense.com

On May 2 2004, I wrote a very similar article to this one, about brainwashing and the Tavistock Institute. It was the first in my Couch Patriot series (http://www.rense.com/general52/couch.htm).
Their subversion of thought not just in America but around the world is well known. Is it any wonder that satellite dish television is being brought to the most remote corners of the earth, even if a solar panel is required?

Although it's easy to focus just on brainwashing of Americans, in reality the entire world is at stake. Ted Twietmeyer

Mass Mind Control Through Network Television: Are Your Thoughts Your Own?

By Alex Ansari, InformationLiberation.com, Apr 21, 2008

Why do countless American people go along with the War on Iraq? Why do so many people call for a police state control grid? A major component to a full understanding of why this kind of governmental and corporate corruption is to discover the modern science of mind control and social engineering. It's baffling to merely glance at the stacks of documentation that this world government isn't being constructed for the greater good of humanity. Although there are a growing number of people waking up the reality of our growing transparent soft cage, there seems to be just enough citizens who are choosing to remain asleep. Worse yet, there are even those who were at least partially awake at one time but found it necessary to return to the slumber of dreamland.

This is no accident; this is a carefully crafted design. The drive to dumb down the populations of planet earth is a classic art that existed before the United States did. One component to understanding and deciphering the systems of control is to become a student of the magicians of influence and propaganda. In order to defeat our enemies (or dictators), it's imperative that we understand how they think and what they believe in.

One of the most common examples of mind control in our so-called free and civilized society is the advent and usage of the television set. This isn't to say that all things on TV are geared towards brainwashing you. They're not. But most of the programming on television today is run by the largest media corporations that have interests in defence contracts, such as Westinghouse (CBS), and General Electric (NBC). This makes perfect sense when you see how slanted and warped the news is today. Examining the conflicts of interest is merely glancing at the issue, although to understand the multiple ways that lies become truth, we need to examine the techniques of brainwashing that the networks are employing.

Radio isn't any different in its ability to brainwash a population into submission. Sixty-seven years ago, six million Americans became unwitting subjects in an experiment in psychological warfare. It was the night before Halloween, 1938. At 8 p.m. CST, the Mercury Radio on the Air began broadcasting Orson Welles' radio adaptation of H. G. Wells' War of the Worlds. As is now well known, the story was presented as if it were breaking news, with bulletins so realistic that an estimated one million people believed the world was actually under attack by Martians. Of that number, thousands succumbed to outright panic, not waiting to hear Welles' explanation at the end of the program that it had all been a Halloween prank, but fleeing into the night to escape the alien invaders.

According to researcher Mack White (http://www.mackwhite.com/),

"Psychologist Hadley Cantril conducted a study of the effects of the broadcast and published his findings in a book, The Invasion from Mars: A Study in the Psychology of Panic. This study explored the power of broadcast media, particularly as it relates to the suggestibility of human beings under the influence of fear. Cantril was affiliated with Princeton University's Radio Research Project, which was funded in 1937 by the Rockefeller Foundation. Also affiliated with the Project was Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) member and Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS) executive Frank Stanton, whose network had broadcast the program. Stanton would later go on to head the news division of CBS, and in time would become president of the network, as well as chairman of the board of the RAND
Corporation, the influential think tank which has done groundbreaking research on, among other things, mass brainwashing. Two years later, with Rockefeller Foundation money, Cantril established the Office of Public Opinion Research (OPOR), also at Princeton. Among the studies conducted by the OPOR was an analysis of the effectiveness of “psycho-political operations” (propaganda, in plain English) of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), the forerunner of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). Then, during World War II, Cantril and Rockefeller money assisted CFR member and CBS reporter Edward R. Murrow in setting up the Princeton Listening Centre, the purpose of which was to study Nazi radio propaganda with the object of applying Nazi techniques to OSS propaganda. Out of this project came a new government agency, the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service (FBIS). The FBIS eventually became the United States Information Agency (USIA), which is the propaganda arm of the National Security Council. Thus, by the end of the 1940s, the basic research had been done and the propaganda apparatus of the national security state had been set up—just in time for the Dawn of Television."

Experiments conducted by researcher Herbert Krugman reveal that when a person watches television, brain activity switches from the left to the right hemisphere. The left hemisphere is the seat of logical thought. Here, information is broken down into its component parts and critically analyzed. The right brain, however, treats incoming data uncritically, processing information in wholes, leading to emotional, rather than logical responses. The shift from left to right brain activity also causes the release of endorphins, the body's own natural opiates—thus, it is possible to become physically addicted to watching television, a hypothesis borne out by numerous studies which have shown that very few people are able to kick the television habit. It's no longer an overstatement to note that the youth today that are raised and taught through network television are intellectually dead by their early teens.

The dumbing down of humanity is represented by another shift which occurs in the brain when we watch television. Activity in the higher brain regions (such as the neo-cortex) is diminished, while activity in the lower brain regions (such as the limbic system) increases. The latter, commonly referred to as the reptile brain, is associated with more primitive mental functions, such as the "fight or flight" response. The reptile brain is unable to distinguish between reality and the simulated reality of television. To the reptile brain, if it looks real, it is real. Thus, though we know on a conscious level it is "only a film," on a subconscious level we do not—the heart beats faster, for instance, while we watch a suspenseful scene. Similarly, we know the commercial is trying to manipulate us, but on an unconscious level the commercial nonetheless succeeds in, say, making us feel inadequate until we buy whatever thing is being advertised—and the effect is all the more powerful because it is unconscious, operating on the deepest level of human response. The reptile brain makes it possible for us to survive as biological beings, but it also leaves us vulnerable to the manipulations of television programmers. This is where the manipulators use our own emotions as strings to control us. The distortions and directions we are being moved to are taking place in the subconscious, often undetected.

Propaganda techniques were first codified and applied in a scientific manner by journalist Walter Lippman and psychologist Edward Bernays (nephew of Sigmund Freud) early in the 20th century. During World War I, Lippman and Bernays were hired by then United States President, Woodrow Wilson, to participate in the Creel Commission, the mission of which was to sway popular opinion in favour of entering the war, on the side of Britain. Edward Bernays said in his 1928 book Propaganda,

"The conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organized habits and opinions of the masses is an important element in democratic society. Those who manipulate this unseen mechanism of society constitute an invisible government which is the true ruling power of our country."
The Creel Commission provided themes for speeches by "four-minute men" at public functions, and also encouraged censorship of the American press. The Commission was so unpopular that after the war, Congress closed it down without providing funding to organize and archive its papers. The war propaganda campaign of Lippman and Bernays produced within six months such an intense anti-German hysteria as to permanently impress American business (and Adolf Hitler, among others) with the potential of large-scale propaganda to control public opinion. Bernays coined the terms "group mind" and "engineering consent", important concepts in practical propaganda work.

The current public relations industry is a direct outgrowth of Lippman's and Bernays' work and is still used extensively by the United States government. For the first half of the 20th century Bernays and Lippman ran a very successful public relations firm. World War II saw continued use of propaganda as a weapon of war, both by Hitler's propagandist Joseph Gobbles and the British Political Warfare Executive, as well as the United States Office of War Information.

Turn on your local newscast. You have a few minutes of blue-collar crime, hardly any white collar crime, a few minutes of sports, misc. chit chat, random political jibber-jabber, and a look at the weather that no one is forecasting correctly.

Is that what happened in your town? And we're supposed to own the airwaves! The mainstream media openly supports the interests of the prison industrial complex.

The stories focus on minority criminal groups, and exploit the real threat to appear much more dangerous than they are. Think about the growing per capita number of prisoners in the country. Then remember that this is happening at the same time that our prison boom began. The police on our streets have created criminals. The focus is to keep us in a state of fear, that way the elitists can attack any group they want to without fear of consequence. This is why the media is continuing to craft the timeless art of dehumanization.

The techniques are increasing in their sophistication over time as the mind scientists that serve the empire continue to discover scientific breakthroughs as to how the human brain functions, learns, retains information, and behaves. The most effective brainwashing techniques are used on the most successful propaganda networks. Examine the music bed that lies low during the fright night scope of the second. It's spooky. I wonder if we are supposed to be thinking with our minds or getting ready for stunt. Observe the graphics with the music. They're glitzy and flashing. Like the monkey that is attracted to shiny objects, it's our monkey hand that controls to remote often stops the search for entertainment when the proper amount of glamour catches their attention.

Most importantly, notice the repetition behind the lies that the politicians and their corporate media groupies tell us. You see, the unimaginable fallacies are created as 'truth' not because it's logical or provable, but because of the broken record technique. No matter how ridiculous the lie, it's repeated often enough that the brain doesn't know the difference between reality and nursery rhymes. This technique is underestimated in its ability to allow the puppeteers to hypnotize millions of people. Instead of "Fair and balanced" it's "We say it enough times, and you believe it."

It's a tragic day when the state can monopolize on the enslaving and imprisonment of a population. Hollywood will continue to frighten us with films on the mafia, gangsters, and the corrupt blue collar criminal whose stupidity and greed get them caught. In the end, our minds are already preconditioned to accept living in a police state economy and society because we read it in the paper, saw it praised on the news and talk shows, or saw it in a movie. There are several movies planned right now that support the official story of 911 and a few movies that glamorize the War on Iraq. According to David L Robb, Author of Operation Hollywood,
"Hollywood and the Pentagon have a long history of making movies together. It's a tradition that stretches back to the early days of silent films, and extends right up until the present day. It's been a collaboration that works well for both sides. Hollywood producers get what they want - access to billions of dollars worth of military hardware and equipment - tanks, jet fighters, nuclear submarines and aircraft carriers - and the military gets what it wants - films that portray the military in a positive light; films that help the services in their recruiting efforts. The Pentagon is not merely a passive supporter of films, however. If the Pentagon doesn't like a script, it will usually suggest script changes that will allow the film to receive the military's support and approval. Sometimes these proposed changes are minor. But sometimes the changes are dramatic. Sometimes they change dialogue. Sometimes they change characters. Sometimes they even change history."

They create something coined 'disinfotainment'. They mix disinformation with entertainment and call it disinfotainment.

Unadulterated violence is now accepted on regular TV. Killing in the name of the mother government is praised, that is unless the violence is committed in self defence to protect someone from the system. Sharp shooters, bombers, and assassin are worshiped if they are fighting for the system, are in the military, or are associated with groups that control the masses locally, such as the local police department. I don't condone violence, however it's hypocritical to support one form of homicide when it favours the elite, and condemn another when it's done to protect your land, freedom, or loved ones.

This odd reality transfers itself into the shady world of video games that are stepped in plots and tasks to kill as much as the player can. The players are getting younger and younger with 7 out of 10 children playing games with a 'Mature' rating. Recently I was browsing the PC video game selection at a very large electronics store. I was appalled to see nearly 50 different games in which the setting of the game is Iraq and the goal is to kill as many insurgents as possible and fulfil the mission. Children today are being indoctrinated through their favourite games and law enforcement programs to be the button pushers of the weapons of mass destruction for tomorrow's world.

Is it any wonder why there are two house bills and a senate bill (with more on the way), which are giant steps in dismantling the free speech of the general public. These bills together would kill (PEG) cable access centres where the public still owns the airwaves. It's the programming created locally, without censorship or commercial gain. Their income is derived from franchises within the local cities and a small percentage cable subscriber frees. This is a corporate takeover because this is centralizing communication by removing the locally based programming and moving the audience to the more official, nationalistic, and sensational programs that promotes violence, uniformity, and slavery over peach, diversity and freedom. Cable access features free speech and information with perspectives neglected by mainstream television. It also features a free flow programming system with fresh programs being aired by new producers on a rotating basis. This keeps the content and information creative and locally based while network TV is rigid with regular time slots and repetitive programming.

The blocks of programming that are universally accepted parallel the shift to craft our entire lives towards the factory's bell and the illusion of time. This is the creation of the hive mind. The hive mind is result of massive brainwashing to the general public. Everyone shares the same thoughts, goals, knowledge and understanding. A hive mind society gears itself towards conformity and ignores diversity while masqueraded as the road to utopia in mainstream television. Network programming, whether it's the news or drama, is geared towards artificially creating your world and reality. With the proper amount of entertainment and sensationalism, we may even be living our lives through the television set. Many anchors and actors are beautiful and research shows that attractive people are usually perceived as trust worthy. While the real news rolls quickly by on the bottom of your
screen, the anchor is selling you on the idea of having your very own police state hell hole right here in your local jurisdiction, or how 2 sports opposing teams chased around on a court for 2 hours in attempt to score points means something to you. No education, no information, SPIN. Today the media represents a tool of brainwashing and indoctrination that is utilized on behalf of the owners interests.

Since the 1996 Telco act, television and radio stations all across the nation were bought out by major international media outlets. Clear Channel and Infinity are the two largest corporations in radio today. This has centralized the distribution of information and has threatened our free society ever since. The media drums to the heartbeat of its owners, whose interests are not of the general public. Instead they are interested in their other financial endeavours like defence contracting, oil business, political parties, prison industry. The conflicts of interest are monumental with the deregulation of the corporations. The lines are now blurred between one network's coverage of the war and the other.

Once we come to the conclusion that the media is intentionally deceiving us, we can apply the principles of problem-reaction-solution. This formula takes a problem by either creating it or allowing it to happen and presenting that to the population. It could be terrorism, molestation, extra terrestrials. These topics create fear and no one in their right mind would support terrorism or crime. It's therefore OK to blast the television, the papers, and radio with 'the problem.' The natural reaction from the people is a request for more control to ensure more safety. Most let their fear and emotional side control their decisions and usually translated into something like, "The government needs more power over our lives to make us safer and freer from tyranny. I believe what the media tells me so I will support whatever decisions they make." Today's mainstream corporate news program discourages dissent of the war and paints activists with a negative brush that hints of treason. At the same time, the so-called journalists are cogs in a much larger machine who know that if they report a story that paints the government in a dark light, is likely to remain on 'the wire' and off the front page.

The most disturbing thing about spending a single hour examining network cable news and modern Hollywood films are the reoccurring themes in the backdrop. The central ideas of countless "investigative reports" or "Friday night special" features are about a threat of some type over the horizon. The end of the world as we know it is being sold. If the news isn't feeding it to you, then the History Channel or Discover Channel are either talking about the crusades, asteroids, UFOs, earthquakes, terrorism, or exposes about serial killers. They are crafted a message that our world is unstable, and the threat is always an invisible and dangerous one that only our military can fix. When you record and log all the messages, you end up with a script, a screen write produced through the movie studios of Hollywood hell.

I am not alone in noting this observation. Local and network news are designing their editorials about despair and fear because the owners, producers, and editors now understand that fear sells. The end result are the desired ratings, delivered like expected. The masters of modern spin understand that we like to be terrified. Just look at the success in the action/suspense/terror genres that have plopped onto the conveyor belt and packaged for our glee consumption. When the editors in charge found out that simply plastering a terror alert chart didn't scare the people the same way it used to, they began to kick up the campaign of terror a few notches with new and creative ways to sell the police state.

When you get to the other side of the terror alerts of all shapes and sizes, you find another nightmare masquerading as the saviour. The 'Ministry of Truth' will protect you. The mother government is here to rescue you and squash this brown terrorist bug, this gray alien, this avian bird flu, and every other nightmare that the nightly news brought you. The finest public relations specialists take the science of worshiping our kings down to a frame by frame level. George W. Bush is pictured in numerous poises with a halo around his head.
other pictures, he stands tall with dozens of American flags blowing in the wind behind him. A more blasphemous display features him speaking in front of the cross of Jesus Christ. The message send couldn't be more clearly presented. Our current leaders are of the messiah status and only through them, will we reach the gates of safety. The lie that has been accepted by so many as truth is that this is a religious war. Numerous prime time programs are telling the story of the crusades (without the horrors) to sync our vibrations up to something out of the 13th Century, instead of the 21st Century. If the America people accept the fact that the crusades are here, that George Bush reports directly to god, and that revelations are here, then they have won the war for our minds.

The loudspeaker whispers, "All our problems are by accident, never design." Across the room the system's minion snorts, "If you have nothing to hide, you have nothing to fear." It's that plot that says Middle Eastern terrorists from an Afghan cave are the reason beyond our little, "War on terror." Related messages in the script demonize young minority males and suggest harsh punishments for crimes they commit. They don't come out overtly and state their racist agenda. They come at you from the side by airing the same crime news repetitively, usually when it's committed by the minority group. The networks love the fact that the TV sets the norms in society and today, and hence politically opinion. Who would imagine that in the United States of America, both candidates of both parties in the 2004 election would be members of the Skull and Bones society at Yale University? Out of 290 million Americans, this is the best we could come up with?

It is the decision of the owners to influence producers, editors, and others involved to paint to brush to fit the objective, which is the bottom line. If Sports is what the people want, then they get it, usually in large doses. Multi-media sports (or spectator sports) is just an escape from our own existence. It's like gambling, or drug addiction. It provides that buffer zone of rooting for something with other people that we've been told is good. People's fantasies also lead them to fixating on sports. It's simulated masculinity, in an age where there's a push to change us from men to robots. It's human nature to resist and fight that which is suppressing us. The sociologists and psychologists in areas of influence know this. Spectator sports prove the outlet internationally for what has been stripped away from us. We've lost the right to rebel and change our government through warfare if necessary.

Today the bulk of our nation's population today doesn't know what's really going on with the fall of the American dollar and the plans for the transfer of American wealth to other countries. However, most can tell you who the top basketball or football players are. A lot of fans wish they were the stars, out there on the stage, the court, and the drag strip. Either you're "numero uno" in centre stage or you're nothing. End of story.

What I never understood when I was in high school was why my peers and friends would act naïve or ignorant in a "Wayne's World" or 'Beavis and Butthead' kind of way. What I've learned since then is that the numerous programs that are pimping themselves of as 'entertainment' are actually targeted to the lowest common denominator. This is especially true with disc jockeys in radio today. The reason our airwaves are saturated with jokes and content centred on fart jokes, private parts, borderline racism, and general trash talk is because it is selling. In the meantime, large numbers of our children, young adults, and older audiences are mimicking what they see and hear because the current 'norm' is selling this behaviour as cool or 'chic.' When the conditioned is so intense that these forms of content are considered the norm, anything else seems either bizarre or uninteresting to the average American's attention span that is decreasing by the day. Hypothetically, if a producer on a network did get away with a feature story exposing government corruption at the highest levels, chances are the large impact necessary wouldn't be realized because the average viewer's brain has already been conditioned to seek out certain types of disinfotainment.

The media has created the picture perfect society that could exist if we only did things their way, (their interests/government interest). It tells us what happiness is and what it is not and same for love, hate or anything else they can implant into our subconsciousness. We
can become the perfect slave to the system through indoctrination given through network TV. Over time the messages are becoming increasingly racist, violent, and dishonest. But the programming began decades ago and few have the eyes to see it for what it has become. We live in a world where the populations give their minds away to the official version of the event, where utopia is right around the corner when big brother is riding shotgun. It's a world where Hollywood can make you believe anything, even that you are free. It's a world in which the prosecutor and the judge sit on the same side of the bench. The most obvious reason that our minds are being controlled on a massive scale psychologically, is because our culture has been conditioned incrementally through TV, radio, or the paper. We are given the world reality through a screen, some ink, or radio waves. The truth is hiding in plain sight. The indoctrination through these mediums warns us that views other than those presented by them are unimportant and too be condemned. This administration and media monopoly has a carefully crafted dehumanization program to anyone that dissent the official version of events.

Some people are wrong about 5% of the time. Some are wrong most of the time. I wish I was wrong all the time. A lot of people deal with these intense realities, by asking me rhetorically, "What is the solution, smart guy?" Remember, it's the viewers, the consumers and all the other little votes called dollars that helped this oligarchy system lay its concrete foundation in our backyards. We must recognize the truth about why the system is flawed and enslaving us if we wish to beat it. The most important solution to fighting this type of brainwashing and mind control is to start with ourselves and our own awakening in the smaller things. In this case, it's brainwashing but after awhile we break outside the box and begin venturing outside the system and into unknown terrain. Fighting with people and forcing them to understand 'our truth' is not a solution. If our collective free will created this nightmare, then only our collective free will change it. The battle begins in the heart and mind of the beholder, and then extends outward from there, only to those open to the information.

If you choose to travel the road to the truth, then you must be prepared for the obstacles that await you. You may be condemned or criticized by your family, your friends, your lovers, or your co-workers. This is their programming that began at birth that is doing exactly what it's supposed to do. You're going to have to be stronger than that. You must realize that there is a reality that exists outside of this controlled artificial system. Like Indiana Jones in the Last Crusade, he took that 'leap of faith' over the bridgeless canyon in an attempt to get to the other side. Like Neo in the Matrix, he took the red pill from Morpheus in his attempt to cross over to his real self. Once you wake up, it's as if a hypnotist came along and snapped his fingers. You wake up and say to yourself, "Oh my god. I can see it now. Why did it take me so long to wake up?!" For some of you it can be a major shock. Like anything else, take this information and knowledge in stages. If it took a lifetime for them to mould your reality for you, then you know that it may take longer than a day to fully awaken. Remember, the journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step.

PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY: Scientists Find Television Viewing is Literally Killing You and Your Family

"Life is short, but with television it’s even shorter, and in more ways than one." - Dr. Aric Sigman

Everybody knows television is not healthy, but after reading what scientists have discovered about how bad television viewing REALLY is, you will be shocked and outraged at the information that has been hidden from us for decades.

Hidden from you by the television companies themselves, exists hundreds of scientific studies that show TV's devastating effects on your health, intelligence, happiness, and even your life span. Extracted from the books Remotely Controlled and The Plug-in Drug, here
are some of the effects of television viewing, every one of them backed by multiple documented scientific studies:

Findings from Scientific Studies about TV’s Health Effects:

- Is a Major Cause of Depression
- Decreases Academic Achievement
- Lowers Libido in Men and Women
- Is a Leading cause of half of all Violence-related crime
- Stunts the Development of Children’s Brains
- Damages the Brains of both Children and Adults
- Inhibits Speech Development
- Decreases Reading Comprehension
- Increases the Likelihood of children developing ADHD
- Decreases Creativity & Imagination
- Decreases Ability to Succeed
- Causes Vision Problems
- Makes you Less Likely to Exercise
- Causes Emotional Problems including PTSD
- One of many causes of Autism
- Makes you Eat More
- Makes you Crave Sugary Foods
- Causes Obesity
- Increases Children’s Changes of Becoming Alcoholics Later in Life
- Makes Men Feel Less in Love with Their Partners
- Makes Women Feel Less Deserving of Being Loved
- Makes Families Spend Less Time Together
- Increases Divorce Rate
- Increases Negative Moods
- Increases ‘Copycat’ Suicides
- Lowers Self-Esteem and Confidence
- Increases Desire for Cosmetic Surgical Procedures
- Decreases your Lifespan
- Reduces Athletic Performance
- Causes Alzheimer’s Disease
- Stresses the Body
- Causes Sleep Deprivation

Television “Safe” Exposure Guidelines:

Since the amount of Television you watch is directly proportional to how happy you are in life, the less you watch the better. However, at EndAllDisease.com we realize that eliminating the Television completely from your life may or may not be realistic, and since the governments of the world are not responsible enough to create safe-exposure guidelines for watching television, we’re going to give you the guidelines brought forth from Harvard Researchers and others based on the existing science. Here is the Recommended Daily Allowance (RDA) for watching television:

- Children under three should see no screen entertainment.
- After this age, television viewing of good quality programmes should be limited to an hour a day.
- Teenagers should be limited to one-and-a-half hours a day.
- And for adults, two hours a day.
"Getting rid of your television should not be considered extreme. You are immediately doubling the amount of free time you have and, after a short period of time, you are very unlikely to miss it." - Dr. Aric Sigman

Too much television can make children ‘mentally ill’

Telegraph Feb 2, 2009

Too much television and time spent on the internet can make children mentally ill, an in-depth report has concluded.

Excessive exposure makes a child materialistic, which in turn affects their relationship with their parents and their health.

That is one of the conclusions of a new wide-ranging survey into British childhood, produced for the Children’s Society.

It says that children are part of a new form of consumerism, with under 16 year-olds spending £3 billion of their own money each year on clothes, snacks, music, video games and magazines.

The report claims that some advertisers “explicitly exploit the mechanism of peer pressure, while painting parents as buffoons” and that in its most extreme form, advertising persuades children that “you are what you own”.

In addition the “constant exposure” to celebrities through, TV soaps, dramas and chat shows is having a detrimental effect.

It says: “Children today know in intimate detail the lives of celebrities who are richer than they will ever be, and mostly better-looking. This exposure inevitably raises aspirations and reduces self-esteem.”

It adds the way celebrities are portrayed “automatically encourages the excessive pursuit of wealth and beauty.”

This “media-driven consumerism” is having a negative effect on a child’s wellbeing, the report says.

It highlights a study into the effect of consumerism on the psychological wellbeing of 10-13 year-olds.

That study found: “Other things being equal, the more a child is exposed to the media (television and Internet), the more materialistic she becomes, the worse she relates to her parents and the worse her mental health.”
The Good Childhood inquiry, compiled by more than 35,000 contributors is independent of the Church of England affiliated society but has been endorsed by the Archbishop of Canterbury Dr Rowan Williams.

It takes an in-depth look at the changing face of childhood and family life in Britain, and the challenges facing youngsters today.

The report has found that only a quarter of children with mental health problems get any specialist help, and one in 10 five to 16-year-olds now have mental health issues, ranging from anxiety or depression to conduct disorders such as destructive behaviour.

It claims that the upward trend of violence in the media in general, is making children violent and causing tension within the family.

The report says: “We know from controlled studies that exposure to violence can breed violence.

“So it seems likely that the upward trend in media violence is helping to produce the upward trend in violent behaviour – and also the growth of psychological conflict in family relationships.”

The report also notes that commercial pressures have led to the “premature sexualisation” of young people.

It notes that young people are having sex earlier because of “many forces”, including “more privacy when both parents work, more contraception, commercial pressures toward premature sexualisation, and fundamental changes in attitude”.

The report recommends that sex and relationships, and understanding of the media should be a compulsory part of the personal, social and health curriculum.

And it says advertising of unhealthy foods and alcohol should be banned before 9pm.

A delusion for the reality-TV era

Montreal psychiatrists Joel and Ian Gold have coined ‘the Truman Show Delusion,’ where patients claim that the world around them is an elaborate production.

National Post Jul 18, 2008 By Craig Offman

Joel and Ian Gold, brothers and psychiatrists from Montreal, believe they have discovered a signature mental illness of the YouTube era: patients who claim they are subjects of their own reality TV shows.
They have named the malady the “Truman Show Delusion” and though they are in the process of putting together a medical paper on the topic, their discovery is already causing a stir.

While traditionalists insist that this delusion offers nothing new – it is no different from say, a deranged man who believes that the CIA has planted a microchip in his tooth – the Gold brothers argue otherwise.

“It’s really a question of the extent of the delusion,” said Joel Gold, 39, who has been on staff at New York’s Bellevue Hospital Centre for eight years. “The delusions we typically treat are narrow: There is Capgras Delusion, where someone will think his family has been replaced by doubles. Or the Fregoli Delusion, where someone believes that one person is persecuting him: a doctor, mailman, butcher. The Truman Show Delusion, though, involves the entire world.”

He also says that The Truman Show had an impact on patients that other films did not, no matter how powerful they were. “I never heard people say, ‘The Godfather, that’s my life.’ “

While Dr. Gold says they could have easily called their new disorder the EdTV Delusion or the Matrix Delusion – both films that refer to an unreal existence – three of the five patients he treated at the storied mental health hospital directly likened their plight to The Truman Show, the 1998 film which depicts Truman Burbank, an affable suburbanite who slowly becomes aware that his every movement is broadcast 24/7 to voyeuristic viewers around the world.

The five patients Dr. Gold treated were white men between the ages of 25 and 34, the majority of whom held university degrees.

“I realized that I was and am the centre, the focus of attention by millions and millions of people,” explained one patient, an army veteran who came from an upper middle-class upbringing. “My family and everyone I knew were and are actors in a script, a charade whose entire purpose is to make me the focus of the world's attention.”

The patient added that he planned to climb to the top of the Statue of Liberty, and if his true love were waiting for him, the puppeteer strings would be cut. If she failed to show up, he would jump to his death.

Another patient even had first-hand experience with reality TV. A 25-year-old New Englander with a bachelor’s degree in film and communication studies, he worked as intern on a program where, he complained, cameras were secretly tracking him.

Thinking that he was also being filmed while at a polling station on Election Day in 2004, he felt that it was his duty to protest against the Bush administration by shouting that the President was “Judas.” The outburst led to his admission to the Bellevue Centre.

“Typically, the Truman Show Delusion is a combination of paranoia, grandiosity and ideas of reference, which means that patients believe they are receiving signals specifically meant for them from a newscast or something like that,” said Dr. Gold, adding that since he started presenting these cases at conferences two years ago, colleagues have informed him of six more examples.

Ian Gold, who holds a Canada Research Chair in philosophy and psychiatry at McGill University, added that there are unprecedented cultural triggers that might explain the phenomenon: the pressure of living in a large, connected community can bring out the unstable side of more vulnerable people.
"The wish for fame is a form of grandiosity, and the fear of threats such as surveillance can bring about paranoia," said the Montreal-based Dr. Gold, 46, who specializes in delusion. "New media is opening up vast social spaces that might be interacting with psychological processes."

The elder Dr. Gold said that despite all the modern technology of brain imaging, little is known about delusions, which are a common trait of schizophrenia. Most experts say there is no set criterion for a delusion beyond defining it as fixed false belief.

Austrian Thomas Stompe, a leading psychiatrist with a traditional bent, believes that there are seven kinds of delusions, period.

“A number of recent case reports published during the last 20 years described a quick inclusion of new technologies and cultural innovations into schizophrenic delusions which led many of the authors to the conclusion that the ‘Zeitgeist’ is creating new delusional contents,” warns Dr. Stompe, the lead author of a paper entitled “Old Wine in New Bottles? Stability and Plasticity of the Contents of Schizophrenic Delusions.”

Published five years ago in the journal Psychopathy, the abstract concludes that there are only a few eternal themes of “extraordinary anthropological importance”: persecution, grandiosity, guilt, religion, hypochondria, jealousy, and love.

Those other Zeitgeist developments, presumably the Truman Show Delusion among them, belong in subcategories according to this categorization.

When reached at his office in Vienna, Dr. Stompe said he had heard the buzz about the findings of the brothers Gold, but did not see anything new in them.

“I have seen someone who thinks they are part of the Matrix,” he said. “This is very near. The patient also told me that the world had changed, that there was an unreal quality in the world.”

Despite that first-hand experience and the talk about the Golds’ theory, Dr. Stompe is unMOVED, asserting the unshakeable truths of his field. “The major topics are always the same.”

FUCK ME, I’M STARTING TO THINK THAT I’M LIVING IN THE MATRIX, TOO, WHAT ABOUT YOU?

Now let’s look at a pretty recent example of the blatant control of the newspapers:

**Tales from the Crypt**

The depraved spies and moguls of the CIA’s ‘Operation Mockingbird’ by Alex Constantine


It is beginning to dawn on a growing number of armchair ombudsmen that the public print reports news from a parallel universe - one that has never heard of politically-motivated assassinations, CIA-Mafia banking thefts, mind control, death squads or even federal agencies with secret budgets fattened by cocaine sales - a place overrun by lone gunmen, where the CIA and Mafia are usually on their best behaviour.
In this idyllic land, the most serious infraction an official can commit is the employment of a domestic servant with (shudder) no residency status.

This unlikely land of enchantment is the creation of Mockingbird.

It was conceived in the late 1940s, the most frigid period of the cold war, when the CIA began a systematic infiltration of the corporate media, a process that often included direct takeover of major news outlets.

In this period, the American intelligence services competed with communist activists abroad to influence European labour unions. With or without the cooperation of local governments, Frank Wisner, an undercover State Department official assigned to the Foreign Service, rounded up students abroad to enter the cold war underground of covert operations on behalf of his Office of Policy Coordination. Philip Graham, a graduate of the Army Intelligence School in Harrisburg, PA, then publisher of the Washington Post, was taken under Wisner's wing to direct the program code-named Operation Mockingbird.

"By the early 1950s," writes former Village Voice reporter Deborah Davis in Katharine the Great, "Wisner 'owned' respected members of the New York Times, Newsweek, CBS and other communications vehicles, plus stringers, four to six hundred in all, according to a former CIA analyst." The network was overseen by Allen Dulles, a templar for German and American corporations who wanted their points of view represented in the public print. Early Mockingbird influenced 25 newspapers and wire agencies consenting to act as organs of CIA propaganda. Many of these were already run by men with reactionary views, among them William Paley (CBS), C.D. Jackson (Fortune), Henry Luce (Time) and Arthur Hays Sulzberger (N.Y. Times).

Activists curious about the workings of Mockingbird have since been appalled to find in FOIA (Freedom of Information Act) documents that agents boasting in CIA office memos of their pride in having placed "important assets" inside every major news publication in the country. It was not until 1982 that the Agency openly admitted that reporters on the CIA payroll have acted as case officers to agents in the field.

WWIII has begun

"World War III has begun," Henry's Luce's Life declared in March, 1947. "It is in the opening skirmish stage already." The issue featured an excerpt of a book by James Burnham, who called for the creation of an "American Empire," "world-dominating in political power, set up at least in part through coercion (probably including war, but certainly the threat of war) and in which one group of people ... would hold more than its equal share of power."

George Seldes, the famed anti-fascist media critic, drew down on Luce in 1947, explaining that "although avoiding typical Hitlerian phrases, the same doctrine of a superior people taking over the world and ruling it, began to appear in the press, whereas the organs of Wall Street were much more honest in favouring a doctrine inevitably leading to war if it brought greater commercial markets under the American flag."

On the domestic front, an abiding relationship was struck between the CIA and William Paley, a wartime colonel and the founder of CBS. A firm believer in "all forms of propaganda" to foster loyalty to the Pentagon, Paley hired CIA agents to work undercover at the behest of his close friend, the busy grey eminence of the nation's media, Allen Dulles. Paley's designated go-between in his dealings with the CIA was Sig Mickelson, president of CBS News from 1954 to 1961.

The CIA's assimilation of old guard fascists was overseen by the Operations Coordination Board, directed by C.D. Jackson, formerly an executive of Time magazine and Eisenhower's
Special Assistant for Cold War Strategy. In 1954 he was succeeded by Nelson Rockefeller, who quit a year later, disgusted at the administration's political infighting. Vice President Nixon succeeded.

Rockefeller as the key cold war strategist.

"Nixon," writes John Loftus, a former attorney for the Justice Department's Office of Special Investigations, took "a small boy's delight in the arcane tools of the intelligence craft - the hidden microphones, the 'black' propaganda." Nixon especially enjoyed his visit to a Virginia training camp to observe Nazis in the "special forces" drilling at covert operations.

Hubert von Blücher

One of the fugitives recruited by the American intelligence underground was heroin smuggler Hubert von Blücher, the son of a German ambassador. Hubert often bragged that that he was trained by the Abwehr, the German military intelligence division, while still a civilian in his twenties. He served in a recon unit of the German Army until forced out for medical reasons in 1944, according to his wartime records. He worked briefly as an assistant director for Berlin-Film on a movie entitled One Day ..., and finished out the war flying with the Luftwaffe, but not to engage the enemy – his mission was the smuggling of Nazi loot out of the country. His exploits were, in part, the subject of Sayer and Botting's Nazi Gold, an account of the knockover of the Reichsbank at the end of the war.

In 1948 he flew the coop to Argentina. Posing as a photographer named Huberto von Bleucher Corell, he immediately paid court to Eva Peron, presenting her with an invaluable Gobelin tapestry (a selection from the wealth of artefacts confiscated by the SS from Europe's Jews?). Hubert then met with Martin Bormann at the Hotel Plaza to deliver German marks worth $80 million. The loot financed the birth of the National Socialist Party in Argentina, among other forms of Nazi revival.

In 1951, Hubert migrated northward and took a job at the Colour Corporation of America in Hollywood. He eked out a living writing scripts for the booming movie industry. His voice can be heard on a film set in the Amazon, produced by Walt Disney.

Nine years later he returned to Buenos Aires, then Düsseldorf, West Germany, and established a firm that developed not movie scripts, but anti-chemical warfare agents for the government. At the Industrie Club in Düsseldorf in 1982, von Blücher boasted to journalists, "I am chief shareholder of Pan American Airways. I am the best friend of Howard Hughes. The Beach Hotel in Las Vegas is 45 percent financed by me. I am thus the biggest financier ever to appear in the Arabian Nights tales dreamed up by these people over their second bottle of brandy."

Moses and Walter Annenberg

Not really. Two of the biggest financiers to stumble from the drunken dreams of world-moving affluence were, in their time, Moses Annenberg, publisher of The Philadelphia Inquirer, and his son Walter, the CIA/mob-anchored publisher of the TV Guide. Like most American high-rollers, Annenberg lived a double life. Moses, his father, was a scion of the Capone mob. Both Moses and Walter were indicted in 1939 for tax evasions totalling many millions of dollars - the biggest case in the history of the Justice Department. Moses pled guilty and agreed to pay the government $8 million and settle $9 million in assorted tax claims, penalties and interest debts. Moses received a three-year sentence. He died in Lewisburg Penitentiary.

Walter Annenberg, the TV Guide magnate, was a lofty Republican. On the campaign trail in April, 1988, George Bush flew into Los Angeles to woo Reagan's kitchen cabinet. "This is the
topping on the cake," Bush's regional campaign director told the Los Angeles Times. The Bush team met at Annenberg's plush Rancho Mirage estate at Sunnylands, California. It was at the Annenberg mansion that Nixon's cabinet was chosen, and the state's social and contributor registers built over a quarter-century of state political dominance by Ronald Reagan, whose acting career was launched by Operation Mockingbird.

Operation Octopus

The commercialization of television, coinciding with Reagan's recruitment by the Crusade for Freedom, a CIA front, presented the intelligence world with unprecedented potential for sowing propaganda and even prying in the age of Big Brother. George Orwell glimpsed the possibilities when he installed omniscient video surveillance technology in 1948, a novel rechristened 1984 for the first edition published in the U.S. by Harcourt, Brace. Operation Octopus, according to federal files, was in full swing by 1948, a surveillance program that turned any television set with tubes into a broadcast transmitter. Agents of Octopus could pick up audio and visual images with the equipment as far as 25 miles away.

Hale Boggs was investigating Operation Octopus at the time of his disappearance in the midst of the Watergate probe.

Mob control of studios

In 1952, at MCA, Actors' Guild president Ronald Reagan - a screen idol recruited by Mockingbird's Crusade for Freedom to raise funds for the resettlement of Nazis in the U.S., according to Lofts - signed a secret waiver of the conflict-of-interest rule with the mob-controlled studio, in effect granting it a labour monopoly on early television programming. In exchange, MCA made Reagan a part owner. Furthermore, historian C. Vann Woodward, writing in the New York Times, in 1987, reported that Reagan had 'fed the names of suspect people in his organization to the FBI secretly and regularly enough to be assigned 'an informer's code number, T-10.' His FBI file indicates intense collaboration with producers to 'purge' the industry of subversive.'

No one ever turned a suspicious eye on Walter Cronkite, a former intelligence officer and in the immediate postwar period UPI's Moscow correspondent. Cronkite was lured to CBS by Operation Mockingbird's Phil Graham, according to Deborah Davis.

Another television conglomerate, Cap Cities, rose like a horror-film simian from CIA and Mafia heroin operations. Among other organized-crime Republicans, Thomas Dewey and his neighbour Lowell Thomas threw in to launch the infamous Resorts International, the corporate front for Lansky's branch of the federally-sponsored mob family and the corporate precursor to Cap Cities. Another of the investors was James Crosby, a Cap Cities executive who donated $100,000 to Nixon's 1968 presidential campaign. This was the year that Resorts bought into Atlantic City casino interests. Police in New Jersey attempted, with no success, to spike the issuance of a gambling license to the company, citing Mafia ties.

In 1954, this same circle of investors, all Catholics, founded the broadcasting company notorious for overt propagandizing and general spookiness. The company's chief counsel was OSS veteran William Casey, who clung to his shares by concealing them in a blind trust even after he was appointed CIA director by Ronald Reagan in 1981.

"Black radio" was the phrase CIA critic David Wise coined in The Invisible Government to describe the agency's intertwining interests in the emergence of the transistor radio with the entrepreneurs who took to the airwaves. "Daily, East and West beam hundreds of propaganda broadcasts at each other in an unrelenting babble of competition for the minds of their listeners. The low-price transistor has given the hidden war a new importance," enthused one foreign correspondent.
A Hydra of private foundations sprang up to finance the propaganda push. One of them, Operations and Policy Research, Inc. (OPR), received hundreds of thousands of dollars from the CIA through private foundations and trusts. OPR research was the basis of a television series that aired in New York and Washington, D.C. in 1964, Of People and Politics, a “study” of the American political system in 21 weekly instalments.

In Hollywood, the visual cortex of The Beast, the same CIA/Mafia combination that formed Cap Cities sank its claws into the film studios and labour unions. Johnny Rosselli was pulled out of the Army during the war by a criminal investigation of Chicago mobsters in the film industry. Rosselli, a CIA asset probably assassinated by the CIA, played sidekick to Harry Cohn, the Columbia Pictures mogul who visited Italy's Benito Mussolini in 1933, and upon his return to Hollywood remodelled his office after the dictator’s. The only honest job Rosselli ever had was assistant purchasing agent (and a secret investor) at Eagle Lion productions, run by Bryan Foy, a former producer for 20th Century Fox. Rosselli, Capone's representative on the West Coast, passed a small fortune in mafia investments to Cohn. Bugsy Seigel pooled gambling investments with Billy Wilkerson, publisher of the Hollywood Reporter.

In the 1950s, outlays for global propaganda climbed to a full third of the CIA's covert operations budget. Some 3,000 salaried and contract CIA employees were eventually engaged in propaganda efforts. The cost of disinforming the world cost American taxpayers an estimated $265 million a year by 1978, a budget larger than the combined expenditures of Reuters, UPI and the AP news syndicates.

In 1977, the Copely News Service admitted that it worked closely with the intelligence services - in fact, 23 employees were full-time employees of the Agency.

Most consumers of the corporate media were - and are - unaware of the effect that the salting of public opinion has on their own beliefs. A network anchorman in time of national crisis is an instrument of psychological warfare in the Mockingbird media. He is a creature from the national security sector's chamber of horrors.

For this reason consumers of the corporate press have reason to examine their basic beliefs about government and life in the parallel universe of these United States.

How Americas Most Powerful News Media Worked Hand in Glove with the Central Intelligence Agency and Why the Church Committee Covered It Up

THE CIA AND THE MEDIA

BY CARL BERNSTEIN Originally published in Rolling Stone, October 20, 1977

In 1953, Joseph Alsop, then one of America's leading syndicated columnists, went to the Philippines to cover an election. He did not go because he was asked to do so by his syndicate. He did not go because he was asked to do so by the newspapers that printed his column. He went at the request of the CIA.

Alsop is one of more than 400 American journalists who in the past twenty-five years have secretly carried out assignments for the Central Intelligence Agency, according to documents on file at CIA headquarters. Some of these journalists’ relationships with the Agency were tacit; some were explicit. There was cooperation, accommodation and overlap. Journalists provided a full range of clandestine services—from simple intelligence gathering to serving as go-betweens with spies in Communist countries. Reporters shared their notebooks with the CIA. Editors shared their staffs. Some of the journalists were Pulitzer Prize winners, distinguished reporters who considered themselves ambassador’s without-portfolio for their country. Most were less exalted: foreign correspondents who
found that their association with the Agency helped their work; stringers and freelancers who were as interested in the derring-do of the spy business as in filing articles; and, the smallest category, full-time CIA employees masquerading as journalists abroad. In many instances, CIA documents show, journalists were engaged to perform tasks for the CIA with the consent of the managements of America’s leading news organizations.

The history of the CIA’s involvement with the American press continues to be shrouded by an official policy of obfuscation and deception for the following principal reasons:

- The use of journalists has been among the most productive means of intelligence gathering employed by the CIA. Although the Agency has cut back sharply on the use of reporters since 1973 primarily as a result of pressure from the media, some journalist-operatives are still posted abroad.

- Further investigation into the matter, CIA officials say, would inevitably reveal a series of embarrassing relationships in the 1950s and 1960s with some of the most powerful organizations and individuals in American journalism.

Among the executives who lent their cooperation to the Agency were William Paley of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Henry Luce of Time Inc., Arthur Hays Sulzberger of the New York Times, Barry Bingham Sr. of the Louisville Courier Journal, and James Copley of the Copley News Service. Other organizations which cooperated with the CIA include the American Broadcasting Company, the National Broadcasting Company, the Associated Press, United Press International, Reuters, Hearst Newspapers, Scripps-Howard, Newsweek magazine, the Mutual Broadcasting System, the Miami Herald and the old Saturday Evening Post and New York Herald-Tribune.

By far the most valuable of these associations, according to CIA officials, have been with the New York Times, CBS and Time Inc.

**WORKING PRESS — CIA STYLE**

The CIA’s use of the American news media has been much more extensive than Agency officials have acknowledged publicly or in closed sessions with members of Congress. The general outlines of what happened are indisputable; the specifics are harder to come by. CIA sources hint that a particular journalist was trafficking all over Eastern Europe for the Agency; the journalist says no, he just had lunch with the station chief. CIA sources say flatly that a well known ABC correspondent worked for the Agency through 1973; they refuse to identify him. A high-level CIA official with a prodigious memory says that the New York Times provided cover for about ten CIA operatives between 1950 and 1966; he does not know who they were, or who in the newspaper’s management made the arrangements.

The Agency’s special relationships with the so-called “majors” in publishing and broadcasting enabled the CIA to post some of its most valuable operatives abroad without exposure for more than two decades. In most instances, Agency files show, officials at the highest levels of the CIA (usually director or deputy director) dealt personally with a single designated individual in the top management of the cooperating news organization. The aid furnished often took two forms: providing jobs and credentials “journalistic cover” in Agency parlance) for CIA operatives about to be posted in foreign capitals; and lending the Agency the undercover services of reporters already on staff, including some of the best-known correspondents in the business.

In the field, journalists were used to help recruit and handle foreigners as agents; to acquire and evaluate information, and to plant false information with officials of foreign governments. Many signed secrecy agreements, pledging never to divulge anything about
their dealings with the Agency; some signed employment contracts, some were assigned
case officers and treated with unusual deference. Others had less structured relationships
with the Agency, even though they performed similar tasks: they were briefed by CIA
personnel before trips abroad, debriefed afterward, and used as intermediaries with foreign
agents. Appropriately, the CIA uses the term “reporting” to describe much of what
cooperating journalists did for the Agency. “We would ask them, ‘Will you do us a
favour?’.”said a senior CIA official. “We understand you’re going to be in Yugoslavia. Have
they paved all the streets? Where did you see planes? Were there any signs of military
presence? How many Soviets did you see? If you happen to meet a Soviet, get his name and
spell it right .... Can you set up a meeting for is? Or relay a message?” Many CIA officials
regarded these helpful journalists as operatives; the journalists tended to see themselves as
trusted friends of the Agency who performed occasional favours—usually without pay—in the
national interest.

“I’m proud they asked me and proud to have done it,” said Joseph Alsop who, like his late
brother, columnist Stewart Alsop, undertook clandestine tasks for the Agency. “The notion
that a newspaperman doesn’t have a duty to his country is perfect balls.”

From the Agency’s perspective, there is nothing untoward in such relationships, and any
ethical questions are a matter for the journalistic profession to resolve, not the intelligence
community. As Stuart Loory, former Los Angeles Times correspondent, has written in the
Columbia Journalism Review: If even one American overseas carrying a press card is a paid
informer for the CIA, then all Americans with those credentials are suspect .... If the crisis
of confidence faced by the news business—along with the government—is to be overcome,
journalists must be willing to focus on themselves the same spotlight they so relentlessly
train on others!’ But as Loory also noted: “When it was reported... that newsmen themselves
were on the payroll of the CIA, the story caused a brief stir, and then was dropped.”

During the 1976 investigation of the CIA by the Senate Intelligence Committee, chaired by
Senator Frank Church, the dimensions of the Agency’s involvement with the press became
apparent to several members of the panel, as well as to two or three investigators on the
staff. But top officials of the CIA, including former directors William Colby and George Bush,
persuaded the committee to restrict its inquiry into the matter and to deliberately
misrepresent the actual scope of the activities in its final report. The multivolume report
contains nine pages in which the use of journalists is discussed in deliberately vague and
sometimes misleading terms. It makes no mention of the actual number of journalists who
undertook covert tasks for the CIA. Nor does it adequately describe the role played by
newspaper and broadcast executives in cooperating with the Agency.

THE AGENCY’S DEALINGS WITH THE PRESS BEGAN during the earliest stages of the Cold War.
Allen Dulles, who became director of the CIA in 1953, sought to establish a
recruiting-and-cover capability within America’s most prestigious journalistic institutions.
By operating under the guise of accredited news correspondents, Dulles believed, CIA
operatives abroad would be accorded a degree of access and freedom of movement
unobtainable under almost any other type of cover.

American publishers, like so many other corporate and institutional leaders at the time,
were willing to commit the resources of their companies to the struggle against “global
Communism.” Accordingly, the traditional line separating the American press corps and
government was often indistinguishable: rarely was a news agency used to provide cover for
CIA operatives abroad without the knowledge and consent of either its principal owner,
publisher or senior editor. Thus, contrary to the notion that the CIA insidiously infiltrated
the journalistic community, there is ample evidence that America’s leading publishers and
news executives allowed themselves and their organizations to become handmaidens to the
intelligence services. “Let’s not pick on some poor reporters, for God’s sake,” William Colby
exclaimed at one point to the Church committee’s investigators. “Let’s go to the
managements. They were witting.” In all, about twenty-five news organizations including those listed at the beginning of this article) provided cover for the Agency.

In addition to cover capability, Dulles initiated a “debriefing” procedure under which American correspondents returning from abroad routinely emptied their notebooks and offered their impressions to Agency personnel. Such arrangements, continued by Dulles’ successors, to the present day, were made with literally dozens of news organizations. In the 1950s, it was not uncommon for returning reporters to be met at the ship by CIA officers. “There would be these guys from the CIA flashing ID cards and looking like they belonged at the Yale Club,” said Hugh Morrow, a former Saturday Evening Post correspondent who is now press secretary to former vice-president Nelson Rockefeller. “It got to be so routine that you felt a little miffed if you weren’t asked.”

CIA officials almost always refuse to divulge the names of journalists who have cooperated with the Agency. They say it would be unfair to judge these individuals in a context different from the one that spawned the relationships in the first place. “There was a time when it wasn’t considered a crime to serve your government,” said one high-level CIA official who makes no secret of his bitterness. “This all has to be considered in the context of the morality of the times, rather than against latter-day standards—and hypocritical standards at that.”

Many journalists who covered World War II were close to people in the Office of Strategic Services, the wartime predecessor of the CIA; more important, they were all on the same side. When the war ended and many OSS officials went into the CIA, it was only natural that these relationships would continue. Meanwhile, the first postwar generation of journalists entered the profession; they shared the same political and professional values as their mentors. “You had a gang of people who worked together during World War II and never got over it,” said one Agency official. “They were genuinely motivated and highly susceptible to intrigue and being on the inside. Then in the Fifties and Sixties there was a national consensus about a national threat. The Vietnam War tore everything to pieces—shredded the consensus and threw it in the air.” Another Agency official observed: “Many journalists didn’t give a second thought to associating with the Agency. But there was a point when the ethical issues which most people had submerged finally surfaced. Today, a lot of these guys vehemently deny that they had any relationship with the Agency.”

**WORDS IN DISGUISE**

From the outset, the use of journalists was among the CIA’s most sensitive undertakings, with full knowledge restricted to the Director of Central Intelligence and a few of his chosen deputies. Dulles and his successors were fearful of what would happen if a journalist-operative’s cover was blown, or if details of the Agency’s dealings with the press otherwise became public. As a result, contacts with the heads of news organizations were normally initiated by Dulles and succeeding Directors of Central Intelligence; by the deputy directors and division chiefs in charge of covert operations—Frank Wisner, Cord Meyer Jr., Richard Bissell, Desmond Fitzgerald, Tracy Barnes, Thomas Karamessines and Richard Helms himself a former UPI correspondent); and, occasionally, by others in the CIA hierarchy known to have an unusually close social relationship with a particular publisher or broadcast executive.

James Angleton, who was recently removed as the Agency’s head of counterintelligence operations, ran a completely independent group of journalist-operatives who performed sensitive and frequently dangerous assignments; little is known about this group for the simple reason that Angleton deliberately kept only the vaguest of files.

The CIA even ran a formal training program in the 1950s to teach its agents to be journalists. Intelligence officers were “taught to make noises like reporters,” explained a
high CIA official, and were then placed in major news organizations with help from management. “These were the guys who went through the ranks and were told ‘You’re going to be a journalist,’” the CIA official said. Relatively few of the 400-some relationships described in Agency files followed that pattern, however; most involved persons who were already bona fide journalists when they began undertaking tasks for the Agency.

The Agency’s relationships with journalists, as described in CIA files, include the following general categories:

■ Legitimate, accredited staff members of news organizations—usually reporters. Some were paid; some worked for the Agency on a purely voluntary basis. This group includes many of the best-known journalists who carried out tasks for the CIA. The files show that the salaries paid to reporters by newspaper and broadcast networks were sometimes supplemented by nominal payments from the CIA, either in the form of retainers, travel expenses or outlays for specific services performed. Almost all the payments were made in cash. The accredited category also includes photographers, administrative personnel of foreign news bureaus and members of broadcast technical crews.)

Two of the Agency’s most valuable personal relationships in the 1960s, according to CIA officials, were with reporters who covered Latin America—Jerry O’Leary of the Washington Star and Hal Hendrix of the Miami News, a Pulitzer Prize winner who became a high official of the International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation. Hendrix was extremely helpful to the Agency in providing information about individuals in Miami’s Cuban exile community. O’Leary was considered a valued asset in Haiti and the Dominican Republic. Agency files contain lengthy reports of both men’s activities on behalf of the CIA.

O’Leary maintains that his dealings were limited to the normal give-and-take that goes on between reporters abroad and their sources. CIA officials dispute the contention: “There’s no question Jerry reported for us,” said one. “Jerry did assessing and spotting [of prospective agents] but he was better as a reporter for us.” Referring to O’Leary’s denials, the official added: “I don’t know what in the world he’s worried about unless he’s wearing that mantle of integrity the Senate put on you journalists.”

O’Leary attributes the difference of opinion to semantics. “I might call them up and say something like, ‘Papa Doc has the clap, did you know that?’ and they’d put it in the file. I don’t consider that reporting for them.... it’s useful to be friendly to them and, generally, I felt friendly to them. But I think they were more helpful to me than I was to them.” O’Leary took particular exception to being described in the same context as Hendrix. “Hal was really doing work for them,” said O’Leary. “I’m still with the Star. He ended up at ITT.” Hendrix could not be reached for comment. According to Agency officials, neither Hendrix nor O’Leary was paid by the CIA.

■ Stringers’ and freelancers. Most were payrolled by the Agency under standard contractual terms. Their journalistic credentials were often supplied by cooperating news organizations. Some filed news stories; others reported only for the CIA. On some occasions, news organizations were not informed by the CIA that their stringers were also working for the Agency.

■ Employees of so-called CIA “proprietaries.” During the past twenty-five years, the Agency has secretly bankrolled numerous foreign press services, periodicals and newspapers—both English and foreign language—which provided excellent cover for CIA operatives. One such publication was the Rome Daily American, forty percent of which was owned by the CIA until the 1970s. The Daily American went out of business this year,
Editors, publishers and broadcast network executives. The CIA's relationship with most news executives differed fundamentally from those with working reporters and stringers, who were much more subject to direction from the Agency. A few executives—Arthur Hays Sulzberger of the New York Times among them—signed secrecy agreements. But such formal understandings were rare: relationships between Agency officials and media executives were usually social—"The P and Q Street axis in Georgetown," said one source. "You don't tell Wilharn Paley to sign a piece of paper saying he won't fink."

Columnists and commentators. There are perhaps a dozen well known columnists and broadcast commentators whose relationships with the CIA go far beyond those normally maintained between reporters and their sources. They are referred to at the Agency as "known assets" and can be counted on to perform a variety of undercover tasks; they are considered receptive to the Agency's point of view on various subjects. Three of the most widely read columnists who maintained such ties with the Agency are C.L. Sulzberger of the New York Times, Joseph Alsop, and the late Stewart Alsop, whose column appeared in the New York Herald-Tribune, the Saturday Evening Post and Newsweek. CIA files contain reports of specific tasks all three undertook. Sulzberger is still regarded as an active asset by the Agency. According to a senior CIA official, "Young Cy Sulzberger had some uses.... He signed a secrecy agreement because we gave him classified information.... There was sharing, give and take. We'd say, 'We'd like to know this; if you tell us this will it help you get access to so-and-so?' Because of his access in Europe he had an Open Sesame. We'd ask him to just report: 'What did so-and-so say, what did he look like, is he healthy?' He was very eager, he loved to cooperate." On one occasion, according to several CIA officials, Sulzberger was given a briefing paper by the Agency which ran almost verbatim under the columnist's byline in the Times. "Cy came out and said, 'I'm thinking of doing a piece, can you give me some background?"' a CIA officer said. "We gave it to Cy as a background piece and Cy gave it to the printers and put his name on it." Sulzberger denies that any incident occurred. "A lot of baloney," he said.

Sulzberger claims that he was never formally "tasked" by the Agency and that he "would never get caught near the spook business. My relations were totally informal—I had a good many friends," he said. "I'm sure they consider me an asset. They can ask me questions. They find out you're going to Slobovia and they say, 'Can we talk to you when you get back?' ... Or they'll want to know if the head of the Ruritanian government is suffering from psoriasis. But I never took an assignment from one of those guys.... I've known Wisner well, and Helms and even McCone [former CIA director John McCone] I used to play golf with. But they'd have had to be awfully subtle to have used me.

Sulzberger says he was asked to sign the secrecy agreement in the 1950s. "A guy came around and said, 'You are a responsible newsman and we need you to sign this if we are going to show you anything classified.' I said I didn't want to get entangled and told them, 'Go to my uncle [Arthur Hays Sulzberger, then publisher of the New York Times] and if he says to sign it I will.'" His uncle subsequently signed such an agreement, Sulzberger said, and he thinks he did too, though he is unsure. "I don't know, twenty-some years is a long time." He described the whole question as "a bubble in a bathtub."

Stewart Alsop's relationship with the Agency was much more extensive than Sulzberger's. One official who served at the highest levels in the CIA said flatly: "Stew Alsop was a CIA agent." An equally senior official refused to define Alsop's relationship with the Agency except to say it was a formal one. Other sources said that Alsop was particularly helpful to the Agency in discussions with, officials of foreign governments—asking questions to which the CIA was seeking answers, planting misinformation advantageous to American policy, assessing opportunities for CIA recruitment of well-placed foreigners.

"Absolute nonsense," said Joseph Alsop of the notion that his brother was a CIA agent. "I was closer to the Agency than Stew was, though Stew was very close. I dare say he did
perform some tasks—he just did the correct thing as an American.... The Founding Fathers [of the CIA] were close personal friends of ours. Dick Bissell [former CIA deputy director] was my oldest friend, from childhood. It was a social thing, my dear fellow. I never received a dollar, I never signed a secrecy agreement. I didn't have to.... I've done things for them when I thought they were the right thing to do. I call it doing my duty as a citizen.

Alsop is willing to discuss on the record only two of the tasks he undertook: a visit to Laos in 1952 at the behest of Frank Wisner, who felt other American reporters were using anti-American sources about uprisings there; and a visit to the Philippines in 1953 when the CIA thought his presence there might affect the outcome of an election. “Des Fitzgerald urged me to go,” Alsop recalled. “It would be less likely that the election could be stolen [by the opponents of Ramon Magsaysay] if the eyes of the world were on them. I stayed with the ambassador and wrote about what happened.”

Alsop maintains that he was never manipulated by the Agency. “You can’t get entangled so they have leverage on you,” he said. “But what I wrote was true. My view was to get the facts. If someone in the Agency was wrong, I stopped talking to them—they’d given me phony goods.” On one occasion, Alsop said, Richard Helms authorized the head of the Agency’s analytical branch to provide Alsop with information on Soviet military presence along the Chinese border. “The analytical side of the Agency had been dead wrong about the war in Vietnam—they thought it couldn’t be won,” said Alsop. “And they were wrong on the Soviet buildup. I stopped talking to them.” Today, he says, “People in our business would be outraged at the kinds of suggestions that were made to me. They shouldn’t be. The CIA did not open itself at all to people it did not trust. Stew and I were trusted, and I’m proud of it.”

**MURKY DETAILS OF CIA RELATIONSHIPS WITH INDIVIDUALS** and news organizations began trickling out in 1973 when it was first disclosed that the CIA had, on occasion, employed journalists. Those reports, combined with new information, serve as casebook studies of the Agency’s use of journalists for intelligence purposes. They include:

- **The New York Times.** The Agency’s relationship with the *Times* was by far its most valuable among newspapers, according to CIA officials. From 1950 to 1966, about ten CIA employees were provided *Times* cover under arrangements approved by the newspaper’s late publisher, Arthur Hays Sulzberger. The cover arrangements were part of a general *Times* policy—set by Sulzberger—to provide assistance to the CIA whenever possible.

  Sulzberger was especially close to Allen Dulles. “At that level of contact it was the mighty talking to the mighty,” said a high-level CIA official who was present at some of the discussions. “There was an agreement in principle that, yes indeed, we would help each other. The question of cover came up on several occasions. It was agreed that the actual arrangements would be handled by subordinates.... The mighty didn’t want to know the specifics; they wanted plausible deniability.

  A senior CIA official who reviewed a portion of the Agency’s files on journalists for two hours on September 15th, 1977, said he found documentation of five instances in which the *Times* had provided cover for CIA employees between 1954 and 1962. In each instance he said, the arrangements were handled by executives of the *Times*; the documents all contained standard Agency language “showing that this had been checked out at higher levels of the *New York Times*,” said the official. The documents did not mention Sulzberger’s name, however—only those of subordinates whom the official refused to identify.

  The CIA employees who received *Times* credentials posed as stringers for the paper abroad and worked as members of clerical staffs in the *Times*’ foreign bureaus. Most were American; two or three were foreigners.
CIA officials cite two reasons why the Agency’s working relationship with the *Times* was closer and more extensive than with any other paper: the fact that the *Times* maintained the largest foreign news operation in American daily journalism; and the close personal ties between the men who ran both institutions.

Sulzberger informed a number of reporters and editors of his general policy of cooperation with the Agency. “We were in touch with them—they’d talk to us and some cooperated,” said a CIA official. The cooperation usually involved passing on information and “spotting” prospective agents among foreigners.

Arthur Hays Sulzberger signed a secrecy agreement with the CIA in the 1950s, according to CIA officials—a fact confirmed by his nephew, C.L. Sulzberger. However, there are varying interpretations of the purpose of the agreement: C.L. Sulzberger says it represented nothing more than a pledge not to disclose classified information made available to the publisher. That contention is supported by some Agency officials. Others in the Agency maintain that the agreement represented a pledge never to reveal any of the *Times’* dealings with the CIA, especially those involving cover. And there are those who note that, because all cover arrangements are classified, a secrecy agreement would automatically apply to them.

Attempts to find out which individuals in the *Times* organization made the actual arrangements for providing credentials to CIA personnel have been unsuccessful. In a letter to reporter Stuart Loory in 1974, Turner Cadedge, managing editor of the *Times* from 1951 to 1964, wrote that approaches by the CIA had been rebuffed by the newspaper. “I knew nothing about any involvement with the CIA... of any of our foreign correspondents on the *New York Times*. I heard many times of overtures to our men by the CIA, seeking to use their privileges, contacts, immunities and, shall we say, superior intelligence in the sordid business of spying and informing. If any one of them succumbed to the blandishments or cash offers, I was not aware of it. Repeatedly, the CIA and other hush-hush agencies sought to make arrangements for ‘cooperation’ even with *Times* management, especially during or soon after World War II, but we always resisted. Our motive was to protect our credibility.”

According to Wayne Phillips, former Times reporter, the CIA invoked Arthur Hays Sulzberger’s name when it tried to recruit him as an undercover operative in 1952 while he was studying at Columbia University’s Russian Institute. Phillips said an Agency official told him that the CIA had “a working arrangement” with the publisher in which other reporters abroad had been placed on the Agency’s payroll. Phillips, who remained at the *Times* until 1961, later obtained CIA documents under the Freedom of Information Act which show that the Agency intended to develop him as a clandestine “asset” for use abroad.

On January 31st, 1976, the *Times* carried a brief story describing the CIA’s attempt to recruit Phillips. It quoted Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, the present publisher, as follows: “I never heard of the *Times* being approached, either in my capacity as publisher or as the son of the late Mr. Sulzberger.” The *Times* story, written by John M. Crewdson, also reported that Arthur Hays Sulzberger told an unnamed former correspondent that he might be approached by the CIA after arriving at a new post abroad. Sulzberger told him that he was not “under any obligation to agree,” the story said and that the publisher himself would be “happier” if he refused to cooperate. “But he left it sort of up to me,” the *Times* quoted its former reporter as saying. “The message was if I really wanted to do that, okay, but he didn’t think it appropriate for a *Times* correspondent”

C.L. Sulzberger, in a telephone interview, said he had no knowledge of any CIA personnel using *Times* cover or of reporters for the paper working actively for the Agency. He was the paper’s chief of foreign service from 1944 to 1954 and expressed doubt that his uncle would have approved such arrangements. More typical of the late publisher, said Sulzberger, was a promise made to Allen Dulles’ brother, John Foster, then secretary of state, that no *Times* staff member would be permitted to accept an invitation to visit the
People’s Republic of China without John Foster Dulles’ consent. Such an invitation was extended to the publisher’s nephew in the 1950s; Arthur Sulzberger forbade him to accept it. “It was seventeen years before another Times correspondent was invited,” C.L. Sulzberger recalled.

The Columbia Broadcasting System. CBS was unquestionably the CIA’s most valuable broadcasting asset. CBS President William Paley and Allen Dulles enjoyed an easy working and social relationship. Over the years, the network provided cover for CIA employees, including at least one well-known foreign correspondent and several stringers; it supplied outtakes of newsfilm to the CIA; established a formal channel of communication between the Washington bureau chief and the Agency; gave the Agency access to the CBS newsfilm library; and allowed reports by CBS correspondents to the Washington and New York newsrooms to be routinely monitored by the CIA. Once a year during the 1950s and early 1960s, CBS correspondents joined the CIA hierarchy for private dinners and briefings.

The details of the CBS-CIA arrangements were worked out by subordinates of both Dulles and Paley. “The head of the company doesn’t want to know the fine points, nor does the director,” said a CIA official. “Both designate aides to work that out. It keeps them above the battle.” Dr. Frank Stanton, for 25 years president of the network, was aware of the general arrangements Paley made with Dulles—including those for cover, according to CIA officials. Stanton, in an interview last year, said he could not recall any cover arrangements.) But Paley’s designated contact for the Agency was Sig Mickelson, president of CBS News between 1954 and 1961. On one occasion, Mickelson has said, he complained to Stanton about having to use a pay telephone to call the CIA, and Stanton suggested he install a private line, bypassing the CBS switchboard, for the purpose. According to Mickelson, he did so. Mickelson is now president of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, both of which were associated with the CIA for many years.

In 1976, CBS News president Richard Salant ordered an in-house investigation of the network’s dealings with the CIA. Some of its findings were first disclosed by Robert Scheer in the Los Angeles Times.) But Salant’s report makes no mention of some of his own dealings with the Agency, which continued into the 1970s.

Many details about the CBS-CIA relationship were found in Mickelson’s files by two investigators for Salant. Among the documents they found was a September 13th, 1957, memo to Mickelson from Ted Koop, CBS News bureau chief in Washington from 1948 to 1961. It describes a phone call to Koop from Colonel Stanley Grogan of the CIA: “Grogan phoned to say that Reeves [J. B. Love Reeves, another CIA official] is going to New York to be in charge of the CIA contact office there and will call to see you and some of your confreres. Grogan says normal activities will continue to channel through the Washington office of CBS News." The report to Salant also states: "Further investigation of Mickelson’s files reveals some details of the relationship between the CIA and CBS News.... Two key administrators of this relationship were Mickelson and Koop.... The main activity appeared to be the delivery of CBS newsfilm to the CIA.... In addition there is evidence that, during 1964 to 1971, film material, including some outtakes, were supplied by the CBS Newsfilm Library to the CIA through and at the direction of Mr. Koop’.... Notes in Mr. Mickelson’s files indicate that the CIA used CBS films for training... All of the above Mickelson activities were handled on a confidential basis without mentioning the words Central Intelligence Agency. The films were sent to individuals at post-office box numbers and were paid for by individual, nor government, checks. ...” Mickelson also regularly sent the CIA an internal CBS newsletter, according to the report.

Salant’s investigation led him to conclude that Frank Kearns, a CBS-TV reporter from 1958 to 1971, “was a CIA guy who got on the payroll somehow through a CIA contact with somebody at CBS.” Kearns and Austin Goodrich, a CBS stringer, were undercover CIA employees, hired under arrangements approved by Paley.
Last year a spokesman for Paley denied a report by former CBS correspondent Daniel Schorr that Mickelson and he had discussed Goodrich's CIA status during a meeting with two Agency representatives in 1954. The spokesman claimed Paley had no knowledge that Goodrich had worked for the CIA. "When I moved into the job I was told by Paley that there was an ongoing relationship with the CIA," Mickelson said in a recent interview. "He introduced me to two agents who he said would keep in touch. We all discussed the Goodrich situation and film arrangements. I assumed this was a normal relationship at the time. This was at the height of the Cold War and I assumed the communications media were cooperating—though the Goodrich matter was compromising.

At the headquarters of CBS News in New York, Paley's cooperation with the CIA is taken for granted by many news executives and reporters, despite the denials. Paley, 76, was not interviewed by Salant's investigators. "It wouldn't do any good," said one CBS executive. "It is the single subject about which his memory has failed."

Salant discussed his own contacts with the CIA, and the fact he continued many of his predecessor's practices, in an interview with this reporter last year. The contacts, he said, began in February 1961, "when I got a phone call from a CIA man who said he had a working relationship with Sig Mickelson. The man said, 'Your bosses know all about it.'" According to Salant, the CIA representative asked that CBS continue to supply the Agency with unedited newstapes and make its correspondents available for debriefing by Agency officials. Said Salant: "I said no on talking to the reporters, and let them see broadcast tapes, but no outtakes. This went on for a number of years—into the early Seventies."

In 1964 and 1965, Salant served on a super-secret CIA task force which explored methods of beaming American propaganda broadcasts to the People's Republic of China. The other members of the four-man study team were Zbigniew Brzezinski, then a professor at Columbia University; William Griffith, then professor of political science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and John Haves, then vice-president of the Washington Post Company for radio-TV. The principal government officials associated with the project were Cord Meyer of the CIA; McGeorge Bundy, then special assistant to the president for national security; Leonard Marks, then director of the USIA; and Bill Moyers, then special assistant to President Lyndon Johnson and now a CBS correspondent.

Salant's involvement in the project began with a call from Leonard Marks, "who told me the White House wanted to form a committee of four people to make a study of U.S. overseas broadcasts behind the Iron Curtain." When Salant arrived in Washington for the first meeting he was told that the project was CIA sponsored. "Its purpose," he said, "was to determine how best to set up shortwave broadcasts into Red China." Accompanied by a CIA officer named Paul Henzie, the committee of four subsequently travelled around the world inspecting facilities run by Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty both CIA-run operations at the time), the Voice of America and Armed Forces Radio. After more than a year of study, they submitted a report to Moyers recommending that the government establish a broadcast service, run by the Voice of America, to be beamed at the People's Republic of China. Salant has served two tours as head of CBS News, from 1961-64 and 1966-present. At the time of the China project he was a CBS corporate executive.)

*Time* and *Newsweek* magazines. According to CIA and Senate sources, Agency files contain written agreements with former foreign correspondents and stringers for both the weekly news magazines. The same sources refused to say whether the CIA has ended all its associations with individuals who work for the two publications. Allen Dulles often interceded with his good friend, the late Henry Luce, founder of *Time* and *Life* magazines, who readily allowed certain members of his staff to work for the Agency and agreed to provide jobs and credentials for other CIA operatives who lacked journalistic experience.
For many years, Luce's personal emissary to the CIA was C.D. Jackson, a Time Inc., vice-president who was publisher of *Life* magazine from 1960 until his death in 1964. While a *Time* executive, Jackson coauthored a CIA-sponsored study recommending the reorganization of the American intelligence services in the early 1950s. Jackson, whose *Time-Life* service was interrupted by a one-year White House tour as an assistant to President Dwight Eisenhower, approved specific arrangements for providing CIA employees with *Time-Life* cover. Some of these arrangements were made with the knowledge of Luce's wife, Clare Boothe. Other arrangements for *Time* cover, according to CIA officials including those who dealt with Luce, were made with the knowledge of Hedley Donovan, now editor-in-chief of Time Inc. Donovan, who took over editorial direction of all Time Inc. publications in 1959, denied in a telephone interview that he knew of any such arrangements. "I was never approached and I'd be amazed if Luce approved such arrangements," Donovan said. "Luce had a very scrupulous regard for the difference between journalism and government."

In the 1950s and early 1960s, *Time* magazine's foreign correspondents attended CIA "briefing" dinners similar to those the CIA held for CBS. And Luce, according to CIA officials, made it a regular practice to brief Dulles or other high Agency officials when he returned from his frequent trips abroad. Luce and the men who ran his magazines in the 1950s and 1960s encouraged their foreign correspondents to provide help to the CIA, particularly information that might be useful to the Agency for intelligence purposes or recruiting foreigners.

At *Newsweek*, Agency sources reported, the CIA engaged the services of several foreign correspondents and stringers under arrangements approved by senior editors at the magazine. *Newsweek*'s stringer in Rome in the mid-Fifties made little secret of the fact that he worked for the CIA. Malcolm Muir, *Newsweek*'s editor from its founding in 1937 until its sale to the Washington Post Company in 1961, said in a recent interview that his dealings with the CIA were limited to private briefings he gave Allen Dulles after trips abroad and arrangements he approved for regular debriefing of *Newsweek* correspondents by the Agency. He said that he had never provided cover for CIA operatives, but that others high in the *Newsweek* organization might have done so without his knowledge.

"I would have thought there might have been stringers who were agents, but I didn't know who they were," said Muir. "I do think in those days the CIA kept pretty close touch with all responsible reporters. Whenever I heard something that I thought might be of interest to Allen Dulles, I'd call him up.... At one point he appointed one of his CIA men to keep in regular contact with our reporters, a chap that I knew but whose name I can't remember. I had a number of friends in Allen Dulles' organization." Muir said that Harry Kern, *Newsweek*'s foreign editor from 1945 until 1956, and Ernest K. Lindley, the magazine's Washington bureau chief during the same period "regularly checked in with various fellows in the CIA."

"To the best of my knowledge," said Kern, "nobody at Newsweek worked for the CIA... The informal relationship was there. Why have anybody sign anything? What we knew we told them [the CIA] and the State Department.... When I went to Washington, I would talk to Foster or Allen Dulles about what was going on. ... We thought it was admirable at the time. We were all on the same side." CIA officials say that Kern's dealings with the Agency were extensive. In 1956, he left *Newsweek* to run *Foreign Reports*, a Washington-based newsletter whose subscribers Kern refuses to identify.

Ernest Lindley, who remained at *Newsweek* until 1961, said in a recent interview that he regularly consulted with Dulles and other high CIA officials before going abroad and briefed them upon his return. "Allen was very helpful to me and I tried to reciprocate when I could," he said. "I'd give him my impressions of people I'd met overseas. Once or twice he asked me
to brief a large group of intelligence people; when I came back from the Asian-African conference in 1955, for example; they mainly wanted to know about various people.”

As Washington bureau chief, Lindley said he learned from Malcolm Muir that the magazine's stringer in southeastern Europe was a CIA contract employee—given credentials under arrangements worked out with the management. "I remember it came up—whether it was a good idea to keep this person from the Agency; eventually it was decided to discontinue the association," Lindley said.

When Newsweek was purchased by the Washington Post Company, publisher Philip L. Graham was informed by Agency officials that the CIA occasionally used the magazine for cover purposes, according to CIA sources. "It was widely known that Phil Graham was somebody you could get help from," said a former deputy director of the Agency. "Frank Wisner dealt with him." Wisner, deputy director of the CIA from 1950 until shortly before his suicide in 1965, was the Agency's premier orchestrator of "black" operations, including many in which journalists were involved. Wisner liked to boast of his "mighty Wurlitzer," a wondrous propaganda instrument he built, and played, with help from the press.) Phil Graham was probably Wisner's closest friend. But Graham, who committed suicide in 1963, apparently knew little of the specifics of any cover arrangements with Newsweek, CIA sources said.

In 1965-66, an accredited Newsweek stringer in the Far East was in fact a CIA contract employee earning an annual salary of $10,000 from the Agency, according to Robert T. Wood, then a CIA officer in the Hong Kong station. Some, Newsweek correspondents and stringers continued to maintain covert ties with the Agency into the 1970s, CIA sources said.

Information about Agency dealings with the Washington Post newspaper is extremely sketchy. According to CIA officials, some Post stringers have been CIA employees, but these officials say they do not know if anyone in the Post management was aware of the arrangements.

All editors-in-chief and managing editors of the Post since 1950 say they knew of no formal Agency relationship with either stringers or members of the Post staff. "If anything was done it was done by Phil without our knowledge," said one. Agency officials, meanwhile, make no claim that Post staff members have had covert affiliations with the Agency while working for the paper.'

Katharine Graham, Philip Graham's widow and the current publisher of the Post, says she has never been informed of any CIA relationships with either Post or Newsweek personnel. In November of 1973, Mrs. Graham called William Colby and asked if any Post stringers or staff members were associated with the CIA. Colby assured her that no staff members were employed by the Agency but refused to discuss the question of stringers.

The Louisville Courier-Journal. From December 1964 until March 1965, a CIA undercover operative named Robert H. Campbell worked on the Courier-Journal. According to high-level CIA sources, Campbell was hired by the paper under arrangements the Agency made with Norman E. Isaacs, then executive editor of the Courier-Journal. Barry Bingham Sr., then publisher of the paper, also had knowledge of the arrangements, the sources said. Both Isaacs and Bingham have denied knowing that Campbell was an intelligence agent when he was hired.

The complex saga of Campbell's hiring was first revealed in a Courier-Journal story written by James R Herzog on March 27th, 1976, during the Senate committee's investigation, Herzog's account began: "When 28-year-old Robert H. Campbell was hired as a Courier-Journal reporter in December 1964, he couldn't type and knew little about news
writing." The account then quoted the paper's former managing editor as saying that Isaacs told him that Campbell was hired as a result of a CIA request: “Norman said, when he was in Washington [in 1964], he had been called to lunch with some friend of his who was with the CIA [and that] he wanted to send this young fellow down to get him a little knowledge of newspapering." All aspects of Campbell's hiring were highly unusual. No effort had been made to check his credentials, and his employment records contained the following two notations: “Isaacs has files of correspondence and investigation of this man”; and, “Hired for temporary work—no reference checks completed or needed.”

The level of Campbell's journalistic abilities apparently remained consistent during his stint at the paper, “The stuff that Campbell turned in was almost unreadable,” said a former assistant city editor. One of Campbell's major reportorial projects was a feature about wooden Indians. It was never published. During his tenure at the paper, Campbell frequented a bar a few steps from the office where, on occasion, he reportedly confided to fellow drinkers that he was a CIA employee.

According to CIA sources, Campbell's tour at the Courier-Journal was arranged to provide him with a record of journalistic experience that would enhance the plausibility of future reportorial cover and teach him something about the newspaper business. The Courier-Journal's investigation also turned up the fact that before coming to Louisville he had worked briefly for the Hornell, New York, Evening Tribune, published by Freedom News, Inc. CIA sources said the Agency had made arrangements with that paper's management to employ Campbell.

At the Courier-Journal, Campbell was hired under arrangements made with Isaacs and approved by Bingham, said CIA and Senate sources. “We paid the Courier-Journal so they could pay his salary,” said an Agency official who was involved in the transaction. Responding by letter to these assertions, Isaacs, who left Louisville to become president and publisher of the Wilmington Delaware) News & Journal, said: “All I can do is repeat the simple truth—that never, under any circumstances, or at any time, have I ever knowingly hired a government agent. I've also tried to dredge my memory, but Campbell's hiring meant so little to me that nothing emerges.... None of this is to say that I couldn't have been 'had.'” Barry Bingham Sr., said last year in a telephone interview that he had no specific memory of Campbell's hiring and denied that he knew of any arrangements between the newspaper's management and the CIA. However, CIA officials said that the Courier-Journal, through contacts with Bingham, provided other unspecified assistance to the Agency in the 1950s and 1960s. The Courier-Journal's detailed, front-page account of Campbell's hiring was initiated by Barry Bingham Jr., who succeeded his father as editor and publisher of the paper in 1971. The article is the only major piece of self-investigation by a newspaper that has appeared on this subject.

The American Broadcasting Company and the National Broadcasting Company. According to CIA officials, ABC continued to provide cover for some CIA operatives through the 1960s. One was Sam Jaffe who CIA officials said performed clandestine tasks for the Agency. Jaffe has acknowledged only providing the CIA with information. In addition, another well-known network correspondent performed covert tasks for the Agency, said CIA sources. At the time of the Senate hearings, Agency officials serving at the highest levels refused to say whether the CIA was still maintaining active relationships with members of the ABC-News organization. All cover arrangements were made with the knowledge off ABC executives, the sources said.

These same sources professed to know few specifics about the Agency’s relationships with NBC, except that several foreign correspondents of the network undertook some assignments for the Agency in the 1950s and 1960s. “It was a thing people did then,” said Richard Wald, president of NBC News since 1973. “I wouldn’t be surprised if people here—including some of the correspondents in those days—had connections with the Agency.”
The Copley Press, and its subsidiary, the Copley News Service. This relationship, first disclosed publicly by reporters Joe Trento and Dave Roman in *Penthouse* magazine, is said by CIA officials to have been among the Agency's most productive in terms of getting "outside" cover for its employees. Copley owns nine newspapers in California and Illinois—among them the *San Diego Union* and *Evening Tribune*. The Trento-Roman account, which was financed by a grant from the Fund for Investigative Journalism, asserted that at least twenty-three Copley News Service employees performed work for the CIA. "The Agency's involvement with the Copley organization is so extensive that it's almost impossible to sort out," said a CIA official who was asked about the relationship late in 1976. Other Agency officials said then that James S. Copley, the chain's owner until his death in 1973, personally made most of the cover arrangements with the CIA.

According to Trento and Roman, Copley personally volunteered his news service to then-president Eisenhower to act as "the eyes and ears" against "the Communist threat in Latin and Central America" for "our intelligence services." James Copley was also the guiding hand behind the Inter-American Press Association, a CIA-funded organization with heavy membership among right-wing Latin American newspaper editors.

Other major news organizations. According to Agency officials, CIA files document additional cover arrangements with the following news-gathering organizations, among others: the *New York Herald-Tribune*, the *Saturday-Evening Post*, Scripps-Howard Newspapers, Hearst Newspapers Seymour K. Freidin, Hearst's current London bureau chief and a former *Herald-Tribune* editor and correspondent, has been identified as a CIA operative by Agency sources), Associated Press," United Press International, the Mutual Broadcasting System, Reuters and the *Miami Herald*. Cover arrangements with the *Herald*, according to CIA officials, were unusual in that they were made "on the ground by the CIA station in Miami, not from CIA headquarters.

"And that's just a small part of the list," in the words of one official who served in the CIA hierarchy. Like many sources, this official said that the only way to end the uncertainties about aid furnished the Agency by journalists is to disclose the contents of the CIA files—a course opposed by almost all of the thirty-five present and former CIA officials interviewed over the course of a year,

**COLBY CUTS HIS LOSSES**

*THE CIA'S USE OF JOURNALISTS CONTINUED VIRTUALLY unabated until 1973 when, in response to public disclosure that the Agency had secretly employed American reporters, William Colby began scaling down the program. In his public statements, Colby conveyed the impression that the use of journalists had been minimal and of limited importance to the Agency.

He then initiated a series of moves intended to convince the press, Congress and the public that the CIA had gotten out of the news business. But according to Agency officials, Colby had in fact thrown a protective net around his valuable intelligence in the journalistic community. He ordered his deputies to maintain Agency ties with its best journalist contacts while severing formal relationships with many regarded as inactive, relatively unproductive or only marginally important. In reviewing Agency files to comply with Colby's directive, officials found that many journalists had not performed useful functions for the CIA in years. Such relationships, perhaps as many as a hundred, were terminated between 1973 and 1976.

Meanwhile, important CIA operatives who had been placed on the staffs of some major newspaper and broadcast outlets were told to resign and become stringers or freelancers, thus enabling Colby to assure concerned editors that members of their staffs were not CIA employees. Colby also feared that some valuable stringer-operatives might find their covers
blown if scrutiny of the Agency’s ties with journalists continued. Some of these individuals were reassigned to jobs on so-called proprietary publications—foreign periodicals and broadcast outlets secretly funded and staffed by the CIA. Other journalists who had signed formal contracts with the CIA—making them employees of the Agency—were released from their contracts, and asked to continue working under less formal arrangements.

In November 1973, after many such shifts had been made, Colby told reporters and editors from the New York Times and the Washington Star that the Agency had “some three dozen” American newsmen “on the CIA payroll,” including five who worked for “general-circulation news organizations.” Yet even while the Senate Intelligence Committee was holding its hearings in 1976, according to high-level CIA sources, the CIA continued to maintain ties with seventy-five to ninety journalists of every description—executives, reporters, stringers, photographers, columnists, bureau clerks and members of broadcast technical crews. More than half of these had been moved off CIA contracts and payrolls but they were still bound by other secret agreements with the Agency. According to an unpublished report by the House Select Committee on Intelligence, chaired by Representative Otis Pike, at least fifteen news organizations were still providing cover for CIA operatives as of 1976.

Colby, who built a reputation as one of the most skilled undercover tacticians in the CIA’s history, had himself run journalists in clandestine operations before becoming director in 1973. But even he was said by his closest associates to have been disturbed at how extensively and, in his view, indiscriminately, the Agency continued to use journalists at the time he took over. “Too prominent,” the director frequently said of some of the individuals and news organizations then working with the CIA. Others in the Agency refer to their best-known journalistic assets as “brand names.”

“Colby’s concern was that he might lose the resource altogether unless we became a little more careful about who we used and how we got them,” explained one of the former director’s deputies. The thrust of Colby’s subsequent actions was to move the Agency’s affiliations away from the so-called “majors” and to concentrate them instead in smaller newspaper chains, broadcasting groups and such specialized publications as trade journals and newsletters.

After Colby left the Agency on January 28th, 1976, and was succeeded by George Bush, the CIA announced a new policy: “Effective immediately, the CIA will not enter into any paid or contractual relationship with any full-time or part-time news correspondent accredited by any U.S. news service, newspaper, periodical, radio or television network or station” At the time of the announcement, the Agency acknowledged that the policy would result in termination of less than half of the relationships with the 50 U.S. journalists it said were still affiliated with the Agency. The text of the announcement noted that the CIA would continue to “welcome” the voluntary, unpaid cooperation of journalists. Thus, many relationships were permitted to remain intact.

The Agency’s unwillingness to end its use of journalists and its continued relationships with some news executives is largely the product of two basic facts of the intelligence game: journalistic cover is ideal because of the inquisitive nature of a reporter’s job; and many other sources of institutional cover have been denied the CIA in recent years by businesses, foundations and educational institutions that once cooperated with the Agency.

“It’s tough to run a secret agency in this country,” explained one high-level CIA official. “We have a curious ambivalence about intelligence. In order to serve overseas we need cover. But we have been fighting a rear-guard action to try and provide cover. The Peace Corps is off-limits, so is USA, the foundations and voluntary organizations have been off-limits since ’67, and there is a self-imposed prohibition on Fulbrights [Fulbright Scholars]. If you take the American community and line up who could work for the CIA and who couldn’t there is a very narrow potential. Even the Foreign Service doesn’t want us. So
where the hell do you go? Business is nice, but the press is a natural. One journalist is worth twenty agents. He has access, the ability to ask questions without arousing suspicion."

ROLE OF THE CHURCH COMMITTEE

**DESPITE THE EVIDENCE OF WIDESPREAD CIA USE OF** journalists, the Senate Intelligence Committee and its staff decided against questioning any of the reporters, editors, publishers or broadcast executives whose relationships with the Agency are detailed in CIA files.

According to sources in the Senate and the Agency, the use of journalists was one of two areas of inquiry which the CIA went to extraordinary lengths to curtail. The other was the Agency’s continuing and extensive use of academics for recruitment and information gathering purposes.

In both instances, the sources said, former directors Colby and Bush and CIA special counsel Mitchell Rogovin were able to convince key members of the committee that full inquiry or even limited public disclosure of the dimensions of the activities would do irreparable damage to the nation’s intelligence-gathering apparatus, as well as to the reputations of hundreds of individuals. Colby was reported to have been especially persuasive in arguing that disclosure would bring on a latter-day “witch hunt” in which the victims would be reporters, publishers and editors.

Walter Elder, deputy to former CIA director McCone and the principal Agency liaison to the Church committee, argued that the committee lacked jurisdiction because there had been no misuse of journalists by the CIA; the relationships had been voluntary. Elder cited as an example the case of the *Louisville Courier-Journal*. “Church and other people on the committee were on the chandelier about the *Courier-Journal*,” one Agency official said, “until we pointed out that we had gone to the editor to arrange cover, and that the editor had said, ‘Fine.’”

Some members of the Church committee and staff feared that Agency officials had gained control of the inquiry and that they were being hoodwinked. “The Agency was extremely clever about it and the committee played right into its hands,” said one congressional source familiar with all aspects of the inquiry. “Church and some of the other members were much more interested in making headlines than in doing serious, tough investigating. The Agency pretended to be giving up a lot whenever it was asked about the flashy stuff—assassinations and secret weapons and James Bond operations. Then, when it came to things that they didn’t want to give away, that were much more important to the Agency, Colby in particular called in his chits. And the committee bought it.”

The Senate committee’s investigation into the use of journalists was supervised by William B. Bader, a former CIA intelligence officer who returned briefly to the Agency this year as deputy to CIA director Stansfield Turner and is now a high-level intelligence official at the Defence Department. Bader was assisted by David Aaron, who now serves as the deputy to Zbigniew Brzezinski, President Carter’s national security adviser.

According to colleagues on the staff of the Senate inquiry, both Bader and Aaron were disturbed by the information contained in CIA files about journalists; they urged that further investigation he undertaken by the Senate’s new permanent CIA oversight committee. That committee, however, has spent its first year of existence writing a new charter for the CIA, and members say there has been little interest in delving further into the CIA’s use of the press.
Bader's investigation was conducted under unusually difficult conditions. His first request for specific information on the use of journalists was turned down by the CIA on grounds that there had been no abuse of authority and that current intelligence operations might be compromised. Senators Walter Huddleston, Howard Baker, Gary Hart, Walter Mondale and Charles Mathias—who had expressed interest in the subject of the press and the CIA—shared Bader's distress at the CIA's reaction. In a series of phone calls and meetings with CIA director George Bush and other Agency officials, the senators insisted that the committee staff be provided information about the scope of CIA-press activities. Finally, Bush agreed to order a search of the files and have those records pulled which deals with operations where journalists had been used. But the raw files could not be made available to Bader or the committee, Bush insisted. Instead, the director decided, his deputies would condense the material into one-paragraph summaries describing in the most general terms the activities of each individual journalist. Most important, Bush decreed, the names of journalists and of the news organizations with which they were affiliated would be omitted from the summaries. However, there might be some indication of the region where the journalist had served and a general description of the type of news organization for which he worked.

Assembling the summaries was difficult, according to CIA officials who supervised the job. There were no “journalist files” per se and information had to be collected from divergent sources that reflect the highly compartmentalized character of the CIA. Case officers who had handled journalists supplied some names. Files were pulled on various undercover operations in which it seemed logical that journalists had been used. Significantly, all work by reporters for the Agency under the category of covert operations, not foreign intelligence.” Old station records were culled. “We really had to scramble,” said one official.

After several weeks, Bader began receiving the summaries, which numbered over 400 by the time the Agency said it had completed searching its files.

The Agency played an intriguing numbers game with the committee. Those who prepared the material say it was physically impossible to produce all of the Agency's files on the use of journalists. “We gave them a broad, representative picture,” said one agency official. “We never pretended it was a total description of the range of activities over 25 years, or of the number of journalists who have done things for us.” A relatively small number of the summaries described the activities of foreign journalists—including those working as stringers for American publications. Those officials most knowledgeable about the subject say that a figure of 400 American journalists is on the low side of the actual number who maintained covert relationships and undertook clandestine tasks.

Bader and others to whom he described the contents of the summaries immediately reached some general conclusions: the sheer number of covert relationships with journalists was far greater than the CIA had ever hinted; and the Agency's use of reporters and news executives was an intelligence asset of the first magnitude. Reporters had been involved in almost every conceivable kind of operation. Of the 400-plus individuals whose activities were summarized, between 200 and 250 were “working journalists” in the usual sense of the term—reporters, editors, correspondents, photographers; the rest were employed at least nominally) by book publishers, trade publications and newsletters.

Still, the summaries were just that: compressed, vague, sketchy, incomplete. They could be subject to ambiguous interpretation. And they contained no suggestion that the CIA had abused its authority by manipulating the editorial content of American newspapers or broadcast reports.

Bader's unease with what he had found led him to seek advice from several experienced hands in the fields of foreign relations and intelligence. They suggested that he press for more information and give those members of the committee in whom he had the most confidence a general idea of what the summaries revealed. Bader again went to Senators
Huddleston, Baker, Hart, Mondale and Mathias. Meanwhile, he told the CIA that he wanted to see more—the full files on perhaps a hundred or so of the individuals whose activities had been summarized. The request was turned down outright. The Agency would provide no more information on the subject. Period.

The CIA’s intransigence led to an extraordinary dinner meeting at Agency headquarters in late March 1976. Those present included Senators Frank Church who had now been briefed by Bader), and John Tower, the vice-chairman of the committee; Bader; William Miller, director of the committee staff; CIA director Bush; Agency counsel Rogovin; and Seymour Bolten, a high-level CIA operative who for years had been a station chief in Germany and Willy Brandt’s case officer. Bolten had been deputized by Bush to deal with the committee’s requests for information on journalists and academics. At the dinner, the Agency held to its refusal to provide any full files. Nor would it give the committee the names of any individual journalists described in the 400 summaries or of the news organizations with whom they were affiliated. The discussion, according to participants, grew heated. The committee’s representatives said they could not honor their mandate—to determine if the CIA had abused its authority—without further information. The CIA maintained it could not protect its legitimate intelligence operations or its employees if further disclosures were made to the committee. Many of the journalists were contract employees of the Agency, Bush said at one point, and the CIA was no less obligated to them than to any other agents.

Finally, a highly unusual agreement was hammered out: Bader and Miller would be permitted to examine “sanitized” versions of the full files of twenty-five journalists selected from the summaries; but the names of the journalists and the news organizations which employed them would be blanked out, as would the identities of other CIA employees mentioned in the files. Church and Tower would be permitted to examine the unsanitized versions of five of the twenty-five files—to attest that the CIA was not hiding anything except the names. The whole deal was contingent on an agreement that neither Bader, Miner, Tower nor Church would reveal the contents of the files to other members of the committee or staff.

Bader began reviewing the 400-some summaries again. His object was to select twenty-five that, on the basis of the sketchy information they contained, seemed to represent a cross section. Dates of CIA activity, general descriptions of news organizations, types of journalists and undercover operations all figured in his calculations.

From the twenty-five files he got back, according to Senate sources and CIA officials, an unavoidable conclusion emerged: that to a degree never widely suspected, the CIA in the 1950s, ‘60s and even early ‘70s had concentrated its relationships with journalists in the most prominent sectors of the American press corps, including four or five of the largest newspapers in the country, the broadcast networks and the two major newsmagazines. Despite the omission of names and affiliations from the twenty-five detailed files (each was between three and eleven inches thick), the information was usually sufficient to tentatively identify either the newsman, his affiliation or both—particularly because so many of them were prominent in the profession.

“There is quite an incredible spread of relationships,” Bader reported to the senators. “You don’t need to manipulate Time magazine, for example, because there are Agency people at the management level.”

Ironically, one major news organization that set limits on its dealings with the CIA, according to Agency officials, was the one with perhaps the greatest editorial affinity for the Agency’s long-range goals and policies: U.S. News and World Report. The late David Lawrence, the columnist and founding editor of U.S. News, was a close friend of Allen Dulles. But he repeatedly refused requests by the CIA director to use the magazine for cover purposes, the sources said. At one point, according to a high CIA official, Lawrence issued
orders to his sub-editors in which he threatened to fire any *U.S. News* employee who was found to have entered into a formal relationship with the Agency. Former editorial executives at the magazine confirmed that such orders had been issued. CIA sources declined to say, however, if the magazine remained off-limits to the Agency after Lawrence’s death in 1973 or if Lawrence’s orders had been followed.)

Meanwhile, Bader attempted to get more information from the CIA, particularly about the Agency’s current relationships with journalists. He encountered a stone wall. “Bush has done nothing to date,” Bader told associates. “None of the important operations are affected in even a marginal way.” The CIA also refused the staff’s requests for more information on the use of academics. Bush began to urge members of the committee to curtail its inquiries in both areas and conceal its findings in the final report. “He kept saying, ‘Don’t fuck these guys in the press and on the campuses,’ pleading that they were the only areas of public life with any credibility left,” reported a Senate source. Colby, Elder and Rogovin also implored individual members of the committee to keep secret what the staff had found. “There were a lot of representations that if this stuff got out some of the biggest names in journalism would get smeared,” said another source. Exposure of the CIA’s relationships with journalists and academics, the Agency feared, would close down two of the few avenues of agent recruitment still open. “The danger of exposure is not the other side,” explained one CIA expert in covert operations. “This is not stuff the other side doesn’t know about. The concern of the Agency is that another area of cover will be denied.”

A senator who was the object of the Agency’s lobbying later said: “From the CIA point of view this was the highest, most sensitive covert program of all.... It was a much larger part of the operational system than has been indicated.” He added, “I had a great compulsion to press the point but it was late .... If we had demanded, they would have gone the legal route to fight it.”

Indeed, time was running out for the committee. In the view of many staff members, it had squandered its resources in the search for CIA assassination plots and poison pen letters. It had undertaken the inquiry into journalists almost as an afterthought. The dimensions of the program and the CIA’s sensitivity to providing information on it had caught the staff and the committee by surprise. The CIA oversight committee that would succeed the Church panel would have the inclination and the time to inquire into the subject methodically; if, as seemed likely, the CIA refused to cooperate further, the mandate of the successor committee would put it in a more advantageous position to wage a protracted fight .... Or so the reasoning went as Church and the few other senators even vaguely familiar with Bader’s findings reached a decision not to pursue the matter further. No journalists would be interviewed about their dealings with the Agency—either by the staff or by the senators, in secret or in open session. The spectre, first raised by CIA officials, of a witch hunt in the press corps haunted some members of the staff and the committee. “We weren’t about to bring up guys to the committee and then have everybody say they’ve been traitors to the ideals of their profession,” said a senator.

Bader, according to associates, was satisfied with the decision and believed that the successor committee would pick up the inquiry where he had left it. He was opposed to making public the names of individual journalists. He had been concerned all along that he had entered a “gray area” in which there were no moral absolutes. Had the CIA “manipulated” the press in the classic sense of the term? Probably not, he concluded; the major news organizations and their executives had willingly lent their resources to the Agency; foreign correspondents had regarded work for the CIA as a national service and a way of getting better stories and climbing to the top of their profession. Had the CIA abused its authority? It had dealt with the press almost exactly as it had dealt with other institutions from which it sought cover — the diplomatic service, academia, corporations. There was nothing in the CIA’s charter which declared any of these institutions off-limits to America’s intelligence service. And, in the case of the press, the Agency had exercised more care in its
dealings than with many other institutions; it had gone to considerable lengths to restrict its role to information-gathering and cover."

Bader was also said to be concerned that his knowledge was so heavily based on information furnished by the CIA; he hadn't gotten the other side of the story from those journalists who had associated with the Agency. He could be seeing only “the lantern show,” he told associates. Still, Bader was reasonably sure that he had seen pretty much the full panoply of what was in the files. If the CIA had wanted to deceive him it would have never given away so much, he reasoned. “It was smart of the Agency to cooperate to the extent of showing the material to Bader,” observed a committee source. “That way, if one fine day a file popped up, the Agency would be covered. They could say they had already informed the Congress.”

The dependence on CIA files posed another problem. The CIA’s perception of a relationship with a journalist might be quite different than that of the journalist: a CIA official might think he had exercised control over a journalist; the journalist might think he had simply had a few drinks with a spook. It was possible that CIA case officers had written self-serving memos for the files about their dealings with journalists, that the CIA was just as subject to common bureaucratic “cover-your-ass” paperwork as any other agency of government.

A CIA official who attempted to persuade members of the Senate committee that the Agency’s use of journalists had been innocuous maintained that the files were indeed filled with “puffing” by case officers. “You can’t establish what is puff and what isn’t,” he claimed. Many reporters, he added, “were recruited for finite [specific] undertakings and would be appalled to find that they were listed [in Agency files] as CIA operatives.” This same official estimated that the files contained descriptions of about half a dozen reporters and correspondents who would be considered “famous”—that is, their names would be recognized by most Americans. “The files show that the CIA goes to the press for and just as often that the press comes to the CIA,” he observed. “...There is a tacit agreement in many of these cases that there is going to be a quid pro quo”—i.e., that the reporter is going to get good stories from the Agency and that the CIA will pick up some valuable services from the reporter.

Whatever the interpretation, the findings of the Senate committees inquiry into the use of journalists were deliberately buried—from the full membership of the committee, from the Senate and from the public. “There was a difference of opinion on how to treat the subject,” explained one source. “Some [senators] thought these were abuses which should be exorcized and there were those who said, ‘We don't know if this is bad or not.’”

Bader’s findings on the subject were never discussed with the full committee, even in executive session. That might have led to leaks—especially in view of the explosive nature of the facts. Since the beginning of the Church committee’s investigation, leaks had been the panel’s biggest collective fear, a real threat to its mission. At the slightest sign of a leak the CIA might cut off the flow of sensitive information as it did, several times in other areas), claiming that the committee could not be trusted with secrets. “It was as if we were on trial—not the CIA,” said a member of the committee staff. To describe in the committee’s final report the true dimensions of the Agency’s use of journalists would cause a furore in the press and on the Senate floor. And it would result in heavy pressure on the CIA to end its use of journalists altogether. “We just weren't ready to take that step,” said a senator. A similar decision was made to conceal the results of the staff's inquiry into the use of academics. Bader, who supervised both areas of inquiry, concurred in the decisions and drafted those sections of the committee’s final report. Pages 191 to 201 were entitled “Covert Relationships with the United States Media.” “It hardly reflects what we found,” stated Senator Gary Hart. “There was a prolonged and elaborate negotiation [with the CIA] over what would be said.”
Obscuring the facts was relatively simple. No mention was made of the 400 summaries or what they showed. Instead the report noted blandly that some fifty recent contacts with journalists had been studied by the committee staff—thus conveying the impression that the Agency's dealings with the press had been limited to those instances. The Agency files, the report noted, contained little evidence that the editorial content of American news reports had been affected by the CIA's dealings with journalists. Colby's misleading public statements about the use of journalists were repeated without serious contradiction or elaboration. The role of cooperating news executives was given short shrift. The fact that the Agency had concentrated its relationships in the most prominent sectors of the press went unmentioned. That the CIA continued to regard the press as up for grabs was not even suggested.

Former ‘Washington Post’ reporter CARL BERNSTEIN is now working on a book about the witch hunts of the Cold War.

1 John McCon, director of the Agency from 1961 to 1965, said in a recent interview that he knew about "great deal of debriefing and exchanging help" but nothing about any arrangements for cover the CIA might have made with media organizations. "I wouldn't necessarily have known about it," he said. 'Helms would have handled anything like that. It would be unusual for him to come to me and say, 'We're going to use journalists for cover.' He had a job to do. There was no policy during my period that would say, 'Don't go near that water,' nor was there one saying, 'Go to it!'" During the Church committee hearings, McCone testified that his subordinates failed to tell him about domestic surveillance activities or that they were working on plans to assassinate Fidel Castro. Richard Helms was deputy director of the Agency at the time; he became director in 1966.

2 A stringer is a reporter who works for one or several news organizations on a retainer or on a piecework basis.

3 From the CIA point of view, access to newsfilm outtakes and photo libraries is a matter of extreme importance. The Agency's photo archive is probably the greatest on earth; its graphic sources include satellites, photoreconnaissance, planes, miniature cameras ... and the American press. During the 1950s and 1960s, the Agency obtained carte-blanche borrowing privileges in the photo libraries of literally dozens of American newspapers, magazines and television, outlets. For obvious reasons, the CIA also assigned high priority to the recruitment of photojournalists, particularly foreign-based members of network camera crews.

4 On April 3rd, 1961, Koop left the Washington bureau to become head of CBS, Inc.'s Government Relations Department — a position he held until his retirement on March 31st, 1972. Koop, who worked as a deputy in the Censorship Office in World War II, continued to deal with the CIA in his new position, according to CBS sources.

5 Hayes, who left the Washington Post Company in 1965 to become U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland, is now chairman of the board of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty — both of which severed their ties with the CIA in 1971. Hayes said he cleared his participation in the China project with the late Frederick S. Beebe, then chairman of the board of the Washington Post Company. Katharine Graham, the Post's publisher, was unaware of the nature of the assignment, he said. Participants in the project signed secrecy agreements.

6 Philip Geyelin, editor of the Post editorial page, worked for the Agency before joining the Post.

7 Louis Buisch, president of the publishing company of the Hornell, New York, Evening Tribune, told the Courier-Journal in 1976 that he remembered little about the hiring of
Robert Campbell. "He wasn't there very long, and he didn't make much of an impression," said Buisch, who has since retired from active management of the newspaper.

8 Probably the most thoughtful article on the subject of the press and the CIA was written by Stuart H. Loory and appeared in the September-October 1974 issue of *Columbia Journalism Review*.

9 Wes Gallagher, general manager of the Associated Press from 1962 to 1976, takes vigorous exception to the notion that the Associated Press might have aided the Agency. "We've always stayed clear on the CIA; I would have fired anybody who worked for them. We don't even let our people debrief." At the time of the first disclosures that reporters had worked for the CIA, Gallagher went to Colby. "We tried to find out names. All he would say was that no full-time staff member of the Associated Press was employed by the Agency. We talked to Bush. He said the same thing." If any Agency personnel were placed in Associated Press bureaus, said Gallagher, it was done without consulting the management of the wire service. But Agency officials insist that they were able to make cover arrangements through someone in the upper management levels of Associated Press, whom they refuse to identify.

10 Many journalists and some CIA officials dispute the Agency's claim that it has been scrupulous in respecting the editorial integrity of American publications and broadcast outlets

**SUBVERTING THE MEDIA**

By David Guyatt taken (without permission) from the DeepBlackLies website

In discussing the assassination of John F. Kennedy, Dan Rather, the well-loved anchorman for CBS Television, described the now famous Zapruder film that captured footage of the shot which killed President John F. Kennedy. The movie, taken by amateur cameraman, Abraham Zapruder, was quickly snapped up by Life magazine for $250,000.00. Although Life published still frames of the movie, the 18 second film was kept under lock and key – not to be seen by Americans until 1975.

But Rather's remarks were misleading. He told his viewers that the film showed JFK falling forward – confirming the official view that Kennedy had been shot from behind. However, the film clearly showed Kennedy lurching violently backwards, evidence of a frontal shot. To add to the confusion, the Warren Commission report printed two frames of the film in reverse again implying a rear shot - an accident the FBI typified as a “printing error.”

Meanwhile, still pictures lifted from the Zapruder film were also published by Life magazine. Remarkably, they too were published in reverse order, thereby creating the impression that the President had been shot from behind by lone gunman Lee Harvey Oswald. Until the film was shown to Americans in its entirety, no one was the wiser. Following the broadcast in 1975, a massive controversy followed giving rise to ongoing allegations of conspiracy.

The Zapruder film clearly showed President Kennedy had also been shot from the front. The result immeasurably strengthened the charge - that had been bubbling in the background – that the President had been assassinated as a result of a well orchestrated conspiracy, and that this was covered-up to protect the guilty, who many now believe involved senior figures in the CIA and US military. Not least it was pointed out that Henry Luce, the founder of Life magazine was a close personal friend of Allen Dulles, the Director of the CIA. Moreover, the individual who purchased the Zapruder film for Life magazine was C.J. Jackson, formerly a “psychological warfare” consultant to the President.
Inevitably, these events were to lead to accusations that the media were culpable of the worst form of toadying and propaganda. This, in turn raised serious questions about the role and integrity of the mass media. Some years later, Washington Post reporter, Carl Bernstein – who came to fame with his colleague Bob Woodward, for their expose of the Nixon administration’s illegal re-election campaign activities, known as “Watergate” – dropped a media bombshell on an unsuspecting America.

In an October 1977, article published by Rolling Stone magazine, Bernstein reported that more than 400 American journalists worked for the CIA. Bernstein went on to reveal that this cozy arrangement had covered the preceding 25 years. Sources told Bernstein that the New York Times, America’s most respected newspaper at the time, was one of the CIA’s closest media collaborators. Seeking to spread the blame, the New York Times published an article in December 1977, revealing that “more than eight hundred news and public information organisations and individuals,” had participated in the CIA’s covert subversion of the media.

“One journalist is worth twenty agents,” a high-level source told Bernstein. Spies were trained as journalists and then later infiltrated – often with the publishers consent - into the most prestigious media outlets in America, including the New York Times and Time Magazine. Likewise, numerous reputable journalists underwent training in various aspects of “spook-craft” by the CIA. This included techniques as varied as secret writing, surveillance and other spy crafts.

The subversion operation was orchestrated by Frank Wisner, an old CIA hand who’s clandestine activities dated back to WW11. Wisner’s media manipulation programme became known as the “Wisner Wurlitzer,” and proved an effective technique for sending journalists overseas to spy for the CIA. Of the fifty plus overseas news proprietary’s owned by the CIA were The Rome Daily American, The Manila Times and the Bangkok Post.

Yet, according to some experts, there was another profound reason for the CIA’s close relations with the media. In his book, “Virtual Government,” author Alex Constantine goes to some lengths to explore the birth and spread of Operation Mockingbird. This, Constantine explains, was a CIA project designed to influence the major media for domestic propaganda purposes. One of the most important “assets” used by the CIA’s Frank Wisner was Philip Graham, publisher of the Washington Post. A decade later both Wisner and Graham committed suicide – leading some to question the exact nature of their deaths. More recently doubts have been cast on Wisner’s suicide verdict by some observers who believed him to have been a Soviet agent.

Meanwhile, however, Wisner had “implemented his plan and owned respected members of the New York Times, Newsweek, CBS and other communication vehicles, plus stringers...” according to Deborah Davis in her biography of Katharine Graham – wife of Philip Graham - and current publisher of the Washington Post. The operation was overseen by Allen Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence. Operation Mockingbird continued to flourish with CIA agents boasting at having “important assets” inside every major news outlet in the country.” The list included such luminaries of the US media as Henry Luce, publisher of Time Magazine, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, of the New York Times and C.D. Jackson of Fortune Magazine, according to Constantine.

But there was another aspect to Mockingbird, Constantine reveals in an Internet essay. Citing historian C. Vann Woodward’s New York Times article of 1987, Ronald Reagan, later to become President of the US, was a FBI snitch earlier in his life. This dated back to the time when Reagan was President of the Actor’s Guild. Woodward says that Reagan “fed the names of suspect people in his organisation to the FBI secretly and regularly enough to be assigned an informer's code number, T.10.” The purpose was to purge the film industry of “subversives.”
As these stories hit the news, Senate investigators began to probe the CIA sponsored manipulation of the media – the “Fourth Estate” that supposedly was dedicated to acting as a check and balance on the excesses of the executive. This investigation was, however, curtailed at the insistence of Central Intelligence Agency Directors, William Colby and George Bush – who would later be elected US President. The information gathered by the Senate Select Intelligence Committee chaired by Senator Frank Church, was “deliberately buried” Bernstein reported.

Despite this suppression of evidence, information leaked out that revealed the willing role of media executives to subvert their own industry. “Let’s not pick on some reporters,” CIA Director William Colby stated during an interview. “Let’s go to the managements. They were witting.” Bernstein concluded that “America’s leading publishers allowed themselves and their news services to become handmaidens to the intelligence services.” Of the household names that went along with this arrangement were: Columbia Broadcasting System, Copley News Service – which gave the CIA confidential information on antiwar and black protestors – ABC TV, NBC, Associated Press, United Press International, Reuters, Newsweek, Time, Scripps-Howard, Hearst Newspapers and the Miami Herald. Bernstein additionally stated that the two most bullish media outlets to co-operate were the New York Times and CBS Television. The New York Times even went so far as to submit stories to Allen Dulles and his replacement, John McConel, to vet and approve before publication.

Slowly, the role of Mockingbird in muzzling and manipulating the press began to be revealed. In 1974, two former CIA agents, Victor Marchetti and John D. Marks, published a sensational book entitled “The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence.” The book caused uproar for the many revelations it contained. Included amongst them was the fact that the, until then, widely respected Encounter magazine was indirectly funded by the CIA. The vehicle used to covertly transfer funds to Encounter and many other publications, was the Congress for Cultural Freedom (CCF) – a CIA front. A decade earlier, in 1965, the CCF was renamed Forum World Features (FWF) and purchased by Kern House Enterprises, under the direction of John Hay Whitney, publisher of the International Herald Tribune and former US Ambassador to the United Kingdom.

The Chairman of Forum World Features was Brian Crozier, who resigned his position shortly before the explosive book went on sale. Crozier, a former “Economist” journalist, was a “contact” of Britain’s Secret Intelligence Service (MI6). His employment to head up the CIA financed Forum World Features in 1965, caused a row with MI6 who felt the CIA had breached the secret agreement between the UK and USA by recruiting one of their own assets.

Crozier’s media style was more discrete than Mockingbird. He preferred, when possible, to insert his pre-spun propaganda stories to unwitting members of the media, who would reprint them unaware of the bias they contained. In time, Crozier would go on to head up a shadowy anti subversive and dirty tricks group called the “61,” that sought to counter communist propaganda. Another group of which he was a member was the Pinay Cercle – a right wing Atlanticist group funded by the CIA - that claimed credit for getting Margaret Thatcher elected as British Prime Minister.

Another propaganda operation, run from Lisburn barracks in Northern Ireland, and under nominal British Army control, participated in extensive media manipulation around the same time. Known as “Clockwork Orange” this involved the construction of propaganda material designed to discredit prominent members of the then Labour government as well as some in the Conservative shadow cabinet. Especially targeted was then Prime Minister Harold Wilson. Clockwork Orange relied heavily on forged documents that would be given to selected journalists for publication. Many of these forgeries sought to demonstrate secret communist ties – or east bloc intelligence affiliations – amongst high profile politicians.
The aim was to destabilise Wilson and the Labour government by falsely showing them to be soft on communism or even pro communist. This operation clearly favoured a right wing Conservative administration under the leadership of Mrs. Thatcher. In the event, Wilson resigned, said to have been sickened by the numerous personal snipe attacks against him. During the time he was under siege, Wilson experienced numerous break ins at his office, as well as having his phone lines tapped—courtesy of unnamed officials in the security service, it is believed. By 1979 the Conservative party was returned to power.

Yet, with the demise of the cold war the motive for media propaganda has collapsed. Or has it? James Lilly, former Director of Operations at the CIA later became Director of Asian studies at the American Enterprise Institute—a think tank heavily staffed by former intelligence types. Lilly, in giving testimony to a Senate committee during 1996 observed: “Journalists, I think, you don’t recruit them. We can’t do that. They’ve told us not to do that. But you certainly sit down with your journalists, and I’ve done this and the Station Chief has done it, others have done it…”

But even as the cold war rationale for subverting the media recedes into the distance, press manipulation continues anon. A classified CIA report surfaced in 1992, that revealed the Agency’s public affairs office “…has relationships with reporters from every major wire service, newspaper, news weekly, and television network in the nation.” The report added that the benefits of these continued contacts had been fruitful to the CIA by turning “intelligence failure stories into intelligence success stories…” Basking in a glow of self satisfaction, the report continued “In many cases, we have persuaded reporters to postpone, change, hold or even scrap stories that could have adversely affected national security interests.”

But the last word goes to Noam Chomsky. A Professor of Linguistics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Chomsky has extensively investigated the role of today's media. His analysis is un-nerving. The democratic postulate, Chomsky says, “is that the media are independent and committed to discovering and reporting the truth...” Despite this axiom, Chomsky finds that the media supports “established power” and is “responsive to the needs of government and major power groups.” He additionally argues that the media is a mechanism for pervasive “thought control” of elite interests and that ordinary citizens need to “undertake a course of intellectual self-defence to protect themselves from manipulation and control...” The covert role of the media has now apparently shifted its focus. One time expediter of the “cold war,” it now clamours for the extension of “corporate power.”

Was the CIA behind Thatcher's election?

Brian Crozier’s protégé was Robert Moss—a speech writer for Margaret Thatcher. It was Moss who wrote Thatcher’s now famous speech “The Sovietization of Britain” that resulted in her being nick-named the “Iron Lady.” It was Thatcher's strident anti-communism and laissez faire free market economic policies that made her so attractive to powerful right wingers in the Conservative party, and ensured her election as Conservative leader. Moss, received much of his inspiration from Cord Meyer, Jr., the London CIA Station Chief—and long time expert in covert operations. Additional input to Moss came from the CIA’s Miles Copeland, formerly the head of the CIA’s “Gaming Room” in Langley, Virginia. The Gaming Room was used to simulate covert actions prior to them being acted out for real.

Profile of Professor Noam Chomsky

Professor of Linguistics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Noam Chomsky is an internationally acclaimed, scholar, writer and political activist who has extensively scrutinised the thorny subject of media manipulation by elite and corporate interests. His books “Necessary Illusions – Thought Control in Democratic Societies,” and “Manufacturing Consent,” co-authored with Edward Herman, are considered classics on the subject.
Chomsky argues that the role of money and elite interests continue to undermine a meaningful society. Professor Chomsky's views will be expounded more fully in an exclusive interview to be published in a forthcoming issue of The X Factor.

The CIA use of the media to undermine Chile

In his expose of the CIA's subversion of the media, reporter Carl Bernstein outlined how Chile's socialist Prime Minister, Salvador Allende, was brought to ruin by a CIA sponsored media campaign. According to Bernstein, one of the Agency's most valuable media “assets” was Hal Hendrix, the Miami News Latin American correspondent during the 1960's. Hendrix, who was known as “The Spook” by his colleagues, was at the forefront of a CIA sponsored anti Allende media campaign. Other reporters sympathetic to the CIA's strategy, funnelled Agency funds to Allende's political foes, as well as writing anti Allende propaganda for CIA controlled newspapers. The entire “get Allende” campaign was orchestrated by the Nixon White House which was under pressure from major US corporations like Coca Cola and IT&T to “keep Allende from taking power.”

Journalists and corporate suppression of the news

Professor Noam Chomsky, and his co-author Edward Herman, in their book “Manufacturing Consent,” have gone to extraordinary lengths to demonstrate how media censorship operates. Self censorship, the authors maintain, largely results from a set of “filters” inculcated into the very heart of journalism, that Chomsky and Herman call the “Propaganda model.” The first of these “filters” the authors maintain, arises from corporate ownership primarily resulting in the mass media being beholden to “profit orientation.” The argument is that the largest media enterprises are now owned not just by one or two corporate entities, but by dozens of them – via cross-ownership. Consequently, a given media outlet is less likely to bite the hand that owns it.

The authors go on to cite a number of additional filters that operate behind the scenes. These range from the power of advertisers through to the role played by powerful pressure groups – for example the military – who work hard to “shape” information in a favourable light. This is a clear example and one that defence correspondents are all too aware of. The Pentagon can be a great aid to a defence journalist providing inside information and other access. But this sort of co-operation and access is dependent on the angle or “spin” that will appear in the resulting story. In other words the article must meet with their approval. If, on the other hand, the story attacks the military, co-operation is quickly pulled. Other powerful pressure groups operate in a similar fashion. These include, for example, the arms, oil, pharmaceutical, farmers and brewing industries.

Today, barely any story reaches the media that hasn't been artfully packaged by Public Relations guru's - retained for their ability to slant stories in favour of their clients interests. Television news regularly air news items that use pre-shot footage supplied by corporate film wizards. In the past, the fag-smoking, booze-guzzling archetypal reporter trudged the streets tracking down a front-page story. Today, however, the media hound merely cuts and pastes the contents of a freebie, pre-spun “Press Pack” – directly to his computer Desk Top Publishing programme. In short, investigative journalism has been replaced by a clubby merry go round of money spinning splutter that regales the reader with carefully wrought stories fronting as news items.

Rarely do the media cover seriously controversial subjects. During the heady days of the Scott enquiry, few stories appeared that looked at the financing of weapons to Iraq and Iran. A few journalists knew this was a major aspect of the arms to Iraq affair, but how many newspapers revealed which British banks had been up to their neck in weapons financing? Corporate money has massive clout and if you want to stay in business, as a journalist, you don't rock the boat. By any measure this is self censorship.
Ask most journalists and they will chuckle and say it is not. Sure, some stories are “spiked” – that is the nature of journalism. Spiked stories generally result from legal reasons and constraints, media professionals will tell you, but rarely result from direct action to suppress stories that the public should learn about. Occasionally, a newspaper proprietor may step in to kill a story for their own reasons. These just as often end up in the pages of Private Eye, so little advantage ultimately accrues. At least that is the rationale.
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'An eye-opening expose', the result of 15 years of investigative work, uncovers the CIA's systematic efforts over several decades to suppress and censor information and to manipulate academia, the domestic media and control Congressional oversight. A very informative and important book. Below are a few extracts.

University of California Press.

1991-94

DCI Gates ordered DeTrani of Public Affairs to explore openness (for a public relations campaign). DeTrani said the CIA had a wide range of contacts with academics through recruiting, professional societies, and contractual agreements which could be expanded. CIA should sponsor more academic conferences and bring scholars to Langley and expand the officer-in-residence program which then had 13 CIA officers at universities. He recommended expanding CIA work with the media. He wanted CIA to declassify certain files to put the CIA in more positive light. By assisting journalists, "intelligence failure" stories could be turned into "intelligence success," stories – and boasted of past successes – "In many instances, we have persuaded reporters to postpone, change, hold, or even scrap stories..." He recommended helping friendly Hollywood directors by allowing them to shoot movies at Langley. He wanted to cooperate with feature writers. Other propaganda could be aimed directly at the public via unclassified versions of the Agency's Studies In Intelligence and CIA officers could step up the number of their speeches - a CIA speakers bureau was established in 1990. DeTrani wanted the CIA to try to better manipulate Congress. Gates accepted the suggestion to persuade friendly journalists to write profiles of CIA officers. Gates assigned more TV time for himself. Gates approved propagandizing the general public through press releases detailing the CIA's history, mission and functions in the new world order. He encouraged setting up intelligence studies programs on campuses and finding universities to publish CIA-subsidized articles. pp. 185-188.

1984

CIA organized the Unauthorized Disclosures Analysis Centre (UDAC) to monitor the news media and to stop leaks. Commanded by Dell Bragan, UDAC was staffed by full-time intelligence officers. CIA officers around the nation were tasked to by UDAC to keep track of reporters who obtained news stories through leaks. Mark Mansfield said UDAC was the coordinating centre to combat disclosures. In addition to UDAC, CIA had an even more secretive unit that investigates leaks, performs damage assessments, and investigates journalists. Located in the Office of Security and called the Special Security Office, the unit reports to UDAC. Journalists were analyzed by how many unauthorized disclosures they printed a year – columnist Jack Anderson, Washington Post reporter Bob Woodward and Bill Gertz were often at the top of the list. pp. 178-180.

1984-90
VP Bush chaired a cabinet-level Task Force on Combating Terrorism. He used terrorism as justification for domestic spying against groups lobbying Congress to ban Contra funding. This when statistics showed domestic terrorist incidents declining rapidly. But the 34-page "Public Report of the Vice President's Task Force on Combating Terrorism of 1986," urged Intel agencies involve themselves in "conventional human and technical intelligence capabilities that penetrate terrorist groups and their support systems." This when the FBI said domestic terrorism was virtually nonexistent. Following directions, FBI conducted 8,450 domestic terrorism investigations in 86, even though they reported only 17 actual terrorist incidents that year. The FBI was conducting political spying under the terrorism label. pp. 147-151.

1972-90

Richard Helms cautioned Ober, head of the MHCHAOS program, re the doubtful legality of MHCHAOS, to describe the operation within the CIA and the intelligence community as an operation against international terrorism. but the illegal domestic operation, MHCHAOS targeted radical youths, blacks, women and antiwar militants. "international terrorist" was designated to replace "political dissident" as the justification for illegal domestic operations. helms transferred the MHCHAOS operation to the international terrorism group. "let's call domestic spying a response to terrorism." pp. 46-49

USSR, 1985-91

Melvin Goodwin, former CIA Division Chief in Soviet foreign policy was a witness at the confirmation hearings for Robert Gates to be DCI. Goodwin testified that Gates had, over a period of years as Deputy Director of CIA, had given Congress and the president misleading and politicized intelligence. "Gates role was to corrupt the process and the ethics of intelligence...[and] to ignore and suppress signs of Soviet strategic retreat." p. 183.

Nicaragua, El Salvador, 1981-90

The House intelligence Committee knew that the Sandinistas were not shipping arms to Communist guerrillas in El Salvador, as claimed by Reagan, "But we were unable to respond to the President's assertions because this information was classified," per Congressman Lee Hamilton, later. Senator Moynihan said "I knew the President's claim could not be substantiated, but I knew this from classified briefings which a chairman or vice chairman of such a committee is sworn not to discuss in public." He said secrecy: "effect is to hide things from the American people that they need to know." pp. 172-3.

1985-92

An eleven-year CIA career officer, Thomas R. Smeeton, had become minority counsel to the House Intel Committee – beginning in 1990, Smeeton made repeated attempts to convince members of Congress to take oaths to uphold executive secrecy classifications. He devised an oath which gave CIA yet another hold over congressional oversight. pp. 173-4.

1981-95

An annotated list of some FBI Surveillance Targets during the 1980s is given in the appendix. pp. 203-207.

1975-85

A photograph of CIA agent Salvatore John Ferrera when he was infiltrating the "Quicksilver Times and other news organizations in Illinois and California. He legally changed his name
to Allen Vincent Carter and fled to the Southern California suburb of Costa Mesa. In 1980, Angus Mackenzie confronted him at his hideout – and he denied he worked for CIA. Angus showed him copies of the informant reports he had sent to CIA HQ’s – he slammed the door.

1972-80

Censoring books, particularly Marchetti’s pre-publication review. Marchetti named Jack O’Connell as the control agent for King Hussein of Jordan. Karamessines warned against making public the existence of electronic collection devices in India aimed at Chinese and Russian weapons systems, CIA financial assistance to Tom Mboya and Jomo Kenyatta in Kenya. the ruling by judge Bryan re reviews effectively nullified the first amendment rights of government workers who sign secrecy agreements. CIA’s attempt to halt the publication of Alfred McCoy’s book, THE POLITICS OF HEROIN IN SOUTHEAST ASIA. pp. 42-49, 52-55

1955-70

Thomas H. Karamessines in 1967 started an operation to handle the antiwar press. On 8/4/67 a telegram re the new special operations group (SOG) in the counterintel section. Angleton appointed Dick Ober to coordinate SOG and expand his Ramparts investigation to encompass the entire underground press – some 500 newspapers. SOG was designated as MHCHAOS. CIA assigned domestic political espionage the highest level of priority. SOG ops grew to sixty field agents as well as other CIA compartments. Due to the large number of reports generated computers were used for the first time to handle the traffic. CIA coordinated efforts with army agents, the local police and the FBI. Penetration of antiwar periodicals (his primary mission). John Ferrera a student was recruited to penetrate various antiwar media. details of Ferrera’s successes. the FBI used its agents to create dissension within protest groups. Ober had relied on the CIA’s domestic contract service (DCS) but was experiencing resistance. pp. 26-41

1955-70

Michael Wood with the national student association, learned that it was funded by CIA. Details of the program. IRS gave copies of Ramparts tax returns to Dick Ober of the CIA’s investigative unit. CIA planted stories in the media to discredit Ramparts. pp. 18-24

Vietnam, 1955-90

Stanley K. Sheinbaum was the first person to go public with his experience of CIA activity in the U.S. he began with the CIA in the 50s when hired by Michigan state u.’s $25 million project to advise the South Vietnamese government. he resented use of academic cover by CIA. he resigned in 1959. he with Robert Sheer wrote an article in Ramparts magazine. The CIA began to investigate Ramparts in violation of its charter. His article caused a storm of protest among academicians – to forestall further embarrassment, president Johnson established the Katzenbach committee. CIA identified the source of Rampart's money and urged the FBI to investigate. pp. 15-18

From the Washington Post 12/27/97 A1

Colombia, 1997 The U.S., fearful that Marxist guerrillas allied with drug traffickers pose a growing threat to Colombia, is loosening restrictions on aid to Colombian armed forces, withheld for years because of the military’s human rights record. A unique agreement worked out last summer – and heavily debated – permits U.S. aid, expected to total about $37 million in fiscal 1998, to be used by the Colombian military for counterinsurgency as part of a larger program to fight drugs. The aid can be used only in a specifically defined geographic area called "the box," whose exact boundaries are classified but which covers
roughly the southern half of the country. Critics say the move brings the U.S. closer to a
vicious, multi-sided political conflict that is decades old and has cost thousands of lives. The
Colombian army and right-wing paramilitary groups it sponsors have been implicated in
scores of civilian massacres, disappearances and cases of torture. Leaders of the army-
backed PM groups have been implicated in large-scale drug trafficking, yet have not been
singled out as targets of the anti-drug efforts.

Berkeley, CA, 1997, written 8:03 AM Jan 2, 1998 by rmcgehee@igc.org in newsgroup
alt.politics.org.cia "CIA's Illegal Ops - Past & Present"

Group Consensus Or Total Manipulation?

By Rob Ronning

The word consensus can be defined as the decision making process used when
the various participators are brought together, and a desirable result for the benefit
of all parties is achieved through appropriate compromises. It certainly does not
sound like a bad idea in theory, right? What if the consensus reached, unknown to
most participants, was a manipulated result intended to steer the process towards
the formulation of greater governmental controls?

Wouldn't this be the very opposite of consensus. How would this blatant manipulation be
achieved without the understanding or acknowledgement of those involved?

Leadership and management techniques at a personal level have almost silently
transformed the world (especially the West). This transformation has been viewed as
benign; even desirable, but the underlying change in individual thought processes these
techniques employ is little more than mind control. Some may ask how this is even
possible? Why would intelligent people allow themselves to be controlled in this manner?

Manipulation often begins in the public school system. In the book “Brave New Schools”
Berit Kjos reveals and thoroughly analyzes the global agenda behind ‘outcome based
education’, and how it affects our children as well as society in general. The United Nations,
through their UNESCO arm, is thoroughly behind these changes, and our ‘conservative’
President recently re-engaged the United States with this organization that espouses a
global mindset.

Behavioural psychology is now being used in our schools to ensure that the natural
individualism all children instinctively posses is replaced by group thinking and politically
correct values. If psychology is unsuccessful, behaviour modification drugs, such as Ritalin
are often forced upon parents and children at the request of teachers to achieve the desired
result.

(Note the comparatively recent dramatic increase in mind-altering drugs prescriptions for
young children.) Academic pursuits have been almost completely usurped by socialization.
Since parents are not deemed capable of socializing their own children, the school system
has been enlisted to perform this function. Agents of change are installed as teachers,
and value systems are cleverly introduced under the guise of higher or critical thinking
skills, thus replacing the basic education originally intended. Our impressionable children
hardly stand a chance to retain their individuality, given this engineered program.

The same agenda is also manifested in the workplace through programs like Total Quality
Management or Leadership (TQM or TQL). This methodology claims that management must
be completely transformed to be effective. The transformation is purported to begin in the
individuals inside the group through an understanding of an outside-looking-in type of view.
This new understanding can then be applied to every kind of interpersonal relationship and
can also be used as a basis of judgment for the decision making process of the individual within any organization to which he or she belongs. This transformation is strikingly similar to the higher or critical thinking agendas being promulgated in the public schools system, and provides similar results: Group-think-mentality and a universal, ever-changing value system.

Another similarity is that truly individual thought is discouraged through this psychology, and if that manipulation fails, economic pressure is used as an incentive for change. If an individual refuses to adhere to these management principles, he is often ostracized from the majority group and future advancement can either be blocked or retarded.

In order to more seamlessly control populations through social engineering, intertwining partnerships must be formed to provide the resources for that control. Our governments are partnering with corporations and other non-governmental organizations (NGO’s) to ensure this takes place. One example of the system at work is the Faith-Based Partnerships initiative President Bush has set into motion. While this is being touted as a better way to help our nation’s poor, it also provides the necessary social links and organization to more quickly implement a global management system for churches, presumably through a one-sided consensus process. This partnership homogenizes each participating church to conform to a set governmental standards designed not to offend anyone. It also allows the complete control of participating entities (through economic means) and virtually guarantees dissent to controversial governmental policies will be suppressed as long as monetary support is received. Again, individual thought is discouraged, one person/organization at a time. Public-private partnerships of this sort are constantly being formed to solidify this socialistic control using the same consensus building method.

All of these partnerships are formed to counteract a perceived crisis, and to formulate a solution via a “well-informed”, critical thought consensus. Total integration is seen as the key to success, and everyone is strongly encouraged to participate in the process so they feel empowered. Those individuals that can be trained to think in the group setting and within the set parameters will advance to some level of leadership. Those that cannot or will not conform will be forced out of the process. Thus, new “rules” are made through “consensus” for more and more aspects of our daily lives without the benefit of true debate. Organizations for better, stronger families, neighbourhoods, schools, cities and etc are prolific. New social norms are being set, and we are either engineered or coerced into agreement, or face the “consequences” of our individual actions.

Propaganda - nobody does it better than America

By Paul Weber, 9th August 2002
http://www.thetexasmercury.com/articles/weber/PW20020120.html

Over the years, I have had the privilege of meeting and having discussions with people who came to America from countries known for their adherence to totalitarianism: China, Russia, and former east European satellites of the Soviet Union. When we discussed how the state managed to control public opinion under totalitarianism, these people would usually produce a weary, knowledgeable, cynical smile and point out that propaganda in those countries was really done quite incompetently.

"How can that be?" I asked, honestly puzzled.

If you really want to know propaganda, they said, you need to study American propaganda technique. According to them, it is, undeniably, the best in the world.
Propaganda in those countries was too obvious, they told me. As soon as you read the first sentence you knew it was a bunch of propaganda, so you didn't even bother to read it. If you heard a speech, you knew in the first few words that it was propaganda, and you tuned it out.

"But," I then queried, "How do you know when it's just propaganda?"

The expatriates explained that bad propaganda uses obvious terminology that anyone can see through. Anyone hearing the phrase "capitalist running dogs", knows he's listening to incompetent propaganda and tunes it out. Lousy propaganda, these knowledgeable but jaded individuals would tell me, appeals to an abstract theory, to a rational thesis that can be disproved. Even though communists had total control of the press, the people just tuned it out (except for those who were the most mentally defective). Most people, they assured me, just went about their lives as best they could, paid lip service to the state, and just tried to keep out of the way of the secret police. But hardly anyone really believed the stuff. The result, after many decades of suffering, was the eventual collapse of the old order once The Great Leader expired, whether his name was Brezhnev, Mao, or Tito.

American propaganda, however, is much cleverer. American propaganda, they patiently explained, relies entirely on emotional appeals. It doesn't depend on a rational theory that can be disproved: it appeals to things no one can object to.

American propaganda had its birth, so far as I can tell, in the advertising industry. The pioneers of advertising - a truly loathsome bunch - learned early on that people would respond to purely emotional appeals. Abstract theory and logical argument do nothing to spur sales. However, appeals to sexiness, to pride of ownership, to fear of falling behind the neighbours are the stock in trade of advertising executives. A man walking down the street with beautiful women hanging on his arms is not a logical argument, but it sure sells after-shave. A woman in a business suit with a briefcase, strolling along with swaying hips, assuring us she can "bring home the bacon, fry it up in a pan, but never let you forget you're a man" really sells the perfume.

Let's take a moment and analyze the particular emotions that this execrable ad appealed to. If you guessed fear, you win the prize. Women often have a fear of inadequacy, particularly in this confused age when they are expected to raise brilliant kids, run a successful business, and be unfailingly sexy, all the time. That silly goal-foisted upon us by feminists and popular culture - is impossible to reach. But maybe there's hope if you buy the right perfume! Arguments from intimidation and appeals to fear are powerful propaganda tools.

American advertising and propaganda has been refined over the years into a malevolent science, based on the assumption that most people react, not to ideas, but to naked emotion. When I worked at an ad agency many years ago, I learned that the successful agencies know how to appeal to emotions: the stronger and baser, the better.

The seven deadly sins

The seven deadly sins, ad agency wags often say, are the key to selling products. Fear, envy, greed, hatred, and lust: these are the basic tools for good propaganda and effective advertising. By far, the most powerful motivating emotion - the top, most sought-after copywriters will tell you in an unguarded moment, is fear followed closely by greed.

Good propaganda appeals to neither logic nor morality.
Morality and ethics are the death of sales. This is why communist propaganda actually hastened the collapse of communism: the creatures running the Commie Empire thought they should appeal to morality by calling for people to engage in sacrifice for the greater good. They gave endless, droning speeches about the inevitability of communist triumph, based on the Hegelian dialectic. Not only were they wrong: their approach to selling their (virtually unsellable) theory was not clever enough. American propagandists (we can be jingoistically proud to say) would have been able to maintain the absurd social experiment called communism a little longer. They would have scrapped all the theory and focused on appealing images. Though the Commies tried to do this through huge, flag-waving rallies, the disparity between their alleged ideals and the reality they created was just too great.

One tyrant who did take American propaganda to heart was Adolph Hitler. Hitler learned to admire American propaganda through a young American expatriate who described to him, in glowing detail, how Americans enjoyed the atmosphere at football games. This American expatriate, with the memorable name of Ernst "Putzi" Hanfstängl, told the Führer how Americans could be whipped up into a frenzy through blaring music, group cheers, and chants against the enemy. Hitler, genius of evil as he was, immediately saw the value in this form of propaganda and incorporated it into his own rise to power. Prior to Hitler, German political rhetoric was dry, intellectual, and uninspiring. Hitler learned the value of spectacle in whipping up the emotions; the famed Nuremberg rallies were really little more than glorified football halftime shows. Rejecting boring, intellectual rhetoric, Hitler learned to appeal to deeply emotional but meaningless phrases, like the appeal to "blood and soil." The German people bought it wholesale. Hitler also called for blind loyalty to the "Fatherland," which eerily echoes our own new cabinet level post of "Homeland" Security.

If you study Nazi propaganda, you will be struck by how well it appeals to gut-level emotions and images - but not thought.

You will see pictures of elderly German women hugging fresh-faced young babies, with captions about the bright future the Führer has brought to German. In fact, German propaganda borrowed the American technique of relying, not so much on words, but on images alone: pictures of handsome German soldiers, sturdy peasants in native costume, and the like. Take a look at any American car commercial featuring rugged farmers tossing bales of hay into the backs of their pickups, and you've seen the source from which the Nazis borrowed their propaganda techniques.

The Germans have a well-deserved reputation for producing a lot of really smart people, but this did not prevent them from being completely vulnerable to American-style propaganda. Amazingly, a nation raised on the greatest classical music, the profoundest scientists, the greatest poets, actually fell for propaganda that led them into a hopeless, two-front war against most of the world. Being smart is, in itself, no defense against skilled American propaganda, unless you know and understand the techniques, so you can resist them.

Emotional, gut-level appeals

American politicians learned, early in the twentieth century, that using emotional sales techniques won elections. Furthermore, they learned that emotional appeals got them what they wanted as they advanced towards their long-term goal of becoming Masters of the Universe. From this, we get our modern lexicon of political speech, carefully crafted to appeal to powerful emotions, with either no appeal to reason, or (better yet) a vague appeal to something that sounds foggily reasonable, but is so obscure that no one will bother to dissect it.

Franklin Roosevelt understood this, which is why he called for Social Security. Security is an emotional appeal: no one is against security, are they? Roosevelt backed up his campaign with a masterful appeal to emotions: images of happy, elderly grandparents smiling while
All kinds of government programs were sold on the basis of appealing images and phrases. Roosevelt even appealed to America's traditional love of freedom, spinning that term by multiplying it into the new Four Freedoms, including Freedom from Want and Freedom from Fear. Well, what heartless human being could possibly be against that? The Four Freedoms were promoted with images of parents tucking their children cosily into bed, and a happy family gathered around a Thanksgiving dinner, obviously free from want. The campaign was also based on that most powerful of all selling emotions: fear. If you don't support Social Security, the ads suggested, you will live your last years in utter destitution.

Putzi Hanfstängl, viewing Roosevelt's evil brilliance from Nazi Germany, was probably jealous.

American advertising executives learned the value of presenting a single image or slogan, and repeating it over and over again until it became ingrained in the public's consciousness. Thus we are all aware that Ivory Soap is so pure that it floats: a point that has been repeated for the better part of a century. I'm not sure why I should be impressed that a bar of soap floats, but on the other hand, it's not intended that I think that far. Politicians now sell their programs the way the advertising creeps sell soap: they dream up a slogan and repeat it over and over again. Thus we get empty slogans like The New Frontier, The New World Order (that one was poorly chosen; it sounds too much like an actual idea), or Reinventing Government (an idea that everyone should favour, except that the idea behind it really means Keeping Government the Same, only no one is supposed to think that far). Empty grandeur sells political products.

Both German and American politicians carried the use of banners to new heights. Flags are impressive emotional symbols, particularly when waved by thousands of enthusiastic people: it's a rare individual who can resist the collective enthusiasm of thousands of his fellow human beings, cheering about their collective greatness. Putzi Hanfstängl understood this, advising Hitler to fill his public spectacles with not just a few, but countless thousands of swastika flags. The swastika, too, was a brilliant stroke of advertising and propaganda: it has become, in the public consciousness, the official emblem of Nazism, even though it had nothing to do with Germany. In fact, swastikas were used by ancient Hindus and American tribes, but I'm not aware of it being used by anyone in Germany prior to Hitler.

Now observe how Americans in the current crisis have taken to displaying huge flags on their cars. Flags are not rational arguments; they are instruments for whipping up the Madness of Crowds. Observe how many Americans have, with a straight face, called for a constitutional amendment to outlaw flag desecration, oblivious to the obvious contradictions such an amendment would have with the rest of the Constitution. But again, if you learn nothing else about propaganda, learn that it must not appeal to rationality.

Politicians don't just use warm, fuzzy images to sell us on the road to tyranny. They also need emotional appeals to intimidate their enemies. Thus the small percentage of the population that really does use thought and reason more than emotion must be demonized. Roosevelt managed this with some masterful propaganda strokes. Those who opposed him were Isolationists, and Malefactors of Great Wealth! (The gut-level emotion appealed to here is envy.) Roosevelt thus showed himself to be an early master of what former California Governor Jerry Brown called "buzz words"; that is, words intended to silence counter-argument by appealing to unassailable emotional images. No one is for Isolation, and almost everyone reacts to an appeal to hate anyone who has a lot of money. The latter appeal, of course, had great power during the Great Depression, which Roosevelt managed to maintain for the entire length of his presidency, all the while blaming others for its evils. Was this guy an evil genius, or what?
The propaganda cleverness used in successfully branding anti-war people as Isolationists is breathtaking. After all, a rational person (ah, keep in mind, that's not a common individual) realizes that those who oppose war are the exact opposite of isolationists. The Old Right at the time called for peaceful, commercial relations with all nations, based on neutrality in foreign affairs. If anything, those who oppose war and meddling in other countries' affairs are the opposite of Isolationists as they really stand for open, profitable relationships with other countries. The people who stand for such ideas do not "sell" them by means of strictly emotional appeals, so they tend to lose the propaganda wars. When Roosevelt succeeded in whipping the country up into a war-frenzy after steering us into the Pearl Harbour fiasco, the Old Right realized their opposition to the war was hopeless.

Schools - propaganda camps

The role of the government propaganda camps known as public schools cannot be discounted in all this. Schools are not so much centres of learning as they are behaviour conditioning camps in which children are taught to be unquestioningly obedient to authority. Since reason and morality are the death of propaganda, schools busy themselves with systematically stunting students' ability to reason and think in moral terms. Because the government owns the propaganda camps, it's not surprising that the beneficiary of the propaganda is almost always the government. Americans accept obvious absurdities because they were drilled into their heads, year after year, in the government propaganda camps until they became true and unquestionable.

Use of propaganda by "great presidents"

Thus, everyone knows Roosevelt got us out of the Great Depression, even though the worst depression years were precisely those in which he and his party controlled every branch of government. Everyone knows Lincoln was a great president because he saved "government by the people" and freed the slaves, even though he became a war tyrant and only freed the slaves when it was politically convenient to do so. Wilson, everyone knows, made the world "safe for democracy", evidently by instituting a draft and getting America involved in a European war that was fought for reasons no-one to this day can fathom. When minds are young and pliable - government experts understand this principle - you can fill them with nonsense that is practically impossible to root out. Laughable falsehoods in effect become true because everyone knows them to be true.

The role of "independent experts", housewives and "the guy on the street"

Advertising executives learned, early on, that companies could not be too obvious in using their propaganda. If their agenda could be clearly seen, then it could also be rejected. The answer to this problem was the American propaganda technique of the "independent expert" and the "guy on the street." One of these appeals to our timidity before authority, and the other to our smugness when dealing with someone at or below our perceived social level. Of course, these two techniques are really just two sides of the same coin. In product advertising, sports heroes and celebrities are used to sell corn flakes because no one would listen to the president of Kellogg telling us why corn flakes are so good. In selling detergent, plain-looking housewives are preferable to sexy models because they look just like us. In political propaganda, "experts" are often trotted out to tell us, in convoluted, circular reasoning, why minimum wage laws are really good for us, why a little bit of inflation is good, or why we just can't rely on the free market for something so crucially important as education. Or, using the "guy on the street" approach, we are told to support idiotic wars because the common soldiers ("our boys"), cannot function unless they know we stand united behind them. If the rare sensible person tries to argue against war, he is accused of making things harder for "our boys."
War on Terror

This brings us to the latest iteration of masterful American Propaganda: the War on Terrorism. Any attempt to explain why the terrorists (crazed as they obviously were) felt motivated to attack the World Trade Centre is looked on as "siding with the terrorists." Indeed, Ashcroft and Bush have said, in so many words, that if you don't support them in everything they do, you stand with the terrorists. Ashcroft and Bush have evidently studied their propaganda lessons from World War II, when Roosevelt silenced all opposition by accusing anyone who stood against him of undermining the war effort. Anyone who suggests we should not risk World War III by invading the Middle East is alternately accused of siding with the terrorists, of slandering the memory of those who died, or (of course) of not "standing by our boys" in times of great need. It's easy to feel alienated in a nation of flag-wavers singing patriotic hymns. The fact that they are marching lockstep to a world in which the government will monitor their e-mail, snoop into their bank accounts, and eventually throw them in jail for voicing opposition doesn't seem to bother them one bit.

Now, most libertarians or otherwise thoughtful people will react with dismay when told that most of their fellow human beings react so unthinkingly to sock-you-in-the-gut emotional propaganda. Unfortunately, most people are not capable of really thinking things out. Most people really do buy perfume because of the emotional imagery. Most people really do believe the "independent expert", whether in politics or buying a car. Most people want to go with the crowd, or follow the leader. To do otherwise requires independent thought and the willingness to be ostracized, which is an unbearable psychological burden for many.

If you want to take heart, remember that the Vietnam War ended because a few people just continued to speak against it, despite the overwhelming government propaganda for it. The fact that a lot of the anti-war protesters were motivated by the wrong reasons (support of commies), doesn't matter in light of the fact they were able to turn the tide. They were right, even if for the wrong reasons. If advocates of freedom continue to speak against the creeping tyranny that our masters justify on the phony grounds of the War on Terrorism, we might just be able to prevent the transition from Republic to Empire.

The thing about propaganda is that, once it is exposed for what it is, no one listens anymore. People tune it out, just as the slaves in Russia and China learned to tune out their official propaganda.


The fake persuaders

Corporations are inventing people to rubbish their opponents on the internet

George Monbiot - Tuesday May 14, 2002 http://www.monbiot.com/

Persuasion works best when it's invisible. The most effective marketing worms its way into our consciousness, leaving intact the perception that we have reached our opinions and made our choices independently. As old as humankind itself, over the past few years this approach has been refined, with the help of the internet, into a technique called "viral marketing". Last month, the viruses appear to have murdered their host. One of the world's foremost scientific journals was persuaded to do something it had never done before, and retract a paper it had published.

While, in the past, companies have created fake citizens' groups to campaign in favour of trashing forests or polluting rivers, now they create fake citizens. Messages purporting to
come from disinterested punters are planted on listservers at critical moments, disseminating misleading information in the hope of recruiting real people to the cause. Detective work by the campaigner Jonathan Matthews and the freelance journalist Andy Rowell shows how a PR firm contracted to the biotech company Monsanto appears to have played a crucial but invisible role in shaping scientific discourse.

Monsanto knows better than any other corporation the costs of visibility. Its clumsy attempts, in 1997, to persuade people that they wanted to eat GM food all but destroyed the market for its crops. Determined never to make that mistake again, it has engaged the services of a firm which knows how to persuade without being seen to persuade. The Bivings Group specialises in internet lobbying.

An article on its website entitled 'Viral Marketing: How to Infect the World', warns that "there are some campaigns where it would be undesirable or even disastrous to let the audience know that your organisation is directly involved... it simply is not an intelligent PR move. In cases such as this, it is important to first 'listen' to what is being said online... Once you are plugged into this world, it is possible to make postings to these outlets that present your position as an uninvolved third party... Perhaps the greatest advantage of viral marketing is that your message is placed into a context where it is more likely to be considered seriously." A senior executive from Monsanto is quoted on the Bivings site thanking the PR firm for its "outstanding work."

On November 29 last year, two researchers at the University of California, Berkeley published a paper in Nature magazine, which claimed that native maize in Mexico had been contaminated, across vast distances, by GM pollen. The paper was a disaster for the biotech companies seeking to persuade Mexico, Brazil and the European Union to lift their embargos on GM crops.

Even before publication, the researchers knew their work was hazardous. One of them, Ignacio Chapela, was approached by the director of a Mexican corporation, who first offered him a glittering research post if he withheld his paper, then told him that he knew where to find his children. In the US, Chapela's opponents have chosen a different form of assassination.

On the day the paper was published, messages started to appear on a biotechnology listserv used by more than 3,000 scientists, called AgBioWorld. The first came from a correspondent named "Mary Murphy". Chapela is on the board of directors of the Pesticide Action Network, and therefore, she claimed, "not exactly what you'd call an unbiased writer". Her posting was followed by a message from an "Andura Smetacek", claiming, falsely, that Chapela's paper had not been peer-reviewed, that he was "first and foremost an activist" and that the research had been published in collusion with environmentalists. The next day, another email from "Smetacek" asked "how much money does Chapela take in speaking fees, travel reimbursements and other donations... for his help in misleading fear-based marketing campaigns?"

The messages from Murphy and Smetacek stimulated hundreds of others, some of which repeated or embellished the accusations they had made. Senior biotechnologists called for Chapela to be sacked from Berkeley. AgBioWorld launched a petition pointing to the paper's "fundamental flaws."

There do appear to be methodological problems with the research Chapela and his colleague David Quist had published, but this is hardly unprecedented in a scientific journal. All science is, and should be, subject to challenge and disproof. But in this case the pressure on Nature was so severe that its editor did something unparalleled in its 133-year history: last month he published, alongside two papers challenging Quist and Chapela's, a retraction in which he wrote that their research should never have been published.
So the campaign against the researchers was extraordinarily successful; but who precisely started it? Who are "Mary Murphy" and "Andura Smetacek"?

Both claim to be ordinary citizens, without any corporate links. The Bivings Group says it has "no knowledge of them". "Mary Murphy" uses a hotmail account for posting messages to AgBioWorld. But a message satirising the opponents of biotech, sent by "Mary Murphy" from the same hotmail account to another server two years ago, contains the identification bw6.bivwood.com. Bivwood.com is the property of Bivings Woodell, which is part of the Bivings Group.

When I wrote to her to ask whether she was employed by Bivings and whether Mary Murphy was her real name, she replied that she had "no ties to industry". But she refused to answer my questions on the grounds that "I can see by your articles that you made your mind up long ago about biotech". The interesting thing about this response is that my message to her did not mention biotechnology. I told her only that I was researching an article about internet lobbying.

Smetacek has, on different occasions, given her address as "London" and "New York". But the electoral rolls, telephone directories and credit card records in both London and the entire US reveal no "Andura Smetacek". Her name appears only on AgBioWorld and a few other listservers, on which she has posted scores of messages falsely accusing groups such as Greenpeace of terrorism. My letters to her have elicited no response. But a clue to her possible identity is suggested by her constant promotion of "the Centre For Food and Agricultural Research". The centre appears not to exist, except as a website, which repeatedly accuses greens of plotting violence. Cffar.org is registered to someone called Manuel Theodorov. Manuel Theodorov is the "director of associations" at Bivings Woodell.

Even the website on which the campaign against the paper in Nature was launched has attracted suspicion. Its moderator, the biotech enthusiast Professor CS Prakash, claims to have no connection to the Bivings Group. But when Jonathan Matthews was searching the site's archives he received the following error message: "can't connect to MySQL server on apollo.bivings.com". Apollo.bivings.com is the main server of the Bivings Group.

"Sometimes," Bivings boasts, "we win awards. Sometimes only the client knows the precise role we played." Sometimes, in other words, real people have no idea that they are being managed by fake ones.

Military-Industrial Journalism Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 The Chicago Tribune

Rupert Murdoch's specialty has been the practice of journalism in cynical mockery of our thirst for knowledge.

Suddenly it's clear to everyone.

Hacking a missing teenager’s cell phone? Deleting calls, interfering with the desperate search for her whereabouts? Tapping the phones of terrorist victims, dead soldiers? What kind of newsroom culture could possibly value the intimate tidbits of unbearable worry and sorrow thus obtained? What kind of organization would call it “news”?

Even those of us long, long, long disgusted with the Murdoch brand had our moment of shock at this new low in cynicism and pandering. Something felt torn open and exposed as the details rushed out: not just a lack of ethics but an ethical void, absolute in its contempt for our lives. And this contempt is the foundation of a media empire.
Murdoch isn’t just a sleaze peddler. He’s one of the wealthiest and most powerful people on the planet — and he has a political agenda that matters more to him, I imagine, than a random billion in cash here or there. The silent virulence of his influence on public events, more than the sensational headlines and lurid scandal-mongering he inflicts on us, is my real concern.

Big as Murdoch is in the U.S., with his 24-7 rightwing propaganda network called Fox News, in Great Britain he’s bigger than the royal family. “He’s often referred to as the country’s permanent Cabinet member,” Beth Fouhy wrote recently for Associated Press. Since the days of Margaret Thatcher, he’s been the godfather of British prime ministers, able to make them offers they can’t refuse.

Since the hacking scandal hit the fan, David Cameron, the current prime minister, has been struggling to disentangle himself from his ties to Murdoch. But there’s no escaping the fact that Cameron’s former communications director, Andy Coulson, had been the editor of News of the World before joining the prime minister’s team and is one of 10 people arrested in the mess.

I don’t know if the Murdoch empire, News Corp., will emerge from the scandal intact and virulent as ever or have to be renamed News Corpse (one can only hope). But the blowing open of its operations is a stunningly teachable moment, a chance to rethink the role of journalists and the meaning of news.

As a starting place, I place side by side the two extremes of Murdoch’s exaggerated influence on our lives, our politics and our self-awareness. The spark that ignited the scandal was the revelation, by Guardian reporter Nick Davies, that News of the World staffers hacked the phone of Milly Dowler, a 13-year-old girl who was abducted near London on her way home from school in 2002. Months later, her body was discovered; she’d been murdered. Before this discovery, when there was nothing but unbearable dread and wild hope on the part of Milly’s loved ones, Murdoch minions were mining the tragedy for its titillation value, ferreting for bits of “human interest” to parade in their newspaper.

This is journalism utterly devoid of human sympathy — journalism, I would say, on the wrong side of the human race. It has zero interest in contributing to an informed society or creating social cohesion. It’s toxic junk food, a creepy sort of “reality” entertainment purveyed to bored and isolated readers for no purpose except to keep them consuming the product. It has made Murdoch rich beyond measure.

Here’s the other extreme, from Fouhy’s AP story describing Murdoch’s influence on British politics: “Murdoch eventually switched his allegiance to Tony Blair, the Labour prime minister from 1997 to 2007. Blair telephoned Murdoch repeatedly before committing British troops to the Iraq war in 2003, which was strongly endorsed by Murdoch’s newspapers across the world.”

To my mind, this magnifies the scandal a millionfold. Here’s a democratically elected head of state conferring with his secret benefactor for the purpose of bringing war to the planet. This is military-industrial journalism, colluding in war for profit, bending politicians to its interest on the strength of its financial success at peddling sleaze. Murdoch’s ethical void isn’t limited to his trashy media empire. He’s a player in war and peace.

This is journalism run amok — the precise opposite of the ideal of my profession. Rather than standing in adversarial relationship to power and representing the interests of those on the outside, it stands in adversarial relationship to common humanity. In Murdoch World, we are all abstractions, whether we have a name (Milly Dowler) or merely a mass identification label (the Iraqis).
Journalism can drift upward toward power, become its lapdog and even, as the News Corpse revelations have demonstrated, become power itself, a behind-the-scenes dictator of events, manipulating the world for its own interests.

But real journalists scatter power by telling the truth, as Davies and the Guardian have led the way in doing in the News of the World revelations. This scandal, finally, is not about Murdoch but about everyone who practices the craft of journalism. The time has come to ask ourselves: Where does our allegiance lie?

Robert Koehler is an award-winning, Chicago-based journalist, contributor to One World, Many Peaces and nationally syndicated writer. His new book, Courage Grows Strong at the Wound (Xenos Press) is now available. Contact him at koehlercw@gmail.com or visit his website at commonwonders.com.
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Top Journalists Expose Major Mass Media Cover-ups

From wanttoknow.info

The riveting excerpts below from the revealing accounts of 20 award-winning journalists in the highly acclaimed book Into the Buzzsaw are essential reading for all who support democracy. These courageous writers were prevented by corporate ownership of the mass media from reporting major news stories. Some were even fired. They have won numerous awards, including several Emmys and a Pulitzer.

Jane Akre spent 20 years as a network and local TV reporter for news and mass media operations throughout the country. She and her husband, investigative reporter Steve Wilson, were awarded the Goldman Environmental Prize for their struggle with mass media ownership related here.

By February 1997 our story was ready to air. It attempted to answer some troubling questions: Why had Monsanto sued two small dairies to prevent them from labelling their milk as coming from cows not injected with [growth hormone rBGH]? Why had two Canadian health regulators claimed that their jobs were threatened – and then said Monsanto offered them a bribe to give fast-track approval to the drug? Why did Florida supermarkets break their much-publicized promise that milk in the dairy case would not come from hormone-treated cows? And why was the US the only major industrialized nation to approve this controversial genetically engineered hormone? (p. 211)

Station managers were so proud of our work that they saturated virtually every Tampa Bay radio station with thousands of dollars' worth of ads urging viewers to watch what we'd uncovered about "The Mystery in Your Milk." But then, our Fox managers' pride turned to panic. [Monsanto lawyer] John Walsh wrote that some points of the story "clearly contain the elements of defamatory statements which, if repeated in a broadcast, could lead to serious damage to Monsanto and dire consequences for Fox News." (pp. 211-213)

It was not long after our [unsuccessful] struggle to air an honest report had begun that Fox fired both the news director and the general manager. The new general manager, Dave Boylan, explained that if we didn't agree to changes that Monsanto and Fox lawyers were insisting upon, we'd be fired for insubordination within 48 hours. We pleaded with Dave to look at the facts we'd uncovered, many of which conclusively disproved Monsanto's claims. We reminded him of the importance of the facts about a basic food most of our viewers consume and feed to their children daily. His reply: "We paid $3 billion dollars for these TV stations. We'll tell you what the news is. The news is what we say it is!" Steve [the author's husband and coworker] was firm but respectful when he made it clear we would neither lie nor distort any part of the story. (pp. 213-215)
[The Dairy Coalition's director] took great pride in bragging that the Coalition "snowed the station with paperwork and pressure to have the story killed." Fox threatened our job every time we resisted the dozens of changes that would sanitize the story and fill it with lies and distortions. [Fox lawyer] Forest finally levelled with us. "You guys don't get it. It doesn't matter whether the facts are true. This story isn't worth a couple of hundred thousand dollars to go up against Monsanto." (pp. 217, 218)

Fox's general manager presented us with an agreement that would give us a full year of salaries and benefits worth $200,000 in no-show "consulting jobs," but with strings attached: no mention of how Fox covered up the story and no opportunity to ever expose the facts Fox refused to air. We turned down this second hush money offer. We were both finally fired, allegedly for "no cause." (p. 219)

The controversy over rBGH has travelled recently to Canada and the European Union, both of which decided to reject the drug for use in those countries. (p. 236)

Dan Rather [was] the anchor and managing editor of CBS Evening News and correspondent for 60 Minutes II. In his more than 30 years at CBS, he received almost every honour in broadcast journalism, including several Emmy Awards, a Peabody Award, and citations from scholarly, professional, and charitable organizations. This is an excerpt from an interview originally aired on BBC Newsnight on May 16, 2002.

Access was extremely limited to the press during the time of September 11th, and ever since then [has been] limited in a way that is unprecedented in American journalism. There was a full understanding of why access was so limited during that time. [However] in the weeks and months that followed September 11th, the federal government began to take an unprecedented attitude about the access of American journalists to the war. What's particularly troubling is that what's being done is in direct variance with the Pentagon's stated policy [of] maximum access and maximum information consistent with national security. What's going on is a belief that you can manipulate communicable trust between the leadership and the led. The way you do that is you don't let the press in anywhere (p. 36-38).

Access to the [Iraq] war is extremely limited. The fiercer the combat, the more the access is limited, [including] access to information. I would say that overwhelmingly the limiting of access to information has much more to do with the determination to be seen as conducting the war errorlessly than it does with any sense of national security (p. 40).

None of us in journalism have asked questions strongly enough about limiting access and information for reasons other than national security. It's unpatriotic not to ask questions. Anybody in American journalism who tells you that he or she has not felt this pressure [not to ask tough questions] is either kidding themselves or trying to deceive you (p. 39-40)

What we're talking about here is a form of self-censorship. Self-censorship is a real and present danger to journalists at every level and on a lot of different kinds of stories. Before the war, before September 11th, fear ruled every newsroom in the country in some important ways – fear if we don't dumb it down, if we don't tart it up, if we don't go to the trivial at the expense of the important, we're not going to be publishing a newspaper or magazine. We're not going to be on the air. The ratings will eat us up. (p. 41-42).

There was a time in South Africa when people would put flaming tires around people's necks if they dissented. In some ways the fear [now in the U.S.] is that you'll have a flaming tire of lack of patriotism put around your neck. It's that fear that keeps journalists from asking the tough questions. And I am humbled to say, I do not except myself from this criticism (p. 42).

Monika Jensen-Stevenson is a former Emmy-winning producer for 60 Minutes. The Vietnam Veterans Coalition awarded her the Vietnam Veterans National Medal.
Marine Private Robert R. Garwood – fourteen years a prisoner of the communist Vietnamese – was found guilty of collaboration with the enemy in the longest court-martial in United States history. I first heard of Garwood in 1979. Wire reports referred to him as a defector whom the US government was charging with being a traitor. At the end of the court-martial, there seemed no question that Garwood was a monstrous traitor. (pp. 255, 256)

In 1985, Garwood was speaking publicly about something that had never made the news during his court-martial. The Wall Street Journal reported he said that he knew firsthand of other American prisoners in Vietnam long after the war was over. He was supported by Vietnam combat veterans whose war records were impeccable. These veterans told a story vastly different from what was made public during the court-martial and one that was intimately tied to another 60 Minutes story I was working on – “Dead or Alive?” The title referred to Vietnam POW/MIA's [Prisoners Of War/Missing In Action]. (p. 256)

My sources included outstanding experts like former head of the Defence Intelligence Agency General Eugene Tighe and returned POWs like Captain Red McDaniel, who held the Navy’s top award for bravery, had commanded the aircraft carrier Lexington, and was director of liaison on Capitol Hill for the Navy and Marine Corps. With such advocates providing back up, it was hard not to consider the possibility that prisoners (some 3,500) had in fact been kept by the Vietnamese communists as hostages to make sure the US would pay the more than $3 billion in war reparations that Nixon had promised before his fall from grace. Particularly compelling was the fact that of the 300 prisoners known to be held in Laos, not one was released for homecoming in 1973. (p. 256)

Initially held back to ensure the US would fulfil its secret promise to pay reparation monies, by 1979 American POWs had become worthless pawns. The US had not paid the promised monies and had no intention of paying in the future. (p. 263)

Kristina Borjesson has been an independent producer and writer for almost 20 years. Among her many accomplishments besides editing this volume, she worked at CBS network where she won an Emmy and a Murrow Award for her investigative reporting on “CBS Reports: Legacy of Shame” with Dan Rather and Randall Pinkston.

You don't choose to have the kind of experience I had while trying to report on the demise of TWA Flight 800. You fall into it. At CBS, I'd recently picked up an Emmy for investigative reporting when I was assigned to investigate the crash. I had no idea that my life would be turned upside down and inside out – that I'd be assigned to walk into what I now call "the buzzsaw." (p. 284)

The buzzsaw is what can rip through you when you try to investigate or expose anything this country's large institutions – be they corporate or government – want kept under wraps. The system fights back with official lies, disinformation, and stonewalling. Your phone starts acting funny. Strange people call you at strange hours to give you strange information. The FBI calls you. Your car is broken into and the thief takes your computer and your reporter's notebook and leaves everything else behind. You feel like you're being followed everywhere you go. (p. 284)

Pierre Salinger announced to the world on November 8, 1996, that he'd received documents from French intelligence proving that a US Navy missile had accidentally downed [TWA Flight 800]. That same day, FBI's Jim Kallstrom called a press conference to deny Salinger's allegations. [At the press conference,] Kallstrom rattled off a prepared speech, and then it was time for questions. A man raised his hand and asked why the Navy was involved in the recovery and investigation while a possible suspect. Kallstrom's response was immediate; "Remove him!" he yelled. Two men leapt over to the questioner and grabbed him by the arms. There was a momentary chill in the air after the guy had been dragged out of the room. Kallstrom acted as if nothing had happened. (pp. 290, 291)
A few weeks after the FBI's visit to CBS, I received my walking papers. Law enforcement consultant Paul Ragonese eventually got his walking papers, too. Ragonese was replaced by none other than the FBI's TWA 800 task force chief, James Kallstrom. (p. 307)

Greg Palast writes for the Guardian and Observer newspapers of London and reports for the BBC's Newsnight. Palast abandoned hopes of working in America when mainstream press failed to report on his groundbreaking exposes known for stripping bare abuses.

In the months leading up to the November [2000] balloting, Florida Governor Jeb Bush and his secretary of state, Katherine Harris, ordered local elections supervisors to purge 58,000 voters from registries on the grounds they were felons not entitled to vote in Florida. As it turns out, only a handful of these voters were felons. The voters were [about 54%] African Americans, and most of the others were white and Hispanic Democrats. [Several] weeks after the election, this extraordinary news ran on page one of the country's leading paper. Unfortunately, it was in the wrong country: Britain. In the USA, it was not covered. It was given big network TV coverage. But again, it was on the wrong continent – on BBC TV, London. (pp. 195, 196)

The office of the governor [also] illegally ordered the removal of felons from the voter rolls – real felons – but with the right to vote under Florida law. As a result, 50,000 of these voters could not vote. The fact that 90% of these voters were Democrats should have made it news because this manoeuvre alone more than accounted for Bush's victory. (pp. 197-200)

In February 2001, I took my BBC film crew to Florida, having unearthed a page marked "secret" and "confidential" from the company the state had hired to make up the list of names to purge from voter rolls. I took my camera crew into an agreed interview with Jeb Bush's director of the Department of Elections. When I pulled out the confidential sheet, Bush's man ripped off the microphone and did the fifty-yard dash, locking himself in his office, all in front of our cameras. It was killer television and wowed the British viewers. We even ran a confession from the company. Newsworthy for the USA? Apparently not. (pp. 202, 203)

A group of well-placed sources told my BBC team that before Sept. 11th the US government had turned away evidence of Saudi billionaires funding bin Laden's network. We got our hands on documents that backed up the story that FBI and CIA investigations had been slowed by the Clinton administration, then killed by Bush Jr.'s. The story made top of the news – in Britain. In the US, one TV reporter picked up the report. He was called, he says, by network chiefs, and told to go no further. He didn't. (p. 205)

Michael Levine is a 25-year veteran of the DEA turned best-selling author and journalist. His articles and interviews on the drug war have been published in numerous national newspapers and magazines, including the New York Times, Los Angeles Times, USA Today, and Esquire.

When Nixon first declared war on drugs in 1971, there were fewer than 500,000 hard-core addicts in the nation, most of whom were addicted to heroin. Three decades later, despite the expenditure of $1 trillion in tax dollars, the number of hard-core addicts is shortly expected to exceed five million. Our nation has become the supermarket of the drug world, with a wider variety and bigger supply of drugs at cheaper prices than ever before. The problem now not only affects every town on the map, but it is difficult to find a family anywhere that is not somehow affected. (pp. 158, 159)

The Chang Mai factory the CIA prevented me from destroying was the source of massive amounts of heroin being smuggled into the US in the bodies and body bags of GIs killed in Vietnam. (p. 165)
My unit, the Hard Narcotics Smuggling Squad, was charged with investigating all heroin and cocaine smuggling through the Port of New York. My unit became involved in investigating every major smuggling operation known to law enforcement. We could not avoid witnessing the CIA protecting major drug dealers. Not a single important source in Southeast Asia was ever indicted by US law enforcement. This was no accident. Case after case was killed by CIA and State Department intervention and there wasn't a damned thing we could do about it. CIA-owned airlines like Air America were being used to ferry drugs throughout Southeast Asia, allegedly to support our "allies." CIA banking operations were used to launder drug money. (pp. 165, 166)

In 1972, I was assigned to assist in a major international drug case involving top Panamanian government officials who were using diplomatic passports to smuggle large quantities of heroin and other drugs into the US. The name Manuel Noriega surfaced prominently in the investigation. Surfacing right behind Noriega was the CIA to protect him from US law enforcement. As head of the CIA, Bush authorized a salary for Manuel Noriega as a CIA asset, while the dictator was listed in as many as 40 DEA computer files as a drug dealer. (pp. 166, 167)

The CIA and the Department of State were protecting more and more politically powerful drug traffickers around the world: the Mujihadeen in Afghanistan, the Bolivian cocaine cartels, the top levels of Mexican government, Nicaraguan Contras, Colombian drug dealers and politicians, and others. Media's duties, as I experienced firsthand, were twofold: first, to keep quiet about the gush of drugs that was allowed to flow unimpeded into the US; second, to divert the public's attention by shilling them into believing the drug war was legitimate by falsely presenting the few trickles we were permitted to indict as though they were major "victories," when in fact we were doing nothing more than getting rid of the inefficient competitors of CIA assets. (pp. 166, 167)

On July 17, 1980, drug traffickers actually took control of a nation. Bolivia at the time [was] the source of virtually 100% of the cocaine entering the US. CIA-recruited mercenaries and drug traffickers unseated Bolivia's democratically elected president, a leftist whom the US government didn't want in power. Immediately after the coup, cocaine production increased massively, until it soon outstripped supply. This was the true beginning of the crack "plague." (pp. 167, 168)

The CIA along with the State and Justice Departments had to combine forces to protect their drug-dealing assets by destroying a DEA investigation. How do I know? I was the inside source. I sat down at my desk in the American embassy and wrote the kind of letter that I never myself imagined ever writing. I detailed three pages typewritten on official US embassy stationary—enough evidence of my charges to feed a wolf pack of investigative journalists. I also expressed my willingness to be a quotable source. I addressed it directly to Strasser and Rohter, care of Newsweek. Two sleepless weeks later, I was still sitting in my embassy office staring at the phone. Three weeks later, it rang. It was DEA's internal security. They were calling me to notify me that I was under investigation. I had been falsely accused of everything from black-marketing to having sex with a married female DEA agent. The investigation would wreak havoc with my life for the next four years. (pp. 168-171)

In one glaring case, an associate of mine was sent into Honduras to open a DEA office in Tegucigalpa. Within months he had documented as much as 50 tons of cocaine being smuggled into the US by Honduran military people who were supporting the Contras. This was enough cocaine to fill a third of US demand. What was the DEA response? They closed the office. (p. 175)

Sometime in 1990, US Customs intercepted a ton of cocaine being smuggled through Miami International Airport. A Customs and DEA investigation quickly revealed that the smugglers were the Venezuelan National Guard headed by General Guillen, a CIA "asset" who claimed that he had been operating under CIA orders and protection. The CIA soon admitted that this was true. If the CIA is good at anything, it is the complete control of American mass
media. So secure are they in their ability to manipulate the mass media that they even brag about it in their own in-house memos. The New York Times had the story almost immediately in 1990 and did not print it until 1993. It finally became news that was "fit to print" when the Times learned that 60 Minutes also had the story and was actually going to run it. The highlight of the 60 Minutes piece is when the administrator of the DEA, Federal Judge Robert Bonner, tells Mike Wallace, "There is no other way to put it, Mike, [what the CIA did] is drug smuggling. It's illegal." (pp. 188, 189)

The fact is – and you can read it yourself in the federal court records – that seven months before the attempt to blow up the World Trade Centre in 1993, the FBI had a paid informant, Emad Salem, who had infiltrated the bombers and had told the FBI of their plans to blow up the twin towers. Without notifying the NYPD or anyone else, an FBI supervisor "fired" Salem, who was making $500 a week for his work. After the bomb went off, the FBI hired Salem back and paid him $1.5 million to help them track down the bombers. But that's not all the FBI missed. When they finally did catch the actual bomber, Ramzi Yousef (a man trained with CIA funds during the Russia-Afghanistan war), the FBI found information on his personal computer about plans to use hijacked American jetliners as fuel-laden missiles. The FBI ignored this information, too. (p. 191)

Gary Webb was an investigative reporter for 19 years. He was one of six reporters to win a 1990 Pulitzer Prize for reporting on northern California's 1989 earthquake. He also received the 1997 Media Hero award, and in 1996 was named Journalist of the Year by the Bay Area Society of Professional Journalists. He worked on several newspapers until being forced out of his job after the San Jose Mercury News retracted their support for the Dark Alliance story discussed below.

In 1996, I wrote a series of stories, entitled Dark Alliance, that began this way: For the better part of a decade, a Bay Area drug ring sold tons of cocaine to the Crips and Bloods street gangs of LA and funnelled millions in drug profits to a Latin American guerrilla army run by the CIA. The cocaine that flooded in helped spark a crack explosion in urban America. It is one of the most bizarre alliances in modern history – the union of a US-backed army attempting to overthrow a socialist government and the Uzi-toting "gangstas" of Los Angeles. (p. 143)

In December 1995, I wrote a lengthy memo to my editors, advising them of what my Nicaraguan colleague and I had found: With the help of recently declassified documents, FBI reports, DEA undercover tapes, as well as interviews with some of the key participants, we will show how a CIA-linked drug and stolen car network provided weapons and tons of high-grade, dirt cheap cocaine to the very person who spread crack through LA and from there into the hinterlands. A bizarre bond between an elusive CIA operative and a brilliant car thief from LA's ghettos touched off a social phenomenon – crack and gang-power – that changed our lives. The day these two men met was literally ground zero for California's crack explosion. This is also the story of how an ill-planned foreign policy adventure – the CIA's "secret" war in Nicaragua – boomeranged back to the streets of America, in the long run doing more damage to us than to our "enemies" in Central America. We have compelling evidence that the kingpins of this cocaine ring enjoyed a unique relationship with the US government that has continued to this day. (pp. 145-146)

The story was developing a political momentum all of its own, and it was happening despite a virtual news blackout from the mass media. Ultimately, it was public pressure that forced the national newspapers into the fray. In Washington, black media outlets were ridiculeing the Post for its silence. [In] October and November, the Washington Post, New York Times, and Los Angeles Times published lengthy stories about the CIA drug issue, but spent precious little time exploring the CIA's activities. Instead, my reporting and I became the focus of their scrutiny. The official conclusion reached by all three papers: Much ado about nothing. No story here. The series was "flawed." It was remarkable [Mercury News editor] Ceppos, wrote, that the four Post reporters assigned to debunk the series "could not find a single significant factual error." (pp. 149-152)
At my editor's request, I wrote another series following up on the first three parts: a package of four stories to run over two days. They never began to edit them. Instead, I found myself involved in hours-long conversations with editors that bordered on surreal. A few months later, the Mercury News officially backed away from Dark Alliance, publishing a long column by Jerry Ceppos apologizing for "shortcomings" in the series. The New York Times hailed Ceppos for setting a brave new standard for dealing with "egregious errors" and splashed his apology on their front page, the first time the series had ever been mentioned there. I quit the Mercury News after that. (p. 153)

The CIA's knowledge and involvement had been far greater than I'd ever imagined. Agents and officials of the DEA had protected the traffickers from arrest, something I'd not been allowed to print. At the start of the Contra war, the CIA and Justice Department had worked out an unusual agreement that permitted the CIA not to have to report allegations of drug trafficking by its agents to the Justice Department. It was a curious loophole in the law, to say the least. (p. 154)

The Mercury News had broken the rules and used the Internet to get in by the back door, leaving the big papers momentarily embarrassed. It forced them to readdress an issue they'd much rather have forgotten. By turning on the Mercury News, the big boys were reminding the rest of the flock who really runs the newspaper business, Internet or no Internet, and the extent to which they will go to protect that power, even if it meant rearranging reality to suit them. (p. 155)

Do we have a free press today? Sure we do. It's free to report all the sex scandals it wants, all the stock market news we can handle, every new health fad that comes down the pike, and every celebrity marriage or divorce that happens. But when it comes to the real down and dirty stuff – stories like Tailwind, the October Surprise, the El Mozote massacre, corporate corruption, or CIA involvement in drug trafficking – that's where we begin to see the limits of our freedoms. In today's mass media environment, sadly, such stories are not even open for discussion. Back in 1938, when fascism was sweeping Europe, legendary investigative reporter George Seldes observed that "it is possible to fool all the people all the time – when government and press cooperate." Unfortunately, we have reached that point. (p. 156)

See Mr. Webb's riveting book Dark Alliance on amazon.com. He was found dead in December 2004. It was strangely declared a suicide even though public reports stated that he had not one, but two bullets in his head.

John Kelly is first author with Phillip Wearne of Tainting Evidence: Inside the Scandals at the FBI Crime Lab, which was nominated for a Pulitzer Prize. It is the first, and to date, the only, contemporaneous critical account of the FBI to be published by a mainstream publisher. He is also an independent investigative producer. He is the former editor and senior writer for the National Reporter, a publication specializing in reporting on the CIA.

According to the Central Intelligence Agency itself, as reported by the House Intelligence Committee, "The Clandestine Service of the CIA is the only part of the Intelligence Community, indeed of government, where hundreds of employees on a daily basis are directed to break extremely serious laws in countries around the world. A safe estimate is that several hundred times every day (easily 100,000 times a year), officers engage in highly illegal activities." (pp. 115, 116)

The national security of the United States requires that more than 100,000 extremely serious crimes be committed every year. The [House Intelligence] Committee expressed no legal or ethical concerns about these crimes. The committee indicated that it did not matter that laws were broken because they were laws of other countries. The CIA [is] committing crimes against humanity with de facto impunity and Congressional sanctioning. (pp. 116, 117)
Government documents, including CIA reports, show that the CIA's crimes include terrorism, assassination, torture, and systematic violations of human rights. The documents show that these crimes are part and parcel of deliberate CIA policy. The report notes that CIA personnel are "directed" to commit crimes. (p. 117)

CIA documents show that the CIA created, trained, and armed death squads in Guatemala as part of its coup and destabilization of the democratically elected government in 1954. In Honduras, the CIA's own inspector general reported that paid CIA assets at the highest level created and ran a death squad which, according to the Honduran government, murdered at least 184 people. The House Intelligence Committee's only concern regarding these brutal CIA informants and other CIA offenders was that they might be arrested and prosecuted. The committee did not advise the CIA to cease or limit its lawlessness. The Senate Intelligence Committee proposed a bill that would immunize CIA offenders who violate treaties and international agreements while following orders. The bill passed both houses of Congress and was signed into law by President Bill Clinton on December 27, 2000. (pp. 117-118)

[This law] means that the Constitution does not apply to the CIA or any US intelligence personnel. Why? Because the constitution provides that all treaties are the supreme law of the land. Not just law, but the supreme law - no exceptions. There was not a peep from the mass media about any of this even though such a story would not have affected corporate sponsorship or profits. (pp. 119)

The intelligence committees recommended that the "aggressive recruitment" of "terrorist informants who have human rights violations in their background" be "one of the highest priorities." Within months of instituting the guidelines, incoming CIA director George Tenet assured Congress that not a single unsavoury applicant had been rejected. (pp. 120, 121)

Former ambassador Robert White wrote that Manuel Noriega of Panama, Colonel Julio Alpirez of Guatemala, General Gustavo Alvarez Martinez of Honduras, Colonel Nicolas Carranza of El Salvador, and Emmanuel Constant of Haiti, all major human rights abusers, were CIA informants who "enjoyed profitable contractual arrangements with the CIA not because they were particularly important sources of information, but because they served as paid agents of influence who promoted actions or policies favoured by the CIA in that country." (p. 122)

Former CIA General Counsel Sporkin revealed that the CIA, not the president, creates findings to fit preordained covert operations and sends the findings to the president for his signature. (p. 126, 127)

There is next to no meaningful coverage ever of the CIA in the mainstream media, let alone analysis. The few exceptions prove the rule. In 1984, I was involved in one such exception. ABC hired me to help produce a story about an investment firm in Hawaii that was heavily involved with the CIA. I had earlier provided the same story to BBC's Newsnight, which aired it. The story was fully documented, and nobody, including the CIA, was able to disprove the charges. Part of the report charged that the CIA had plotted to assassinate an American, Ron Rewald, the president of [the investment firm]. The ABC report provoked a brutal response from the CIA. The CIA demanded a full retraction without providing any counterproof other than their denial. (pp. 130, 131)

At the centre of the uproar was Scott Barnes who said on camera that the CIA had asked him to kill Rewald. After the show aired, CIA officials met with ABC News executive David Burke. They presented no evidence to counter the charges made in the program. Nonetheless, Burke was sufficiently impressed "by the vigour with which they made their case" to order an on-air "clarification" in which Peter Jennings acknowledged the CIA's position but stood by the story. But that was not good enough. [CIA Director William] Casey called ABC Chairman Leonard H. Goldenson. The call led to three meetings between ABC officials and Stanley Sporkin, CIA general counsel. On November 21, 1984, despite all the
documented evidence presented in the program, Peter Jennings reported that ABC could no longer substantiate the charges, and that "We have no reason to doubt the CIA's denial." He presented no evidence supporting the CIA's position. (pp. 131, 132)

That same day, the CIA filed a formal complaint with the FCC, written by Sporkin and signed by [CIA Director] Casey, charging that ABC had "deliberately distorted" the news. Casey asked that ABC be stripped of its TV and radio licenses. This was the first time in the history of the country that a government agency had formally attacked the press. Yet, there was no uproar. (p. 132)

During this time, Capital Cities Communications was manoeuvring to buy ABC. [CIA Director] Casey was one of the founders of Cap Cities. Cap Cities bought ABC for $3.5 billion, which was called a "bargain rate" by the trade media. Besides Casey, two other founders of Cap Cities had extensive ties to the intelligence community. Within months, the entire investigative unit [of ABC] was dispersed, and the commentator on the Rewald program was assigned to covering beauty pageants. Needless to say, my contract was not renewed. (pp. 132, 122)

Carl Jensen, Ph.D., founder and director emeritus of Project Censored, America's longest running research project on mass media censorship, has been involved with the media for more than 50 years as a daily newspaper reporter, weekly newspaper publisher, public relations practitioner, advertising executive, educator, and author. Jensen is author of the 1990-1996 annual Project Censored yearbooks, Censored: The News That Didn't Make the News ... and Why. He has won numerous awards for his work.

There were 50 major media corporations in 1993, and now there are only about half a dozen. Corporate socialization has been exacerbated by the multibillion-dollar mergers that created international giants such as AOL Time Warner, Disney, General Electric, News Corporation, and Viacom. (pp. 425-428)

Shortly after the outbreak of the First Terrorist War of the 21st Century, I was reminded of what US Senator Hiram Johnson said during World War I: "The first casualty when war comes, is truth." Post-September 11, 2001, the free flow of information in America is slowing to a carefully monitored trickle. The president of the US says he can only trust eight members of Congress. The attorney general admonishes Congress to pass the controversial Anti-Terrorism Act without debate. The national security adviser cautions TV networks not to broadcast press conferences with Taliban leaders because they may contain hidden messages. The military tells the press this is a "different war" and thus it can't observe the 1992 agreement allowing the media more access to information. The president's press secretary warns the media and all Americans to watch what they say and watch what they do. These are ominous signs for democracy. (pp. 432, 433)

In the same way that we survived Pearl Harbour, we will survive the Sept. 11 terrorist attack. In the meantime, let us not be terrorized into giving up any of our constitutionally guaranteed rights. (p. 434)

Robert McChesney has written or edited seven books and is currently research professor at the Institute of Communications Research at the University of Illinois. He has made more than 500 radio and TV appearances and has been the subject of nearly 50 published interviews.

Professional journalism had three distinct biases built into it, biases that remain to this day. First, it regarded anything done by official sources, for example, government officials and prominent public figures, as the basis for legitimate news. Second, professional journalism posited that there had to be a news hook or a news peg to justify a news story. [This] helped to stimulate the birth and rapid rise of the public relations (PR) industry. Surveys show that PR accounts for anywhere from 40 to 70 percent of what appears as news. The third bias is that [professional journalism] smuggles in values conducive to the
commercial aims of the owners and advertisers as well as the political aims of the owning class. The affairs of government are subjected to much closer scrutiny than the affairs of big business. The genius of professionalism in journalism is that it tends to make journalists oblivious to the compromises with authority they routinely make. (pp. 440, 441)

Professional journalism equates the spread of "free markets" with the spread of democracy. To the US elite, however, democracy tends to be defined by their ability to maximize profit in a nation, and that is, in effect, the standard of professional journalism. (p. 442)

[There] is the striking consolidation of the mass media from hundreds of significant firms to an integrated industry dominated by less than ten enormous transnational conglomerates and rounded out by no more than another fifteen very large firms. The first tier giants include AOL Time Warner, Disney, Viacom, News Corporation, Bertelsmann, Vivendi Universal, Sony, AT&T, and General Electric. The nine or ten largest media conglomerates now almost all rank among the 300 largest firms in the world; in 1965, there were barely any media firms among the five hundred largest companies in the world. (p. 444)

The largest ten media firms own all the US TV networks, most of the TV stations in the largest markets, all major film studios, all major music companies, nearly all of the cable TV channels, much of the book and magazine publishing [industry], and much, much more. The logic of mass media industries is that a firm can no longer compete if it is not part of a larger conglomerate. General Electric's NBC is the only commercial TV network that does not own a major Hollywood film studio. (pp. 444, 445)

Expensive investigative journalism – especially that which goes after powerful corporate or national security interests – is discouraged. Largely irrelevant human interest/tragedy stories get the green light for extensive coverage. These are cheap, easy to cover, and they never antagonize those in power. The mass media companies claim they are responding to demand. (p. 445)

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, real income declined or was stagnant for the lower 60 percent, while wealth and income for the rich skyrocketed. By 1998, discounting home ownership, the top 10 percent of the population claimed 76 percent of the nation's net worth. More than half is accounted for by the richest 1 percent. The Washington Post has gone so far as to describe ours as a nearly "perfect economy," which [reveals] the vantage point of the corporate news media. And it does appear more and more perfect the higher one goes up the socioeconomic ladder. (pp. 447, 448)

The rate of incarceration has more than doubled since the late 1980s. The US now has five times more prisoners per capita than Canada and seven times more than the whole of Western Europe. The US has 5 percent of the world's population and 25 percent of the world's prisoners. Nearly 90 percent of prisoners are jailed for nonviolent offenses, often casualties of the so-called drug war. It is a debate among Democrats and Republicans over who can be "tougher" on crime, hire more police, and build more prisons. Almost overnight, the prison-industrial complex has become a big business and a powerful lobby for public funds. (p. 448)

In the year 2000, a Texas man received 16 years in prison for stealing a Snickers candy bar, while four executives at Hoffman-LaRoche were found guilty of conspiring to suppress and eliminate competition in the vitamin industry in what the Justice Department called perhaps the largest criminal antitrust conspiracy in history. The four executives were fined anywhere from $75,000 to $350,000. They received prison terms ranging from three all the way up to four months. (p. 449)

The propagandistic nature of the war coverage was made crystal clear by AOL Time Warner's CNN a few weeks after the war began in Afghanistan. CNN president Walter Isaacson authorized CNN to provide two different versions of the war: a more critical one for the global audience and a sugarcoated one for Americans. Isaacson instructed the domestic
CNN to be certain that any story that might undermine support for the US war be balanced with a reminder that the war on terrorism is a response to the heinous attacks of September 11. (p. 452)

We need to press for the overhaul of the media system, so that it serves democratic values rather than the interests of capital. The US media system has nothing to do with the wishes of the Founding Fathers and even less to do with the workings of some alleged free market. To the contrary, the media system is the result of laws, government subsidies, and regulations made in the public's name, but made corruptly behind closed doors without the public's informed consent. The largest media firms are all built on top of the profits generated by government gifts of monopoly rights. It is impossible to conceive of a better world with a media system that remains under the thumb of Wall Street and Madison Avenue, under the thumb of the owning class. It is nearly impossible to conceive of a better world without some changes in the media status quo. We have no time to waste. (p. 453)

To finish off here are a few quotes from those in power telling you exactly how the media works and who really controls it.

"We are grateful to the Washington Post, The New York Times, Time Magazine and other great publications whose directors have attended our meetings and respected their promises of discretion for almost forty years. It would have been impossible for us to develop our plan for the world if we had been subjected to the lights of publicity during those years. But, the world is now more sophisticated and prepared to march towards a world government. The supranational sovereignty of an intellectual elite and world bankers is surely preferable to the national auto-determination practiced in past centuries."
David Rockefeller, Baden-Baden, Germany 1991

Reference the above - If you wankers truly believed that notion for a second why don´t you ask the dumb masses what they think about it?

John Swinton (1829-1901) was the Scottish born managing editor of the New York Times during the Civil War, who later served eight years in the same position on the New York Sun and published a weekly labour sheet, John Swinton's Paper. In 1880, Swinton was the guest of honour at a banquet given him by his peers. Someone who knew neither the press nor Swinton offered a toast to the independent press. Swinton outraged his colleagues by replying:

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


"News is something that somebody somewhere wants suppressed. All else is advertising."
British newspaper proprietor Lord Northcliffe (1865-1922)
"Newspapers are unable, seemingly, to discriminate between a bicycle accident and the collapse of civilization." George Bernard Shaw (1856-1950)

"The news and truth are not the same thing." Walter Lippmann (1889-1974)

"There are some things the general public does not need to know and shouldn't. I believe democracy flourishes when the government can take legitimate steps to keep its secrets, and when the press can decide whether to print what it knows." Katherine Graham (1917-2001) former owner of the Washington Post, to a class of CIA recruits in Langley (1988).

“The man who reads nothing at all is better educated than the man who reads nothing but newspapers.” Thomas Jefferson

“I think the subject which will be of most importance politically is Mass Psychology .... Its importance has been enormously increased by the growth of modern methods of propaganda .... 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.” Bertrand Russell - a character I once heard lauded by Stephen Fry, what do you think about this comment mate, benign, intellectual or the words of a narrow minded, deranged, psychopathic, elitist, megalomaniac?

“A newspaper has three things to do. One is to amuse, another is to entertain and the rest is to mislead.” Ernest Bevin

"Our job is to give people not what they want, but what we decide they ought to have.”
Richard Salent, former president, CBS News

Here is a spoof advert for George W, which adheres to the principles that you have just read about. It was taken from oldamericancentury.org It is followed by a spoof TV guide by Dees that was taken from Rense.com
We need to take back control of our press NOW. (And going by what you’re about to read in the next chapter we might want to take back control of our children’s games consoles too!!)

To end this chapter let’s quickly look at a very small group of companies who between them own nearly every TV station, newspaper, magazine, book company, radio station, record label, and pay per view service - (basically the entire mainstream media for the world).

Who Owns the Media?

From CorporateMediaExposed.com

Sadly we now find ourselves in a word where six massive media conglomerates literally control the entire “mainstream” media.

These six corporations, Time Warner, Walt Disney, Viacom, Rupert Murdoch’s News Corp., CBS Corporation and NBC Universal are responsible for countless lies, propaganda pieces, death, and the ultimate dumbing down of America.

When you take even a small look at the companies that run under the six corporations listed above, a clear picture emerges.
Sources for the list below include mondotimes.com and the Economic Collapse Blog.

**Time Warner**

Home Box Office (HBO)

Time Inc.

Turner Broadcasting System, Inc.

Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc.

CW Network (partial ownership)

TMZ

Moviefone

Castle Rock

Sports Illustrated

Fortune

New Line Cinema

Time Warner Cable

Cinemax

Cartoon Network

TBS

TNT

America Online

MapQuest

Marie Claire

People Magazine
Walt Disney

SOAPnet
A&E
Lifetime
Buena Vista Home Entertainment
Buena Vista Theatrical Productions
Buena Vista Records
Disney Records
Hollywood Records
Miramax Films
ABC Television Network
Disney Publishing
ESPN Inc.
Touchstone Pictures
Walt Disney Pictures
Pixar Animation Studios
Disney Channel
Buena Vista Games
Hyperion Books

Viacom

Black Entertainment Television (BET)
Comedy Central
Country Music Television (CMT)
Logo
Paramount Pictures
Paramount Home Entertainment
MTV
MTV Canada
MTV2
Nick Magazine
Nick at Nite
Nick Jr.
Nickelodeon
Noggin
Spike TV
The Movie Channel
TV Land
VH1

News Corporation

Dow Jones & Company, Inc.
Fox Television Stations
The New York Post
Fox Searchlight Pictures
Beliefnet
Fox Business Network
Fox Kids Europe
Fox News Channel
Fox Sports Net
Fox Television Network
FX
My Network TV
MySpace
News Limited News
Phoenix InfoNews Channel
Phoenix Movies Channel
Sky PerfecTV
Speed Channel
STAR TV India
STAR TV Taiwan
STAR World
Times Higher Education Supplement Magazine
Times Literary Supplement Magazine
Times of London
20th Century Fox Home Entertainment
20th Century Fox International
20th Century Fox Studios
20th Century Fox Television
BSkyB
DIRECTV
The Wall Street Journal
Fox Broadcasting Company
Fox Interactive Media
FOXTEL
HarperCollins Publishers
The National Geographic Channel
National Rugby League
News Interactive
News Outdoor
Radio Veronica
ReganBooks
Sky Italia
Sky Radio Denmark
Sky Radio Germany
Sky Radio Netherlands
STAR
Zondervan

CBS Corporation

CBS News
CBS Sports
CBS Television Network
CNET
Showtime
TV.com
CBS Radio Inc. (130 stations)
CBS Consumer Products
CBS Outdoor
CW Network (50% ownership)
Infinity Broadcasting
Simon & Schuster (Pocket Books, Scribner)
Westwood One Radio Network

NBC Universal

Bravo
CNBC
NBC News
MSNBC
NBC Sports
We created this website so that we could directly expose the companies and actual individuals involved with the corporate controlled media.

In the weeks and months ahead we will be publishing reports detailing the worst offenders in the corporate controlled media and calling them out by name.

We also plan to delve deep into the actual owners of the media and what they all seem to have in common.

To end this part on media brainwashing, I’m going to look at the influence of the games your children play on their games consoles with their behaviour. (If I was you, in my mind I’d also be recalling what you learned in the “programmed to kill” and “conditioning” chapters!!!)
Chapter Twenty Six

I mentioned at the beginning of the first part of this how we have been conditioned to accept violence through films and video games.

Look at our kids today as a result of this, it’s a playstation nation on a self imposed plantation. Our children are X-box zombie’s who shoot people through telescopic lenses on TV screens for 10 years, and then you wonder why they don’t talk to you, or seem social.

These games “handily” test their aptitude for the military too, do you know it was a very small percentage of soldiers who done most of the efficient killing during the first and second World Wars? With the introduction of virtual-reality type software programmes, paid for by the military, this figure has risen enormously (I think it used to be 15% of men who were able to kill while 85% couldn’t really do it, nowadays it’s reversed, 90% kill without thinking and 10% have a problem with it) (you also might want to look into who funded the software companies who designed the games your kids play as well if you were smart) - it’s all about conditioning. How many of you are aware of the fact that many of your kids are looking at a TV screen peering through the cross hairs of a sniper’s rifle, shooting, killing and generally training to be an assassin right now? (Might make you think twice if you’re about to stick your head in their room door and demand to know if your kid has cleaned their room yet!)

"Trained to Kill"


Are we training our children to kill? I am from Jonesboro, Arkansas. I travel the world training medical, law enforcement, and U.S. military personnel about the realities of warfare. I try to make those who carry deadly force keenly aware of the magnitude of killing. Too many law enforcement and military personnel act like "cowboys," never stopping to think about who they are and what they are called to do. I hope I am able to give them a reality check.

So here I am, a world traveller and an expert in the field of "killology," and the largest school massacre in American history happens in my hometown of Jonesboro, Arkansas. That was the March 24, 1999, schoolyard shooting deaths of four girls and a teacher. Ten others were injured, and two boys, ages 11 and 13, are in jail, charged with murder. My son goes to one of the middle schools in town, so my aunt in Florida called us that day and asked, "Was that Joe's school?" And we said, "We haven't heard about it." My aunt in Florida knew about the shootings before we did!

We turned on the television and discovered the shootings took place down the road from us but, thank goodness, not at Joe's school. I'm sure almost all parents in Jonesboro that night hugged their children and said, "Thank God it wasn't you," as they tucked them into bed. But there was also a lot of guilt because some parents in Jonesboro couldn't say that.

I spent the first three days after the tragedy at Westside Middle School, where the shootings took place, working with the counsellors, teachers, students, and parents. None of us had ever done anything like this before. I train people how to react to trauma in the military; but how do you do it with kids after a massacre in their school?

I was the lead trainer for the counsellors and clergy the night after the shootings, and the following day we debriefed the teachers in groups. Then the counsellors and clergy, working with the teachers, debriefed the students, allowing them to work through everything that
had happened. Only people who share a trauma can give each other the understanding, acceptance, and forgiveness needed to understand what happened, and then they can begin the long process of trying to understand why it happened.

Virus of Violence

To understand the why behind Jonesboro and Springfield and Pearl and Paducah, and all the other outbreaks of this "virus of violence," we need to understand first the magnitude of the problem. The per capita murder rate doubled in this country between 1957 when the FBI started keeping track of the data—and 1992. A fuller picture of the problem, however, is indicated by the rate people are attempting to kill one another—the aggravated assault rate. That rate in America has gone from around 60 per 100,000 in 1957 to over 440 per 100,000 by the middle of this decade. As bad as this is, it would be much worse were it not for two major factors.

First is the increase in the imprisonment rate of violent offenders. The prison population in America nearly quadrupled between 1975 and 1992. According to criminologist John J. Dilulio, "dozens of credible empirical analyses . . . leave no doubt that the increased use of prisons averted millions of serious crimes." If it were not for our tremendous imprisonment rate (the highest of any industrialized nation), the aggravated assault rate and the murder rate would undoubtedly be even higher.

Children don't naturally kill; they learn it from violence in the home and most pervasively, from violence as entertainment in television, movies, and interactive video games.

The second factor keeping the murder rate from being any worse is medical technology. According to the US Army Medical Service Corps, a wound that would have killed nine out of ten soldiers in World War II, nine out of ten could have survived in Vietnam. Thus, by a very conservative estimate, if we had 1940-level medical technology today, the murder rate would be ten times higher than it is. The magnitude of the problem has been held down by the development of sophisticated lifesaving skills and techniques, such as helicopter medivacs, 911 operators, paramedics, CPR, trauma centres, and medicines.

However, the crime rate is still at a phenomenally high level, and this is true worldwide. In Canada, according to their Centre for Justice, per capita assaults increased almost fivefold between 1964 and 1993, attempted murder increased nearly sevenfold, and murders doubled. Similar trends can be seen in other countries in the per capita violent crime rates reported to Interpol between 1977 and 1993. In Australia and New Zealand, the assault rate increased approximately fourfold, and the murder rate nearly doubled in both nations. The assault rate tripled in Sweden, and approximately doubled in Belgium, Denmark, England-Wales, France, Hungary, Netherlands, and Scotland, while all these nations had an associated (but smaller) increase in murder.

This virus of violence is occurring worldwide. The explanation for it has to be some new factor that is occurring in all of these countries. There are many factors involved, and none should be discounted: for example, the prevalence of guns in our society. But violence is rising in many nations with draconian gun laws. And though we should never downplay child abuse, poverty, or racism, there is only one new variable present in each of these countries, bearing the exact same fruit: media violence presented as entertainment for children.

Killing is Unnatural

Before retiring from the military, I spent almost a quarter of a century as an army infantry officer and a psychologist, learning and studying how to enable people to kill. Believe me, we are very good at it. But it does not come naturally; you have to be taught to kill. And just
as the army is conditioning people to kill, we are indiscriminately doing the same thing to our children, but without the safeguards.

After the Jonesboro killings, the head of the American Academy of Paediatrics Task Force on Juvenile Violence came to town and said that children don't naturally kill. It is a learned skill. And they learn it from abuse and violence in the home and, most pervasively, from violence as entertainment in television, the movies, and interactive video games.

Killing requires training because there is a built-in aversion to killing one's own kind. I can best illustrate this from drawing on my own work in studying killing in the military.

We all know that you can't have an argument or a discussion with a frightened or angry human being. Vasoconstriction, the narrowing of the blood vessels, has literally closed down the forebrain—that great gob of gray matter that makes you a human being and distinguishes you from a dog. When those neurons close down, the midbrain takes over and your thought processes and reflexes are indistinguishable from your dog's. If you've worked with animals, you have some understanding in the realm of midbrain responses.

Within the midbrain there is a powerful, God-given resistance to killing your own kind. Every species, with a few exceptions, has a hardwired resistance to killing its own kind in territorial and mating battles. When animals with antlers and horns fight one another, they head butt in a harmless fashion. But when they fight any other species, they go to the side to gut and gore. Piranhas will turn their fangs on anything, but they fight one another with flicks of the tail. Rattlesnakes will bite anything, but they wrestle one another. Almost every species has this hardwired resistance to killing its own kind.

When we human beings are overwhelmed with anger and fear, we slam head-on into that midbrain resistance that generally prevents us from killing. Only sociopaths—who by definition don't have that resistance—lack this innate violence immune system.

Throughout human history, when humans fight each other, there is a lot of posturing. Adversaries make loud noises and puff themselves up, trying to daunt the enemy. There is a lot of fleeing and submission. Ancient battles were nothing more than great shoving matches. It was not until one side turned and ran that most of the killing happened, and most of that was stabbing people in the back. All of the ancient military historians report that the vast majority of killing happened in pursuit when one side was fleeing.

In more modern times, the average firing rate was incredibly low in Civil War battles. Paddy Griffith demonstrates that the killing potential of the average Civil War regiment was anywhere from five hundred to a thousand men per minute. The actual killing rate was only one or two men per minute per regiment (The Battle Tactics of the American Civil War). At the Battle of Gettysburg, of the 27,000 muskets picked up from the dead and dying after the battle, 90 percent were loaded. This is an anomaly, because it took 95 percent of their time to load muskets and only 5 percent to fire. But even more amazingly, of the thousands of loaded muskets, over half had multiple loads in the barrel—one with 23 loads in the barrel. In reality, the average man would load his musket and bring it to his shoulder, but he could not bring himself to kill. He would be brave, he would stand shoulder to shoulder, he would do what he was trained to do; but at the moment of truth, he could not bring himself to pull the trigger. So, he lowered the weapon and loaded it again. Of those who did fire, only a tiny percentage fired to hit. The vast majority fired over the enemy's head.

During World War II, US Army Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall had a team of researchers study what soldiers did in battle. For the first time in history, they asked individual soldiers what they did in battle. They discovered that only 15 to 20 percent of the individual riflemen could bring themselves to fire at an exposed enemy soldier.
That is the reality of the battlefield. Only a small percentage of soldiers are able and willing to participate. Men are willing to die, they are willing to sacrifice themselves for their nation; but they are not willing to kill. It is a phenomenal insight into human nature; but when the military became aware of that, they systematically went about the process of trying to fix this "problem." From the military perspective, a 15 percent firing rate among riflemen is like a 15 percent literacy rate among librarians. And fix it the military did. By the Korean War, around 55 percent of the soldiers were willing to fire to kill. And by Vietnam, the rate rose to over 90 percent.

The Methods in this Madness: Desensitization

How the military increases the killing rate of soldiers in combat is instructive, because our culture today is doing the same thing to our children. The training methods militaries use are brutalization, classical conditioning, operant conditioning, and role modelling. I will explain these in the military context and show how these same factors are contributing to the phenomenal increase of violence in our culture.

Brutalization and desensitization are what happen at boot camp. From the moment you step off the bus you are physically and verbally abused: countless pushups, endless hours at attention or running with heavy loads, while carefully trained professionals take turns screaming at you. Your head is shaved, you are herded together naked and dressed alike, losing all individuality. This brutalization is designed to break down your existing mores and norms and to accept a new set of values that embrace destruction, violence, and death as a way of life. In the end, you are desensitized to violence and accept it as a normal and essential survival skill in your brutal new world.

Something very similar to this desensitization toward violence is happening to our children through violence in the media--but instead of 18-year-olds, it begins at the age of 18 months when a child is first able to discern what is happening on television. At that age, a child can watch something happening on television and mimic that action. But it isn't until children are six or seven years old that the part of the brain kicks in that lets them understand where information comes from. Even though young children have some understanding of what it means to pretend, they are developmentally unable to distinguish clearly between fantasy and reality.

When young children see somebody shot, stabbed,raped, brutalized, degraded, or murdered on TV, to them it is as though it were actually happening. To have a child of three, four, or five watch a "splatter" movie, learning to relate to a character for the first 90 minutes and then in the last 30 minutes watch helplessly as that new friend is hunted and brutally murdered is the moral and psychological equivalent of introducing your child to a friend, letting her play with that friend, and then butchering that friend in front of your child's eyes. And this happens to our children hundreds upon hundreds of times.

Sure, they are told: "Hey, it's all for fun. Look, this isn't real, it's just TV." And they nod their little heads and say, "okay." But they can't tell the difference. Can you remember a point in your life or in your children's lives when dreams, reality, and television were all jumbled together? That's what it is like to be at that level of psychological development. That's what the media is doing to them.

The Journal of the American Medical Association published the definitive epidemiological study on the impact of TV violence. The research demonstrated what happened in numerous nations after television made its appearance as compared to nations and regions without TV. The two nations or regions being compared are demographically and ethnically identical; only one variable is different: the presence of television. In every nation, region, or city with television, there is an immediate explosion of violence on the playground, and within 15 years there is a doubling of the murder rate. Why 15 years? That is how long it
takes for the brutalization of a three-to five-year-old to reach the "prime crime age." That is how long it takes for you to reap what you have sown when you brutalize and desensitize a three-year-old.

Today the data linking violence in the media to violence in society are superior to those linking cancer and tobacco. Hundreds of sound scientific studies demonstrate the social impact of brutalization by the media. The Journal of the American Medical Association concluded that "the introduction of television in the 1950's caused a subsequent doubling of the homicide rate, i.e., long-term childhood exposure to television is a causal factor behind approximately one half of the homicides committed in the United States, or approximately 10,000 homicides annually." The article went on to say that ". . . if, hypothetically, television technology had never been developed, there would today be 10,000 fewer homicides each year in the United States, 70,000 fewer rapes, and 700,000 fewer injurious assaults" (June 10, 1992).

Classical Conditioning

Classical conditioning is like the famous case of Pavlov's dogs you learned about in Psychology 101: The dogs learned to associate the ringing of the bell with food, and, once conditioned, the dogs could not hear the bell without salivating.

The Japanese were masters at using classical conditioning with their soldiers. Early in World War II, Chinese prisoners were placed in a ditch on their knees with their hands bound behind them. And one by one, a select few Japanese soldiers would go into the ditch and bayonet "their" prisoner to death. This is a horrific way to kill another human being. Up on the bank, countless other young soldiers would cheer them on in their violence. Comparatively few soldiers actually killed in these situations, but by making the others watch and cheer, the Japanese were able to use these kinds of atrocities to classically condition a very large audience to associate pleasure with human death and suffering. Immediately afterwards, the soldiers who had been spectators were treated to sake, the best meal they had had in months, and to so-called comfort girls. The result? They learned to associate committing violent acts with pleasure.

The Japanese found these kinds of techniques to be extraordinarily effective at quickly enabling very large numbers of soldiers to commit atrocities in the years to come. Operant conditioning (which we will look at shortly) teaches you to kill, but classical conditioning is a subtle but powerful mechanism that teaches you to like it.

This technique is so morally reprehensible that there are very few examples of it in modern US military training; but there are some clear-cut examples of it being done by the media to our children. What is happening to our children is the reverse of the aversion therapy portrayed in the movie A Clockwork Orange. In A Clockwork Orange, a brutal sociopath, a mass murderer, is strapped to a chair and forced to watch violent movies while he is injected with a drug that nauseates him. So he sits and gags and retches as he watches the movies. After hundreds of repetitions of this, he associates violence with nausea, and it limits his ability to be violent.

Every time a child plays an interactive video game, he is learning the exact same conditioned reflex skills as a soldier or police officer in training.

We are doing the exact opposite: Our children watch vivid pictures of human suffering and death, learning to associate it with their favourite soft drink and candy bar, or their girlfriend's perfume.
After the Jonesboro shootings, one of the high-school teachers told me how her students reacted when she told them about the shootings at the middle school. "They laughed," she told me with dismay. A similar reaction happens all the time in movie theaters when there is bloody violence. The young people laugh and cheer and keep right on eating popcorn and drinking pop. We have raised a generation of barbarians who have learned to associate violence with pleasure, like the Romans cheering and snacking as the Christians were slaughtered in the Coliseum.

The result is a phenomenon that functions much like AIDS, which I call AVIDS—Acquired Violence Immune Deficiency Syndrome. AIDS has never killed anybody. It destroys your immune system, and then other diseases that shouldn't kill you become fatal. Television violence by itself does not kill you. It destroys your violence immune system and conditions you to derive pleasure from violence. And once you are at close range with another human being, and it's time for you to pull that trigger, Acquired Violence Immune Deficiency Syndrome can destroy your midbrain resistance.

Operant Conditioning

The third method the military uses is operant conditioning, a very powerful procedure of stimulus-response, stimulus-response. A benign example is the use of flight simulators to train pilots. An airline pilot in training sits in front of a flight simulator for endless hours; when a particular warning light goes on, he is taught to react in a certain way. When another warning light goes on, a different reaction is required. Stimulus-response, stimulus-response, stimulus-response. One day the pilot is actually flying a jumbo jet; the plane is going down, and 300 people are screaming behind him. He is wetting his seat cushion, and he is scared out of his wits; but he does the right thing. Why? Because he has been conditioned to respond reflexively to this particular crisis.

When people are frightened or angry, they will do what they have been conditioned to do. In fire drills, children learn to file out of the school in orderly fashion. One day there is a real fire, and they are frightened out of their wits; but they do exactly what they have been conditioned to do, and it saves their lives.

The military and law enforcement community have made killing a conditioned response. This has substantially raised the firing rate on the modern battlefield. Whereas infantry training in World War II used bull's-eye targets, now soldiers learn to fire at realistic, man-shaped silhouettes that pop into their field of view. That is the stimulus. The trainees have only a split second to engage the target. The conditioned response is to shoot the target, and then it drops. Stimulus-response, stimulus-response, stimulus-response—soldiers or police officers experience hundreds of repetitions. Later, when soldiers are on the battlefield or a police officer is walking a beat and somebody pops up with a gun, they will shoot reflexively and shoot to kill. We know that 75 to 80 percent of the shooting on the modern battlefield is the result of this kind of stimulus-response training.

Now, if you're a little troubled by that, how much more should we be troubled by the fact that every time a child plays an interactive point-and-shoot video game, he is learning the exact same conditioned reflex and motor skills.

I was an expert witness in a murder case in South Carolina offering mitigation for a kid who was facing the death penalty. I tried to explain to the jury that interactive video games had conditioned him to shoot a gun to kill. He had spent hundreds of dollars on video games learning to point and shoot, point and shoot. One day he and his buddy decided it would be fun to rob the local convenience store. They walked in, and he pointed a snub-nosed .38 pistol at the clerk's head. The clerk turned to look at him, and the defendant shot reflexively from about six feet. The bullet hit the clerk right between the eyes—which is a pretty remarkable shot with that weapon at that range—and killed this father of two. Afterward, we
asked the boy what happened and why he did it. It clearly was not part of the plan to kill the
guy—it was being videotaped from six different directions. He said, "I don't know. It was a
mistake. It wasn't supposed to happen."

In the military and law-enforcement worlds, the right option is often not to shoot. But you
never, never put your quarter in that video machine with the intention of not shooting.
There is always some stimulus that sets you off. And when he was excited, and his heart
rate went up, and vasoconstriction closed his forebrain down, this young man did exactly
what he was conditioned to do: he reflexively pulled the trigger, shooting accurately just like
all those times he played video games.

This process is extraordinarily powerful and frightening. The result is ever more homemade
pseudo-sociopaths who kill reflexively and show no remorse. Our children are learning to
kill and learning to like it; and then we have the audacity to say, "Oh my goodness, what's
wrong?"

One of the boys allegedly involved in the Jonesboro shootings (and they are just boys) had a
fair amount of experience shooting real guns. The other one was a nonshooter and, to the
best of our knowledge, had almost no experience shooting. Between them, those two boys
fired 27 shots from a range of over 100 yards, and they hit 15 people. That's pretty
remarkable shooting. We run into these situations often—kids who have never picked up a
gun in their lives pick up a real gun and are incredibly accurate. Why?

Video Games

Role models In the military, you are immediately confronted with a role model: your drill
sergeant. He personifies violence and aggression. Along with military heroes, these violent
role models have always been used to influence young, impressionable minds.

Today the media are providing our children with role models. This can be seen not just in
the lawless sociopaths in movies and TV shows, but it can also be seen in the media-
inspired, copycat aspects of the Jonesboro murders. This is the part of these juvenile
crimes that the TV networks would much rather not talk about.

Research in the 1970s demonstrated the existence of "cluster suicides" in which the local
TV reporting of teen suicides directly caused numerous copycat suicides of impressionable
teenagers. Somewhere in every population there are potentially suicidal kids who will say to
themselves, "Well, I'll show all those people who have been mean to me. I know how to get
my picture on TV, too." Because of this research, television stations today generally do not
cover suicides. But when the pictures of teenage killers appear on TV, the effect is the
same: Somewhere there is a potentially violent little boy who says to himself, "Well, I'll show
all those people who have been mean to me. I know how to get my picture on TV too."

Thus we get copycat, cluster murders that work their way across America like a virus
spread by the six o'clock news. No matter what someone has done, if you put his picture on
TV, you have made him a celebrity, and someone, somewhere, will emulate him.

The lineage of the Jonesboro shootings began at Pearl, Mississippi, fewer than six months
before. In Pearl, a 16-year-old boy was accused of killing his mother and then going to his
school and shooting nine students, two of whom died, including his ex-girlfriend. Two
months later, this virus spread to Paducah, Kentucky, where a 14-year-old boy was arrested
for killing three students and wounding five others.

A very important step in the spread of this copycat crime virus occurred in Stamps,
Arkansas, 15 days after Pearl and just a little over 90 days before Jonesboro. In Stamps, a
14-year-old boy, who was angry at his schoolmates, hid in the woods and fired at children as they came out of school. Sound familiar? Only two children were injured in this crime, so most of the world didn't hear about it; but it got great regional coverage on TV, and two little boys in Jonesboro, Arkansas, probably did hear about it.

And then there was Springfield, Oregon, and so many others. Is this a reasonable price to pay for the TV networks' "right" to turn juvenile defendants into celebrities and role models by playing up their pictures on TV?

Our society needs to be informed about these crimes, but when the images of the young killers are broadcast on television, they become role models. The average preschooler in America watches 27 hours of television a week. The average child gets more one-on-one communication from TV than from all her parents and teachers combined. The ultimate achievement for our children is to get their picture on TV. The solution is simple, and it comes straight out of the suicidology literature: The media have every right and responsibility to tell the story, but they have no right to glorify the killers by presenting their images on TV.

Reality Check: Sixty percent of men on TV are involved in violence; 11 percent are killers. Unlike actual rates, in the media the majority of homicide victims are women. (Gerbner 1994) In a Canadian town in which TV was first introduced in 1973, a 160 percent increase in aggression, hitting, shoving, and biting was documented in first- and second-grade students after exposure, with no change in behaviour in children in two control communities. (Centerwall 1992) Fifteen years after the introduction of TV, homicides, rapes and assaults doubled in the United States. (American Medical Association) Twenty percent of suburban high schoolers endorse shooting someone "who has stolen something from you." (Toch and Silver 1993) In the United States, approximately two million teenagers carry knives, guns, clubs or razors. As many as 135,000 take them to school. (America by the Numbers) Americans spend over $100 million on toy guns every year. What Counts: The Complete Harper's Index © 1991)

Unlearning Violence

What is the road home from the dark and lonely place to which we have travelled? One route infringes on civil liberties. The city of New York has made remarkable progress in recent years in bringing down crime rates, but they may have done so at the expense of some civil liberties. People who are fearful say that is a price they are willing to pay.

Another route would be to "just turn it off"; if you don't like what is on television, use the "off" button. Yet, if all the parents of the 15 shooting victims in Jonesboro had protected their children from TV violence, it wouldn't have done a bit of good. Because somewhere there were two little boys whose parents didn't "just turn it off."

On the night of the Jonesboro shootings, clergy and counsellors were working in small groups in the hospital waiting room, comforting the groups of relatives and friends of the victims. Then they noticed one woman sitting alone silently.

A counsellor went over to the woman and discovered that she was the mother of one of the girls who had been killed. She had no friends, no husband, no family with her as she sat in the hospital, stunned by her loss. "I just came to find out how to get my little girl's body back," she said. But the body had been taken to Little Rock, 100 miles away, for an autopsy. Her very next concern was, "I just don't know how I'm going to pay for the funeral. I don't know how I can afford it." That little girl was truly all she had in all the world. Come to Jonesboro, friend, and tell this mother she should "just turn it off."
Ten Nonviolent Video Games

The following list of nonviolent video games has been developed by The Games Project (1999). These games are ranked high for their social and play value and technical merit.

- Bust a Move
- Tetris
- Theme Park
- Absolute Pinball
- Myst
- NASCAR
- SimCity
- The Incredible Machine
- Front Page Sports: Golf
- Earthworm Jim

Fighting back

We need to make progress in the fight against child abuse, racism, and poverty, and in rebuilding our families. No one is denying that the breakdown of the family is a factor. But nations without our divorce rates are also having increases in violence. Besides, research demonstrates that one major source of harm associated with single-parent families occurs when the TV becomes both the nanny and the second parent. Work is needed in all these areas, but there is a new front—taking on the producers and purveyors of media violence. Simply put, we ought to work toward legislation that outlaws violent video games for children. There is no constitutional right for a child to play an interactive video game that teaches him weapons-handling skills or that simulates destruction of God's creatures.

The day may also be coming when we are able to seat juries in America who are willing to sock it to the networks in the only place they really understand—their wallets. After the Jonesboro shootings, Time magazine said: "As for media violence, the debate there is fast approaching the same point that discussions about the health impact of tobacco reached some time ago—it's over. Few researchers bother any longer to dispute that bloodshed on TV and in the movies has an effect on kids who witness it" (April 6, 1998).

Most of all, the American people need to learn the lesson of Jonesboro: Violence is not a game; it's not fun, it's not something that we do for entertainment. Violence kills.

Every parent in America desperately needs to be warned of the impact of TV and other violent media on children, just as we would warn them of some widespread carcinogen. The problem is that the TV networks, which use the public airwaves we have licensed to them, are our key means of public education in America. And they are stonewalling.

In the days after the Jonesboro shootings, I was interviewed on Canadian national TV, the British Broadcasting Company, and many US and international radio shows and newspapers. But the American television networks simply would not touch this aspect of the story. Never in my experience as a historian and a psychologist have I seen any institution in America so clearly responsible for so very many deaths, and so clearly abusing their publicly licensed authority and power to cover up their guilt.

Time after time, idealistic young network producers contacted me from one of the networks, fascinated by the irony that an expert in the field of violence and aggression was living in Jonesboro and was at the school almost from the beginning. But unlike all the other media, these network news stories always died a sudden, silent death when the network's powers—that-be said, "Yeah, we need this story like we need a hole in the head."
Many times since the shooting I have been asked, "Why weren't you on TV talking about the stuff in your book?" And every time my answer had to be, "The TV networks are burying this story. They know they are guilty, and they want to delay the retribution as long as they can."

As an author and expert on killing, I believe I have spoken on the subject at every Rotary, Kiwanis, and Lions Club in a 50-mile radius of Jonesboro. So when the plague of satellite dishes descended upon us like huge locusts, many people here were aware of the scientific data linking TV violence and violent crime.

The networks will stick their lenses anywhere and courageously expose anything. Like flies on open wounds, they find nothing too private or shameful for their probing lenses—except themselves, and their share of guilt in the terrible, tragic crime that happened here.

A CBS executive told me his plan. He knows all about the link between media and violence. His own in-house people have advised him to protect his child from the poison his industry is bringing to America's children. He is not going to expose his child to TV until she's old enough to learn how to read. And then he will select very carefully what she sees. He and his wife plan to send her to a daycare centre that has no television, and he plans to show her only age-appropriate videos.

That should be the bare minimum with children: Show them only age-appropriate videos, and think hard about what is age appropriate. The most benign product you are going to get from the networks are 22-minute sitcoms or cartoons providing instant solutions for all of life's problems, interlaced with commercials telling you what a slug you are if you don't ingest the right sugary substances and don't wear the right shoes.

The worst product your child is going to get from the networks is represented by one TV commentator who told me, "Well, we only have one really violent show on our network, and that is NYPD Blue. I'll admit that that is bad, but it is only one night a week."

I wondered at the time how she would feel if someone said, "Well, I only beat my wife in front of the kids one night a week." The effect is the same.

"You're not supposed to know who I am!" said NYPD Blue star Kim Delaney, in response to young children who recognized her from her role on that show. According to USA Weekend, she was shocked that underage viewers watch her show, which is rated TV-14 for gruesome crimes, raw language, and explicit sex scenes. But they do watch, don't they?

Education about media and violence does make a difference. I was on a radio call-in show in San Antonio, Texas. A woman called and said, "I would never have had the courage to do this two years ago. But let me tell you what happened. You tell me if I was right."

"My 13-year-old boy spent the night with a neighbour boy. After that night, he started having nightmares. I got him to admit what the nightmares were about. While he was at the neighbour's house, they watched splatter movies all night: people cutting people up with chainsaws and stuff like that.

"Every parent in America desperately needs to be warned of the impact of TV and other violent media on children. But the TV networks--our key means of public education in America--are stonewalling."

"I called the neighbours and told them, 'Listen: you are sick people. I wouldn't feel any different about you if you had given my son pornography or alcohol. And I'm not going to have anything further to do with you or your son--and neither is anybody else in this neighbourhood, if I have anything to do with it--until you stop what you're doing.' "
That's powerful. That's censure, not censorship. We ought to have the moral courage to censure people who think that violence is legitimate entertainment.

One of the most effective ways for Christians to be salt and light is by simply confronting the culture of violence as entertainment. A friend of mine, a retired army officer who teaches at a nearby middle school, uses the movie Gettysburg to teach his students about the Civil War. A scene in that movie very dramatically depicts the tragedy of Pickett's Charge. As the Confederate troops charge into the Union lines, the cannons fire into their masses at point-blank range, and there is nothing but a red mist that comes up from the smoke and flames. He told me that when he first showed this heart-wrenching, tragic scene to his students, they laughed.

He began to confront this behaviour ahead of time by saying: "In the past, students have laughed at this scene, and I want to tell you that this is completely unacceptable behaviour. This movie depicts a tragedy in American history, a tragedy that happened to our ancestors, and I will not tolerate any laughing." From then on, when he played that scene to his students, over the years, he says there was no laughter. Instead, many of them wept.

What the media teach is unnatural, and if confronted in love and assurance, the house they have built on the sand will crumble. But our house is built on the rock. If we don't actively present our values, then the media will most assuredly inflict theirs on our children, and the children, like those in that class watching Gettysburg, simply won't know any better.

There are many other things that the Christian community can do to help change our culture. Youth activities can provide alternatives to television, and churches can lead the way in providing alternative locations for latchkey children. Fellowship groups can provide guidance and support to young parents as they strive to raise their children without the destructive influences of the media. Mentoring programs can pair mature, educated adults with young parents, helping them through the preschool ages without using the TV as a babysitter. And most of all, the churches can provide the clarion call of decency and love and peace as an alternative to death and destruction—not just for the sake of the church, but for the transformation of our culture.

*Violent Video Games — A Surprise or Two*

By Denise Breton and Christopher Largent

This is the second of Dave Grossman's comments on video game violence, which may surprise many parents:

**STATEMENT OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL DAVE GROSSMAN**

**BEFORE THE NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATURE**

I am Lt. Col. Dave Grossman, U.S. Army, (Retired). My expertise in the area of human aggression and violence includes service as a West Point psychology professor, a professor of military science, the author of a Pulitzer nominated book and numerous peer reviewed encyclopaedia entries on this topic.

It is my professional opinion, and it is the opinion of major experts in this area (such as the American Medical Association (AMA), the American Psychiatric Association (APA), the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), the American Academy of Mental Health, and the Surgeon General), based on extensive research, that violent video games are harmful to children.
Legislation to rate these games, and enforcement of the ratings in order to keep the violent games out of the hands of children, is essential to the safety and security of the population of New York.

The games that permit a child to hold and aim a gun, and fire it at humans, are particularly harmful, since these devices teach shooting skills. They are firearms training devices at best, and murder simulators at worst.

**Media Violence Overview**

The AMA, the APA, NIMH, the American Academy of Paediatrics, the Surgeon General, and the United Nations (UNESCO) have all made definitive statements about the relationship between childhood exposure to visual violent images and later manifestation of real world aggression and violent criminal acts.

The impact of visual, violent imagery on children has been identified as the key variable responsible for an explosion of violent crime around the world. The per capita aggravated assault rate in the U.S. increased almost sevenfold between the mid-1950s and the middle of this decade. In Canada per capita assaults increased almost fivefold between 1964 and 1993. Between 1977 and 1993, the per capita assault rate increased nearly fivefold in Norway and Greece. In Australia and New Zealand the per capita assault rate increased approximately fourfold, tripled in Sweden, and approximately doubled in: Belgium, Denmark, England-Wales, France, Hungary, Netherlands, and Scotland. The common denominator in all these nations is the influence of media violence on children.

The Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA) has definitively concluded that "long-term childhood exposure to TV is a causal factor behind approximately one-half of the homicides committed in the U.S., or approximately 10,000 homicides committed annually," and that "if, hypothetically, TV technology had never been developed, there would today be 10,000 fewer homicides each year in the U.S." (June 10th, 1992 issue of JAMA)

Every one of these major authorities agrees that all the data on media violence immediately transfers to violent video games. To argue otherwise is like arguing that the data on cigarettes does not apply to cigars.

In the realm of violent video games, in addition to the data on the impact of visual, violet images on children, there is now approximately 50 years worth of research indicating the value of simulators in "programming" or "conditioning" a set of responses in individuals. Everything from fire drills to airline pilots’ use of flight simulators are based upon the research in simulations. Such research has led to the military making extensive use of such simulation to enable soldiers to pull the trigger and to shoot accurately in combat.

**Case Study**

The classic case of the influence of video games can be found in the Paducah, Kentucky, school shooting. I served as a consultant in this case, and my understanding of the facts, based upon official records, is that Michael Carneal, a 14-year old boy who had never fired a handgun before, stole a pistol, fired a few practice shots the night before and came into his school the next morning with the gun. In this case 8 shots were apparently fired, for 8 hits—4 of them head shots, one neck, and 3 upper torso. This is simply astounding, unprecedented marksmanship, especially when it comes from a child who apparently had never fired a real pistol in his life (prior to stealing the gun) and had only fired a .22 calibre rifle once at a summer camp.
I am an Army Ranger, "expert" qualified on all major U.S. small arms and many NATO weapons, an instructor for: the American Society of Law Enforcement Trainers (ASLET); the International Association Society of Law Enforcement Firearms Instructors (IALEFI); the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Emergency Response Teams; the California Highway Patrol Academy; and numerous other state patrol academies. I have fired many tens of thousands of rounds of ammunition, and even with all of this I sincerely doubt that I could have fired as accurately under these circumstances.

Indeed, I have never heard of anything remotely like this in its degree of deadly accuracy under these circumstances. One state police study in an assessment of the accuracy of their officers across several years found that the average officer, in the average engagement, at the average distance of 23 feet, hit with 13% of the rounds fired. In the Amadu Diallo shooting in New York City, four members of an elite NYPD unit fired 41 rounds at an unarmed African immigrant, at point-blank range, and hit 19 times. That is the norm, even in the best of conditions, among trained, professional law enforcement officers. In the recent Jewish daycare centre shootings in Los Angeles, the shooter is reported to have fired 70 shots, and wounded 5 individuals. This is what should be expected from an untrained shooter.

I trained a battalion of Green Berets, the Texas Rangers, the California Highway Patrol, the Australian Federal Police, and numerous other elite military and law enforcement organizations, and when I told them of Michael Carneal's achievement, they were simply amazed. Nowhere in the annals of military or law enforcement or criminal history can any of us find an equivalent achievement, and this from a 14-year old boy with no previous experience in firing a handgun.

Michael Carneal had never fired an actual pistol before, but he had fired thousands of bullets in the video game "murder simulators." His superhuman accuracy, combined with the fact that he "stood still," firing two-handed, not wavering far to the left or far to the right in his shooting "field," and firing only one shot at each target, are all behaviours that are completely unnatural to either trained or 'native' shooters, behaviours that could only have been learned in a video game.

It is not natural to fire one shot at every target. The normal, near universal response of anyone with a semiautomatic weapon, in combat or while hunting, is to fire at a target until it drops, and then to move on to another target. But, if you are very, very good at video games, you will only fire one shot at every target, not even waiting for that target to drop before moving on to another target, because you "know" (from countless thousands of previous repetitions of the action) that you have hit and you "know" that the target will fall when it is hit with no need to waste time shooting it further. (Some games do not use the one-shot-one-kill model, but many, if not most, do.) As a player in the video game your goal is simply to rack up the highest "score" as quickly as possible. And many of the video games (such as "House of the Dead," "Goldeneye," or "Turok") give bonus effects for head shots.

This is reinforced by Michael Carneal's "blank and passive" facial expression, and his report that it was all "like a dream" which are common reactions of someone who is in the "flow state" associated with completing an operantly conditioned response under a stressful situation: like children in a fire drill, or an expert typist finding the next key. These kind of video games provide the "motor reflexes" responsible for over 75% of the firing on the modern battlefield. In addition, they provide violent suggestions and reinforcement for violent behaviour.

(The application of this to the military is outlined in my book, On Killing: The Psychological Cost of Learning to Kill in War and Society. This book was nominated for the Pulitzer prize for nonfiction in 1995, has been translated into Japanese and Italian, and is currently being
used as a standard text in numerous universities and academies, to include West Point, and the California Highway Patrol Academy.)

I have reviewed these conclusions with other experts in the field of law enforcement marksmanship training. Based upon my communications with them, the heads of the three major national and international law enforcement training organizations (IALEFI, ASLET and PPCT) have all concurred with these conclusions, and they have told me that they would be willing to serve (pro bono) as expert witnesses in a lawsuit against the manufacturers of these games. Certainly, if the information I received is correct, no firearms expert can deny the extraordinary marksmanship achievement in the Michael Carneal case (and many others like it), and that the influence of video games is the only possible explanation for that aspect of this tragedy.

The Case Against Video Games

Based upon research outlined in my book, On Killing, President Clinton stated in his national radio address on April 24, 1999, following the Littleton shootings that: "A former Lieutenant Colonel and psychologist, Professor David Grossman, has said that these games teach young people to kill with all the precision of a military training program, but none of the character training that goes along with it. For children who get the right training at home and who have the ability to distinguish between real and unreal consequences, they’re still games. But for children who are especially vulnerable to the lure of violence, they can be far more."

The President's conclusions are completely correct. The U.S. Army has taken the basic Super Nintendo, replaced the plastic pistol with a plastic M-16, modified the targets that appear on the screen, and this device (known as the Multipurpose Arcade Combat Simulator (MACS)) is used extensively for military marksmanship training. Similarly, the U.S. Marine Corps has licensed the basic "first person shooter" game "Doom," and is using it to train their combat fire teams in tactics and to rehearse (or "script") combat actions of killing. (Some claim that the Marines only use it to develop teamwork, but if that was the desire they could use flag football; the Marines’ goal is to develop teamwork in killing.

The video game industry cannot market these devices to the military to train individuals whose job it is to kill, and then claim that they have no expectation that such devices would be potentially harmful when marketed to children.

The video game industry blatantly markets their products as killing devices:

- One advertisement, in a "gaming" magazine, for a joystick that gives feedback (thus you feel the recoil of a gun when you pull the trigger), says: "Psychiatrists say it is important to feel something when you kill."

- An ad for one video game says: "Kill your friends guilt free."

- Another ad for a home video game shooting system says: "More fun than shooting your neighbour's cat."

- Recent ads for "Quake II" (a follow-on to "Doom" by the same manufacturer) says: "We took what was killer, and made it mass murder."

- An ad for the same game has a picture of a corpse with a toe tag, saying: "He practiced on a PC." (Personal computer.)
An ad for a Sony Playstation controller that gives feedback shows an old man and his wife, saying: "George Anderson, 64. Responsible for thousands of deaths and ruthless beatings, is about to discover how it feels."

An ad for one Playstation game says: "Destroying your enemies is not enough ... you must devour their souls."

An ad for a networking kit says: "Gratuitous violence is 200 times faster with a D-Link Network."

Thus, the industry's own ads acknowledge that their products are "killer ... mass murder ... ruthless beatings ... [and] gratuitous beatings."

The industry's own rating systems indicate that many of their games are inappropriate for children. Yet the industry has spent enormous sums of money fighting legislative initiatives designed to regulate the availability of their products to children.

Imagine if the gun, tobacco, alcohol, or even the fireworks industry had rated and acknowledged their products as harmful to children, but then refused to accept regulation of the sale of their products to children. Furthermore, imagine if these industries had intentionally and irresponsibly marketed their products with advertisements clearly oriented toward children. If this were the situation, then these industries would arguably find themselves subject to even greater litigation and liability than is currently the case.

In a recent case, the book, Hit Man was used as a manual to commit a multiple murder. The family of the victims of this murder sued the publisher and author of this book. Based on my reading of the decision in that case (which was upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court), this case could be brought to trial because the book, Hit Man: taught criminal behaviour, exhorted the reader to engage in criminal behaviour, and then taught the reader to develop a blatant disregard for human life.

It is interesting to me to apply these same criteria to the video games:

- The violent video games teach criminal behaviour: i.e., shooting human beings, to include motor skills, aiming skills, target selection, and trigger control.

- The video games and their advertisements exhort the reader to engage in criminal behaviour while teaching blatant disregard for human life: being rewarded for harming and killing humans, and: "Kill your friends ... More fun than shooting your neighbour's cat ... Destroying your enemies is not enough ... you must devour their souls."

The video game industry knows that their products are not for children, and they openly support and expect enforcement of the ratings on their products. In a current issue of PC Gamer Magazine (the industry's leading magazine), the game "Kingpin" is discussed. (This is a hyperviolent game in which the player leads a life of crime, killing, pimping and selling drugs, working up to a position of leadership.)

There are certain people who believe "Kingpin" crosses the line of good taste and shouldn't be in the hands of children or young teens. Those people would be absolutely right! If you see the game in the store, you'll notice a big yellow sticker across the front of the box stating the game was designed for mature audiences, and that you'll need an ID to prove you're old enough to buy it. (PC Gamer, Oct 99, "The Killing Box," pg 213.)

In other words, it is the responsibility of stores and society to enforce the industry's rating system. And they are right.
In that same magazine there is a review of a new, hyperviolent game called Soldier of Fortune, in which the magazine says that:

Don't expect to be able to buy this one without a picture ID ... It is inevitable that, given the recent controversy regarding violence in games, Soldier of Fortune will attract its share of flack ... Raven is hoping to head at least some of the criticism off with ... warnings on the packaging. 'Raven's plan from day one was to make a game for mature audiences that would carry a mature ESRB rating,' says [the manufacturer]. 'When the rating has been established ... how can they criticize the game? If people don't take advantage of the tools we are providing, they're the ones opening themselves up to criticism.' (PC Gamer, Oct 99, pg 27.)

In other words, again, according to the industry, they are counting on us to enforce the ratings, if we do not enforce their ratings, we are to blame. And they are right.

But the industry will oppose this legislation. They will claim that their rating and labelling system is enough to protect kids from the products that they themselves admit should not be in the hands of children, and they will oppose enforcement of their warning labels. This is simply offensive to the intelligence of the legislators and people of the great state of New York. Again, what would happen if the gun or tobacco or alcohol industry had tried to use that logic?

I strongly support this legislation, and I sincerely believe that if it is not passed we will pay a tragic price in lives, just as surely as if we had failed to keep guns or alcohol or tobacco out of the hands of kids.

Respectfully submitted, Dave Grossman
Lt. Col., U.S. Army (Ret.)
Director, Killology Research Group

Note: Dave Grossman's new book, Stop Teaching Our Kids to Kill has just come out in the autumn of 1999.

Are video games just propaganda and training tools for the military?

It's a shadowy and lucrative relationship. But just how close are video-game developers with various military outfits? And how does it affect the games we play?


It's Monday night, the kids are in bed, and I am trying to kill Osama bin Laden. I stalk through his Abbottabad compound and I aim my rifle at the first person I see, only to discover he's my brother in arms, aka "OverdoseRocks". So I walk downstairs into a prayer room, at which point my gun accidentally goes off. Then the mission is over. We were victorious.

Next, I join US servicemen during the 2007 surge in Iraq. For about three minutes I kick about a palm-lined boulevard, strafing apartment buildings. I am ambushed. In my dying moments, I am presented with an advert for a game in which I can embody a cheetah and kill an antelope, but I have had enough bloodshed for one evening.

I have been on the Kuma Games site, an online entertainment developer and, according to reports on Iranian television, an international distributor of military propaganda. Kuma produces a range of games, from second world war air-battle shoot-em-ups for the History Channel, through to the carnivore-themed I Predator, a tie-in for the cable station Animal Planet. Yet it's the company's Kuma\War series of topical military games, as well as a more discreet line of Arabic-language first-person shooter games, that have piqued media attention. During a televised confession on Iranian TV, alleged US agent and former marine Amir Mirzai Hekmati said he had worked for Kuma, and it was a CIA front company.
Though his words cannot be regarded as the unvarnished truth, publicly available government documents indicate that Hekmati had been a Kuma employee, while Kuma’s CEO, Keith Halper, admits to taking on military work. If his words are true, Kuma’s War are only one of a number of bloody titles produced under varying degrees of military aegis.

In 2001 Syria’s Afkar Media published Under Ash, in which players take on the role of Palestinians fighting off an Israeli assault; they followed this in 2005 with Under Siege, and in 2008 non-violent children’s game Road Block Buster, in which players take on the role of "Maan" the boy with a thousand ways to get over any barrier or road block implanted by Israeli Defence forces’. In 2003, developers linked to Hezbollah entered the market with a Special Force series, a set of PC war games set in Lebanon.

In 2007, Iran’s Association of Islamic Unions of Students released Special Operation 85: Hostage Rescue; a first-person-shooter game wherein players aim to free two Iranian nuclear scientists kidnapped by the US. The game was published in response to Kuma’s Assault on Iran, which was based around a US assault on an Iranian nuclear facility.

There are also more formal offerings from the world’s leading powers. America’s Army, a free online simulator, was published by the US military in 2002 to aid recruitment. The British army launched their online game Start Thinking Soldier in 2009, to drive interest among 16- to 24-year-olds. Then in May last year, China’s People’s Liberation Army unveiled Glorious Revolution, a Call of Duty-style game for both military and domestic markets.

This is all in addition to numerous game-like training tools, from language apps through to tank-driving tutorials, which are used to educate recruits around the globe.

"For decades the military has been using video-game technology," says Nina Huntemann, associate professor of communication and journalism at Suffolk University in Boston and a computer games specialist. "Every branch of the US armed forces and many, many police departments are using retooled video games to train their personnel."

Like much of early computing, nascent digital gaming benefited from military spending. The prototype for the first home video games console, the 1972 Magnavox Odyssey, was developed by Sanders Associates, a US defence contractor. Meanwhile, pre-digital electronic flight simulators, for use in both military and civilian training, date back to at least the second world war.

Later, the games industry began to repay its debts. Many insiders note how instruments in British Challenger 2 tanks, introduced in 1994, look uncannily like the PlayStation’s controllers, one of the most popular consoles of that year. Indeed, warfare’s use of digital war games soared towards the end of the 20th century.

"By the late 1990s," says Nick Turse, an American journalist, historian and author of The Complex: How the Military Invades Our Everyday Lives, "the [US] army was pouring tens of millions of dollars into a centre at the University of Southern California – the Institute of Creative Technologies – specifically to build partnerships with the gaming industry and Hollywood."

It’s a toxic relationship in Turse’s opinion, since gaming leads to a reliance on remote-controlled warfare, and this in turn makes combat more palatable.

"Last year," says Turse, "the US conducted combat missions in Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Pakistan, Somalia and Yemen. There are a great many factors that led to this astonishing number of simultaneous wars, but the increasing use of drones, and thus a lower number of US military casualties that result, no doubt contributed to it."

Many closer to the action take a different view. Justin Crump served in the British army for seven years and has been a reservist since the early 90s; he saw active duty in the Balkans, Iraq and Afghanistan. Prior to enlisting, Crump was also a keen gamer.
"I learned my tactics playing games in the 80s," he says. "In the recruitment interview I said I'd been flying simulators for a few years."

While Crump recognises the military's involvement in early games development, he believes the computer industry has outpaced military simulators.

"With 30-year procurement programmes, you'll be spec'ing simulators in the 80s and 90s," he says. Imagine ordering Space Invaders to be played in the Xbox era, and you realise why the British military has had to improve some of its simulated training to keep the attention of new recruits.

Crump laughs when recalling the mechanical tank trainers he used in the early 90s, as well as the Laserdisc system used for training on the Challenger 2 tank, back in 1998. "We asked: 'Why aren't these things on CDs or a flash drive?'"

For a taste of how war games and armies might work best, try Steel Beasts. Developed by eSim, an American firm with ex-US and European army personnel, Steel Beasts is perhaps the world's most successful tank-training simulator. "We wanted to develop a computer game that would be both entertaining and educational," says Nils Hinrichsen, eSim's marketing director, "which at the same time would offer a bit of 'trigger time', but with accurate procedures and ballistics."

Hinrichsen admits that Steel Beasts won't exactly top gamers' Christmas present lists. Yet it runs on PCs, allows users to edit their maps and layout, and has playback facilities, so players can learn from their mistakes. eSim charges armies a fee for customising the game to suit their vehicles so that it can be used for training. These adaptations are then included in subsequent versions of the game – which means they are available to other armies.

Until now most militaries have bought bespoke simulators tied to particular weaponry, "and woe betide the army that changes specifications in mid-stream," says Hinrichsen. Instead, Steel Beasts can be fitted to suit any new armoured vehicle. Since its introduction in 2000, the game has been used by the US military and the armies of Australia, Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, and the Canadian air force.

From a certain point of view, any link between the games system in your child's bedroom and automated killing on the battlefield is grossly distasteful. Yet, if you accept the need for standing armies, and believe in the efficiencies of information technology, then it's hard to view Steel Beasts as anything other than a canny application of processing power.

It's quite different from Kuma\War games, which Huntemann calls "soft propaganda", in the same way that Top Gun or John Wayne war films are soft propaganda. She also questions whether glitzy online games really drive gamers towards the frontline. "When you look why people enlist," she says, "it is overwhelmingly tied to history of military service in the family, socio-economic status and the current state of the economy."

Crump agrees. "I find some of the modern first-person shooters ridiculous," he says. "If people joining are expecting that sort of thing they are going to be disappointed."

He questions whether those drawn to blameless gore even aspire to a life of service. Recalling a trip to a paint-balling range with some army friends, he says: "There were some other really tooled-up guys there, and they didn't know we were military." Crump put it to the opposing side that, if they enjoyed firing guns, they should enlist. "They said: 'No, too dangerous, wouldn't want to,'" he recalls, quite surprised by their response. Yet he wasn't so startled by the outcome.

How did those weapons-loving gamers do against him at paintball?

"They lost."
Violent video games make teenagers more aggressive, study finds

Teenagers who play violent video games over a number of years become more aggressive towards other people as a result, a new study has found.

08 Oct 2012 the Telegraph

The research findings were said to be the first indication of a clear link between a sustained period of playing violent games and subsequent increases in hostile behaviour.

Girls who played them during their school years were found to be affected just as much as boys.

The research team at Brock University in Canada said their results were "concerning" and argued that violent games could "reinforce the notion that aggression is an effective and appropriate way to deal with conflict and anger."

Evidence suggests that long-term players of violent games may become more likely to react aggressively to unintentional provocations such as someone accidentally bumping into them, they added.

The study, published in the journal Developmental Psychology, involved 1,492 adolescents at eight high schools in Ontario, 51 per cent of whom were female and 49 per cent male.

Surveys were carried out annually across four school years with the participants aged 14 or 15 at the start of the study and 17 or 18 at its conclusion.

The teenagers were asked a series of questions such as how often they pushed or shoved people and whether they frequently kicked or punched people who made them angry.

Psychologists used their answers to give each individual a score for their aggression level at each point in time.

Analysis showed that teenagers who played violent video games over a number of years saw steeper rises in their aggression scores during the study.

Others who regularly played non-violent games did not show any evidence of increased aggression.

The trend remained even after the researchers took into account other factors that could be linked to aggression such as gender, parental divorce and marijuana use.

Lead researcher Professor Teena Willoughby said: "The current study is the first to demonstrate a relation between sustained violent video game play and the progression of aggressive behaviour."

"It is clear that there is a long-term association between violent video games and aggression.

"This is an important and concerning finding, particularly in light of the hours that youth spend playing these games."

Playing violent video games for just 20 minutes a day can encourage aggressive behaviour

- University students were asked to play a violent video game or a driving game over three days
- They were then set a couple of tests to see how they reacted to the outside world
Those who played shoot-em-ups like Call of Duty were more likely to assume the world was hostile and react aggressively.


Playing a violent video game for just an hour over a three-day period is enough to increase aggressive behaviour, according to a new study.

However, playing a non-violent video game, such as a racing game, has no effect on aggression when played for 20 minutes a day for three consecutive days.

Although previous studies have revealed a single violent gaming session can increase short-term aggression, this is the first to show longer-term effects.

Lead author Professor Brad Bushman, of Ohio State University, USA, compares the effect to smoking: 'It's important to know the long-term causal effects of violent video games, because so many young people regularly play these games.

'Playing video games could be compared to smoking cigarettes. A single cigarette won't cause lung cancer, but smoking over weeks or months or years greatly increases the risk.

'In the same way, repeated exposure to violent video games may have a cumulative effect on aggression.'

A total of 70 French university students were told they would be taking part in a three-day study on the effects of brightness of video games on visual perception.

They were then told to play either a violent or non-violent game for 20 minutes everyday for three consecutive days by the researchers from the University Pierre Mendhs-France and the University of Hohenheim, Germany.

The violent video games in the study for the Journal of Experimental Social Psychology were Condemned 2, Call of Duty 4 and The Club, while those in the non-violent group played S3K Superbike, Dirt2 and Pure.

After playing each game, the students were given the beginning of a story, and then asked to list 20 things the main character will do or say as the story unfolds to measure their hostile expectations.

In one story, a driver crashes into the back of the protagonist's car - causing significant damage - and the researchers counted how many times the students listed violent or aggressive actions and words that might occur.

People who have a steady diet of playing these violent games may come to see the world as a hostile place, say scientists

The students then participated in a competitive reaction time task, which is used to measure aggression, with each participant told they would compete against an unseen opponent in a computer game where the object was to be the first to respond to a visual cue on the screen.

The loser received a blast of unpleasant noise through headphones - such as nails on a chalk board or sirens - and the winner decided how loud and long the blast would be.

In reality, there was no opponent and the participants were told they won about half the trials.

Results showed that after each day, those who played the violent games had an increase in their hostile expectations - meaning they were more likely to think the characters would react with aggression or violence.
Prof Bushman said: 'People who have a steady diet of playing these violent games may come to see the world as a hostile and violent place.

These results suggest there could be a cumulative effect. Hostile expectations are probably not the only reason that players of violent games are more aggressive, but our study suggests it is certainly one important factor.

'After playing a violent video game, we found that people expect others to behave aggressively.

'That expectation may make them more defensive and more likely to respond with aggression themselves, as we saw in this study and in other studies we have conducted.'

He said it is 'impossible' to know how much aggression could increase for those who play video games for months or years, as most people do.

'We would know more if we could test players for longer periods of time, but that isn't practical or ethical.

'I would expect that the increase in aggression would accumulate for more than three days. It may eventually level off.

'However, there is no theoretical reason to think that aggression would decrease over time, as long as players are still playing the violent games.'

if you don’t believe what you have just read is true then read this:

**Computer games fan 'planned school massacre'**

Charles Bremner and Marie Tourres in Paris From The Times

November 19, 2009

A 13-year-old computer games enthusiast is facing charges of attempted murder after police said that they had thwarted a plan to shoot dead his teachers for giving him poor marks.

The boy, named only as Bastien, was arrested in Beauvais, 60 miles (96km) north of Paris, on Tuesday morning, hours after leaving his home in the nearby village of Allonne armed with his father's shotgun and cartridges.

His parents were said to have been suspicious about his behaviour, including his unusually early 7am departure to Saint Esprit college, his Catholic private secondary school. They called police after finding a note on his blog saying: ‘This is my last muzik and certainly the last because Tuesday, November 17, 2009, will be the last day of my life. Sorry to leave you’

Prosecutors believe that France narrowly escaped a school massacre of the type suffered so often in the US and, recently, in Germany and Finland. Police rushed to the 2,000-pupil school and sealed it off after searching it and failing to find Bastien. Pupils were told to sit on the floor away from doors and windows in case he was hiding in the building. Bastien’s father, a manager at an electrical company, later found him in a nearby internet café.

The boy told police that he had turned away from the school after seeing them blocking the gate. He had thrown the gun and ammunition into a field.
“He left his home with a loaded shotgun and 25 cartridges,” said Raymond Yeddou, a senior state official in Beauvais. “He went in the direction of the school where, according to his statement, he intended to kill all his teachers.”

James Juan, the local prosecutor, said that the boy had “wanted to attack his teachers because they found fault with him even though he had done nothing wrong”. Friends said that Bastien — usually near the top of his class at the highly competitive school — was upset that his teachers had recently given him middling marks.

The school denied that it had put any special pressure on him. Dominique Moutin, the headmaster, said: “I never had any problem with this pupil. I never had any idea that he could have such negative and dangerous ideas. But you never know.”

The incident again raised the question of the influence of violent online games. A boy who described himself as Bastien’s best friend said: “He always wanted to go into the army. He loved battles. He was passionate about history, warriors. He played video games up to one or two in the morning. I didn’t think that he would be capable of something like this. I don’t think he wanted to harm anyone.”

Bastien was said by friends to have been devoted to World of Warcraft, the hugely popular online game in which the player takes the role of a fantasy warrior from the Middle Ages. Christian Sadowski, the Mayor of Allonne, said that he knew the family well and that the boy was a fan of computer games. “Many young people end up finding it difficult to tell the difference between dream and reality,” he told The Times.

Bastien is likely to be charged in court today with attempted murder. Police said that he was in good health and did not appear depressed. He would face a maximum 20-year prison term if found guilty.

Connecticut town to burn violent video games in wake of Sandy Hook tragedy

January 2, 2013. (Reuters/Carlo Allegri)

A Connecticut community is urging people to turn in violent video games to be destroyed. The move was prompted by the December 14 mass shooting at nearby Sandy Hook Elementary School, during which 20 children and six educators were killed.

A collection drive will take place on January 12 in the town of Southington, Connecticut, a 30-minute drive from the scene of the massacre in Newtown.

Violent video games, CDs, and DVDs will be placed in a dumpster and later burned by town employees.

The event was organized by Southington SOS, a coalition of local groups.

"As people arrive in their cars to turn in their games of violence, they will be offered a gift certificate donated by a member of the Greater Southington Chamber of Commerce as a token of appreciation for their action of responsible citizenship," the group said in a statement.

In a press release, Southington SOS said its actions should not be “construed as statement declaring that violent videogames were the cause of the shocking violence in Newtown on December 14," but that violent video games and films desensitize children to “acts of violence.”
However, experts have said there is absolutely no link between violent video games and violent behaviour.

A study by Texas A&M University found that exposure to violent games “had neither short-term nor long-term predictive influences on either positive or negative outcomes.”

“There is no good evidence that video games or other media contributes, even in a small way, to mass homicides or any other violence among youth,” report author Christopher J. Ferguson wrote in Time magazine.

Other nearby communities have expressed sympathy for the grieving community. Danbury, the large town nearest to Newtown, cancelled a gun show scheduled to take place this weekend after organizers received a number of complaints. The show was permanently cancelled rather than postponed, the Guardian reported.

Students of Sandy Hook elementary returned to class for the first time on Thursday, at a former middle school in the nearby town of Monroe.

Teams of workers, including many volunteers, renovated the school, even raising the bathroom floors so that smaller elementary students can reach the toilets.

Workers tried their best to replicate Sandy Hook elementary, painting classroom walls the same colours and hanging the same pictures. Backpacks and other belongings left behind after the shooting were also taken to the new school to help the children feel at home.

Sandy Hook elementary is being treated as a crime scene, and it remains unclear whether it will ever reopen.

### Grand Theft Auto 4: The Ballad Of Gay Tony video game review

The Ballad Of Gay Tony features sharp writing, larger than life characters, and the kind of gaming experience that will remind players why they were drawn to GTA in the first place.

By Nick Cowen the Telegraph

Published: 11:39AM GMT 02 Nov 2009

Nightclub owner, bouncer, and affable murderer, Luis Lopez
Glory days: The missions in The Ballad Of Gay Tony are completely outlandish and over the top

Property damage: the new attack helicopter and tank allow players to unleash hell on Liberty City

Walk carefully and carry a very big gun: the new weapons in The Ballad Of Gay Tony are incredibly effective

Format: Xbox 360
Developer: Rockstar North
Publisher: Rockstar Games
Released: Out now
Score: 10/10

When Rockstar Games released The Lost And Damned on Xbox Live, they effectively set the bar for any DLC which followed it. The sheer size of the new content was impressive enough
in itself, but the way it all came together so smoothly in one slick package was simply mind-boggling. In the months since, the only expansions comparable to The Lost And Damned, are the DLC packs for Bethesda's mighty open-world monster, Fallout 3. The Ballad Of Gay Tony, the latest DLC for Grand Theft Auto 4, has an unbelievably tough act to follow, so it's to its developer's credit that it not only lives up to the standards set by its predecessor, it also manages to bring down the curtain on GTA 4 in no small amount of style.

Like The Lost And Damned, the narrative of The Ballad Of Gay Tony exists at the periphery of Niko Bellic's story in GTA 4, and once again, it occasionally overlaps with it. However, the new DLC's story feels more like a bookend to the themes of the main game's plot than its predecessor; whereas GTA 4 documented Niko Bellic's rise up Liberty City's social food chain, The Ballad Of Gay Tony follows the efforts of nightclub managers Luis Lopez and 'Gay' Tony Prince as they try grimly to hang onto their positions at the top of it. The Ballad Of Gay Tony starts with Prince admitting to Lopez that the financial backing for their nightclubs came from Liberty City's underworld, and now the pair of them are in debt to some extremely dangerous people. Lopez soon finds himself lent out as muscle to a series of shady criminals – as well as a couple of certifiably insane dilettantes – as a means of paying off his and Tony's debt. At the same time Lopez tries to prevent Prince from doing himself in with a cocktail of pills, booze, drugs and hysterical fits.

Despite the grim set-up, The Ballad Of Gay Tony is an altogether more upbeat affair than The Lost And Damned. The location is far more glamorous as most of the DLC's action forsakes Liberty City's dour ghettos and docile suburbs for the glitzy island of Algonquin (or Manhattan to you). The dour palette of The Lost And Damned has been ejected, and even the pause menu takes on a Day-Glo font. The characters in the new content, with one or two exceptions, come across more like spoiled buffoons than genuinely nefarious criminals. Lopez seems fairly easy-going for a self-confessed 'murdering maniac', while Prince for his part is a highly strung, tantrum throwing drama queen without the sense God gave goats. The best new character is the story's incredibly spoiled billionaire, Yusuf; wonderfully voiced by British-Iranian comedian Omid Djalili, Yusuf is easily the most likeable person in the game due to his shameless behaviour and bullet-proof self-belief. (An exchange with Luis during which Yusuf describes himself as a 'flying cobra' is laugh-out-loud hilarious.) The story's overall tone is far more optimistic than either that GTA 4 or The Lost And Damned DLC; while Lopez and Prince are constantly under the hammer, there's never a doubt in the player's mind that everything will turn out all right for this particular odd couple. The new additions to the game's radio stations are a mix of high-energy disco and cheesy pop classics from the 1980s; you haven't lived until you've shot down Liberty City police helicopters in a gold-painted chopper while listening to 'Breakout' by Swing Out Sister.

The new missions on offer in The Ballad Of Gay Tony have been ramped up to ridiculously entertaining levels. The new DLC will take players around ten to twelve hours to complete, but chances are they'll be having so much fun, the time will flash by. This is largely down to the outlandish activities they'll find themselves taking part in which include stealing a subway car with an air-crane, escaping from a skyscraper by parachuting onto a flatbed truck and taking part in a race which involves skydiving, boat-racing and speeding down Algonquin's main roads in a nitro-boosted sports car. Ultimately, the story's main missions hearken back to the cartoonish, over the top and (it has to be said) highly enjoyable style of gameplay that made the GTA series a smash hit in the first place.

The missions are complimented by the new weapons on offer; top among these is the auto-shotgun loaded with explosive rounds – fire this baby at an approaching vehicle and it leaves the target looking like it was punched by a grizzly bear. Lopez also has access to a new selection of machine guns, including a light P90 assault rifle, an augmented machine gun and Tech 9. There are also several missions involving sticky bombs, which can be placed on stationary targets or hurled onto moving targets from the window of a speeding vehicle. The sticky bombs cause a satisfying amount of damage – especially when heaped in
a cluster – but can be fiddly to use at times, as they don’t always land on the target they’re aimed at; we gave up using them in one mission involving a fleeing jet, and used a missile launcher instead. The DLC also offers a couple of new vehicles, including the aforementioned gold-painted attack helicopter, and a police tank complete with a rotating turret gun; both are all you need to unleash hell on your fellow Liberty City commuters.

Apart from the new weapons and missions, players have quite a few more activities to occupy Luis’ time with; given that his main job is nightclub management, Lopez will occasionally get a call to check in at one of his and Tony’s clubs to help run the show. This can involve watching the floor for trouble, solving the odd crisis for preferred clients and tossing unruly patrons out into the street. Luis can also cut up a rug with the best of them, and the dancing mini-game is loads of fun to play. After the first story mission involving parachutes, a series of base-jumping platforms open up around Algonquin and players can earn extra points by parachuting down to highlighted landing zones. They can also use helicopters to fly them to a jump zone, and parachute down through a series of markers. The base-jumping mechanics will be familiar to anyone who played Grand Theft Auto: San Andreas, and overall the experience is fun and easy to master. Aside from club management and base jumping, Lopez can also venture into his old neighbourhood to dabble in a spot of bare-knuckled cage fighting, or help out some of his drug-dealing homeboys in the odd turf war. The DLC also comes with a multiplayer in which players can engage in street racing or a variety of deathmatches.

Perhaps the only downside to the new DLC is that it’s (reportedly) the last new content which will be released for GTA 4. While the game is starting to show its age visually a year after its release, it has to be said that we’ve become rather attached to the Liberty City’s collection of affable sociopaths. It also raises questions about where Rockstar can take the GTA franchise next; with Red Dead Redemption and Max Payne 3 on the horizon, there’s been no indication from Rockstar as to when a new GTA title is set to appear on a console that isn’t a hand-held. It might not be beyond the realms of possibility that they may be about to draw a line under the franchise altogether. If that’s the case, then the series couldn’t want for a better swansong than The Ballad Of Gay Tony; this DLC may not push GTA in completely new directions, but at its best it features sharp writing, larger than life characters, and the kind of gaming experience that will remind players why they were drawn to GTA in the first place.

Screen violence 'desensitises teenage brains'

Violent films and video games really do numb the brains of teenagers, with repeated viewings making them less sensitive to aggression, according to a new study.

By Stephen Adams, Medical Correspondent the Telegraph Published: 7:30AM BST 19 Oct 2010

The researchers used brain scans to show how they become less emotionally responsive to violence the more they see.

They say it is among the first hard physiological evidence for the theory that on-screen violence leads to real-world aggression.

For years campaigners have argued that watching violent films and playing games like Grand Theft Auto, Mortal Kombat and Modern Warfare makes youngsters more prone to violence. In the Grand Theft Auto series, players become characters who win points for carjacking, killing prostitutes and running over pedestrians.

Summarising his findings, Dr Jordan Grafman, of the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke in Bethesda, US, said: "Exposure to the most violent videos inhibits
emotional reactions to similar aggressive videos over time and implies that normal adolescents will feel fewer emotions over time as they are exposed to similar videos."

He added: "Continued exposure to violent videos will make an adolescent less sensitive to violence, more accepting of violence, and more likely to commit aggressive acts since the emotional component associated with aggression is reduced and normally acts as a brake on aggressive behaviour."

For the study, Dr Grafman and his team recruited 22 boys aged 14 to 17.

They were asked to watch a series of 60 four-second video clips, arranged randomly in three lots of 20 clips.

The degree of violence and aggression in each scene was low, mild or moderate. There were no extreme scenes.

The boys were asked to rate the aggression of each scene compared to the last by pressing one of two response buttons.

As they watched, their brain activity were monitored using MRI scans.

Electrodes were also attached to their fingers to measure small second-by-second changes in sweat levels - known as skin conductance responses (SCRs) - another indicator of emotional state.

Dr Grafman said: "We found that as the boys were exposed to more violent videos over time, their activation in brain regions concerned with emotional reactivity decreased and that was reflected in the data from the functional MRI and in the skin conductance responses."

In particular, the area of the brain known as the lateral orbitofrontal cortex (lOFC), which is thought to be involved in emotions and emotional responses, became increasingly desensitised over time.

This was most marked after watching the most aggressive clips.

Dr Grafman noted: "No prior study has examined this from the complete perspective we had that included behaviour, brain activation, and SCRs in adolescent brains."

The study has been published online in the Oxford Journal Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience.

But Prof Mark Griffiths, a psychologist at the International Gaming Research Unit at Nottingham Trent University, said such studies could not prove a causal link between watching violent images and committing real-life violence.

He said: "I don't think anybody would deny that people do become desensitised to violence. But the real issue is whether that in and of itself causes negative consequences."

People were not simply slaves to the biological processes of their bodies and brains, he said. How they behaved also depended on a host of psychological and social factors, such as how much violence they experienced as children.

UN official: drone attacks ordered away from battlefield may lead to 'PlayStation' mentality
A United Nations investigator has called for a halt to CIA-directed drone strikes on suspected Islamic militants, warning that killings ordered far from the battlefield could lead to a 'PlayStation' mentality.

Published: 11:05AM BST 03 Jun 2010 The Telegraph

Philip Alston, UN special rapporteur on extrajudicial executions, said missile strikes could be justified only when it was impossible to capture insurgents alive.

He said drone attacks should only be authorised if they were carried out by regular US armed forces operating with proper oversight and respect for the rules of war.

The CIA's use of unmanned Predator or Reaper drones in Afghanistan and Pakistan against al Qaeda and Taliban suspects had led to the death of "many hundreds," including innocent civilians, he said in a 29-page report.

"Intelligence agencies, which by definition are determined to remain unaccountable except to their own paymasters, have no place in running programmes that kill people in other countries," Mr Alston said.

The world does not know when and where the CIA is authorised to kill; its criteria for choosing targets; whether they are lawful killings; and how it follows up when civilians are illegally killed, said Mr Alston, an independent expert who will present his report to the UN Human Rights Council on Thursday.

The CIA disputed the investigator's conclusion.

"Without discussing or confirming any specific action or program, this agency's operations unfold within a framework of law and close government oversight. The accountability's real, and it would be wrong for anyone to suggest otherwise," said a CIA spokesman.

Under President Barrack Obama, the CIA has stepped up its drone strikes in the tribal zone of Pakistan bordering Afghanistan, targeting not only high-level al Qaeda and Taliban targets but largely unknown foot soldiers as well.

Following a directive first issued by former President George W. Bush and continued by Obama, the CIA has widened the "target set" for drone strikes in Pakistan.

Al Qaeda's third-in-command, Sheikh Sa'id al-Masri, is believed to have been killed in May in a U.S. missile strike in Pakistan.

The United States is believed to control the fleet of drones from CIA headquarters in Virginia, coordinating with civilian pilots near hidden airfields in Afghanistan and Pakistan who fly the drones remotely.

"Because operators are based thousands of miles away from the battlefield, and undertake operations entirely through computer screens and remote audio-feed, there is a risk of developing a 'PlayStation' mentality to killing," he said.

Under international law, targeted killings are permitted in armed conflicts when used against fighters or civilians who engage directly in combat-like activities, Mr Alston said. "But they are increasingly being used far from any battle zone."

The United States is among 40 countries with drone technology.
Britain, China, France, India, Iran, Israel, Russia and Turkey are named as having or seeking the capacity to fire missiles from their drones.

But countries should use graduated force and where possible capture suspects rather than kill them, he said.

"Thus, rather than using drone strikes, US forces should, wherever and whenever possible, conduct arrests or use less-than-lethal force to restrain."

Now it's time to look at our education system. You read in the first chapter how this was the key to having an obedient and compliant populace, now we will spend a few chapter's looking at exactly how much time and effort has been expended by our rich masters to control what goes into our children's heads.

I knew Pink Floyd were right...

TEACHER LEAVE THEM KIDS ALONE!!!

Incidentally if you thought I was exaggerating when I said they're turning your kids into serial killers?

Read this if you doubt me...

Serial killer assignment withdrawn from curriculum

*By Mandy Squires Geelong Advertiser*  December 03, 2012  6:16PM

- School asks students to complete a serial killer assignment
- Tasks include create a serial killer board game

"Hello everyone, welcome to your serial killer assignment.

You are to complete 10, yes 10, of the activities listed below in the next two weeks

You will have all the class time we have to complete it.

Remember to ask questions and plan out things, these tasks need to be detailed and not a five-minute hit and giggle.

As you can see each activity has been assigned points from 1-5. For you to pass this assignment your 10 activities must add up to a minimum 30 points.

Take some time to figure out your activities and then begin.

Good luck!"

Your task choices:

1. Draw a cartoon panel about how your serial killer murdered someone. (2)

2. Produce a detailed artwork about your chosen serial killer. (3)
3. Choose two serial killers, compare them and decide which of them is worse and why. (3)

4. Write a poem about a serial killer. (2)

5. Write a newspaper article about a serial killer who hasn't been caught yet. Describe what they are doing, why people should be scared, what they should look out for etc etc. Make it look like a real newspaper article (at least 200 words). (4)

6. Write an interview with a serial killer as if you were a journalist a make up their answers. (3)

7. Do an A-Z chart of serial killers. (2)

8. Construct a serial killer survey and record the results. (2)

9. Categorise 10 different serial killers into their different motivations (hedonistic, visionary, mission orientated, power/control) and why you have chosen that. (4)

10. Do a similarities and differences table between a spree killer and a serial killer. have at least 10 examples of each. (3)

11. Invent a psychological test which you could give to someone which would accurately assess if someone was a potential serial killer. (5)

12. Hypothesize what would have happened to Jeffrey Dahmer if he went to a psychologist when he started hurting animals? (3)

13. Construct a list of 15 questions you would like to ask a serial killer. (2)

14. Make a children's book which teaches them about serial killers. Make sure you are aware of the audience it will be written for. (5)

15. Draw a floor plan of what you think a serial killer's dream house looks like. This needs to be detailed with notes about what you have included and why. (5)

16. Imagine you are a judge, what sort of sentence would you have given Ted Bundy and why? (3)

17. Create a rap about serial killers. (4)

18. Draw the movie poster about the life of a serial killer. (3)

19. Create a serial killer board game with full instructions. (5)

20 Decide whether or not it is a good thing that serial killers can make money from being famous for their crimes. (2)

This assignment was this year given to year nine students at Northern Bay College in Geelong.
It has been widely condemned and withdrawn from the curriculum.

Now it's time to turn our attention to all matters connected with education. We will begin by looking at a brief piece that connects Mr W. Wundt to the way were all taught at school, (You remember him from our psychiatry part of the work surely?) - Wouldn't you know it, here he is popping up again to get us started with our education, on education. Then it's a brief, yet still enlightening, chronology from Dennis Cuddy, before two long chapters on the true “Foundation's” of education, that's before rounding up this, the part of this work that's on our education system, by giving you the reader a short wee test.
Chapter Twenty Seven

The Systematic Destruction of American Education

A Book Review by Dr. John R. Fawcett, Jr.

The Leipzig Connection, by Paolo Lionni and Lance J. Klass. Portland, OR, Heron Books, 104 p. (P.O. Box 563, Portland, Oh 97207)

The answer to the question, what is wrong with education in the United States, has already been provided by a number of educators from Arthur Bester to Russell Kirk. The answer to the question, what caused the rot in American education in the first place, is supplied by Paolo Lionni and Lance J. Klass in an excellent, well-documented, and straight-to-the-point book entitled The Leipzig Connection.

Tracing the educational psychology presently in vogue, and serving as the underpinning for most of our present educational practices, to the work of Wilhelm Maximilian Wundt in his laboratory in Leipzig, Germany, from 1875 to 1925, Lionni and Klass describe not only how Wundt corrupted education, but also how he and his disciples impressed the corruptions on the American educational system. The corruption stems from Wundt's teachings that man is devoid of spirit and self determination, that he is merely the summation of his experiences. The impression upon American education was accomplished by Wundt's students who returned to the United States to teach.

The first of Wundt's students to return and teach in the United States was G. Stanley Hall who returned in 1883 to teach at Johns Hopkins University, and who established the American Journal of Psychology in 1887, and who became president of Clark University in 1892.

Hall and others of Wundt's students had little trouble securing positions in major American universities due to the prestige of having studied in Germany. In these positions, they trained many PhDs in psychology.

John Dewey studied under Hall at Johns Hopkins. He received his PhD in psychology from that university. John Dewey went on to become the leading figure in American education while teaching at Teachers College of Columbia University.

James McKeen Cattell, another of Wundt's students, returned to this country in 1887. By 1891, Cattell had become head of the psychology department of Columbia University. While at Columbia, he supervised 344 successful doctoral candidates in psychology.

James Earl Russell, a student of Wundt's, became Dean of Teachers College of Columbia University in 1897, a position he was to hold for the next 30 years while it, Teachers College, Columbia University, became the largest institution in the world for the training of teachers. There, Russell hired Edward Lee Thordike who had been trained by several of Wundt's students at Wesleyan University, and who later provided the literature of education with such gems as "Artificial exercises like drills on phonetics, multiplication tables, and formal writing movements are used to a wasteful degree."

Although Wundt's students and students of his students were well positioned by the start of this century to spread their brand of psychology throughout the rapidly growing American system of education, they would not have been nearly so successful had they lacked funding. And it is in recounting the marriage of the Wundtions and Rockefeller money that Lionni and Klass perform a great service to those of us interested in another question. How did the rot spread so wide and so fast?
It spread wide and fast due largely to the choice of people John D. Rockefeller made to distribute his wealth, and the choices they made regarding to whom to distribute it.

By 1887, Rockefeller had employed Frederick Taylor Gates, a Baptist minister, to handle requests for Rockefeller money, and, at the same time to do all he could to improve the Rockefeller image. In 1902, Gates, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and others established the General Education Board to promote education mainly in the South. To this board, John D. Rockefeller contributed one million dollars. The General Education Board was soon contributing money for scholarships to Columbia University at the request of Dean James Earl Russell. This was only the start of the outpouring of Rockefeller money which was to enable Teachers College of Columbia University to have such a great effect on American education. In September, 1902, Rockefeller established a $250,000 endowment for the college, and promised to match dollar for dollar up to $250,000 all money contributed to the college by others during the next two years.

In 1916 Abraham Flexner, who was then employed by The General Education Board, proposed the establishment of a new school from which Latin and Greek would be barred and in which the teaching of English grammar would be dropped and classical literature ignored while history and literature would be taught in new ways. In 1920, this school came into being as The – “Lincoln School” and Teachers College of Columbia University used it as laboratory school in which Wundtian psychology and Rockefeller money combined to construct a new curriculum and develop new methods. (My Note. The guy mentioned b4)

Thousands of educators visited this school.

Even though Rockefeller poured five million dollars into it and sent four of his five sons to it, one of whom later complained that he was not taught how to read at the school, the Lincoln School was closed in 1946. But from 1920-1946 a generation of teachers and educators attending Teachers College had been taught that The Lincoln School was the type school they should run back home.

Meanwhile, the rot was being spread through the efforts of Dewey's disciples at Teachers College of Columbia University through such pronouncements as the following by 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 interest of all people." Both Rugg and George S. Counts spent much time as faculty members calling for a new social order to be built through the schools.

By 1953, about one-third of all presidents and deans of accredited teacher training schools were graduates of Teachers College, Columbia University.

It is these men and others trained by them who Lionni and Klass point out are making decisions that influence great numbers of people, men who believe and teach that man is merely a stimulus-response animal.

Prof. John R. Fawcett, Jr., serves as chairman of the Higher Education Department at the University of Mississippi and has served UPAO as Director and Vice President.

As you shall see the paths taken by many of our subjects conveniently mingle, and quite frequently, here we have that pesky verbal-vooodoo – namely psychology once again it takes a leading role, only this time it is with regards to our educational system.

And shock surprise there’s our old friends the Rockefeller’s again popping up like “that” creepy uncle aren’t they? We all remember Mr Wundt too don’t we? All we need now is a
Lesbian Homo Paedophile Dave McGowan to pop up somewhere soon to be trippily back at square one! (Sorry about that mate, but you’d have to admit that’s what you’d call a quality segue, (of sorts)).

Chronology of Education With Quotable Quotes

By Dennis Laurence Cuddy, Ph.D

If someone told the American people today that he or she and those with the same philosophy or ideology were going to destroy the values parents were instilling in their children, and that these same people were going to take control of the country there would be a tremendous and swift reaction by the American public. However, when almost the same things were said by Humanists Sidney Hook and H. J. Blackham, the public hardly reacted at all. In the January/February, 1977 issue of The Humanist, Hook (signer of the 1973 Humanist Manifesto) wrote that "human beings can be influenced to examine critically their religious beliefs only by indirection, (by which) I mean the development of a critical attitude in all our educational institutions that will aim to make students less credulous to claims that transcend their reflective experience." And in the September/October 1981 issue of The Humanist, Blackham (a founder of the 4 million member International Humanist and Ethical Union) proclaimed that if schools teach dependence on one's self, "they are more revolutionary than any conspiracy to overthrow the government." These are not isolated quotations, and the following chronology concerning what has happened in the area of education from the 18th century to the present will begin with a historical perspective. (My note, sorry you’ll have to look it up in your own time to see it in full, I'm only including a few choice quotes from the start of the book and this introduction in full).

In 1762, Jean Jacques Rousseau wrote Emile concerning his philosophy of "permissive education." He followed this with his Social Contract, which gave impetus to the French Revolution, from which sprang the idea that "philosopher kings" or elitists should rule the masses through social engineering and a Socialist form of government. Education would be non-sectarian, and in the United States, Horace Mann (father of public education in the U.S.) and later John Dewey (father of "progressive education" in the U.S.) would adopt this same non-sectarian philosophy. In the early part of the current century, Dewey and his "progressive" disciples published many works furthering their cause, and were given a great deal of financial support from various tax-exempt foundations.

After the Second World War, UNESCO added an international dimension to the picture. And by the early 1950s "progressive educators" (largely from Teachers College, Columbia University) had obtained key positions in Colleges of Education and as school superintendents and principals around the nation, from which they could appoint teachers to their liking. By the early 1960s, sufficient "progressive" teachers were in place throughout the land, so that education in general shifted from an emphasis on the cognitive academic basics to the affective domain of feelings and relationships. The monumental Elementary and Secondary Education Act became law in 1965 with a tremendous amount of federal dollars for "innovative" programs. With all of this "innovation," school discipline became lax, and grade inflation along with social promotions soon followed in a major way.

By the early 1970s, National Education Association presidents such as Catherine Barrett were so emboldened that they began to talk of de-emphasizing academic basics in favour of teachers becoming philosophical "change agents." Comprehensive sex education was brought into schools more and more at this time, and because teachers had bought a "don't impose morality" approach to education, it was non-morally-based sex education. No one seemed to ask why, if school prayer had to be discontinued because that was government promoting religion, shouldn't non-morally-based sex education also be prohibited because it promoted immoral sexual activities?
Toward the end of the decade of the 1970s, NEA presidents were talking even more openly about their political power, and resolutions were passed at their annual conventions which went far beyond the realm of education (e.g., resolutions supporting abortion rights). For many years, spokespersons for the NEA had been promoting the teaching of world citizenship, and by the beginning of the 1990s, the New World Order was on its way.

We will deal with the oft mentioned concept of a New World Order later in this work, for now we will be sticking with the blatant manipulation of education for downright evil purposes.

Here are a few choice dates taken from this brilliantly put together chronology:

1884

– The Fabian Society (My Note. They appear in book three too popular guys that they are) is founded at the beginning of the year, not long after the death of Karl Marx. Unlike the openly revolutionary Socialistic or Communistic goals of Marxism, Fabians plan to achieve Socialist governments more gradually. To accomplish their aims, they produce a number of tracts, research pamphlets, books and other publications. A few of these will be listed here, and when reading them, one should reflect upon their similarity to what is happening in the United States today (e.g., school-based clinics, Hillary Clinton’s national health plan, etc.):

Tracts

The Workers’ Political Programme (1890)
The Workers’ School Board Programme (1894)
The Secret of Rural Depopulation (1904)
Public Service Versus Private Expenditure (1905)
Socialism and the Churches (1908)
The Case for School Nurseries (1909)
What a Health Committee Can Do (1910)
The Case for School Clinics (1911)
A National Medical Service (1911)
Robert Owen, Idealist (1917), refer to Owen earlier in this chronology.
The Teacher in Politics (1918)
International Co-operative Trade (1922)
Co-operative Education (1923)
Nursery Education (1941)
Disarmament—the Way Ahead (1957)
Research Pamphlets
An International Monetary Agreement (1933)
Nurseries and Nursery Schools (1944)
Books and Other Publications
A Public Medical Service (1919)
The Decay of Capitalist Civilisation (1923)
The Nationalisation of Banking (1934)
Regionalism (1949)

1886

Poison Drops in the Federal Senate: The School Question from a Parental and Non-Sectarian Standpoint by Zachary Montgomery (nominated for U. S. Attorney-General) is published. He informs that after about two hundred years of public education in Massachusetts, the 1860 census figures showed that state to have one native white criminal to every 649 people, while Virginia, which always left the educational control of children to their parents, had only one criminal to every 6,566 inhabitants.
Moreover, the aggregate figure for suicides in six northeastern states where the states controlled education was one to every 13,285, but in six mid-Atlantic and southern coastal states where parents controlled education, the aggregate for suicides was one to every 56,584. Why? Montgomery found that there were two causes—first, the loss of parental authority and home influence over children, through and by means of a state-controlled system of education; and second, a neglect of moral and religious education and training. After reading Montgomery’s analysis, letters of support were sent to him by such individuals as John LeConte (president of the California State University) and George Washington (grand-nephew and nearest living relative to President Washington).

1895

- The Fabian Socialists establish the London School of Economics (which Mick Jagger of the Rolling Stones would later attend) as part of their plan to further Socialism. Beatrice Webb was a founder of the Fabians and in Beatrice Webb: A Life 1858-1943, she is quoted as saying: “We can now feel assured that with the London School of Economics as a teaching body, the Fabian Society as a propagandist organisation, the London City Council Progressives as an object lesson in (our) electoral success, our books as the only elaborate and original work in economic fact and theory, no young man or woman who is anxious to study or to work in public affairs can fail to come under our influence.” Addresses and Proceedings are published by the NEA, in which its Committee of Fifteen declares: “Modern education emphasizes the opinion that the child, not the subject of study, is the guide to the teacher’s efforts.”

1897

My Pedagogic Creed by John Dewey (“Father of Progressive Education,” honorary president of the National Education Association in 1932, and co-author of the 1933 Humanist Manifesto) is published, in which he states: “I believe the true centre of correlation on the school subjects is not science, nor literature, nor history, nor geography, but the child’s social activities . . . .! believe that the school is primarily a social institution . . . .The teacher’s business is simply to determine, on the basis of larger experience and riper wisdom, how the discipline of life shall come to the child . . . .All the questions of the grading of the child and his promotion should be determined by reference to the same standard . Examinations are of use only so far as they test the child’s fitness for social life. . . .”

1898

John Dewey writes an essay titled "The Primary Education Fetish," in which he attacks the teaching of reading in the primary grades, saying "It does not follow that because this course was once wise it is so any longer. . ..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.” Similarly, Dewey’s psychology mentor at Johns Hopkins University, G. Stanley Hall, proclaimed elsewhere the benefits of illiteracy, stating that “illiterates...escape much eye strain and mental excitement ...and certain temptations.”

1901

Nicholas Murray Butler becomes president of Columbia University. He had helped organize Teachers College there, and would be a major figure in organizing the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

1902

The General Education Board, established by John D. Rockefeller, Sr. is chartered. In Raymond Fosdick’s memorial history of the Board, he indicates that it will be part of John D. Rockefeller, Jr.’s effort toward "this goal of social control."
1904

John Dewey leaves the University of Chicago and joins the Department of Philosophy at Columbia University. He begins to lead the "Progressive Education" movement.

In Dr. Milo McDonald's American Education-The Old, The Modern and The "New" (1952), one reads: "Dewey favoured and taught the desirability of extending the kindergarten (Froebelian) idea to the elementary school and to the high school as well. He advocated the theory of the freedom of untrammeled self-expression to be granted the learner; he favoured the dominance of the 'whole child' in the classroom. Dewey conceived of education as an informal process of learning from which all restraint was to disappear, and not as a formal process directed by a trained teacher leading the learner toward good personal character; ... according to Dewey the teacher was to follow the child who, by reason of his natural inclination, would be directed toward the personal goals he should achieve by co-operation with others in the efforts of humanity to achieve an ideal social democracy ... The work that has been done in this, the first half of the twentieth century, in the name of education and the relationship of that work to the attempt to build in this country a new social order of socialistic design is the work of those who have been closely associated with Dr. Dewey at Teachers College. The degeneration of the schools of the United States throughout the past fifteen years is directly related to his instrumentalistic philosophy, to his theories of the relativity of ideas, to his exaggerated pragmatism and to his influence and that of his associates at Teachers College in directing American education toward the values which atheistic socialism approves."

1905

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching is founded.

1908

Eleven-year-old Avis Carlson passes a test in a one-room schoolhouse in Kansas, which she recalls in her book Small World. Long Gone: A Family Record of an Era (1977): "The orthography quiz asked us to spell twenty words, including elucidation and animosity ... An arithmetic question asked us to find the interest on an eight percent note for nine hundred dollars running two years, two months, six days ... In reading, we were required to tell what we knew of the writings of Thomas Jefferson ... and give the meanings of words such as panegyric and eyrie ... Among geography's ten questions was, 'Name two countries producing large quantities of wheat, two of cotton, two of coal.' ... In history, we were to 'name the principle political questions which have been advocated since the Civil War and the party which advocated each.' There is simply no comparison between this test and the relatively easy multiple choice nationally standardized tests American students will take years later.

1910

- The U. S. Census Bureau reports that illiteracy among those 10 to 20 years of age is down to 4.7% from 7.6% in 1900. The nation is well on its way to wiping out illiteracy, until the "progressive educators" succeed in establishing the "look-say" or "whole word" method of reading instruction in most schools, replacing the previously successful intensive phonics method.

1913

- Occasional Letter, No. 1 is published by the General Education Board (founded 1902). It is by Frederick Gates (appointed by John D. Rockefeller as chairman of the Board), who remarks that "In our dream, we have limitless resources, and the people yield themselves with perfect docility to our moulding hand. The present educational conventions fade from
our minds; and, unhampered by tradition, we work our own good will upon a grateful and responsive rural folk.”

1915

- Rockefeller's General Education Board (GEB) meets with Charles Eliot and Abraham Flexner present. Flexner claims that Eliot initiates a conversation about a possible "model school," and that therefore Eliot is the real founder of the Lincoln School. In Flexner's autobiography, I Remember (1940), though, it seems clear that the idea for such a school originated in his own experience when he organized a school as a young man in Louisville, Kentucky. At the GEB meeting, Eliot states: "I have long wanted some such experiment; now I should regard it as a calamity if we, having in our service the one man best fitted to organize such a school, should fail to give him and the country a chance." The "one man," Flexner, developed his essay "A Modern School" (see American Review of Reviews, vol. 53, 1916), influenced by Dewey and Eliot. His utilitarian school would be organized around science, industry, aesthetics and civics. Modern European languages would be in, and much of conventional math would be out. On January 1, 1917, the GEB agreed to meet the costs of the school, and on September 24, 1917, the school will come into existence as the Lincoln School of Teachers College. Harold Rugg would be one of the teachers in the secondary division, and in his Foundations for American Education (1947), he would say their motto was "Try anything once and see if it works." The Lincoln School would be similar in many ways to Dewey's "Laboratory School." By 1916, Dewey would become the recognized leader of the "progressive educators," otherwise known as "Frontier Thinkers."

The National Association of Directors of Educational Research is formed, and leading "progressive educator" Harold Rugg will become its president in 1921. The organization's name will change in 1930 to the American Educational Research Association (AERA). The "Educational Trust" known as the Cleveland Group (because its first meeting is in Cleveland) meets for the first time. Among the members of the Group are: George Strayer (professor at Teachers College and NEA president 1918-1919), Elwood Cubberly (dean of Stanford University's School of Education), Walter Jessup (president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching), William H. Kilpatrick (professor at Teachers College), James Angell (colleague of John Dewey and trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation), Leonard Ayers (director of the Russell Sage Foundation), Abraham Flexner (director of the Rockefeller Institute), Paul Hanus (established Harvard University's Graduate School of Education with the help of Rockefeller's General Education Board), Frank Spaulding (received his Ph.D. from Leipzig and became a member of Rockefeller's General Education Board), Paul Monroe (founded the World Federation of Education Associations), Edward Thorndike (colleague of John Dewey), and leader of the "Educational Trust" Charles Judd (colleague of John Dewey) who received his Ph.D. from Wilhelm Wundt in Leipzig. In David Tyack's and Elisabeth Hansot's Managers of Virtue (1982), Judd is quoted as urging the Cleveland Conference to attempt "the positive and aggressive task of ...a detailed reorganization of the materials of instruction in schools of all grades. ..." Tyack and Hansot will also write: 'There were 'placement barons,' usually professors of educational administration in universities such as Teachers College, Harvard, University of Chicago, or Stanford who had an inside track in placing their graduates in important positions. One educator commented after spending a weekend with Cubberly in Palo Alto that 'Cubberly had an educational Tammany Hall that made the Strayer-Engelhardt Tammany Hall in New York look very weak'.[And] one principal recalled 'Strayer's Law' for dealing with disloyal subordinates was "Give 'em the axe"'

This is the beginning of a plan to use the "credentialing process" to control education. Around the turn of the century, the moulders of society established tax-exempt foundations to which they would donate large sums of money, thus avoiding the payment of taxes on those funds. These foundations, in turn, would promote the world view or ideology of their
benefactor by providing scholarships or grants to individuals who were "politically correct" in their thinking. Through this funding, these scholars would be able to have their works published and thereby establish credentials enabling them to receive appointments to the government or as university departmental chairmen (who could appoint faculty members, who in turn could select graduate students, who would become school superintendents and principals, who would hire school faculty, who would teach students the "politically correct" way of thinking).

1917

Columbia University's Lincoln School is established at the urging of Abraham Flexner (who wanted to call it 'The Modern School') of Teachers College, and it is funded by Rockefeller's General Education Board (GEB). The New York Times calls the School a "radical and dangerous" experiment, and the Congressional Record includes the concerns of several Congressmen that the GEB might come to control education in the U. S. Regarding Flexner, years later (1966) Professor Carroll Quigley's Tragedy and Hope will be published while Bill Clinton (future U. S. president who considered Quigley his hero) is at Georgetown University where Quigley is a professor. In the book, Quigley not only describes how the Rhodes scholarships (Clinton will become a Rhodes scholar) were part of Cecil Rhodes secret plan for world dominion, but he also will write: "...there grew up in the 20th century a power structure between London and New York which penetrated deeply into university life, the press, and the practice of foreign policy . . . . For example, it set up in Princeton a reasonable copy of the Round Table Group's chief Oxford headquarters. The copy was called the Institute for Advanced Study and was organized by Abraham Flexner of the Carnegie Foundation and Rockefeller's General Education Board."

1922

March 27: The New York Times quotes New York City Mayor John Hylan speaking in Chicago on March 26: "The warning of Theodore Roosevelt has much timeliness today, for the real menace of our republic is this invisible government which like a giant octopus sprawls its slimy length over city, State and nation. Like the octopus of real life, it operates under cover of a self-created screen. It seizes in its long and powerful tentacles our executive officers, our legislative bodies, our schools, our courts, our newspapers and every agency created for the public protection." (emphasis added)

Propaganda Through the Schools is published by the International Federation of League of Nations Societies.

1925

- The International Bureau of Education (formerly the Institut Jean-Jacques Rousseau) begins with a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. It will be part of UNESCO.
- July 10-21: The Scopes "monkey trial" takes place regarding the teaching of the theory of evolution in public schools in Tennessee. The defence for the teaching of this theory is largely conducted by famed attorney Clarence Darrow, who was a founder of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society. The evolutionists' argument is basically that this theory should not be censored from the public schools.

Fabian Socialist and first head of UNESCO Sir Julian Huxley will later claim that humanism's "keynote, the central concept to which all its details are related, is evolution." Huxley will be 1962 Humanist of the Year, at a time when the theory of evolution will be taught as "fact" in many schools around the nation. Interestingly, in a role reversal of 1925, most evolutionist's years later will censor the scientific evidence against evolution from textbooks and school classes.

1926
The National Association for Nursery Education is founded. After 1964, its name will be changed to National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), and in 1993 the organization will have a budget of $5,000,000. The NAEYC will state that it is "open to all individuals interested in serving and acting on behalf of the needs and rights of young children."

1928

Because "progressive educators" are embracing Socialism, it is relevant to note that in this year, Fabian Socialist George Bernard Shaw's The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism is published, in which he reveals that "...under Socialism you would not be allowed to be poor. You would be forcibly fed, clothed, lodged, taught, and employed whether you liked it or not. If it were discovered that you had not character and industry enough to be worth all this trouble, you might possibly be executed in a kindly manner. .. ."

In Shaw's words, the Fabian Socialists set out to "Educate, Agitate, Organize." This expression is almost identical to the words "Advocate, Organize, Agitate" used in The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education (look under 1973 in this chronology).

A Sociological Philosophy of Education by Ross Finney is published, in which the author explains: "The young mind is as absorbent as blotting paper. The ideas of other people exert an insistent pressure even upon adults unless we are already possessed of ideas with which they seem to conflict. As a young child's mind is so meagrely equipped as yet with knowledge, it can offer no such resistance. Accordingly, it absorbs whatever cognitive material happens to be extant in its social environment. .. .It is the business of teachers to run not merely the school, but the world..."

1929

Elementary Principles of Education by Edward Thorndike and Arthur Gates is published in which one reads: 'Traditionally the elementary school has been primarily devoted to teaching the fundamental subjects, the three R's, and closely related disciplines .... 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. ...' Pursuing "progressive education," Thorndike will have produced new spellers, math texts, dictionaries, and textbooks on education and educational testing.

1930

- The "Dick and Jane" basal reading series, using the "look-say" or "whole word" method of reading instruction, begins. The consequences of using this method of the "progressive educators" (instead of the highly successful intensive phonics method) will prove disastrous.

1933

- The Great Technology by Harold Rugg is published, in which he announces: "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 neighbourhoods of America. But that is the task of the building of a science of society for the schools. ...Basic problems confront us: 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.. ..If educational agencies are to be utilized in the production of a new social order, an indispensable first step is that of developing a totally new outlook
upon life and education among the rank and file of teachers... Thus 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..." Rugg would author 14 Social Studies textbooks along with teachers' guides, course outlines and student workbooks used by 5 million American school children in the 1930s.

April 11: Rockefeller Foundation president Max Mason assures trustees that in their program, "The Social Sciences will concern themselves with the rationalization of social control, the control of human behaviour. 'The Rockefeller Foundation (as well as the Carnegie Institute) had for some time been funding research regarding eugenics (term coined by Francis Galton), and in a February 1934 "progress report' by one of the foundation's division heads, one finds the statement: "Can we develop so sound and extensive a genetics that we can hope to breed, in the future, superior men?" (See The Circuit Riders: Rockefeller Money and the Rise of Modern Science by Gerald Jonas, 1989.)

1934

Who Shall Survive? A New Approach to the Problem of Human Interrelations by psychiatrist J. L. Moreno is printed (an expanded version titled Who Shall Survive? Foundations of Sociometry, Group Psychotherapy and Sociodrama will be printed in 1953). Moreno is the founder of "sociometry," which utilizes sensitivity training methods such as role-playing, psychodrama and sociodrama. Moreno acknowledges in his book that John Dewey had a great part in preparing the way for sociometry. And after Dewey reads Moreno's book, Dewey will say that sociometry is "the next stage."

Moreno refers to role-playing as "God-playing" to develop "social shock methods which may well become scientific methods of social action. - Fifty years later, Jacqueline Lawrence will testify on June 7, 1984, before the Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities of the U. S. Senate Committee on Labour and Human Resources, regarding psychodrama being used for attitudinal change. Her testimony includes the following: "one example is for the concept that we must prune away defective persons in order to improve the quality of life for the remainder of the group. This drama involves murder. Many variations are found. I first came across this psychodrama theme in a federally funded home economics curriculum guide containing the exercise, 'Whom Will You Choose?'

It goes as follows: 11 people are in a bomb shelter with provisions sufficient to last 11 persons two weeks or 6 persons a month. The group is told that 5 persons must be killed. They are instructed to accept the situation as fact, that is, to concern themselves with life/death choices, not with attacking the logic or probability of the situation. A profile is given of each person in the shelter. Problem people, such as the athlete who eats too much, the religious type with 'hang-ups,' the pregnant or ill are generally killed. Survivors tend to be those trained in medicine, engineers, and pacifiers.

It can readily be seen that once a student has acted out the murders, he has resolved the dilemma and by his action agreed to the concept of murder. From this point on, it will not be difficult for him to accept and justify murder in any number of situations. The student will no longer hold the same commitment to his previously held conviction that murder is illegal and unjustifiable.

One student I know played out the life/death exercise in five different classes in one school term—in mathematics, geography, English, biology and social studies. The life/death exercises have shocked students. Many have refused to participate, while others have broken down emotionally and even fled the classroom. Such survival exercises have been written into federally funded programs since 1971. Why have educators held onto this strategy with such tenacity for so many years? Will it prepare the child's eventual
acceptance of the concept found in totalitarian societies that in order to have a planned, productive society we must prune away the defective?"

After reading Moreno's book, President Franklin Roosevelt will tell Moreno in Hyde Park one day that "When I am back in Washington, I will see where your ideas can be put to use." Moreno's sociometric groupings will be taken up in the 1950s and early 1960s by Hilda Taba when she will develop a social studies curriculum that will become widely used in the U. S. Receiving considerable federal funds while at San Francisco State College, she will develop the "Thinking Project," which will de-emphasize subject matter and facts in favour of carefully selected information that would lend itself to analysis and discussion—this will become known as "critical thinking."

I included these extracts to bolster my case concerning the roots of education, read the book for a complete chronology. I highly recommend it.

Now we will look at (another) bunch of rich guys, and their wee club, to see what they too have done with reference to our eduction (and quite bit more too).
Chapter Twenty Eight

My entire four section story covers practically the whole of recorded human history, but seeing as I am not giving you a rundown of absolutely everything that went down in that period, -(in order to make this semi-reasonably sized) - I will obviously be using my own opinion to fill in the blanks and sew together that which I feel I have proven with these articles, extracts and documents (but obviously by doing so, that requires you going out and verifying the facts alluded to by me on your own steam) - and that is the sole reason that most of the subjects I cover, or the grand theory I present by the end of this, have not been exposed a long time ago, people like you have not been going out finding things out and verifying facts for themselves, instead you take the word of those that you have been told to trust, - foolish people are we not, because the individuals who own and control many of the sources of our information are more often than not the people we need to watch the most!).

This entire first section doesn't really count as part of the chronology that follows in sections 2, 3, and 4, and you shouldn't be trying to formulate or calculate the so called big-picture while reading this first section - this is a merely a grab-bag of subjects to gain both your attention and hopefully your trust, instead of trying to make sense of the theory I present at this stage, you should use this first book to compliment the others, as many of these subjects will be touched upon or mentioned later.

I am just trying to keep the chronological parts more fluid, and that is the other main reason that you are getting such a large first section, to fill you in on all of these matters as I went along would have sidetracked you from seeing the clear pattern that develops by observing some other key points that we will be getting ourselves acquainted with and up to speed with in due course, as I have said, there is actually a method to my madness. Just know some things are seriously wrong with what you would call the “system” and also with many individuals, organisations and institutions that you trust, and be aware of the fact that the same small group of people seem to be involved. (The Rockefeller's for one.)

Now we will take a look at another organisation that took a very strong interest in (amongst other things) children's education in the USA, it is called Skull and Bones:

America's Secret Establishment

Authors Preface:

After 16 books and 25 years in basic research I thought I'd heard it all ... the world was a confused mess, probably beyond understanding and certainly beyond salvation - and there was little 'l could do about it.

Back in 1968 my Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development was published by the Hoover Institution at Stanford University. In three substantial volumes I detailed how the West had built the Soviet Union. However, the work generated a seemingly insoluble puzzle - why have we done this? Why did we build the Soviet Union, while we also transferred technology to Hitler's Germany? Why does Washington want to conceal these facts? Why have we boosted Soviet military power? And simultaneously boosted our own?

In subsequent books, the Wall Street series, I added more questions - but no answers. I had more or less arrived at the conclusion that there was no rational answer that could be proven. Then a year or so ago I received an eight-inch batch of documents - nothing less than the membership lists of an American secret society.

Glancing through the sheets it was more than obvious - this was no ordinary group. The names spelled Power, with a capital P. As I probed each individual a pattern emerged ... and a formerly fuzzy world became crystal clear.
The book you will read here is a combined version of a series reporting on this research. Each volume builds on the previous volume in a logical step-by-step process.

These volumes will explain why the West built the Soviets and Hitler; why we go to war, to lose; why Wall Street loves Marxists and Nazis; why the kids can't read; why the Churches have become propaganda founts; why historical facts are suppressed, why politicians lie and a hundred other whys.

This series is infinitely more important than the original Western Technology series on technological transfers. If I have a magnum opus, this is it.

ANTONY C. SUTTON Phoenix, Arizona July 30, 1983

Introduction to the 2002 Edition:

AMERICAS SECRET ESTABLISHMENT has had an unusual publishing history.

The book began with an anonymous donation to the author of an 8-inch package of documents in the early 1980s. Nothing less than the membership list and supporting documents for a truly secret society the Yale Skull and Bones.

The late Johnny Johnson, of Phoenix Arizona was the spark that moved me to write first a four-part series and later, a jumbo volume based on this material. This volume went to several editions with several publishers, even a Russian edition of 12,000 copies. Probably in the past few years, as many copies have been sold in Russia as in the United States.

America's Secret Establishment has had little publicity, few reviews ignored by mainline distributors yet, has sold steadily for the past 16 years at a rate of several hundred copies a month.

This activity, in turn, has generated other articles and books by other authors. But my real intent, to generate an exploration of Hegelian influence in modern America, has not been fulfilled. In great part, this can be attributed to an educational system based on a statist-Hegelian philosophy, and which has already achieved the "dumbing down" of America.

This disastrous, destructive philosophy, the source of both Nazism and Marxism, has infected and corrupted our constitutional republic. Much of the blame for this corruption is with an elitist group of Yale "Bonesmen." Their symbol of Skull and Bones, and their Hegelian philosophy, says it all, although with typical duplicity, they would have you believe otherwise.

Hegelianism glorifies the State, the vehicle for the dissemination of statist and materialist ideas and policies in education, science, politics and economics.

Wonder why we have a "dumbed-down" society? Look no further than the Bonesmen troika who imported the Prussian education system into the U.S. in the 19th Century. A political philosophy in direct opposition to the classical liberalism nurtured in 19th Century British and American history. In classical liberalism, the State is always subordinate to the individual. In Hegelian Statism, as we see in Nazism and Marxism, the State is supreme, and the individual exists only to serve the State.

Our two-parry Republican-Democrat (= one Hegelian party, no one else welcome or allowed) system is a reflection of this Hegelianism. A small group - a very small group - by using Hegel, can manipulate, and to some extent, control society for its own purposes.

More than that, reflect on their pirate flag. An emblem found on poison bottles, the symbol of the Nazi Death Head Division in World War Two. Not only did Skull and Bones become a major force in drug smuggling (the Bush and Prescott families in the 1860s), but in true
Hegelian fashion, generated the antithesis, the so-called "war on drugs." This hypocritical policy maintains the price of drugs, controls supply, and puts millions in jail while the gainers, in great part, are none other than the same "Bonesmen" who pass the laws to prohibit (Bonesmen Taft, 1904).

Right and Left - A Control Device

For Hegelians, the State is almighty, and seen as "the march of God on earth." Indeed, a State religion.

Progress in the Hegelian State is through contrived conflict: the clash of opposites makes for progress. If you can control the opposites, you dominate the nature of the outcome.

We trace the extraordinary Skull and Bones influence in a major Hegelian conflict: Nazism vs. Communism. Skull and Bones members were in the dominant decision-making positions - Bush, Harriman, Stimson, Lovett, and so on - all Bonesmen, and instrumental in guiding the conflict through use of "right" and "left." They financed and encouraged the growths of both philosophies and controlled the outcome to a significant extent. This was aided by the "reductionist" division in science, the opposite of historical "wholeness."

By dividing science and learning into narrower and narrower segments, it became easier to control the whole through the parts.

In education, the Dewey system was initiated and promoted by Skull and Bones members. Dewey was an ardent statist, and a believer in the Hegelian idea that the child exists to be trained to serve the State. This requires suppression of individualist tendencies and a careful spoon-feeding of approved knowledge. This "dumbing down" of American education is not easily apparent unless you have studied in both foreign and domestic U.S. universities - then the contrast becomes crystal clear.

This dumbing down is now receiving attention. Two excellent books are The Deliberate Dumbing Down of America, by Charlotte Thomson Iserbyt (Conscience Press, Revenna Ohio, 2001), and The Dumbing Down of America, by John Taylor Gatto. Both books trace this process to the impact of education, and both give remarkable detail of the process. We go further, in that we trace the import of the system to three Yalies members of Skull & Bones.

For Iserbyt, in The Deliberate Dumbing Down of America, the American education system begins with Rockefeller and Gates. But in fact, this statist system is a reflection of the Hegelian ideas brought to the United States by the Skull and Bones "troika" of Gilman, White and Dwight, and then financed by Rockefeller.

People Control

Today in California, one can see in real time the use of controlled conflict to achieve a desired outcome. The debate over the energy crisis is carefully contained to a debate over price caps and price control. Republicans want no caps and no controls. Most Democrats want price controls through caps.

But look at what is NOT discussed anywhere. The entire spectrum of almost free energy, based on a decade of research is carefully kept out of the discussion. Isn't this highly relevant to an energy crisis?

In fact, the existence of free energy systems just down the road is the reason for the controlled debate. Mills Blacklight Power now has its patents and some utilities have already bought in. Bearden's MEG energy from space, is under discussion. Working models exist. The maligned cold fusion has hundreds of successful experiments, but so far as we know,
cannot be repeated with sufficient assurance. Other systems have come into the view of
government agencies, and then disappear from sight.
A knowing public would ask, Why are these not included in the discussion?" - Simple.
Because the utilities know they are for real, and only a few years down the road. The
problem for utilities is not the price of energy today, but how to dump their fixed assets
(hydro plants, transmission lines, etc.) onto the public. These 'valuable' assets will have
zero value down the road, because all new systems are stand-alone units which don't need
fixed plant and transmission lines.

If the public is aware of the dilemma of the utilities, the ability to dump assets onto the
State is heavily reduced.

The Republican-Democrat debate over "caps" is a diversion. The relevant question carefully
avoided is, how long will it take to get these new systems into production?

Another example is Monsanto Corporation development of genetic engineering and predator
seed, a barely-concealed effort for world domination of agriculture.

President George Bush, Jr., a Bonesmen, appoints a Monsanto vice president, Dr. Virginia
Weldon, as Director of Food and Drug Administration, which has the power to block
labelling of genetically-engineered foods, and pass on other corporate control efforts.

Just before this, in New Technology, we had the 1989 dramatic announcement of "cold
fusion." When this announcement was made public, President George Bush (also a
Bonesmen) called establishment scientist the late physicist Seagrum into his office and gave
instructions.

We don't know what was said, but we know what happened. Cold fusion, a valid process for
free energy, as was subsequently revealed, was slandered and harassed by the
establishment, no doubt fearful of what free energy would do to the oil industry.

What is to be Done?

If the voting public was even vaguely aware of this rampant and concealed scenario, it
could, and possibly would force change. However, this is not a likely possibility. Most people
are 'go-along' types, with limited personal objectives and a high threshold for official
misdeeds.

What has taken over a century to establish cannot be changed in a few years. The initial
question is education.

To eliminate the Hegelian system that stifles individual initiative and trains children to
become mindless zombies, serving the State.

We need a lot less propaganda for "education" and a more individual creative search for
learning.

Instead of more money for education, we need to allocate a lot less.

The existing system of education is little more than a conditioning mechanism. It has little
to do with education in the true sense, and a lot to do with control of the individual.

It is more likely that time, rather than the voting booth, will erode the secret power of this
Yale group, Nothing this outrageous can survive forever.

Antony Sutton
The Official Establishment History

There is an Establishment history, an official history, which dominates history textbooks, trade publishing, the media and library shelves. The official line always assumes that events such as wars, revolutions, scandals, assassinations, are more or less random unconnected events. By definition events can NEVER be the result of a conspiracy, they can never result from premeditated planned group action. An excellent example is the Kennedy assassination when, within 9 hours of the Dallas tragedy, TV networks announced the shooting was NOT a conspiracy, regardless of the fact that a negative proposition can never be proven, and that the investigation had barely begun.

Woe betide any book or author that falls outside the official guidelines. Foundation support is not there. Publishers get cold feet. Distribution is hit and miss, or non-existent.

Just to ensure the official line dominates, in 1946 the Rockefeller Foundation allotted $139,000 for an official history of World War Two. This was to avoid a repeat of debunking history books which embarrassed the Establishment after World War One.

The reader will be interested to know that The Order we are about to investigate had great foresight, back in the 1880s, to create both the American Historical Association and the American Economic Association (most economists were then more historians than analysts) under their terms, with their people and their objectives. Andrew Dickson White was a member of The Order and the first President of the American Historical Association.

Memorandum Number Two: The Order - What It Is And How It Began

Those on the inside know it as The Order. Others have known it for more than 150 years as Chapter 322 of a German secret society. More formally for legal purposes, The Order was incorporated as The Russell Trust in 1856. It was also once known as the "Brotherhood of Death." Those who make light of it, or want to make fun of it, call it "Skull & Bones," or just plain "Bones."

The American chapter of this German order was founded in 1833 at Yale University by General William Huntington Russell and Alphonso Taft who, in 1876, became Secretary of War in the Grant Administration. Alphonso Taft was the father of William Howard Taft, the only to be both President and Chief Justice of the United States.

What Is The Order?

The Order is not just another campus Greek letter fraternal society with passwords and handgrips, common to most campuses. Chapter 322 is a secret society whose members are sworn to silence. It only exists on the Yale campus (that we know about). It has rules. It has ceremonial rites. It is not at all happy with prying, probing citizens - known among initiates as "outsiders" or "vandals." Its members always deny membership (or are supposed to deny membership) and in checking hundreds of autobiographical listings for members we found only half a dozen who cited an affiliation with Skull & Bones. The rest were not. An interesting point is whether the many members in various Administrations or who hold government positions have declared their members in the biographical data supplied for FBI "background checks.

Above all, The Order is powerful, unbelievably powerful. If the reader will persist and examine the evidence to be presented - which is overwhelming - there is no doubt his view of the world will suddenly come sharply into focus, with almost frightening clarity.

Before we go further we need to add a couple of important observations about The Order:

• It is a Senior year society which exists only at Yale. Members are chosen in their Junior year and spend only one year on campus, the senior year, with Skull & Bones. In other
words, the organization is oriented to the post graduate outside world. The Order meets annually - patriarchs only - on Deer Island in the St. Lawrence River.

- Senior societies are unique to Yale. There are two other senior societies at Yale, but none elsewhere. Scroll & Key and Wolf's Head are supposedly competitive societies founded in the mid-19th century. We believe these to be part of the same network. Rosenbaum commented in his Esquire article, very accurately, that anyone in the Eastern Liberal Establishment who is not a member of Skull & Bones is almost certainly a member of either Scroll & Key or Wolf's Head.

What is the significance of the "322" in Chapter 322? William Russell imported the society from Germany and so it has been argued the 322 stands for '32 (from 1832), the second chapter, of this German organization. Possibly a chapter 320 and a chapter 321 may exist somewhere And 323 is the designation of a room within the Skull & Bones temple at Yale.

Another interpretation is that The Order is descended from a Greek fraternal society dating back to Demosthenes in 322 B.C. This has perhaps some credibility because Bones records are dated by adding 322 to the current year, i.e., records originating in 1950 are dated Anno - Demostheni 2272.

How A Member Is Chosen By The Order?

The selection procedure for new members of The Order has not changed since 1832. Each year 15, and only 15, never more, never fewer, are selected. In the past 150 years about 2500 Yale graduates have been initiated into The Order. At any one time about 500-600 are alive and active. Roughly about one-quarter of these take an active role in furthering the objectives of The Order. The others either lose interest or change their minds. They are silent drop-outs.

A Yale Junior cannot ask to join. There is no electioneering. Juniors are invited to join and are given two options: accept or reject. Apparently some amount of personal information is gathered on potential members.

The following is the kind of evaluation made in the last century; we doubt it has changed too much down to the present time:

- "Frank Moore is an ideal Bones man, he is a hard worker and a man whose efforts have been more for Yale than himself. He is manager of the Musical clubs and has been active in Dwight Hall. His election will be well deserved and popular."

- "Don Thompson is a sure man whom the class wishes well for and will be glad to see go. He comes from a Bones family." In selection emphasis is placed on athletic ability - the ability to play on a team. The most unlikely potential member of The Order is a loner, an iconoclast, an individualist, the man who goes his own way in the world.

Readers who want more on the ceremonial and initiation aspects should read the September 1977 Esquire article by Ron Rosenbaum. 'The Last Secrets of Skull and Bones'. Unfortunately, the article completely misses the historical significance of Skull & Bones, although it is an excellent source of lurid details and the mumbo-jumbo rites.

The most likely potential member is from a Bones family, who is energetic, resourceful, political and probably an amoral team player.

A man who understands that to get along you have to go along.

A man who will sacrifice himself for the good of the team.
A moment's reflection illustrates why this is so. In real life the thrust of The Order is to bring about certain objectives. Honours and financial rewards are guaranteed by the power of The Order. But the price of these honours and rewards is sacrifice to the common goal, the goal of The Order. Some, perhaps many, have not been willing to pay this price.

Inside The Order

Entry into The Order is accompanied by an elaborate ritual and no doubt by psychological conditioning.

For example:

"Immediately on entering Bones the neophyte's name is changed. He is no longer known by his name as it appears in the college catalogue but like a monk or Knight of Malta or St. John, becomes Knight so and so.

The old Knights are then known as Patriarch so and so. The outside world are known as Gentiles and vandals."

The Catalogue (or membership list - it became "Addresses" sometime in this century) of Chapter 322, however, is made with the usual "outside" names and is unique and impressive. Each member has a copy bound in black leather with peculiar symbols on the outside and inside. The symbols presumably have some meaning.

The owner's name and the single letter "D" is gilt-stamped' on the outer cover of earlier issues, at least up to the mid-19th century. It then appears to have been omitted, at least on copies we have seen: Each right hand page, printed one side only, about 6 x 4 inches, has the members listed for one year and surrounded by a heavy black border, thick in the early years, not so thick in recent decades. This symbolizes the death of the person named as he adopts his new name and new life upon entering The Order.

Most interesting is an entry between the decade lists of members. On the 1833 list, before the 15 founders' names, are the words "Period 2 Decade 3." Similarly, before names on the 1843 list are the words "Period 2 Decade 4." In brief, "Period" stays the same throughout the years, but the "Decade" number increases by one in each ten years. No doubt this means something to The Order, else it wouldn't be there. Another mystical group of letters and numbers is at the top of the first list of names in 1833, "P.231-D.31." The numbers increase by one in each succeeding class. In 1834, for example, the entry reads "P.232-D 32." Furthermore, the first class list of 1833 has two blank lines in place of the eleventh name on the list. This supports the argument that the society has German origins and this is the listing of the anonymous German connection.

The Members of 1833

We estimate that at any one time only about one-quarter of the membership is active. Even the active quarter is not always effective or successful. It's instructive to compare 1833 with 1983 and how, over the century and a half span, a group of 20-30 families has emerged to dominate The Order.

The very first name on the very first membership list, Samuel Henshaw Bates, was a private in the Union Army, went west to farm in Santa Rosa, California, at that time very much in the boondocks, and died in 1879. A life not different to millions of other Americans.

In fact, out of the first 15 members (actually 14 plus the anonymous member), achievements were not much greater than we would expect from the cream of a Yale "class". Rufus Hart spent several years in the Ohio Senate, Asahel Hooker Lewis was in the Ohio Legislature for a couple of years, Samuel Marshall was an Illinois State Legislator for a
while, and Frederick Mather was in the New York Legislature. Other members, apart from
the two founders of The Order, did nothing much with their lives or for The Order.
By contrast, the two founding members, William Huntington Russell and Alphonso Taft, went
far. William Russell was a member of the Connecticut State Legislature in 1846-47, a
General in the Connecticut National Guard from 1862-70, and founded the Collegiate and
Commercial Institute in New Haven, Connecticut. Alphonso Taft went further: he was
Secretary of War in 1876 - the first of several members of The Order to hold this post down
into the 1950s. Taft became U.S. Attorney General in 1876-7, then U.S. Minister to Austria
in 1882-4, and finally U.S: Ambassador to Russia in 1884-5.

During the 150-year interval since 1833, active membership has evolved into a core group
of perhaps 20-30 families; it seems that active members have enough influence to push
their sons and relatives into The Order, and there is significant inter-marriage among the
families. These families fall into two major groups.

First we find old line American families who arrived on the East coast in the 1600s, e.g.,
Whitney, Lord, Phelps, Wadsworth, Allen, Bundy, Adams and so on.

Second, we find families who acquired wealth in the last 100 years, sent their sons to Yale
and in time became almost old line families, e.g., Harriman, Rockefeller, Payne, Davison.
Some families, like the Whitney’s, were Connecticut Yankees and acquired wealth in the
nineteenth century.

In the last 150 years a few families in The Order have gained enormous influence in society
and the world.

One example is the Lord family. Two branches of this family date from the 1630s: Those
descended from Nathan Lord and those from Thomas Lord. Other Lords arrived in the U.S.
over the years but do not enter our discussion. Of these two main branches, only the
Thomas Lord group appears to have contributed members to The Order.

Their ancestry traces to Thomas Lord, who left Essex, England in 1635 in a company led by
Rev. Thomas Hooker, and settled in what is now Hartford, Connecticut. In fact, part of
Hartford is still known as Lord’s Hill. The line of descent for this Lord family is full of
DeForest and Lockwood names because intermarriage is more than common among these
elite families.

The first Lord to be initiated into The Order was George DeForest Lord (1854), a New York
lawyer. Together with his father, Daniel Lord (another Yale graduate), George DeForest Lord
established the New York law firm of Lord, Day and Lord. Among its present day clients are
The New York Times and the Rubin Foundation. The Rubin Foundation is one of the financial
angels for the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington, D.C.

In the next hundred years five more Lords were initiated into The Order:

Franklin Atkins Lord (’98)

William Galey Lord (’22)

Oswald Bates Lord (’26)

Charles Edwin Lord, II (’49)

Winston Lord (’59)

When we ask the question, what have these members achieved? And what are they doing
today? a dramatic picture emerges . . . as demonstrated in the chart that follows . . .
Memorandum Number Three: How Much Is Known About The Order?

The openly published literature on The Order amounts to merely two articles over a span of one hundred years: The Iconoclast (Volume One, Number One only) published October 13, 1873 and an already cited article in Esquire by Ron Rosenbaum, published in 1977. This book and its successors are based on unpublished archival material originating with The Order.

The Iconoclast October 1873

Back in October 1873 an enterprising Yale student, stung to action because The Order had taken over Yale finances and left the University near poverty, took it upon himself to publish an expose. Unfortunately, some of the anonymous student's acutest observations were buried in not-so-good verse. We will reprint some of the verse below as in the original Iconoclast because it's impossible to summarize.

The Yale college newspapers, Courant and Record, had a blackout policy on The Order. As Iconoclast puts it, "We speak through a new publication, because the college press is closed to those who dare to openly mention 'Bones'."

The College Press was controlled by The Order. From time to time Yale newspapers were run by Editors in The Order. For example, one noteworthy editor of the Yale Record also in The Order was Thomas Cochran ('94), who went on to make a career as an influential partner in the influential banking firm of J.P. Morgan.

Three paragraphs in this anonymous publication summarize the Iconoclast accusation. First, there is a Yale secret society open only to a select few:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past Lords in The Order</th>
<th>The Lords Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1854 George de Forest Lord</td>
<td>CHARLES EDWIN LORD Acting Comptroller of the Currency (1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898 Franklin Atkins Lord</td>
<td>WINSTON LORD Chairman of the Council on Foreign Relations (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922 William Galey Lord = Francis Norton son is Charles Edwin Lord 2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926 Oswald Bates Lord = Mary Pillsbury (of Pillsbury flour family) son is Winston Lord</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949 Charles Edwin Lord 2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959 Winston Lord</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"For more than forty years a secret society called Skull and Bones has existed in Yale College. It receives a certain number of men from each class. These are chosen nominally by the members of the class . . ., although it is understood that a prominent man's influence avails for his friends and relatives through several years after his graduation. By observing the men elected from year to year, we find that they are chosen with a distinct end in view, namely, that of obtaining for the society the most honours. Some of these honours are given to literary, some to wealthy men. This, then, is the case. Men receive marks of distinction from Yale College or from their entire class, because of which they are taken into this secret society. Since Yale honours men, this fraternity professes to honour them also."

Secondly, the Iconoclast states that The Order has obtained control of Yale, and its members care more for their society than for Yale:

"Out of every class Skull and Bones takes its men. They have gone out into the world and have become, in many instances, leaders in society. They have obtained control of Yale. Its business is performed by them. Money paid to the college must pass into their hands, and be subject to their will. No doubt they are worthy men in themselves, but the many whom they looked down upon while in college, cannot so far forget as to give money freely into their hands. Men in Wall Street complain that the college comes straight to them for help, instead of asking each graduate for his share. The reason is found in a remark made by one of Yale's and America's first men: Few will give but Bones men, and they care far more for their society than they do for the college."

Finally, the Iconoclast calls The Order a "deadly evil" growing year by year:

"Year by year the deadly evil is growing. The society was never as obnoxious to the college as it is today, and it is just this ill-feeling that shuts the pockets of non-members. Never before has it shown such arrogance and self-fancied superiority. It grasps the College Press and endeavours to rule it all. It does not deign to show its credentials, but clutches at power with the silence of conscious guilt. To tell the good which Yale College has done would be well nigh impossible. To tell the good she might do would be yet more difficult. The question, then, is reduced to this - on the one hand lies a source of incalculable good, - on the other a society guilty of serious and far-reaching crimes. It is Yale College against Skull and Bones!! We ask all men, as a question of right, which should be allowed to live?"

The power of The Order is put to use on behalf of its members even before they leave Yale. Here's a case from the late 19th century which predates the cases we will present later and suggests how long immoral use of power has prevailed within The Order:

"The Favouritism Shown To Bones Men"

"Are not we coming to a sad state when open injustice can be done by the Faculty, and when the fact that a man is a member of Skull and Bones can prejudice them in his favour? Briefly, the case which calls forth this question is this: Two members of the Senior class, the one being a neutral, the other a Bones man, returned at the beginning of the college year laden with several conditions, some of which, upon examination, they failed to pass. Up to this point the cases were parallel, and the leniency, if there was to be leniency, should have been shown to the neutral, who has done all that lay in his power to further the interests of the college, rather than to the Bones man, who has, during his three years at Yale, accomplished nothing that we know of. But, strange to say, the former has been suspended until the end of the term and obliged to leave town, not being permitted to pass another examination until he returns. The Bones man, on the contrary, is allowed to remain in New Haven, attends recitation daily, is called upon to recite, and will have a second examination in less than six weeks. Why is this distinction made? 'O, Mr. So-and-so is a special case,' said a professor (a Bones man), - the specialty, we presume, being the fact that Mr. So-and-so wears a death's head and cross bones upon his bosom. We understand that Mr. So-and-so claims to have been ill during vacation and offers the illness as an excuse for not passing the examination; but the neutral gentleman was also ill, as the
Faculty were expressly informed in a letter from his father," "The circumstance has caused a very lively indignation throughout the Senior class. It is certainly time for a radical reform when the gentlemen who superintend our destinies, and who should be just if nothing else, can allow themselves to be influenced by so petty a thing as society connections."

Esquire (September 1977)

Only one article is known to have been published within the last 100 years on The Order. Unfortunately, it is a superficial, almost mocking, review and provides some enlightenment but little contribution to historical knowledge. The article is the "Last Secrets of Skull and Bones" by Ron Rosenbaum (Esquire, September 1977).

Rosenbaum is a Yale graduate attracted by the fictional possibilities of a secret society out to control the world; he is apparently not aware of the political implications. The contribution is a blend of known authentic documents and outright hearsay. On the other hand, Rosenbaum does make some notable observations. Among these are: " . . . the people who have shaped America's national character since it ceased being an undergraduate power had their undergraduate character shaped in that crypt over there" (i.e., the "temple" on the Yale campus).

Another comment: when a new member is initiated into The Order, "tonight he will die to the world and be born again into The Order as he will thenceforth refer to it. The Order is a world unto itself in which he will have a new name and fourteen new blood brothers, also with new names."

And when Rosenbaum starts to inquire about The Order, he is told: "They don't like people tampering and prying. The power of Bones is incredible. They've got their hands on every lever of power in the country. You'll see - it's like trying to look into the Mafia. Remember they're a secret society too."

The Esquire piece is well worth reading; it gives a side of The Order that doesn't concern us too much.

The "Address" Books

As The Order is a secret society it does not publish minutes or journals. As Rosenbaum suggests, "they don't like people tampering and prying"

This author does, however, possess copies of the "Addresses" books, which used to be called "Catalogues." These are the membership lists all the way back to 1832, the founding date in the United States. How did this material make its way into outside hands? It is possible that one or more members, although bound by oath, would not be dismayed if the story became public knowledge. That's all we will say. Other material exists, Skull & Bones is always a lively topic for Yale conversation. Some time back a few practical minded students made their own investigation; they did a break-in job, a "Yalegate." A small hoard of Bones mementos, a layout diagram and considerable embarrassment resulted.

The core of the research for this book is the "Addresses" books. With these we can reconstruct a picture of motives, objectives and operations. The actions of individual members are already recorded in open history and archives.

By determining when members enter a scene, what they did, what they argued, who they appointed and when they faded out, we can assemble patterns and deduce objectives.

Memorandum Number Four: Who Is In This Secret Society?

The membership list of about 2500 initiates into The Order has very obvious features:
Most members are from the Eastern seaboard United States. As late as 1950 only three members resided in Los Angeles, California, but 28 members resided in New Haven, Connecticut.

Members are all males and almost all WASPS (White Anglo Saxon Protestant). In great part they descended from English Puritan families, their ancestors arrived in North America in the 1630-1660 period.

These Puritan families either intermarried with financial power or invited in sons of money moguls, e.g., Rockefellers, Davisons, and Harrimans, whose sons became members of The Order.

From this preliminary information we can derive Hypothesis One:

THERE EXISTS IN THE UNITED STATES TODAY, AND HAS EXISTED SINCE 1833, A SECRET SOCIETY COMPRISING MEMBERS OF OLD LINE AMERICAN FAMILIES AND REPRESENTATIVES OF FINANCIAL POWER.

The chart on page 19 presents a simplified layout of this hypothesis. Full information remains for a later book - for now we'll give details of just two key families, the Whitney’s and the Harrimans.

The Whitney Family

A key family is the Whitney’s, descended from English Puritans who came to the U.S. about 1635 and settled in Watertown, Mass. Eight Whitney’s have been members of The Order. Of these, three had brief lives;

Emerson Cogswell Whitney died a few months after initiation and Edward Payson Whitney "disappeared in 1858" according to his biographer. However, three Whitney’s, William Collins Whitney and his two sons, are the core of Whitney influence in The Order which survives today through the Harriman family and intermarriage with Payne’s and Vanderbilt’s.

Whitney’s In The Order:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Emerson Cogswell Whitney</td>
<td>Education &quot;Died December 1854&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Payson Whitney</td>
<td>Medicine: &quot;Disappeared in 1858&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>James Lyman Whitney</td>
<td>Library work: Boston Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>William Collins Whitney</td>
<td>Secretary of Navy (1885-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promoter and Financier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Edward Baldwin Whitney</td>
<td>Law: Justice, New York Supreme Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Joseph Ernest Whitney</td>
<td>Education: &quot;Died Feb. 25, 1893&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
William Collins Whitney (1841-1904) is a fine example of how members of The Order rise to fame and fortune. W.C. Whitney was initiated in 1863 and by 1872 had only advanced his career to Inspector of Schools for New York. However, in the last three decades of the century, he rolled up a massive fortune, became a power behind the throne in the Cleveland Administration, and directed the often unscrupulous activities of a cluster of capitalists known as "the Whitney Group". A brief quotation suggests the power that Whitney amassed in a brief 30 years. This is a list of Whitney estates at the turn of the century:
"... a city residence in New York, a Venetian palace and 5,000 acres in Wheatley Hills, near Jamaica, L.I.; a Sheepshead Bay house, with a private track covering 300 acres; a mansion at Berkshire Hills, Mass., with 700 acres of land; October Mountain house, with a large tract of land; Stony Ford Farm, New York, used as an auxiliary to his Kentucky Stock Farm; an Adirondack game preserve of 16,000 acres; a lodge at Blue Mountain Lake with a fine golf course, a Blue Grass farm of 3,000 acres in Kentucky; and an estate at Aiken, S.C., comprising a mansion, race course, and 2,000 acres of hunting land."

William C. Whitney married Flora Payne, daughter of Standard Oil Treasurer Oliver Payne. The Payne’s are not in The Order, but adding the Payne piece of the Standard Oil fortune made Whitney's fortune that much larger. Their two sons, Harry Payne ('94) and Payne Whitney ('98), went to Yale and became members of The Order. After Yale Harry Payne promptly married Gertrude Vanderbilt in 1896 and so the Whitney-Payne fortune now joined some Vanderbilt money. This financial power was channelled into Guaranty Trust, the J.P. Morgan and Guggenheim outfits.

And it gets more complicated. For example, the son of Harry Payne Whitney, Cornelius Vanderbilt Whitney, married Marie Norton. After their divorce, Marie Norton Whitney married W. Averell Harriman (his first wife) who is today at 91 a key member. It is these tightly woven family and financial interlocks that make up the core of The Order.

So let's take a look at the Harriman family.

The Harriman Family

In the first few days of June 1983 a prominent American, a private citizen, flew to Moscow for a confidential chat with Yuri Andropov. A State Department interpreter went along. This American was not the President, nor the Vice-President, nor the Secretary of State, nor any member of the Reagan Administration. It was a private individual - W. Averell Harriman. The first time any American had talked with Yuri Andropov since the death of his predecessor, Brezhnev. So who is W. Averell Harriman?

The elder Harriman, a prominent and not too scrupulous railroad magnate, sent both his sons to Yale. William Averell Harriman ('13) and Edward Roland Noel Harriman ('17) joined The Order. A good example of how old line families in The Order absorbed new wealth families, although as history has unfolded it may be that Harriman and his fellow investment bankers have dominated the direction of The Order in the past few decades.

In the 1930s W.A. Harriman & Company merged with Brown Brothers. This was an older financial house whose partners were also members of The Order. Alexander Brown was founded 1800 in New York and Philadelphia.

By the 1970s the relatively unknown private international banking firm of Brown Brothers, Harriman, with assets of about one-half billion dollars, had taken in so many of "the Brotherhood" that out of 26 individual partners, no fewer than 9 were members of The Order. We don't know of any greater concentration of members.

And to make it more interesting, Prescott Bush, father of President George H. W. Bush (both in The Order), was a partner in Brown Brothers, Harriman for over 40 years.

Finally, because Brown Brothers, Harriman is a private banking firm it has relatively no government supervision and does not publish an annual report. In other words, we know NOTHING about its operations - at least we know nothing from Brown Brothers, Harriman sources.

Here's a line-up of Brown Brothers, Harriman partners who were also members of The Order in the mid 1970s:
It's worth thinking about this concentration of names and the power it represents in the light of outside comments on The Order over the years.

After the title page of this volume we reprint the verse of an anonymous Yale student of the 1870s. He commented on the requirement to put The Order ahead of all else.

The Editor of The Iconoclast (also in the 1870s) wrote:

And on their breasts they wear a sign That tells their race and name It is the ghastly badge of death And from his kingdom came The son of Satan, son of sin The enemy of man.

Another writer in the 1870s called The Order the "Brotherhood of Death":

Outside already, in the doubtful dawn, Thither, from this side and from that, slow sweep, And settle down in silence solidly, Crow-wise, the frightful Brotherhood of Death. Black-hatted and black-hooded huddle they, With black cravats a-dangling from each neck; So take they their grim station at the door, Torches lit, skull-and-cross-bones-banner spread.

Ron Rosenbaum in his 1977 Esquire article a century later, was no less caustic.

Rosenbaum called it a Mafia.

From evidence to be presented later this author would term The Order "an international Mafia" . . .unregulated and all but unknown. To the outside world, however, it's merely Brown Brothers, Harriman, 59 Wall Street, New York. But obviously Yuri Andropov over in Moscow knows who holds the cards.

The British Connection

Some well read readers may raise a question - how does The Order the its families relate to Cecil Rhodes secret society, Milner's Round Table, the Illuminati and the Jewish secret society equivalents? How do these fit into the picture?

We are concerned here only with the core of a purely American phenomenon with German origin. It is undoubtedly linked to overseas groups. The links between The Order and Britain go through Lazard Freres and the private merchant bankers. Notably the British establishment was also founded at a University - Oxford University, and especially All Souls College at Oxford. The British element is called "The Group." The Group links to the Jewish
equivalent through the Rothschild's in Britain (Lord Rothschild was an original member of Rhodes "inner circle"). The Order in the U.S. links to the Guggenheim, Schiff and Warburg families. There were no Jews at all in The Order until very recently. In fact, The Order has, as Rosenbaum suggests, some definite anti-Semitic tendencies. Token Jews (and token blacks) have been admitted in recent years.

There is an Illuminati connection. Some details are in the Esquire article, more details will be in our future volumes.

All these groups have cooperative and competitive features. But to argue that all the world's ills can be ascribed to any one of these groups is false. The core of The Order, like the core of "The Group" in England, comprises about 20 families. In the U.S. case they are mostly descendents from the original settlers in Massachusetts. New wealth did not enter The Order until the mid-19th century and until recently, has never dominated The Order. On the other hand, key families, the Whitney's and the Harriman's, are linked to their own banking interests. In many ways these old line Yankee families have outsmarted the bankers. The Puritans diverted bankers' wealth to their own objectives without always absorbing the banker families. The Order controls the substantial wealth of Andrew Carnegie, but no Carnegie has ever been a member of The Order. The Order used the Ford wealth so flagrantly against the wishes of the Ford family that two Fords resigned from the board of the Ford Foundation. No Ford has been a member of The Order. The name Morgan has never appeared on the membership lists, although some Morgan partners are with the inner core, for example, Davison and Perkins. Interestingly, the Astor name is prominent in "The Group" in England, but not in The Order in the U.S.

Memorandum Number Five: What Organizations Has It Penetrated?

The Order has either set up or penetrated just about every significant research, policy, and opinion making organization in the United States, in addition to the Church, business, law, government and politics.

Not all at the same time, but persistently and consistently enough to dominate the direction of American society. The evolution of American society is not, and has not been for a century, a voluntary development reflecting individual opinion, ideas and decisions at the grass roots. On the contrary, the broad direction has been created artificially and stimulated by The Order.

Not all organizations know they have been penetrated or used for another purpose. It's a situation very much as Quigley (see page 30) found in "The Group":

"there is . . . an inner core of intimate associates who unquestionably knew that they were members of a group devoted to a common purpose and an outer circle of a larger number on whom the inner circle acted by personal persuasion, patronage distribution and social pressure. It is probable that most members of the outer circle were not conscious that they were being used by a secret society."

Therefore our Hypothesis Number Two is:

THE ORDER HAS PENETRATED OR BEEN THE DOMINANT INFLUENCE IN SUFFICIENT POLICY, RESEARCH AND OPINION MAKING ORGANIZATIONS THAT IT DETERMINES THE BASIC DIRECTION OF AMERICAN SOCIETY.
The Order Is The Original Impulse

One observation is that The Order gets the ball rolling in new organizations, i.e., puts in the FIRST President or Chairman and the ideas and then, when operations are rolling along, often just fades out of the picture.

Among universities we can cite Cornell University, where Andrew Dickson White ('53) was its FIRST President, and Johns Hopkins University, based on the German educational system, where Daniel Coit Gilman ('52) was the FIRST President (1875-1901).

Among academic associations the American Historical Association, the American Economic Association, the American Chemical Society, and the American Psychological Association were all started by members of The Order or persons close to The Order. These are key associations for the conditioning of society.

This phenomenon of The Order as the FIRST on the scene is found especially among foundations, although it appears that The Order keeps a continuing presence among Foundation Trustees. It does more than just be FIRST where money is concerned. It stays around to keep an eye on expenditures. The FIRST President of the Carnegie Institution (1902-5) was Daniel Coit Gilman, but other members of The Order have been on Carnegie boards since the turn of the century. Gilman was on the scene for the founding of the Peabody, Slater, and Russell Sage Foundations. McGeorge Bundy was President of the Ford Foundation from 1966-1979.

The FIRST Chairman of an influential but almost unknown organization established in 1910 was also a member of The Order. In 1920 Theodore Marburg founded the American Society for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes, but Marburg was only President. The FIRST Chairman was member William Howard Taft (78). The Society was the forerunner of the League to Enforce the Peace, which developed into the League of Nations concept and ultimately into the United Nations.

In United Nations we find, for example, that Archibald McLeash ('15) was the brains behind the constitution of the UNESCO organization. We find the same FIRST on the scene phenomenon in "think tanks." in 1960, James Jeremiah Wadsworth ('27) set up the Peace Research Institute. In 1963 this was merged to become the Institute for Policy Studies,
along with Marcus Rashkin, who had been National Security Council Aide (1961-3) to McGeorge Bundy (40), a very active member of The Order.

The Church

About 2 percent of The Order is in the Church (all Protestant denominations), although this percentage has declined in recent years. (my note, I have info which totally contradicts this point that I will share with you in later sections)

A key penetration is the Union Theological Seminary, affiliated with Columbia University in New York. This Seminary, a past subject of investigation for Communist infiltration, has close links to The Order. Henry Sloane Coffin (97) was Professor of Practical Theology at Union from 1904 to 1926 and President of Union Theological Seminary, also known as the "Red Seminary," from 1926 to 1945. Union has such a wide interpretation of religious activity that has, or used to have, an Atheists Club for its students. Henry Sloane Coffin, Jr. ('49) was one of the Boston Five indicted on federal conspiracy charges. And this is only part of The Order's penetration into the Church.

The Law

The major establishment law firms in New York are saturated with The Order. In particular, Lord, Day and Lord, dominated by the Lord family already discussed; also Simpson, Thacher and Bartlett, especially the Thacher family; David, Polk, Wardwell and Debevoise, Plimpton, the Rockefeller family law firm.

Communications

There has been a significant penetration into communications. Some examples:

Henry Luce of Time-Life is in The Order

so is William Buckley (50) of National Review

and Alfred Cowles ('13), President of Cowles Communications, Des Moines Register, Minneapolis Star

and Emmert Bates ('32) of Litton Educational Systems

plus ' Richard Ely Danielson ('07) of Atlantic Monthly

Russell Wheeler Davenport ('23), Fortune

John Chipman Farrar ('18), of Farrar, Straus, the publishers.

The most prestigious award in journalism is a Nieman Fellowship at Harvard University. Over 300 were granted from 1937-68. The FIRST Director of the Nieman Fund was member Archibald McLeash.

Industry

The oil companies have their links to The Order. Members Percy Rockefeller, the Payne's, the Pratt's, all link to Standard Oil, Shell Oil, Creole Petroleum, and Socony Vacuum also link. A wide variety of manufacturing firms have members in The Order from the Donnelley family in Chicago (printers of the Official Airline Guide and other references); lumber companies like Weyerhaeuser, who is also a Trilateralist; Dresser Industries, and so on.

The Federal Reserve System
A dozen members can be linked to the Federal Reserve, but one appointment is noteworthy, Pierre Jay (’92), whose only claim to fame in 1913 was to run a private school and be an obscure Vice President of Manhattan Bank yet he became FIRST Chairman of the New York Federal Reserve, the really significant Reserve Bank.

The White House, Politics and Government

This is the area where The Order has made headway: with names like Taft, Bush, Stimson, Chafee, Lovett, Whitney, Bundy and so on. It will take a separate volume to cover this story and in Memorandum Nine we describe just one example, THE BUNDY OPERATION.

Memorandum Number Six:

Operations Of The Order

In 1981 The Anglo American Establishment, by Carroll Quigley, was published in New York by a small anti-Establishment publisher. Quigley was formerly instructor at Princeton and Harvard and then Professor at the School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University. The publisher notes in his introduction that Quigley had been unable to find a major publisher for the manuscript. This is not surprising. The book blows the lid off the British equivalent of The Order.

The Anglo American Establishment has nothing at all to do with the American establishment, which is hardly mentioned, but it has a lot to do with the British establishment. The publisher probably inserted the word "AMERICAN" into the title to enhance marketability in the States. Quigley describes in minute detail the historical operations of the British establishment controlled by a secret society and operating very much as The Order operates in the U.S. This is the real significance of Quigley's explosive book.

The Group

The British secret society, known as "The Group" or just plain "Us", was founded at Oxford University, much as The Order was founded at Yale, but without the Masonic mumbo jumbo. As we noted in Memorandum Five, the Group operates in a series of concentric circles and like The Order consists of old line families allied with private merchant bankers, known in the U.S. as investment bankers.

Bearing in mind the proven existence of The Group, the operations of The Order and the kind of penetration it has achieved cannot be explained by mere chance. By examining The Order's operations we can generate a picture of its objectives without access to any internal constitution or statement of objectives even if such exists. It may only be word of mouth.

By contrast, The Group's objective is recorded in Cecil Rhodes' will. It was:

The extension of British rule throughout the world, the perfecting of a system of emigration from the United Kingdom and of colonization by British subjects of all lands wherein the means of livelihood are attainable by energy, labour and enterprise ... and the ultimate recovery of the United States of America as an integral part of the British Empire.

This objective is, of course, ridiculous and somewhat immature, but no less ridiculous and immature than the New World order objective of The Order. Yet The Group has controlled British policy for a hundred years and still does.

Both The Group and The Order have been created by Anglophiles who want to pattern the world on a Hegelian-Anglo hybrid culture. Where the Latins, the Slavs and the Sino races fit is not considered, but clearly these cultures will be disinclined to become pawns of either the British Empire or New England Yankees. Even within the Commonwealth, a voluntary
association of nations, it is unlikely that Canada, Australia and New Zealand would accept the constitutional bondage envisaged by Cecil Rhodes. Both secret organizations overlook, and there is a philosophic basis for this neglect, the natural right of any ethnic group, be it white, black or yellow, English, Slavic or Latin, to develop its own culture without coercion. Unlike this author, Quigley sympathizes with the ends of The Group, although he terms their methods despicable. Both The Group and The Order are unwilling or unable to bring about a global society by voluntary means, so they opted for coercion. To do this they have created wars and revolutions, they have ransacked public treasuries, they have oppressed, they have pillaged, they have lied - even to their own countrymen.

How have they done this?

Modus Operandi Of The Order

The activities of The Order are directed towards changing our society, changing the world, to bring about a New World Order. This will be a planned order with heavily restricted individual freedom, without Constitutional protection, without national boundaries or cultural distinction.

We deduce this objective by examining and then summing up the actions of individual members: there has been a consistent pattern of activity over one hundred years. Part of this activity has been in cooperation with The Group, with its parallel and recorded objectives.

Now if, for example, we found that the dominant interest of members was raising ducks, that they wrote articles about ducks, bred ducks, sold ducks, formed duck-studying councils, developed a philosophy of ducks, then it would be reasonable to conclude that they had an objective concerning ducks, that this is not mere random activity.

Historically, operations of The Order have concentrated on society, now to change society in a specific manner towards a specific goal: a New World Order. We know the elements in society that will have to be changed in order to bring about this New World order, we can then examine The Order's actions in this context.

More or less these elements would have to be:

Education - how the population of the future will behave,

Money - the means of holding wealth and exchanging goods,

Law - the authority to enforce the will of the state, a world law and a world court is needed for a world state,

Politics - the direction of the State, Economy - the creation of wealth,

History - what people believe happened in the past,

Psychology - the means of controlling how people think,

Philanthropy - so that people think well of the controllers,

Medicine - the power over health, life and death,

Religion - people's spiritual beliefs, the spur to action for many,

Media - what people know and learn about current events,
Continuity - the power to appoint who follows in your footsteps. Operations in each of these areas will be detailed in subsequent volumes. For example, in the next volume, The Order Controls Education, we will describe how Daniel Coit Gilman, President of Johns Hopkins University, imported Wundt psychological methods from Germany, then welded education and psychology in the U.S., established laboratories, brought these educational laboratories into major Universities and generated 100s of PhDs to teach the new educational conditioning system. One of the first of these Johns Hopkins doctorates was John Dewey. The result we well know. The educational morass of the '80s where most kids - not all - can't spell, read or write, yet can be programmed into mass behaviour channels.

The Order's next move was to control the Foundations. They got all the big ones - Carnegie, Ford, Peabody, Slater, Russell Sage and so on. That's the topic of another volume. As in education, the modus operandi of The Order was to get in FIRST and set the stage for the future. The initial objective was to establish a direction in an organization. Selection of managers, intuitive or amoral enough to catch on to the direction, kept the momentum going. In the case of Foundations, The Order has usually maintained a continuing presence over decades.

When it comes to activities by individual members, at first sight the pattern is confusing and superficially inconsistent. Let's give some examples:

• Andrew Carnegie profited from war through his vast steel holdings, but under the guidance of member Daniel Coit Gilman, Carnegie was also an enthusiastic president and financial backer of the American Peace Society. This is seemingly inconsistent. Could Carnegie be for war and peace at the same time?

• The League to Enforce the Peace, founded by members William H. Taft and Theodore Marburg, was promoting peace, yet active in urging U.S. participation in World War One. How could the League be for war and peace at the same time?

• In the 1920s, W. Averell Harriman was a prime supporter of the Soviets with finance and diplomatic assistance, at a time when such aid was against State Department regulations. Harriman participated in RUSKOMBANK, the first Soviet commercial bank. Vice-President Max May of Guaranty Trust, dominated by the Harriman-Morgan interests, became the FIRST Vice President of RUSKOMBANK in charge of its foreign operations. In brief, an American banker under guidance of a member of The Order had a key post in a Soviet bank! But we also find that Averell Harriman, his brother Roland Harriman, and members E.S. James and Knight Woolley, through the Union Bank (in which they held a major interest) were prime financial backers of Hitler. Now our textbooks tell us that Nazis and Soviets were bitter enemies and their systems are opposites. How could a rational man support Soviets and Nazis at the same time? Is Harriman irrational or is the inconsistency explainable?

• The Bundy family (we have a Memorandum on them later) gives us another example of seeming inconsistency. William Bundy was with the Central Intelligence Agency for a decade. McGeorge Bundy was National Security Assistant to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. So the Bundy's presumably support U.S.-European policy which is pro-NATO. Yet the Bundy's have been linked to activities and organizations which are anti NATO and, indeed, pro-Marxist - for example, the Institute for Policy Studies. Are the Bundy's inconsistent?

• Among individual members of The Order we find a wide variety of publicly proclaimed beliefs, ideologies and politics. William Buckely periodically chews out the Soviets. On the other hand, member John Burtt has been a member of a dozen communist front groups. Member William S. Coffin, Jr. spent three years with CIA and then became a leader of anti-Vietnam war activity through the National Conference for a New Politics and Clergy and Laymen Concerned about Vietnam. In fact, Coffin was one of the Boston Five charged and
indicted for conspiracy to violate Federal laws. And, of course, W. Averell Harriman is elder statesman of the Democratic Party. Quite a mixture of beliefs and activities. Do they reflect inconsistent philosophies?

How can The Order have a consistent objective with this potpourri of individual actions?

The answer is, they are not at all inconsistent: because the objective of The Order is above and beyond these actions and in fact needs these seeming contradictions.

The State is Absolute

How can there exist a common objective when members are apparently acting in opposition to one another? Probably the most difficult task in this work will be to get across to the reader what is really an elementary observation: that the objective of The Order is neither "left" nor "right." "Left" and "right" are artificial devices to bring about change, and the extremes of political left and political right are vital elements in a process of controlled change.

The answer to this seeming political puzzle lies in Hegelian logic. Remember that both Marx and Hitler, the extremes of "left" and "right" presented as textbook enemies, evolved out of the same philosophical system:

Hegelianism. That brings screams of intellectual anguish from Marxists and Nazis, but is well known to any student of political systems.

The dialectical process did not originate with Marx as Marxists claim, but with Fichte and Hegel in late 18th and early 19th century Germany. In the dialectical process a clash of opposites brings about a synthesis.

For example, a clash of political left and political right brings about another political system, a synthesis of the two, neither left nor right. This conflict of opposites is essential to bring about change. Today this process can be identified in the literature of the Trilateral Commission where "change" is promoted and "conflict management" is termed the means to bring about this change.

In the Hegelian system conflict is essential. Furthermore, for Hegel and systems based on Hegel, the State is absolute. The State requires complete obedience from the individual citizen. An individual does not exist for himself in these so-called organic systems but only to perform a role in the operation of the State. He finds freedom only in obedience to the State. There was no freedom in Hitler's Germany, there is no freedom for the individual under Marxism, neither will there be in the New World Order. And if it sounds like George Orwell's 1984 - it is.

In brief, the State is supreme and conflict is used to bring about the ideal society.

Individuals find freedom in obedience to the rulers.

So who or what is the State? Obviously it's a self-appointed elite. It is interesting that Fichte, who developed these ideas before Hegel, was a freemason, almost certainly Illuminati, and certainly was promoted by the Illuminati. For example, Johann Wolfgang Goethe (Abaris in the Illuminati code) pushed Fichte for an appointment at Jena University.

Furthermore, the Illuminati principle that the end justifies the means. A principle that Quigley scores as immoral and used by both The Group and The Order, is rooted in Hegel. Even the anonymous Yale student who wrote the verse in Memorandum Three observed this principle at work on the Yale campus.
This, then, is a vital part of our explanation of The Order. When its co-founder, William Russell, was in Germany in 1831-2, there was no way he could have avoided Hegelian theory and discussion. It was the talk of the campus. It swept intellectual Germany like a Pac Man craze. Most Americans haven't heard of it. And those who have don't want to hear any more about it. Why? Because its assumptions are completely at variance with our sense of individual freedom and Constitutional guarantees. Most of us believe the State exists to serve the individual, not vice versa.

The Order believes the opposite to most of us. That is crucial to understanding what they are about. So any discussion between left and right, while essential to promote change, is never allowed to develop into a discussion along the lines of Jeffersonian democracy, i.e., the best government is least government. The discussion and the funding is always towards more state power, use of state power and away from individual rights. So it doesn't matter from the viewpoint of The Order whether it is termed left, right, Democratic, Republican, secular or religious - so long as the discussion is kept within the framework of the State and the power of the State.

This is the common feature between the seemingly dissimilar positions taken by members - they have a higher common objective in which clash of ideas is essential. So long as rights of the individual are not introduced into the discussion the clash of ideas generates the conflict necessary for change.

As the objective is also global control an emphasis is placed on global thinking, i.e., internationalism. This is done through world organizations and world law.

The great contribution of the Tafts to The Order was on the world court system and world law - to the internationalist aspect of the New World Order.

Memorandum Number Eight: The Chain Of Influence

Initiates into The Order are assured of career advancement and success, even wealth, providing they follow the rule "to get along you must go along"

Interruption consolidates the power of the families and expands their span of influence. Finally, a chain of influence spread over many years guarantees continuity and must be extraordinarily impressive to any new initiate who doubts the power of The Order.

We can identify two types of influence chains: a horizontal chain and a vertical chain. Both types are duplicated many times, for the moment well give a single example.

Horizontal Chains of Influence

Members of The Order are to be found in every segment of society: in education, in foundations, in politics, in government, industry, law and finance. Consequently, at any time The Order can tap influence in any area of society. The occupational breakdown of The Order demonstrates the great breadth of this horizontal chain of influence. The major occupations of members are law, education, business, finance and industry.

Approximately, the breakdown is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Percent of members (approximately)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>18 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>16 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>16 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>15 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>12 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In other words, these five occupations account for over three quarters of the membership, and these are the key fields for control of society. Government and politics account for only about 3 percent at any one time. This is misleading, as any member in the above five fields can find himself temporarily in and out of government through the "revolving door" phenomenon.

The Church accounts for only 2 percent of members. These are concentrated in the Union Theological Seminary (the so-called "Red Seminary") and the Yale School of Divinity. Notably the areas of society least represented are those with the least ability to influence the structural direction of society. They may give depth and richness to society, but are not essential to its control and direction. For example, very, very few engineers have ever been members of The Order - we only identified five engineers in the 150 year span. Yet
engineering and technology are key elements to the success of the material aspects of American society. Art, architecture, and music are under-represented. We can only identify 16 members in these three occupations over 150 years. Again, these occupations are not influential in determining the structure of society. Farmers are under-represented; only 16 in 150 years, but we suspect some took up farming to get away from The Order.

In brief: at any one time The Order can call on members in any area of American society to do what has to be done.

Vertical Chains of Influence

A tribute to the success of The Order has been an ability to implement one of its principles. This principle is:

"That only he who wears upon his breast, Their emblem, he for every post shall be considered best."

The practice of absolute preferment for members of The Order has worked to perpetuate its influence over time in a remarkable manner. Before we look at this chain of influence we need to look at some basic statistics. The Order has only initiated about 2500 members in its history in the United States. Each year 15 new members are initiated, no more, no less. On the other hand, between 800,000 and 1 million persons receive college degrees each year from an institute of higher learning, including about 30,000 doctorates. When you follow the chain of influence below, hold in mind that out of 30-40 million degree holders, a few hundred men (never women) or in this case less than a dozen men, are presumed to be the only ones fit to occupy top posts in government. No one else is even seriously considered. We are asked to believe that only a few hundred members of The Order are capable of guiding the United States.

If we assume a random distribution of ability throughout the United States, then our evidence cannot be accounted for by chance. It must reflect, just on the basis of mathematical laws of average, a conscious series of choices. Unless you want to assume that all wisdom and all ability in the United States is generated solely by 15 Yale graduates each year. And that gets you back to the argument of this book.

Memorandum Number One:

![Further Influence Of The Order - Post-1900]

Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research
President 1910-1934, Wm. H. Welch ('70)

American Economic Association — first Secretary Richard T. Ely

Union Theological Seminary — President 1926-1945 Rev. Henry Sloane Coffin — ('37)

U.S. Naval Academy
William Chauvenet ('40)

UNESCO - Constitution
Archibald MacLeish ('15)
It All Began At Yale

The first volume of this series introduced The Order, presented three preliminary hypotheses with examples of the evidence to come.

We also asserted that any group that wanted to control the future of American society had first to control education, i.e., the population of the future. This volume will outline the way in which education has been controlled by The Order.

It all began at Yale. Even the official Yale history is aware of Yale's power and success: "The power of the place remain(s) unmistakable. Yale was organized. Yale inspired a loyalty in its sons that was conspicuous and impressive. Yale men in after life made such records that the suspicion was that even there they were working for each other. In short, Yale was exasperatingly and mysteriously successful. To rival institutions and to academic reformers there was something irritating and disquieting about old Yale College."

"Yale was exasperatingly and mysteriously successful," says the official history.

And this success was more than obvious to Yale's chief competitor, Harvard University. So obvious, in fact, that in 1892 a young Harvard instructor, George Santanyana, went to Yale to investigate this "disturbing legend" of Yale power. Santanyana quoted a Harvard alumnus who intended to send his son to Yale - because in real life "all the Harvard men are working for Yale men."

But no one has previously asked an obvious question - Why? What is this "Yale power"?

A Revolutionary Yale Trio

In the 1850s, three members of The Order left Yale and working together, at times with other members along the way, made a revolution that changed the face, direction and purpose of American education. It was a rapid, quiet revolution, and eminently successful. The American people even today, in 1983, are not aware of a coup d'état.

The revolutionary trio were:

- Timothy Dwight ('49) Professor in the Yale Divinity School and then 12th President of Yale University.
- Daniel Coit Gilman ('52), first President of the University of California, first President of the Johns Hopkins University and first President of the Carnegie Institution.
- Andrew Dickson White ('53), first President of Cornell University and first President of the American Historical Association.

This notable trio were all initiated into The Order within a few years of each other (1849, 1852, 1853). They immediately set off for Europe. AD three went to study philosophy at the University of Berlin, where post-Hegelian philosophy had a monopoly.

- Dwight studied at the Universities of Berlin and Bonn between 1856 and 1858,
- Gilman was at the University of Berlin between 1854 and 55 under Karl von Ritter and Friedrich Trendelenberg, both prominent "Right" Hegelians, and
- White studied at the University of Berlin between 1856 and 1858.

Notably also at the University of Berlin in 1856 (at the Institute of Physiology) was none other than Wilhelm Wundt, the founder of experimental psychology in Germany and the later source of the dozens of American PhDs who came back from Leipzig, Germany to start the modern American education movement.

Why is the German experience so important? Because these were the formative years, the
immediate post graduate years for these three men, the years when they were planning the future, and at this period Germany was dominated by the Hegelian philosophical ferment. There were two groups of these Hegelians. The right Hegelians, were the roots of Prussian militarism and the spring for the unification of Germany and the rise of Hitler. Key names among right Hegelians were Karl Ritter (at the University of Berlin where our trio studied), Baron von Bismarck, and Baron von Stockmar, confidential adviser to Queen Victoria over in England. Somewhat before this, Karl Theodor Dalberg 1744-1817, arch-chancellor in the German Reich, related to Lord Acton in England and an Illuminati (Baco v Verulam in the Illuminati code), was a right Hegelian.

There were also Left Hegelians, the promoters of scientific socialism. Most famous of these, of course, are Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, Heinrich Heine, Max Stirner and Moses Hess. The point to hold in mind is that both groups use Hegelian theory of the State as a start point, i.e., the State is superior to the individual. Prussian militarism, Nazism and Marxism have the same philosophic roots.

And it left its mark on our trio.


Daniel Coit Gilman

Gilman wrote his sister in 1854 that what he most desired to do on returning home to America was to "influence New England minds." An extract from one Gilman letter is worth quoting at length. Gilman wrote his sister from St. Petersburg in April, 1854:

And what do you think I am "keeping" for? Tell me, some day when you write, for every year makes me feel that I must draw nearer to a point. When I go home to America I must have some definite notions. Day and night I think of that time, and in all I see and do I am planning for being useful at home. I find my wishes cling more and more towards a home in New England, and I long for an opportunity to influence New England minds. If I am an editor, New York is the place; but, to tell the truth, I am a little afraid of its excitements, its politics, its money-making whirl. I look therefore more and more to the ministry as probably the place where I can do more good than anywhere else; that is to say, if I can have a congregation which will let me preach such things as we have talked over so many times in our up-stairs confabs. I am glad you remember those talks with pleasure, for I look upon them as among the greatest "providences" of my life. If ever I make anything in this world or another I shall owe it to the blessed influences of home. For me, it seems as though new notions and wider views of men and things were crowding upon me with wonderful rapidity, and every day and almost every hour I think of some new things which I wish to have accomplished in America.... I find my thoughts, unconsciously, almost, dwelling on the applications of Christianity or the principles of the New Testament to business, study, public education, political questions, travel, and so forth. I had a long talk with Mr. Porter in Berlin (it was three days long with occasional interruptions) on topics related to such as I have named, and he assures me that there are many places in New England ripe for the advocacy of some such views upon these questions as I have often hinted to you at home. I told him a great deal about my thoughts on such things, talking quite as freely and perhaps more fully than I have ever done with you girls at home:

He seemed exceedingly interested .... He told me that the kind of preaching I spoke of was the kind now needed - the kind which would be most influential of good - and on the whole he encouraged me to attempt it. I feel more and more desirous to do so, and shall keep on, in all I see and hear abroad, with the examination of every influence now working upon men - churches and schools, politics and literature . . .
Daniel Coit Gilman is the key activist in the revolution of education by The Order. The Gilman family came to the United States from Norfolk, England in 1638. On his mother's side, the Coit family came from Wales to Salem, Massachusetts before 1638.

Fabian Franklin, THE LIFE OF DANIEL COIT GILMAN Dodd, Mead. New York, 1910, p. 28-9. Gilman was born in Norwich, Connecticut July 8, 1831, from a family laced with members of The Order and links to Yale College (as it was known at that time). Uncle Henry Coit Kingsley (The Order '34) was Treasurer of Yale from 1862 to 1886. James I. Kingsley was Gilman's uncle and a Professor at Yale. William M. Kingsley, a cousin, was editor of the influential journal New Englander. On the Coit side of the family, Joshua Coit was a member of The Order in 1853 as well as William Coit in 1887. Gilman's brother-in-law, the Reverend Joseph Parrish Thompson ('38) was in The Order. Gilman returned from Europe in late 1855 and spent the next 14 years in New Haven, Connecticut - almost entirely in and around Yale, consolidating the power of The Order. His first task in 1856 was to incorporate Skull & Bones as a legal entity under the name of The Russell Trust. Gilman became Treasurer and William H. Russell, the cofounder, was President. It is notable that there is no mention of The Order, Skull & Bones, The Russell Trust, or any secret society activity in Gilman's biography, nor in open records. The Order, so far as its members are concerned, is designed to be secret, and apart from one or two inconsequential slips, meaningless unless one has the whole picture. The Order has been remarkably adept at keeping its secret. In other words, The Order fulfils our first requirement for a conspiracy - i.e., IT IS SECRET.

The information on The Order that we are using surfaced by accident. In a way similar to the surfacing of the Illuminati papers in 1783, when a messenger carrying Illuminati papers was killed and the Bavarian police found the documents. All that exists publicly for The Order is the charter of the Russell Trust, and that tells you nothing.

On the public record then, Gilman became assistant Librarian at Yale in the fall of 1856 and "in October he was chosen to fill a vacancy on the New Haven Board of Education." In 1858 he was appointed Librarian at Yale. Then he moved to bigger tasks.

The Sheffield Scientific School

The Sheffield Scientific School, the science departments at Yale, exemplifies the way in which The Order came to control Yale and then the United States.

In the early 1850s, Yale science was insignificant, just two or three very small departments. In 1861 these were concentrated into the Sheffield Scientific School with private funds from Joseph E. Sheffield. Gilman went to work to raise more funds for expansion. Gilman's brother had married the daughter of Chemistry Professor Benjamin Silliman (The Order, 1837). This brought Gilman into contact with Professor Dana, also a member of the Silliman family, and this group decided that Gilman should write a report on reorganization of Sheffield. This was done and entitled "Proposed Plan for the Complete Reorganization of the School of Science Connected with Yale College."

While this plan was worked out, friends and members of The Order made moves in Washington, D.C., and the Connecticut State Legislature to get state funding for the Sheffield Scientific School. The Morrill Land Bill was introduced into Congress in 1857, passed in 1859, but vetoed by President Buchanan. It was later signed by President Lincoln. This bill, now known as the Land Grant College Act, donated public lands for State colleges of agriculture and sciences .... and of course Gilman's report on just such a college was ready. The legal procedure was for the Federal government to issue land scrip in proportion to a state's representation, but state legislatures first had to pass legislation accepting the scrip. Not only was Daniel Gilman first on the scene to get Federal land scrip, he was first among all the states and grabbed all of Connecticut's share for Sheffield Scientific School! Gilman had, of course, tailored his report to fit the amount forthcoming
for Connecticut. No other institution in Connecticut received even a whisper until 1893, when Storrs Agricultural College received a land grant.

Of course it helped that a member of The Order, Augustus Brandegee ('49), was speaker of the Connecticut State Legislature in 1861 when the state bill was moving through, accepting Connecticut's share for Sheffield. Other members of The Order, like Stephen W. Kellogg ('46) and William Russell ('33), were either in the State Legislature or had influence from past service. The Order repeated the same grab for public funds in New York State. All of New York's share of the Land Grant College Act went to Cornell University. Andrew Dickson White, a member of our trio, was the key activist in New York and later became first President of Cornell. Daniel Gilman was rewarded by Yale and became Professor of Physical Geography at Sheffield in 1863.

In brief, The Order was able to corner the total state shares for Connecticut and New York, cutting out other scholastic institutions. This is the first example of scores we shall present in this series – how The Order uses public funds for its own objectives.

And this, of course, is the great advantage of Hegel for an elite. The State is absolute. But the State is also a fiction. So if The Order can manipulate the State, it in effect becomes the absolute. A neat game. And like the Hegelian dialectic process we cited in the first volume, the Order has worked it like a charm.

Back to Sheffield Scientific School. The Order now had funds for Sheffield and proceeded to consolidate its control. In February 1871 the School was incorporated and the following became trustees:

Charles J. Sheffield  
Prof. G.J. Brush (Gilman's close friend)  
Daniel Coit Gilman (The Order, '52)  
W.T. Trowbridge  
John S. Beach (The Order, '39)  
William W. Phelps (The Order, '60)

Out of six trustees, three were in The Order. In addition, George St. John Sheffield, son of the benefactor, was initiated in 1863, and the first Dean of Sheffield was J.A. Porter, also the first member of Scroll & Key (the supposedly competitive senior society at Yale).

How The Order Came To Control Yale University

From Sheffield Scientific School The Order broadened its horizons. The Order's control over all Yale was evident by the 1870s, even under the administration of Noah Porter (1871-1881), who was not a member. In the decades after the 1870s, The Order tightened its grip. The Iconoclast (October 13, 1873) summarizes the facts we have presented on control of Yale by The Order, without being fully aware of the details:

"They have obtained control of Yale. Its business is performed by them. Money paid to the college must pass into their hands, and be subject to their will. No doubt they are worthy men in themselves, but the many whom they looked down upon while in college, cannot so far forget as to give money freely into their hands. Men in Wall Street complain that the college comes straight to them for help, instead of asking each graduate for his share. The reason is found in a remark made by one of Yale's and America's first men: 'Few will give but Bones men, and they care far more for their society than they do for the college.' The Woolsey Fund has but a struggling existence, for kindred reasons."

"Here, then, appears the true reason for Yale's poverty. She is controlled by a few men who shut themselves off from others, and assume to be their superiors . . . "
The anonymous writer of Iconoclast blames The Order for the poverty of Yale. But worse was to come. Then-President Noah Porter was the last of the clerical Presidents of Yale (1871-1881), and the last without either membership or family connections to The Order. After 1871 the Yale Presidency became almost a fiefdom for The Order.

From 1886 to 1899, member Timothy Dwight ('49) was President, followed by another member of The Order, Arthur Twining Hadley (1899 to 1921). Then came James R. Angell (1921-37), not a member of The Order, who came to Yale from the University of Chicago where he worked with Dewey, built the School of Education, and was past President of the American Psychological Association.

From 1937 to 1950 Charles Seymour, a member of The Order was President followed by Alfred Whitney Griswold from 1950 to 1963. Griswold was not a member, but both the Griswold and Whitney families have members in The Order. For example, Dwight Torrey Griswold ('08) and William Edward Schenk Griswold ('99) were in The Order. In 1963 Kingman Brewster took over as President. The Brewster family has had several members in The Order, in law and the ministry rather than education.

We can best conclude this memorandum with a quotation from the anonymous Yale observer:

"Whatever want the college suffers, whatever is lacking in her educational course, whatever disgrace lies in her poor buildings, whatever embarrassments have beset her needy students, so far as money could have availed, the weight of blame lies upon this ill-starred society. The pecuniary question is one of the future as well as of the present and past. Year by year the deadly evil is growing. The society was never as obnoxious to the college as it is today, and it is just this ill-feeling that shuts the pockets of non-members. Never before has it shown such arrogance and self-fancied superiority. It grasps the College Press and endeavours to rule in all. It does not deign to show its credentials, but clutches at power with the silence of conscious guilt."

APPENDIX TO MEMORANDUM NUMBER ONE:

THE ORDER IN THE YALE FACULTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Member Initiated</th>
<th>Position at Yale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Beebe, William</td>
<td>Professor of Mathematics (1882-1917)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>Beers, Henry A.</td>
<td>Professor of English Literature (1874-1926)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Bellinger, Alfred R.</td>
<td>Professor of Greek (1926)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Dahl, George</td>
<td>Professor Yale Divinity School (1914-1929)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Darling, Arthur B.</td>
<td>Professor of History (1925-1933)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Day, Clive</td>
<td>Professor of Economic History (1902-1938)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Dexter, Franklin B.</td>
<td>Secretary, Yale University (1869-99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Dwight, Timothy</td>
<td>President of Yale University (1886-98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Farnam, Henry</td>
<td>Professor of Economics (1880-1933)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>Farnam, William</td>
<td>Trustee Sheffield Scientific School (1894-1923)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>French, Robert D.</td>
<td>Professor of English (1919-1950)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>Gilman, Daniel C.</td>
<td>See text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Graves, Henry S.</td>
<td>Dean, Yale School of Forestry (1900-1939)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Gruener, G.</td>
<td>Professor of German (1892-1928)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Hadley, Arthur T.</td>
<td>President of Yale (1899-1921)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Hilles, Frederick W.</td>
<td>Professor of English (1931)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Holden, Reuben A.</td>
<td>Assistant to President (1947)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Hoppin, James M.</td>
<td>Professor of History of Art (1861-99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Ingersoll, James W.</td>
<td>Professor of Latin (1897-1921)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Jones, Frederick S.</td>
<td>Dean, Yale College 1909-1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Lewis, Chariton M.</td>
<td>Professor of English (1898-1923)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum Number Two:

The Look-Say Reading Scam

A tragic failure of American education in this century has been a failure to teach children how to read and write and how to express themselves in a literary form. For the educational system this may not be too distressing. As we shall see later, their prime purpose is not to teach subject matter but to condition children to live as socially integrated citizen units in an organic society - a real life enactment of the Hegelian absolute State. In this State the individual finds freedom only in obedience to the State, consequently the function of education is to prepare the individual citizen unit for smooth entry into the organic whole.

However, it is puzzling that the educational system allowed reading to deteriorate so markedly. It could be that The Order wants the citizen components of the organic State to be little more than automated order takers; after all a citizen who cannot read and write is not going to challenge The Order. But this is surmise. It is not, on the basis of the evidence presently at hand, a provable proposition.

In any event, the system adopted the look-say method of learning to read, originally developed for deaf mutes. The system has produced generations of Americans who are functionally illiterate. Yet, reading is essential for learning and learning is essential for most occupations. And certainly those who can read or write lack vocabulary in depth and stylistic skills. There are, of course, exceptions. This author spent five years teaching at a State University in the early 1960s and was appalled by the general inability to write coherent English, yet gratified that some students had not only evaded the system, acquired vocabulary and writing skills, but these exceptions had the most scepticism about The Establishment.

The Order comes into adoption of the look-say method directly and indirectly. Let's start at the beginning.

The Founder Of Deaf Mute Instruction
Look-say reading methods were developed around 1810 for deaf mutes by a truly remarkable man, Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet. Thomas H. Gallaudet was the eldest son of Peter Wallace Gallaudet, descended from a French Huguenot family, and Jane Hopkins. Jane Hopkins traced her ancestry back to John Hopkins and the Reverend Thomas Hooker in the seventeenth century, who broke away from the Congregational Church to help found Hartford, Connecticut. This parallels the story of the Lord family (see Volume One). The Lords also traced their ancestry back to Hopkins and Hooker and the Lords founded Hartford, Connecticut. And it was in Hartford, Connecticut in 1835 that a printer named Lord produced Thomas Gallaudet's first look-say primer, Mother's Primer.

Gallaudet's original intention was to use the look-say method only for deaf mutes who have no concept of a spoken language and are therefore unaware of phonetic sounds for letters. For this purpose, Gallaudet founded the Hartford School for the Deaf in 1817. The Gallaudet system works well for deaf mutes, but there is no obvious reason to use it for those who have the ability to hear sounds.

Anyway, in 1835 Mother's Primer was published and the Massachusetts Primary School Committee under Horace Mann immediately adopted the book on an experimental basis. Later we shall find that Horace Mann ties directly to The Order - in fact, the cofounder of The Order. On pages 73-74 we reproduce two pages from the second edition of 1836, with the following directions to the teacher:

. . . pointing to the whole word Frank, but not to the letters. Nothing is yet to be said about letters..."

Why did Horace Mann push a method designed for deaf mutes onto a school system populated with persons who were not deaf mutes? There are two possible reasons. The reader can take his or her pick.

First, in 1853 Mann was appointed President of Antioch College. The most influential Trustee of Antioch College was the co-founder of The Order - Alphonso Taft.

Second, Mann never had a proper education and consequently was unable to judge a good method from a bad method for reading. Here's a description of Mann's school days:
"The opportunities for the lad's schooling were extremely meagre. The locality enjoyed the reputation of being the smallest school district, with the poorest school house and the cheapest teacher in the State."

Mann's teacher was Samuel Barratt and we quote: "In arithmetic he was an idiot. He could not recite the multiplication table and could not tell the time of day by the clock ... Six months of the year he was an earnest and reliable teacher, tasting nothing stronger than tea, then for another six months he gave himself up to a state of beastly drunkenness . . ."

By 1840 there was a backlash, and the look-say system was dropped in Massachusetts.

The Second Attempt

Towards the end of the 19th century The Order came on the scene - and the look-say method was revived. The youngest son of Thomas Hopkins and Sophia Gallaudet was Edward Miner Gallaudet. Two of his sons went to Yale and became members of The Order:

• Edson Fessenden Gallaudet (93), who became an instructor of physics at Yale, and
• Herbert Draper Gallaudet (98), who attended Union Theological Seminary and became a clergyman.

Then the method was adopted by Columbia Teachers' College and the Lincoln School. The thrust of the new Dewey-inspired system of education was away from learning and towards
preparing a child to be a unit in the organic society. Look-say was ideal for Deweyites. It skipped one step in the learning process. It looked "easy," and de-emphasized reading skills.

The educational establishment rationalized look-say by claiming that up to the turn of the century reading was taught by "synthetic" methods, i.e., children were taught letters and an associated sound value. Then they learned to join syllables to make words. This was held to be uninteresting and artificial. Educational research, it was claimed, demonstrated that in reading words are not analyzed into component letter parts but seen as complete units. Therefore, learning to read should start with complete units.

Education

Of course, there is a gigantic non-sequitur in this reasoning process. Certainly a skilled reader does see words as complete units. And a really skilled reader does see lines and paragraphs at a glance. But the accuracy of perceiving the whole is based on the degree of understanding and knowledge of the component parts.

The educational establishment argues today in the 1980s that, based on further experimental testing, it is easier for a child to read the line "the rocket zoomed into space" than "the cat sat on the mat." The first line has "contrasting visual structure" and the second quote has a "similar visual pattern." What they have done now is to make a mountain out of a molehill, convert the relatively simple task of learning to read into an unnecessarily complex system.

Why? That we shall see as the story progresses.

How children are taught to read - and why they can't.

Memorandum Number Three:

The Illuminati Connection

We need to trace three historical lines in modern education: the first we looked at in Memorandum Number Two, the development of the look-say method of reading, its abandonment and its later adoption around the turn of the century.

Another line is the import of the experimental psychology of Wilhelm Wundt into the United States by The Order. This we shall examine in Memorandum Number Four.

For the moment we want to briefly trace the influence of Johann Friedrich Herbart, a major German philosopher of the early 19th century. There was at one time in the United States a National Herbart Society for the Scientific Study of Education to adapt Herbartian principles to American education. Later, this became just National Society for the Study of Education. You don't hear too much about Johann Herbart today, but his influence survives in the so-called "enriched" school curricula and in current educational methodology.

Our purpose in this memorandum is twofold: to show the Hegelian aspects of Herbartian theory and to trace the Illuminati connection. There is no direct connection to The Order. However, in a subsequent book, we will trace The Order to the Illuminati and this section will then fall into a logical place.

Herbart was an educational theorist as well as philosopher and psychologist, and strongly influenced Wilhelm Wundt. For Herbart, education had to be presented in a scientifically correct manner, and the chief purpose of education for Herbart is to prepare the child to live properly in the social order of which he is an integral part. Following Hegel, the
individual is not important. The mere development of individual talent, of individual fitness, mental power and knowledge is not the purpose of education.

The purpose is to develop personal character and social morality, and the most important task of the educator is to analyze the activities and duties of men within society. The function of instruction is to fulfill these aims and impart to the individual socially desirable ideas. Morality for Herbart, therefore, is what is good for society, following Hegelian theory. Herbartians favour grouping of subjects around a core topic, i.e., the grouping of history, social science and English literature. This enables the teacher to more easily draw out those notions useful to the objective.

All of these ideas we can recognize in today's educational philosophy came into American education through the Herbartian groups.

The Illuminati Connection

Johann Herbart studied at the University of Jena, and came under the influence of Johann Herder, Friedrich Schiller, Johann Fichte and Johann Goethe. Later, in Switzerland, Herbart came into contact with Johann Pestalozzi.

What is interesting about these names, and they comprise the most important influence on Herbart, is that they are either known members of the Illuminati or reputed to be close to the Illuminati Order.

Let's take each name in turn:

• Johann Gottried Herder (1744-1803) was "Damascus pontifex" in the Illuminato.
• Johann Fichte, we have already noted in the previous volume, was close to the Illuminati and pushed by Goethe ("Abaris") for the post at the University of Jena, where Johann Herbart was studying.
• Friedrich Schiller (1759-1805) was known in the circle but not reliably recorded as an Illuminati member.
• Johann Wolfgang Goethe (1749-1832) was "Abaris" in the Illuminati.

We have an even more precise connection for another prominent Illuminati, Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi (1746-1827), a Swiss teacher of some renown living at Interlaken, and known as "Alfred" in the Illuminati code.

Before Herbart completed his doctorate, just after the turn of the 19th century, he spent three years at Interlaken in Switzerland. Out of his contact with Pestalozzi came a book on Pestalozzi's educational theories, much of which rubbed off onto Herbart. The book is Pestalozzi's Idee Eines ABC Der Anschaung Untersucht Und Wissenschaftlich Asugefuhrht (Pestalozzi's idea of an ABC of sense impression). This book has been translated and we reproduce a copy of the title page of the 1896 New York edition. This is not insignificant. It is a commentary by a prominent influence on today's education upon an Illuminati book.

Why Is The Illuminati Connection Significant?

The Illuminati was founded May 1, 1776 by Professor Adam Weishaupt of the University of Ingolstadt. It was a secret society, but in 1785 and 1787 several batches of internal documents came to the Bavarian Government. Subsequent investigation determined that the aim of the Illuminati was world domination, using any methods to advance the objective, i.e., the end always justifies the means. It was anti-Christian, although clergymen were found in the organization. Each member had a pseudonym to disguise his identity.

During its time, the Illuminati had widespread and influential membership. After suppression by the Bavarian Government in 1788 it was quiet for some years and then reportedly revived. The significance for this study is that the methods and objectives parallel
those of The Order. In fact, infiltration of the Illuminati into New England is known and will be the topic of a forthcoming volume.

So far as education is concerned, the Illuminati objective was as follows:

"We must win the common people in every corner. This will be obtained chiefly by means of the schools, and by open, hearty behaviour, show, condescension, popularity and toleration of their prejudices which we shall at leisure root out and dispel."

As Rosenbaum has pointed out in his Esquire article, the Illuminati ceremony has similarities to The Order. For example, John Robison in Proofs Of A Conspiracy: "The candidate is presented for reception in the character of a slave; and it is demanded of him what has brought him to this most miserable of all conditions. He answers - Society - the State - Submissiveness - False Religion. A skeleton is pointed out to him, at the feet of which are laid a Crown and a Sword. He is asked whether that is the skeleton of a King, a Nobleman or a Beggar?

As he cannot decide, the President of the meeting says to him, "the character of being a man is the only one that is of importance." Finally, in conclusion, we can trace the foundation of three secret societies, in fact the most influential three secret societies that we know about, to Universities. The Illuminati was founded at University of Ingolstadt. The Group was founded at All Souls College, Oxford University in England, and The Order was founded at Yale University in the United States.

The paradox is that institutions supposedly devoted to the search for truth and freedom have given birth to institutions devoted to world enslavement.


Memorandum Number Four:

The Leipzig Connection*

The link between German experimental psychology and the American educational system is through American psychologist G. Stanley Hall, in his time probably the foremost educational critic in the U. S.

The Hall family is Scotch and English and goes back to the 1630s, but Hall was not a Yale graduate, and at first sight there is no connection between Hall and The Order.

On the other hand, Hall is a good example of someone whose life has major turning points and on probing the turning points, we find The Order with its guiding hand. The detail below is important to link Hall with The Order. It is an open question how much Hall knew, if he knew anything at all, about The Order and its objectives.

After graduation from Williams College, Hall spent a year at the Union Theological Seminary, New York. Our "Addresses" books for The Order do not give church affiliations for members citing the ministry as their occupation. We do know that Rev. Henry Sloane Coffin (’97) was Associate Professor of Practical Theology at Union from 1904-1926 and President of Union Seminary from 1926 to 1945, but we cannot trace any members at Union before 1904. Fortunately, Hall was an egocentric and wrote two long, tedious autobiographies: Recreations Of A Psychologist and Life And Confessions Of A Psychologist. This is how Hall described his entry to Union in the latter book (pp. 177-8):

"Recovering from a severe attack of typhoid fever the summer after graduation and still being very uncertain as to what I would be and do in the world, I entered Union Theological Seminary in September 1867."
Later Hall adds, "The man to whom I owe far more in this group than any other was Henry B. Smith, a foreign trained scholar, versed more or less not only in systematic theology, which was his chair, but in ancient and modern philosophy, on which he gave us a few lectures outside the course. Of him alone I saw something socially. He did me perhaps the greatest intellectual service one man can render another by suggesting just the right reading at the right time. It was he, too, who seeing my bent advised me to go to Europe." The Leipzig Connection is the title of an excellent little booklet by Lance J. Klass and Paoli Lionni, published by The Delphian Press. Route 2, Box 195, Sheridan, Oregon 97378 ($4 postpaid), The book came out in 1967 and was the first to trace the Wundt link. It has more detail on Wundt than this memorandum, but, of course, is not concerned with The Order. The Rev. Henry Boynton Smith cited by Hall was Professor of Church History at Union Seminary from 1850 to 1874, and in the "liberal" wing of the Presbyterian Church, he edited Theological Review from 1859-1874 and translated several German theological works. Smith was not a member of The Order.

How did Hall, who says he was broke, get from New York to Europe, specifically to Germany? Here's the interesting twist. Someone he didn't know (but whom today we can trace to The Order) gave him $1,000 - a lot of money in those days. Here's how it happened. While preaching in Pennsylvania in 1868, Hall received a letter from Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, whose church he attended in New York:

"... asking me to call on him. I immediately took the train and Beecher told me that through the Manns (friends) he had learned that I wished to study philosophy in Germany but lacked the means... (he) gave me a sealed note to the lumber magnate Henry Sage, the benefactor of Cornell, which I presented at his office without knowing its contents. To my amazement, after some scowling and a remark to the effect that his pastor took amazing liberties with his purse, he gave me a check for one thousand dollars. Taking my note to repay it with interest, he told me to sail for Germany the next day" (Confessions, p. 182). Who was "lumber magnate Henry Sage, the benefactor of Cornell"? The Sage family had several "Henrys" involved with Yale and Cornell Universities in those days. The "Henry Sage" cited is probably William Henry Sage (1844-1924) who graduated Yale 1865 and then joined the family lumber company, H.W. Sage & Company in New York. Henry Sage was a member of Scroll & Key - the sister Senior Society to Skull & Bones at Yale. Furthermore, two of Henry Sage's nephews were in The Order, but well after 1868:

- Dean Sage (’97)
- Henry Manning Sage (’98)

Both Sages entered the family lumber business, by then renamed Sage Land & Lumber. In brief: the funds to get Hall to Germany on his first trip came from a member of Scroll & Key, i.e., Henry Sage, while Sage's two nephews joined The Order later in the century. In Germany, Hall studied philosophy at the University of Berlin for two years under Hegelians Trendelenberg (Gilman of The Order also studied under Trendelenberg) and Lepsius. There were few American students in Berlin at this time. So few that the American Minister George Bancroft could entertain them at the U.S. Embassy to meet German Chancellor von Bismarck.

Hall At Antioch College

Hall returned to the U.S. from Germany in 1871 and by design or accident found himself under the wing of The Order.

Again, the detail is important. There are two versions of Hall's life immediately after returning from his first trip to Germany. According to Hall's Confessions, he became tutor for the Seligman banking family in New York and was then contacted by James K. Hosmer, Professor at Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio. Hosmer asked, and this is very unusual, if Hall would like his professorial post at Antioch. Said Hall, "I gladly accepted."
There is another version in National Cyclopaedia Of American Biography which states, "In 1872 he (Hall) accepted a professorship at Antioch College, Ohio, that formerly was held by Horace Mann." In any event Hall went to Antioch, a "liberal" Unitarian college with a more than "liberal" view of education. And at Antioch College, G. Stanley Hall was at the core of The Order. Horace Mann, whom we met in Memorandum Two as the promoter of "look-say" reading, was the first President of Antioch (1853-1860). The most prominent trustee of Antioch College was none other than the co-founder of The Order, Alphonso Taft. According to Hall, "(I) occasionally spent a Sunday with the Taft's. Ex-President Taft was then a boy and his father, Judge Alonzo (sic) Taft was a trustee of Antioch College" Confessions, p. 201). Furthermore, Cincinnati, Ohio, at that time was the centre for a Young Hegelian movement including famous left Hegelian August Willich, and these were well known to Judge Alphonso Taft.

In brief, while at Antioch College in Yellow Springs, Ohio, Hall came under the influence of four groups:

(a) the legend of Horace Mann, a hero of the modern education movement.
(b) the Unitarian Church, which will enter our later reports,
(c) a Hegelian discussion group comprised of left Hegelians, and
d) the co-founder of The Order, Alphonso Taft. And Hall knew William Howard Taft, also a
member of The Order ('78) and future President and Chief Justice of the United States.
Hall stayed four years at Antioch, then took off again for Europe, while Alphonso Taft went
to Washington, D.C. as Secretary of War, then as Attorney General in the Grant
Administration. Hall paused a while in England and then went on to Germany, to Leipzig and
Wilhelm Wundt. He became the first of a dozen Americans to receive a Ph.D. in psychology
(a new field) under Wundt.

The Hegelian Influence On Hall

So between 1870 and 1882, a span of twelve years, Hall spent six years in Germany. As Hall
himself comments, "I do not know of any other American student of these subjects (i.e.,
philosophy and psychology) who came into even the slight personal contact it was my
fortune to enjoy with Hartmann and Fechner, nor of any psychologist who had the
experience of attempting experimental work with Helmholtz and I think I was the first
American pupil of Wundt. The twelve years included in this span, more than any other equal
period, marked and gave direction to modern psychology . . ."1

Who were these four German philosophers who so influenced Stanley Hall?

Eduard von Hartmann (1842-1906), a prominent philosopher. Hartmann's views on
individual rights are entirely contrary to our own, i.e., "The principle of freedom is negative . . . in every department of life, save religion alone, compulsion is necessary ... What all men
need is rational tyranny, if it only holds them to a steady development, according to the laws
of their own nature." There isn't too much difference between Hegel and Hartmann on the
idea of social progress. Individual freedom is not acceptable to these philosophers, man
must be guided by "rational tyranny."

Gustav Theodor Fechner (1801-1887). Fechner disliked Hegel, who Fechner said,
"unlearned men to think." However, Fechner was mainly interested in psycho-physics, i.e.,
parapsychology:

"... he was particularly attracted to the unexplored regions of the soul and so he
became interested in somnambulism, attended séances when table tapping came into
vogue." Herman L. F. von Helmholtz (1821-1894) was undoubtedly Germany's greatest
scientist in the 19th century and was rooted in Kant, the predecessor of Hegel.

For Helmholtz:

"The sensible world is a product of the interaction between the human organism and an
unknown reality. The world of experience is determined by this interaction but the organism
itself is only an object of experience and is to be understood by psychology and physiology."

Wilhelm Maximilian Wundt Wilhelm Wundt (1832-1920), Professor of Philosophy at
University of Leipzig, was undoubtedly the major influence on G. Stanley Hall. Modern
education practice stems from Hegelian social theory combined with the experimental
psychology of Wilhelm Wundt. Whereas Karl Marx and von Bismarck applied Hegelian theory
to the political field, it was Wilhelm Wundt, influenced by Johann Herbart, who applied Hegel
to education, which in turn, was picked up by Hall and John Dewey and modern educational
theorists in the United States.

Wilhelm Maximilian Wundt was born August 16, 1832 at Neckarau, a suburb of Mannheim,
Germany. His father Maximilian (1787-1846) was a minister. Wundt's grandfather on the
paternal side is of significant interest: Kirchenrat Karl Kasimir Wundt (1744-84) was
Professor at Heidelberg University in the history and geography of Baden and pastor of the
church at Wieblingen, a small neighbourhood town.
The Illuminati-Order documents show that "Raphael" in the Illuminati is identified as this same Professor Karl Kasimir Wundt and is referred to in the Illuminati Provincial Report from Utica (i.e., Heidelberg) dated September 1782.1

The magnum opus of Wilhelm Wundt, i.e., Volkerpsychologie, is also today a recommended book in Internationales Freimaurer Lexikon (page 50).

Historical links aside, Wundt is important in the history of American education for the following reasons:

(1) He established in 1875 the world's first laboratory in experimental psychology to measure individual responses to stimuli.

'Richard van Dulman, Der Geheimbund Der Illuminaten (Stuttgart, 1977, p. 269).

(2) Wundt believed that man is only the summation of his experience, i.e., the stimuli that bear upon him. It follows from this that, for Wundt, man has no self will, no self determination. Man is in effect only the captive of his experiences, a pawn needing guidance.

(3) Students from Europe and the United States came to Leipzig to learn from Wundt the new science of experimental psychology. These students returned to their homelands to found schools of education or departments of psychology, and trained hundreds of Ph.D.s in the new field of psychology.

The core of our problem is that Wundt's work was based on Hegelian philosophical theory and reflected the Hegelian view of the individual as a valueless cog in the State, a view expanded by Wundt to include man as nothing more than an animal influenced solely by daily experiences. This Wundtian view of the world was brought back from Leipzig to the United States by G. Stanley Hall and other Americans and went through what is known among psychologists as "The Americanization of Wundt."

Although Hall was primarily psychologist and teacher, his political views were partially Marxist, as Hall himself writes: "... (I) had wrestled with Karl Marx and half accepted what I understood of him" (Confessions, p. 222).

In the next Memorandum, Number Five, we will link Hall with Gilman and trace their joint influence on American education.

Memorandum Number Five:

The Baltimore Scheme

While G. Stanley Hall was in Leipzig working under Wilhelm Wundt, the revolutionary trio Gilman-Dwight-White were moving events back home - and The Order ran into its first organized opposition. The protesting "neutrals" at Yale had no hope of winning. Even under independent President Noah Porter in the 1870s, The Order had Yale University under its control. But while Yale students were watching, protesting and writing bad verse, Daniel Gilman ran into opposition 3000 miles away - and if the leaders of this counter revolution had known the story we are recounting here, they might just have stopped The Order dead in its tracks.

In 1867 Daniel Gilman received an offer as President of the University of Wisconsin. This he declined. In 1872 Gilman was offered the Presidency of the newly established University of California. This offer he accepted. In California Gilman found a political hornets' nest. For some years there had been increasing popular concern about the railroad monopolies,
government subsidies to railroads and - oddly enough - the Morrill Bill which gave federal land grants to agricultural and scientific colleges. The reader will recall that in Connecticut and New York, The Order had grabbed the total state's share for Yale and Cornell respectively. Californians believed that the University of California, a land grant college, should teach agriculture and science, whereas Gilman had different ideas. Unrest over corruption, including corruption among University of California Regents and the railroads (in which members of The Order had widespread interests), led to formation of a new California political party. In 1873 the party was known as the Patrons of Husbandry or the Grangers. Then members of the Republican Party broke away and joined with the Grangers to form the Peoples Independent Party (known also as the Dolly Varden Party). They won a decisive victory in the 1873 California elections and following investigations by the Grangers, a petition was sent to the Legislature concerning operation of the University of California under Daniel Gilman.

At that time Henry George was editor of the San Francisco Daily Evening Post and George used his considerable journalistic skills to attack the University, the Regents, Gilman, and the land grants. Although Henry George is known as a socialist, we classify him as an independent socialist, not part of the Hegelian right-left spectrum. His main target was land monopoly, whereas the "scientific" Hegelian socialism of Karl Marx is geared to establishing monopolies of all kinds under state control, following the Hegelian theory of the supremacy of the State.

This populist furore scared Gilman, as he freely admits:

"... there are dangers here which I could not foresee. ... This year the dangers have been averted but who can tell what will happen two years hence? I feel that we are building a superior structure but it rests over a powder mill which may blow it up any day. All these conditions fill me with perplexity."

Reading between the lines, Daniel Gilman was not too anxious to face the populist west. He needed a more stable base where prying journalists and independent politicians could be headed off. And this base presented itself in the "Baltimore scheme."

Daniel Gilman Becomes President Of Johns Hopkins

Johns Hopkins, a wealthy Baltimore merchant, left his fortune to establish a University for graduate education (the first in the United States along German lines) and a medical school. Hopkins' trustees were all friends who lived in Baltimore. How then did they come to select Daniel Coit Gilman as President of the new University?

In 1874 the trustees invited three university presidents to come to Baltimore and advise on the choice of a President. These were Charles W. Eliot of Harvard, Andrew Dickson White of Cornell, and James B. Angell of Michigan. Only Andrew Dickson White was in The Order. After meeting independently with each of these presidents, half a dozen of the trustees toured several American Universities in search of further information - and Andrew D. White accompanied the tour. The result, as in the words of James Angell:

"And now I have this remarkable statement to make to you, that without the least conference between us three, we all wrote letters telling them that the one man was Daniel C. Gilman of California,"1 The truth is that Gilman not only knew what was going on in Baltimore, but was in communication with Andrew White on the Baltimore scheme," as they called it. In a letter dated April 5, 1874, Gilman wrote as follows to Andrew D. White "(could not conclude on any new proposition without conferring upon it with some of my family friends, and I have not felt at liberty to do so. I confess that the Baltimore (italics in original) scheme has often suggested itself to me, but I have no personal relations in that quarter."2
Here's the interesting point: the board appointed by Johns Hopkins to found a university did not even meet to adopt its by-laws and appoint committees until four weeks before this letter i.e., March 7, 1874. Yet Gilman tells us "the Baltimore scheme has of times suggested itself to me...In brief: Gilman knew what was happening over in Baltimore BEFORE HIS NAME HAD BEEN PRESENTED TO THE TRUSTEES! Gilman became first President of Johns Hopkins University and quickly set to work.

Johns Hopkins had willed substantial amounts for both a University and a medical school. Dr. William H. Welch ('70), a fellow member of The Order, was brought in by Gilman to head up the Hopkins medical school. (Welch was President of the Board of Directors of the Rockefeller Institute of Medical Research for almost 25 years, 1910-1934. This we shall expand upon later in the series when we examine how The Order came to control medicine). For the moment let's return to G. Stanley Hall who was in Leipzig while Johns Hopkins was acquiring its new President.

Gilman Starts The Revolution in American Education

When he returned to the United States Hall was feeling pretty low: 'I came home, again in the depths because of debt and with no prospects, took a small flat on the edge of Somerville, where my two children were born, and waited, hoped and worked. One Wednesday morning President Eliot (of Harvard University) rode up to the house, rapped on the door without dismounting from his horse and asked me to begin Saturday of that week a course of lectures on education . . .'

As Hall recounts it, he had a "very impressive audience" for these lectures. Sometime later, "In 1881 I was surprised and delighted to receive an invitation from the Johns Hopkins University, then the cynosure of all aspiring young professors, to deliver a course of twelve semi-public lectures on psychology."

At the end of the lecture series, Gilman offered Hall the chair of Professor of Psychology and Pedagogy. This puzzled Hall because others at Johns Hopkins were "older and abler" than himself and "Why the appointment for which all of them had been considered fell to me I was never able to understand unless it was because my standpoint was thought to be a little more accordant with the ideals which then prevailed there." Hall was given a psychological laboratory, a thousand dollars a year for equipment and, with the encouragement of Gilman, founded The American Journal Of Psychology.

And what did Hall teach? Again in his own words:

"The psychology I taught was almost entirely experimental and covered for the most part the material that Wundt had set forth in the later and larger edition of Physiological Psychology."

The rest is known. The chart demonstrates how doctoral students from Wundt and Hall fanned out through the United States, established departments of psychology and education by the score; 117 psychological laboratories just in the period up to 1930. Prominent among these students were John Dewey, J.M. Cattell and E.L. Thorndike - all part of the founding of Columbia Teachers' College and Chicago's School of Education - the two sources of modern American education. Their activities can be measured by the number of doctorates in educational psychology and experimental psychology granted in the period up to 1948. The following list includes psychologists with training in Germany under Wilhelm Wundt before 1900, and the number of doctorates they in turn awarded up to 1948:
American Students of Wundt Teaching at U.S. Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career At</th>
<th>Number of Doctorates They Awarded up to 1948</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. Stanley Hall: Johns Hopkins and Clark University</td>
<td>149 doctorates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. McKeen Cattell: Columbia University</td>
<td>344 doctorates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. W. Scripture: Yale University</td>
<td>138 doctorates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.B. Titchener: Cornell University</td>
<td>112 doctorates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Gale: Minnesota University</td>
<td>123 doctorates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.T.W. Patrick: Iowa University</td>
<td>269 doctorates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.H. Judd: University of Chicago</td>
<td>196 doctorates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these only E.B. Titchener at Cornell could be called a critic of the Wundt school of experimental psychology. The rest followed the party line: an amalgamation of Hegelian philosophy and Wundtian animal psychology.

So from the seed sown by Daniel Coit Gilman at Johns Hopkins grew the vast network of interlocking schools of education and departments of psychology that dominates education today. (my note, which was why I made you read all of this)

Memorandum Number Six:

The Troika Spreads Its Wings

Around the turn of the century The Order had made significant penetration into the educational establishment. By utilizing the power of members in strategic positions they were able to select, groom and position non-members with similar philosophy and activist traits.

In 1886 Timothy Dwight (The Order) had taken over from the last of Yale's clerical Presidents, Noah Porter. Never again was Yale to get too far from The Order. Dwight was followed by member Arthur T. Hadley ('76). Andrew Dickson White was secure as President of Cornell and alternated as U.S. Ambassador to Germany. While in Berlin, White acted as recruiting agent for The Order. Not only G. Stanley Hall came into his net, but also Richard T. Ely, founder of the American Economic Association. Daniel Gilman, as we noted in the last memorandum, was President of Johns Hopkins and used that base to introduce Wundtian psychology into U.S. education. After retirement from Johns Hopkins, Gilman became the first President of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, D.C.

The chart overleaf summarizes the achievements of this remarkable troika.

Now let's see how The Order moved into more specialized fields of education, then we need to examine how The Order fits with John Dewey, the source of modern American educational philosophy, then how The Order spread Dewey throughout the system.

Founding Of The American Economic Association

Academic associations are a means of conditioning or even policing academics. Although academics are great at talking about academic freedom, they are peculiarly susceptible to peer group pressures. And if an academic fails to get the word through his peer group, there is always the threat of not getting tenure. In other words, what is taught at University levels is passed through a sieve. The sieve is faculty conformity. In this century when faculties are larger, conformity cannot be imposed by a President. It is handled equally well through faculty tenure committees and publications committees of academic associations.
We have already noted that member Andrew Dickson White founded and was first President of the American Historical Association and therefore was able to influence the constitution and direction of the AHA.

This has generated an official history and ensured that existence of The Order is never even whispered in history books, let alone school texts.

An economic association is also of significance because it conditions how people who are not economists think about the relative merits of free enterprise and state planning. State economic planning is an essential part of State political control. Laissez faire in economics is the equivalent of individualism in politics. And just as you will never find any plaudits for the Ninth and Tenth Amendments to the Constitution in official history, neither will you find any plaudits for individual free enterprise.

The collectivist nature of present day college faculties in economics has been generated by the American Economic Association under influence of The Order. There are very few outspoken preachers of the Austrian School of Economics on American campuses today. They have been effectively weeded out. Even Ludwig von Mises, undisputed leader of the school, was unable to find a teaching post in the United States. So much for academic freedom in economics. And it speaks harshly for the pervasive, deadening, dictatorial hand of the American Economics Association. And the controlling hand, as in the American Psychological Association and the American Historical Association, traces back to The Order.

The principal founder and first Secretary of the American Economic Association was Richard T. Ely. Who was Ely?

Ely descended from Richard Ely of Plymouth, England who settled at Lyme, Connecticut in 1660. On his grandmother's side (and you have heard this before for members of The
Ely's first degree was from Dartmouth College. In 1876 he went to University of Heidelberg and received a Ph.D. in 1879. Ely then returned to the United States, but as we shall describe below, had already come to the notice of The Order.

When Ely arrived home, Daniel Gilman invited Ely to take the Chair of Political Economy at Johns Hopkins. Ely accepted at about the same time Gilman appointed G. Stanley Hall to the Chair of Philosophy and Pedagogy and William Welch, a member of The Order we have yet to describe, to be Dean of the Johns Hopkins medical school.

Fortunately, Richard Ely was an egocentric and left an autobiography, Ground Under Our Feet, which he dedicated to none other than Daniel Coit Gilman. Then on page 54 of this autobiography is the caption "I find an invaluable friend in Andrew D. White." And in Ely's first book, French And German Socialism, we find the following:

"The publication of this volume is due to the friendly counsel of the Honourable Andrew D. White, President of Cornell University, a gentleman tireless in his efforts to encourage young men and alive to every opportunity to speak fitting words of hope and cheer. Like many of the younger scholars of our country, I am indebted to him more than I can say." Ely also comments that he never could understand why he always received a welcome from the U.S. Embassy in Berlin, in fact from the Ambassador himself. But the reader has probably guessed what Ely didn't know - White was The Order's recruiter in Berlin.

Ely recalls his conversations with White, and makes a revealing comment: "I was interested in his psychology and the way he worked cleverly with Ezra Cornell and Mr. Sage, a benefactor and one of the trustees of Cornell University." The reader will remember it was Henry Sage who provided the first funds for G. Stanley Hall to study in Germany. Then Ely says, "The only explanation I can give for his special interest in me was the new ideas I had in relation to economics." And what were these new ideas? Ely rejected classical liberal economics, including free trade, and noted that free trade was "particularly obnoxious to the German school of thought by which I was so strongly impressed." In other words, just as G. Stanley Hall had adopted Hegelianism in psychology from Wundt, Ely adopted Hegelian ideas from his prime teacher Karl Knies at University of Heidelberg.

And both Americans had come to the watchful attention of The Order. The staff of the U.S. Embassy in Berlin never did appreciate why a young American student, not attached to the Embassy, was hired by Ambassador White to make a study of the Berlin City Government. That was Ely's test, and he passed it with flying colours. As he says, "It was this report which served to get me started on my way and later helped me get a teaching post at the Johns Hopkins."

The rest is history. Daniel Coit Gilman invited Richard Ely to Johns Hopkins University. From there Ely went on to head the department of economics at University of Wisconsin. Through the ability to influence choice of one's successor, Wisconsin has been a centre of statist economics down to the present day. Before we leave Richard Ely we should note that financing for projects at University of Wisconsin came directly from The Order - from member George B. Cortelyou ('13), President of New York Life Insurance Company.

Ely also tells us about his students, and was especially enthralled by Woodrow Wilson: "We knew we had in Wilson an unusual man. There could be no question that he had a brilliant future." And for those readers who are wondering if Colonel Edward Mandell House, Woodrow Wilson's mysterious confidant, is going to enter the story, the answer is Yes! He does, but not yet.
The clue is that young Edward Mandell House went to school at Hopkins Grammar School, New Haven, Connecticut. House knew The Order from school days. In fact one of House's closest classmates at Hopkins Grammar School was member Arthur Twining Hadley ('76), who went on to become President of Yale University (1899 to 1921). And it was Theodore Roosevelt who surfaced Hadley's hidden philosophy: "Years later Theodore Roosevelt would term Arthur Hadley his fellow anarchist and say that if their true views were known, they would be so misunderstood that they would both lose their jobs as President of the United States and President of Yale."  

House's novel, Philip Dru, was written in New Haven, Connecticut and in those days House was closer to the Taft segment of The Order than Woodrow Wilson. In fact House, as we shall see later, was The Order's messenger boy. House was also something of a joker because part of the story of The Order is encoded within Philip Dru!

We are not sure if The Order knows about House's little prank. It's just like House to try to slip one over on the holders of power.

American Medical Association

Your doctor knows nothing about nutrition? Ask him confidentially and he'll probably confess he had only one course in nutrition. And there's a reason. Back in the late 19th century American medicine was in a deplorable state. To the credit of the Rockefeller General Education Board and the Institute for Medical Research, funds were made available to staff teaching hospitals and to eradicate some pretty horrible diseases.

1 Morris Hadley. ARTHUR TWINING HADLEY, Yale University Press. 1948, p. 33.

On the other hand, a chemical-based medicine was introduced and the medical profession cut its ties with naturopathy. Cancer statistics tell you the rest.

For the moment we want only to note that the impetus for reorganizing medical education in the United States came from John D. Rockefeller, but the funds were channelled through a single member of The Order.

Briefly, the story is this. One day in 1912 Frederick T. Gates of Rockefeller Foundation had lunch with Abraham Flexner of Carnegie Institution. Said Gates to Flexner: "What would you do if you had one million dollars with which to make a start in reorganizing medical education in the United States?"

As reported by Fosdick, this is what happened:

"The bluntness was characteristic of Mr. Gates, but the question about the million dollars was hardly in accord with his usual indirect and cautious approach to the spending of money. Flexner's reply, however, to the effect that any funds - a million dollars or otherwise - could most profitably be spent in developing the Johns Hopkins Medical School, struck a responsive chord in Gates who was already a close friend and devoted admirer of Dr. William H. Welch, the dean of the institution." Welch was President of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research from 1901, and a Trustee of the Carnegie Institution from 1906. William H. Welch was also a member of the Order and had been brought to Johns Hopkins University by Daniel Coit Gilman.

Other Areas Of Education

We should note in conclusion other educational areas where The Order had its influence. In theology we have already noted that The Order controlled Union Theological Seminary for many years, and was strong within the Yale School of Divinity.
The constitution for UNESCO was written largely by The Order, i.e., member Archibald MacLeish. And member William Chauvenet (1840) was "largely responsible for establishing the U.S. Naval Academy on a firm scientific basis." Chauvenet was director of the Observatory, U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis from 1845 to 1859 and then went on to become Chancellor of Washington University (1869).

Finally, a point on methodology. The reader will remember from Memorandum One (Volume One) that we argued the most "general" solution to a problem in science is the most acceptable solution. In brief, a useful hypothesis is one that explains the most events. Pause a minute and reflect. We are not developing a theory that includes numerous superficially unconnected events.


For example, the founding of Johns Hopkins University, the introduction of Wundtian educational methodology, a psychologist G. Stanley Hall, an economist Richard T. Ely, a politician Woodrow Wilson – and now we have included such disparate events as Colonel Edward House and the U.S. Naval Observatory. The Order links to them all . . . and several hundred or thousand other events yet to be unfolded. In research when a theory begins to find support of this pervasive nature it suggests the work is on the right track. So let's interpose another principle of scientific methodology. How do we finally know that our hypothesis is valid? If our hypothesis is correct, then we should be able to predict not only future conduct of The Order but also events where we have yet to conduct research. This is still to come. However, the curious reader may wish to try it out. Select a major historical event and search for the guiding hand of The Order.

Memorandum Number Seven:

The Order's Objectives For Education

We can deduce The Order's objectives for education from evidence already presented and by examining the work and influence of John Dewey, the arch creator of modern educational theory. How do we do this? We first need to examine Dewey's relationship with The Order. Then compare Dewey's philosophy with Hegel and with the philosophy and objectives of modern educational practice.

These educational objectives have not, by and large, been brought about by governmental action. In fact, if the present state of education had been brought about by legislation, it would have been challenged on the grounds of unconstitutionality.

On the contrary, the philosophy and practice of today's system has been achieved by injection of massive private funds by foundations under influence, and sometimes control, of The Order. This implementation we will describe in a future volume, How The Order Controls Foundations. In fact, the history of the implementation of Dewey's objectives is also the history of the larger foundations, i.e., Ford, Carnegie, Rockefeller, Peabody, Sloan, Slater and Twentieth Century.

MY NOTE - YOU NEED TO BE AWARE OF THE FACT THAT ALL THE FOUNDATIONS ARE JUST RICH MEN'S SOCIAL ENGINEERING PROJECTS DISGUISED AS CHARITY, ADD BILL GATES, WARREN BUFFET ETC TO THAT LIST TOO, WE WILL BE COVERING MR GATES AND HIS MEGALOMANIA LATER IN THIS SECTION, AND BUFFET POPS UP IN BOOK FOUR. FOR NOW LET'S GET BACK TO S+B. - Now to get back to how John Dewey Relates To The Order

John Dewey worked for his doctorate at Johns Hopkins University from 1882-86 under Hegelian philosopher George Sylvester Morris. Morris in turn had his doctorate from University of Berlin and studied under the same teachers as Daniel Gilman, i.e., Adolph Trendelenberg and Hermann Ulrici. Neither Morris nor Dewey were members of The Order,
Gilman hired Morris, knowing full well that Hegelianism is a totally integrated body of 'knowledge and easy to recognize. It is a different from the British empirical school of John Stuart Mill as night and day. John Dewey's psychology was taken from G. Stanley Hall, the first American student to receive a doctorate from Wilhelm Wundt at University of Leipzig. Gilman knew exactly what he was getting when he hired Hall. With only a dozen faculty members, all were hired personally by the President. In brief, philosophy and psychology came to Dewey from academics hand-picked by The Order. From Johns Hopkins Dewey went as Professor of Philosophy to University of Michigan and in 1886 published Psychology, a blend of Hegelian philosophy applied to Wundtian experimental psychology. It sold well. In 1894 Dewey went to University of Chicago and in 1902 was appointed Director of the newly founded - with Rockefeller money - School of Education.

The University of Chicago itself had been founded in 1890 with Rockefeller funds - and in a future volume we will trace this through Frederick Gates (of Hartford, Connecticut), and the Pillsbury family (The Order). The University of Chicago and Columbia Teachers' College were the key training schools for modern education.

The Influence Of Dewey

Looking back at John Dewey after 80 years of his influence, he can be recognized as the pre-eminent factor in the collectivization, or Hegelianization, of American Schools. Dewey was consistently a philosopher of social change. That's why his impact has been so deep and pervasive. And it is in the work and implementation of the ideas of John Dewey that we can find the objective of The Order.

When The Order brought G. Stanley Hall from Leipzig to Johns Hopkins University, John Dewey was already there, waiting to write his doctoral dissertation on "The Psychology of Kant." Already a Hegelian in philosophy, he acquired and adapted the experimental psychology of Wundt and Hall to his concept of education for social change. To illustrate this, here's a quote from John Dewey in My Pedagogic Creed:

"The school is primarily a social institution. Education being a social process, the school is simply that form of community life in which all those agencies are concentrated that will be most effective in bringing the child to share in the inherited resources of the race, and to use his own powers for social ends. Education, therefore, is a process of living and not a preparation for future living."

What we learn from this is that Dewey's education is not child centred but State centred, because for the Hegelian, "social ends" are always State ends.

This is where the gulf of misunderstanding between modern parents and the educational system begins. Parents believe a child goes to school to learn skills to use in the adult world, but Dewey states specifically that education is "not a preparation for future living." The Dewey educational system does not accept the role of developing a child's talents but, contrarily, only to prepare the child to function as a unit in an organic whole - in blunt terms a cog in the wheel of an organic society. Whereas most Americans have moral values rooted in the individual, the values of the school system are rooted in the Hegelian concept of the State as the absolute. No wonder there is misunderstanding!

The Individual Child

When we compare Hegel, John Dewey, and today's educational thinkers and doers, we find an extraordinary similarity.

For Hegel the individual has no value except as he or she performs a function for society: "The State is the absolute reality and the individual himself has objective existence, truth and morality only in his capacity as a member of the State."
John Dewey tried to brush the freedom of the individual to one side. In an article, "Democracy and Educational Administration" (School & Society, XVL, 1937, p. 457) Dewey talks about the "lost individual," and then restates Hegel in the following way: "freedom is the participation of every mature human being in formation of the values that regulate the living of men together." This is pure Hegel, i.e., man finds freedom only in obedience to the State. As one critic, Horace M. Kallen stated, John Dewey had a "blindness to the sheer individuality of individuals."

In other words, for Dewey man has no individual rights. Man exists only to serve the State. This is directly contradictory to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution with the preamble "We the people." They then go on to define the rights of the state which are always subordinate and subject to the will of "We the people."

This, of course, is why modern educationists have great difficulty in introducing the Constitution into school work. Their ideas follow Hegel and Dewey and indirectly the objectives of The Order. For example: "An attempt should be made to redress the present overemphasis on individualism in current programs . . . students need to develop a sense of community and collective identity." (Educational Leadership, May 1982, William B. Stanley, Asst. Professor, Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction, Louisiana State University).

The Purpose Of Education

What then is the purpose of education, if the individual has no rights and exists only for the State?

There was no need for Hegel to describe education, and so far as we know there is no statement purely on education in Hegel's writings. It is unnecessary. For Hegel every quality of an individual exists only at the mercy and will of the State. This approach is reflected in political systems based on Hegel whether it be Soviet Communism or Hitlerian national socialism. John Dewey follows Hegel's organic view of society. For example:

"Education consists either in the ability to use one's powers in a social direction or else in ability to share in the experience of others and thus widen the individual consciousness to that of the race" (Lectures For The First Course In Pedagogy).

This last sentence is reminiscent of the Hitlerian philosophy of race (i.e., right Hegelianism).

And today's educators reflect this approach. Here's a quote from Assemblyman John Vasconcellos of California, who also happens to be Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education and the Education Goals Committee for the California State Assembly - a key post:

"It is now time for a new vision of ourselves, of man, of human nature and of human potential, and a new theory of politics and institutions premised upon that vision. What is that vision of Man? That the natural, whole, organismic human being is loving . . . that man's basic thrust is towards community" (quoted in Rex Myles, Brotherhood and Darkness, p. 347).

What is this "widen(ing) the individual consciousness" (Dewey) and "thrust . . . towards community" (Vasconcellos)?

Stripped of the pedantic language it is new world order, a world organic society. But there is no provision for a global organic order within the Constitution. In fact, it is illegal for any government officer or elected official to move the United States towards such an order as it would clearly be inconsistent with the Constitution. To be sure, Dewey was not a government official, but Vasconcellos has taken an oath of allegiance to the Constitution.
The popular view of a global order is probably that we had better look after our problems at home before we get involved in these esoteric ideas. Political corruption, pitifully low educational standards, and insensitive bureaucracy are probably of more concern to Americans.

It's difficult to see what the new world order has to do with education of children, but it's there in the literature. Fichte, Hegel's predecessor from whom many of his philosophical ideas originated, had a definite concept of a League of Nations (Volkerbund) and the idea of a league to enforce peace. Fichte asserted "As this federation spreads further and gradually embraces the whole earth, perpetual peace begins, the only lawful relation among states . . . ."

The National Education Association, the lobby for education, produced a program for the 1976 Bicentennial entitled "A Declaration Of Interdependence: Education For A Global Community." On page 6 of this document we find:

"We are committed to the idea of Education for Global Community. You are invited to help turn the commitment into action and mobilizing world education for development of a world community."

An objective almost parallel to Hegel is in Self Knowledge And Social Action by Obadiah Silas Harris, Associate Professor of Educational Management and Development New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico:

"When community educators say that community education takes into consideration the total individual and his total environment, they mean precisely this: the field of community education includes the individual in his total psycho-physical structure and his entire ecological climate with all its ramifications - social, political, economical, cultural, spiritual, etc. It seeks to integrate the individual within himself (sic) and within his community until the individual becomes a cosmic soul and the community the world."

And on page 84 of the same book:

"The Cosmic soul ... the whole human race is going to evolve an effective soul of its own - the cosmic soul of the race. That is the future of human evolution. As a result of the emergence of the universal soul, there will be a great unification of the entire human race, ushering into existence a new era, a new dawn of unique world power." This last quote sounds even more like Adolph Hitler than Assemblyman John Vasconcellos. It has the same blend of the occult, the ethnic and absolutism.

In conclusion we need only quote the Constitution, the basic body of law under which the United States is governed.

The generally held understanding of the Constitution on the relationship between the individual and the State is that the individual is Supreme, the State exists only to serve individuals and the State has no power except by express permission of the people.

This is guaranteed by Amendments IX and X of the Constitution. Amendment IX reads, "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the People." Note, the "retained". And, Amendment X 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."

In brief, the proposals of John Dewey and his followers are un constitutional. They would never have seen the light of day in American schoolrooms unless they had been promoted by The Order with its enormous power.
Memorandum Number Eight: Summary

Up to this point we have established the following:

(1) By the 1870s The Order had Yale University under its control. Every President of Yale since Timothy Dwight has either been a member of The Order or has family connections to The Order. It also appears that some Yale graduates who are not members of The Order will act towards objectives desired by The Order. Some of these, for example Dean Acheson, we can identify as members of Scroll & Key, or with relatives in The Order. Others yet to be brought into our discussion are members of Wolf's Head (for example, Reeve Schley, who worked for the Rockefellers). Still others, for example Robert Maynard Hutchins (Fund for the Republic), are Yale graduates but not yet identified as members of any Yale senior society. It appears at this point that Ron Rosenbaum's assertion (in Esquire, 1977), that members of the Eastern Establishment who are not members of Skull & Bones will be members of either Scroll & Key or Wolf's Head is holding up.

(2) So far as education is concerned, look-say reading originated with Thomas Gallaudet and was designed for deaf mutes. The elder Gallaudet was not a member of The Order, but his two sons (Edson and Herbert Gallaudet) were initiated in 1893 and 1898. Horace Mann, a significant influence in modern educational theory and the first promoter of "look-say," was not a member. However, Mann was President of Antioch College, and the Taft's (The Order) were the most powerful trustees of Antioch.

(3) We traced John Dewey's philosophy, that education is to prepare a person to fit into society rather than develop individual talents, to Herbart who was influenced by the Swiss Pestalozzi. Personal development cannot be achieved by developing individual talents, it must take the form of preparation to serve society, according to Herbart, Dewey and Pestalozzi. Pestalozzi was a member of the Illuminati, with the code name "Alfred." This raises new perspectives for future research, specifically whether The Order can be traced to the illuminati.

(4) The scene shifts in the late 19th century from Yale to Johns Hopkins University. Member Daniel Coit Gilman is the first President of Johns Hopkins and he has handpicked either members of The Order (Welch) or Hegelians for the new departments. G. Stanley Hall, the first of Wilhelm Wundt's American students, began the process of Americanization of Wundt, established the first experimental psychology laboratory for education in the United States with funds from Gilman, and later started the Journal Of Psychology. John Dewey was one of the first doctorates from Johns Hopkins (under Hall and Morris), followed by Woodrow Wilson, who was President of Princeton University before he became President of the United States.

We noted that at key turning points of G. Stanley Hall's career the guiding hand of The Order can be traced. Hall also links to another member of The Order, Alphonso Taft. We noted that Wilhelm Wundt's family had Illuminati connections.

(5) The Order was able to acquire all the Morrill Act land grant entitlements for New York and Connecticut for Cornell and Yale respectively. However, member Gilman ran into trouble as President of University of California on the question of the California land grants and corruption among the University regents. The first organized opposition to The Order came from the San Francisco Times, but editor Henry George was not fully aware of the nature of his target.

(6) The core of The Order's impact on education can be seen as a troika: Gilman at Johns Hopkins, White at Cornell (and U.S. Minister to Germany) and Dwight, followed by member Hadley, at Yale. Andrew White was first President of the American Historical Association. Richard T. Ely (not a member but aided by The Order) became a founder and first secretary
of the American Economic Association. Members can also be traced into such diverse areas as the U.S. Naval Observatory and the Union Theological Seminary.

(7) John Dewey, the originator of modern educational theory, took his doctorate at Johns Hopkins under Hegelians. Dewey's work is pure Hegel in theory and practice, and is totally inconsistent with the Constitution of the U.S. and rights of the individual. A comparison of German Hegelians, John Dewey and modern educational theorists demonstrates the parallelism. Children do not go to school to develop individual talents but to be prepared as units in an organic society. Experimental schools at University of Chicago and Columbia University fanned the "new education" throughout the United States.

In brief, The Order initiated and controlled education in this century by controlling its CONTENT. The content is at variance with the traditional view of education, which sees each child as unique and the school as a means of developing this uniqueness.

Criticism of the educational system today bypasses the fundamental philosophic aspect and focuses on omissions, i.e., that the kids can't read, write, spell or undertake simple mathematical exercise. If we look at the educational system through the eyes of The Order and its objectives, then the problems shift.

If teachers are not teaching basics, then what are they doing?

They appear to be preparing children for a political objective which also happens to be the objective of The Order.

The emphasis is on global living, preparing for a global society. It is apparently of no concern to the educational establishment that children can't read, can't write, and can't do elementary mathematics...but they are going to be ready for the Brave New World.

Summary Of The Order's Influence In Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution/Field</th>
<th>DIRECT (Major impact only)</th>
<th>INDIRECT (via a member of The Order)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>Gilman/Dewey/Hasley/White</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>Gilman/Welch/White</td>
<td>Hall/Ely/Dewey/Wilson/Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Hall/Dewey+foundation financial aid (Volume III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Teachers College</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Hall/Dewey+foundation financial aid (Volume III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look-say reading</td>
<td>Gallaudet (Edison and Herbert)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mann/Gallaud (Thomas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace Mann</td>
<td>Taft</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert</td>
<td>Illuminati (Penalozi i.e. &quot;Alfred&quot;)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windt</td>
<td>Gilman/Taft/White</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refer to membership at end of Memoranda #1 and #5 for lesser influences.

Memorandum Number Nine: Conclusions And Recommendations
A general conclusion is that The Order has been able to convert the educational system from one aimed at developing the individual child to one aimed at conditioning the child to be a unit in an organic, i.e., Hegelian, society.

When we look at philanthropic foundations in the next volume we shall see the way this has been implemented by private foundation funds.

There is not sufficient evidence to argue whether the decline in educational standards is an accidental byproduct of this "new education" or a deliberate subsidiary policy. In any event, the Reagan Administration policy of merit pay will compound, not solve, the problem.

Recommendations for reform have been forthcoming at intervals since the late 1950s when educational problems first surfaced. At the time of Sputnik there was a hue and cry about the backward nature of U.S. training in mathematics and science, which at the University level are not at all backward. Anyway the educational establishment recognized an opportunity and cried, "more, more money." They got it, and there was a massive expansion in the '60s. But the funds have been poured into social conditioning. Mathematics and sciences have taken back seat in the last 30 years.

Then in 1981, James S. Coleman of the University of Chicago produced a study of public schools for the U.S. Department of Education. In this study Coleman used the National Opinion Research Centre to contact 58,728 sophomores and seniors in 1,016 public, parochial, and private schools across the United States. His findings were:

• private and parochial schools provide an education closer to the common school ideal than do public schools,

• private school students learned more than public school counterparts,

• Coleman wrote it was paradoxical that "catholic schools function much closer to the American ideal of the common school . . . than do public schools."

• private schools provide "a safer, more disciplined and more ordered environment" than public schools,

• "blacks and Hispanics perform better at private schools."

The reason? Private schools are less under the influence of the Dewey educational philosophy. They still have to use accredited teachers, but these teachers - quite bluntly - have been able to survive the teacher training conditioning.

Yet the educational establishment does not see the writing on the wall.

In Fall 1983 a report by John Goodlad, Dean of the School of Education at University of Southern California, will be published. John I. Goodlad wrote the Foreword to Schooling For A Global Age (McGraw Hill, 1979) which includes these comments:

"Enlightened social engineering is required to face situations that demand global action now" (page xiii).

"Parents and the general public must be reached . . . otherwise children and youth enrolled in globally oriented programs may find themselves in conflict with values assumed in the home."

And more. Another 345 pages of globalony follows. Nothing about the child as an individual. Nothing about the child as a repository of talents that need to be encouraged.
Nothing about basic education: the 3 R's. Yet this Goodlad report is being pushed in The \textit{N Y Times} July 19, 1983 as the most "comprehensive report" ever made on American schools.

These are some Goodlad proposals:

- education should start at 4 years old • schools should be smaller
- head teachers with doctorates should have more pay.

And this does nothing, of course, to stop what a former Commissioner of Education called "a rising tide of mediocrity." If the United States is to survive in the coming technologically intensive age, then certain recommendations follow. These are:

- the function of the school is to develop individual talent. Social engineering as an objective has to be discarded.
- A thorough grounding in the 3 R's is essential for a good education. In other words, "content" is all important.
- It follows that Schools of Education should be abolished (this is under serious discussion at Duke University and has been proposed at University of Michigan and even Cal Berkeley).
- Teacher credentials should be based on subject matter entirely, not educational theory.
- All restrictions on private schools should be abolished. • Public schools should be returned to local control.

\textbf{Children have never worked so hard and learnt so little}

For all the time and money put in, the education system is fundamentally flawed.

By Charles Moore the Telegraph Published: 8:05PM GMT 11 Dec 2009

...Never in history have politicians talked more about the importance of education. Never has it been more generally agreed that the modern world is a “knowledge economy”. The famous Clause Four of the Labour Party’s constitution referred to securing for “workers by hand or by brain the full fruits of their industry”. Everyone realises that nowadays brain usually secures fuller fruits than hand.

Yet, does the average pupil end up knowing more or knowing things more deeply than, say, 50 years ago? Could the average pupil of today do long division, or speak French, or write an English paragraph, or explain the Great Reform Bill, or find Valparaiso on a map, or operate the laws of thermo-dynamics better than his or her equivalent half a century ago?

Perhaps not, the defenders of current education would say, but modern pupils know much more about saving the planet, safe sex, Eid, and challenging racism, not to mention things not even thought of in the 1950s, such as the internet. They learn more that is “relevant”. They also, modern educationalists argue, acquire more “skills”. Instead of being crammed with sterile facts, they know how to engage with a subject. They learn less mere “what”, but more “why” and “how to”.

This is not all rubbish. Looking back on my own (mostly good) education, both state and private, in the 1960s, I can see some of its deficiencies. We were not taught where history came from. It was just a series of facts and stories: no one taught me the idea of sources and evidence until I was about 15.
We learnt grammar – both Latin and English – well, but we never quite knew what grammar was. Grammar was considered so important that it gave its name to the best state schools in the country, but why was it considered so important? We were not really told. The aim of modern education to teach children to ask more questions, and not simply to stuff them with information, is surely right.

But that promise has been broken. We seem to have devised a system of curriculum and examination which pulls off the incredible double of being very hard work but very low quality. There are endless projects and modules, and endless ways of re-marking to upgrade one’s results, but no definite test of what is known and understood.

In this process, a strange thing has happened. For all the patter about diversity, education has become more hostile to things that are outside the immediate experience of the pupil. Much less pre-20th-century history or literature is taught. Fewer pupils learn foreign languages, let alone dead ones. Individual sciences have been conflated into the easier “dual science” paper. We heard this week that a quarter of primary schools never teach pupils the Lord’s Prayer, partly (presumably) because the words of a Jew who has been dead for 2,000 years are considered out of date.

Schooling is now effectively compulsory from the age of four to 18. But too often, the people who emerge from those long years have not learnt the “what” or the “how to” or the “why”. (My Note - they are turning out exactly what they set out to - robotic morons)

You can see this in the practical things of daily life. Huge numbers of drugs, it turns out, are wrongly administered in hospital because nurses have not followed the instructions precisely. No one taught them the habit of accuracy.

How many people can draft, unaided, a letter that coherently makes an argument? How many people can calculate their own tax, or work out whether they are choosing the right pension? How many people can begin to understand the legal system or argue successfully with a bureaucrat or comprehend with any accuracy what their doctor is telling them?

More important still, how can people enjoy the richness of our civilisation if no one has introduced them to its glories? It is possible to go to school now without ever learning why those large buildings in every town have plus signs on them, or to look at a pound coin and not to know why it says “D.G.REG.F.D” on it, or to catch a train at Waterloo station without knowing why it is so called.

So there you have it there are numerous rich men’s clubs seriously interfering with not only our education system but so much more as well. The last article demonstrates to you that they are getting what they want. Unquestioning docile idiots. Will you at least now begin to accept that our reality is being manipulated for reasons that have nothing to do with our welfare?

If you still need more convincing even after all that you’ve been told then read on...
Chapter Twenty Nine

THE SUBJECT OF THIS E-FILE IS FOUNDATIONS' CONTROL OF EDUCATION.

WHAT ARE FOUNDATIONS? Randall G. Holcombe in "Writing Off Ideas" said, "The business empires of Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Ford, to name a few, generated tremendous personal wealth for their owners, and they placed the bulk of their wealth into foundations... now directed by foundation trustees. They do no fundraising, but operate using the earnings from foundation assets... these assets are sufficient to underwrite millions of dollars worth of projects every year... most of the largest foundations earn enough every year that their endowments are actually increasing... Foundations... continue to undertake expenditures to further their visions of the public good."

"Governments are run by elected officials. Business firms must satisfy their customers to remain viable. Even charities that operate from donations must satisfy their donors in order to keep the donations flowing. But foundations... do not have to answer to anyone for their programs, and their income will continue regardless of the merits of the programs and projects they fund. Should foundations have to meet some higher level of accountability?"

http://fdncenter.org/research/trends_analysis/top100assets.html has financial information on tax-exempt foundations.

THE FOUNDERS AND THE SUBSEQUENT TRUSTEES of the foundations were/are not ordinary people. They have been described as "that portion of the American ruling class that is usually called the Eastern Establishment. These are the couth, polished fellows who believe in fair play and enough social change to prevent the mobs on the street from stealing their money." (Nicholas von Hoffman, quoted in 'The Colour of Truth.') Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. wrote in 1965, "...the New York financial and legal community was the heart of the American establishment... It's front organizations were the Rockefeller, Ford and Carnegie Foundations and the Council on Foreign Relations." (Iserbyt). They are business or academic elites who form "an invisible government" (Mayor John F. Hylan of New York.) They are an "interlocking and self-perpetuating group" (Wormser) that has an "unparalleled amount of power" by moving among trusteeships of one or more of the foundations, government, academia, and media. Dennis Cuddy, Ph.D. refers to his former employer, the U.S. Department of Education, as the "Carnegie Department of Education." Periodic investigations of foundations have taken place (1912, 1950s, 1960s) but are not easily done. The foundations are powerful, and they have powerful friends.

THE HISTORY OF FOUNDATIONS' INTERVENTION IN EDUCATION is well-documented in three books: "The Cloning of the American Mind" by Beverly Eakman, "The Deliberate Dumbing Down of America" by Charlotte Iserbyt, and "The Underground History of American Education" by John Taylor Gatto. The information in this E-File comes mostly from these books. They show that the foundations from their start took control of or heavily influenced American education in teacher training and certification, student testing, the accreditation of educational institutions, funding of behavioural research, organization of universities, development of curricula, writing of textbooks, writing of standards, definition of educational goals, use of psychological techniques, drafting and passage of education legislation, funding of activist groups, promotion of centralization of education in Washington, and more. The foundations understand that by controlling education, they can control society.

Other sources for this E-File are "Writing Off Ideas" by Randall G. Holcombe, "Foundations: Their Power and Influence" by Rene Wormser, and "The Colour of Truth" by Kai Bird (concerning the Ford Foundation.)

E.D. HIRSCH SUPERBLY DESCRIBED IN "THE SCHOOLS WE NEED" the educational fads that have resulted from decades of top-down, forced adoption of social engineering disguised as
education (project method, cooperative learning, etc.) Hirsch's book is recommended for anyone who wants to understand the problems with modern curriculum and teaching methods. But, Hirsch does not discuss that it is the foundations who have and continue to promote this social engineering.

SOME EDUCATION/FOUNDATION HISTORY:

1895: Rockefeller endowed the University of Chicago at which John Dewey served as head of the combined departments of philosophy, psychology and pedagogy. Rockefeller also funded a laboratory for Dewey to study psychological principles and experimental techniques of learning. Rockefeller also contributed millions to the National Committee for Mental Hygiene, the goal of which was to prevent mental illness, focusing on elementary and secondary schools. The philosophy was that "mental illness hinged on faulty personality development in childhood and that personality development should supersede all other educational objectives. Stress was seen as the chief culprit, and parents and other authority figures as the second....The primary thrust of stress-reduction was to eradicate the "reactionary" criteria of authoritarianism, in particular, self-reliance and the work ethic, in favour of peer consensus and interdependence." (Eakman)

1896-1920: "A small group of industrialists and financiers, together with their private charitable foundations, subsidized university chairs, university researchers, and school administrators, and spent more money on forced schooling than the government itself did....In this laissez-faire fashion a system of modern schooling was constructed without public participation." (Gatto).

1905: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (CFAT) was founded to define and expand the standard of professional education. Eakman said that CFAT "is the most influential Carnegie entity for education" and "is the key to a long-standing partnership with the federal government."

1913: Rockefeller Foundation set up the predecessor to General Education Board. This was to further the Foundation's stated goal of "social control". Director of Charity Frederick Gates wrote, "...In our dream, we have limitless resources, and the people yield themselves with perfect docility to our moulding hand. The present educational conventions fade from our minds; and, unhampered by tradition, we work our own good will upon a grateful and responsive folk. We shall not try to make these people or any of their children into philosophers or men of learning or science..."

1917: By this year, Gatto said, "the major administrative jobs in American schooling were under the control of "the Education Trust": representatives of Rockefeller, Carnegie, Harvard, Stanford, University of Chicago, and the National Education Association. The chief end, wrote Benjamin Kidd, was to "impose on the young the ideal of subordination." Gatto called Andrew Carnegie, J.P. Morgan, John D. Rockefeller, and Henry Ford "The Four Architects of Modern Forced Schooling" who thought that modern industry needed "workers who know nothing".

1921: Carnegie founded The Psychological Corporation, with J.McKeen Cattell as president. Cattell wrote, "...whatever else people have thought over the years that the various Carnegie organizations were contributing to education, their mission, as stated, has been "to promote the extension of applied psychology." (Eakman).

1925: Rockefeller Foundation set up The International Bureau of Education, formerly known as The Institute Jean-Jacques Rousseau, which later became part of UNESCO.

1933: Rockefeller Foundation began a comprehensive national program to allow "the control of human behaviour". Schooling would figure prominently in the design.
1933-1941: Carnegie Corporation funded the Eight-Year Study that laid the groundwork for many of the education "reforms" and innovations we are now encountering. This study was foundational to the outcome-based education of today.

1934: Carnegie Corporation funded "Conclusions and Recommendations for the Social Studies". Professor Harold Laski said: "At bottom and stripped of its carefully neutral phrases, the report is an educational program for a Socialist America." The report concluded that the educational system "must adjust its objectives, its curriculum, its methods of instruction, and its administrative procedures to the requirements of the emerging integrated order."

1944: Carnegie Corporation funded with $250,000 a study of problems of southern black Americans. A Carnegie committee reviewed applicants to perform the research, and selected Swedish socialist economist Dr. Gunnar Myrdal. He wrote "An American Dilemma", which became very influential in subsequent racial integration actions. Wormser wrote, "In "An American Dilemma", Dr. Myrdal libelled and insulted the American people unmercifully." Myrdal said Americans had a "nearly fetishistic cult of the Constitution."


1947: Rockefeller Foundation funded the creation of the Tavistock Institute for Human Relations, which joined with Kurt Lewin's Research Centre for Group Dynamics at the University of Michigan. They created techniques now used in educational and other social settings (see E-File Number Six re: Dialectical Education).

1950s: "By the mid-1950s, the term "child-centred (or student-centred) curriculum" had worked its way into American educational lexicon, thanks to one of the Carnegie Foundation's presidents, testing mogul Ralph Tyler." (Eakman) Tyler was closely associated with Louis Raths, later to team up with Sidney Simon to create "Values Clarification" in the 1970s, used to free students to form opinions about controversial or sensitive subjects independent of their parents or other authority.

1953: The Reece Committee began to investigate tax-exempt foundations. It found that Carnegie Endowment trustees had decided they should get control of education and the social sciences in the U.S. to prevent a return to the way of U.S. life before the war (decentralized, individualistic, family-centred.)

1955: Rockefeller Foundation funded Marcuse's "Eros and Civilization", which "became the founding document of the sixties counterculture. It was pressed into the hands of student anti-war activists, bringing the Frankfurt School's messianic revolutionary mission to all the American colleges and universities, beginning with Columbia's Teachers' College...Although the Frankfurt School/Institute for Social Research started with Comintern support, over the next 30 years it obtained funding from, among others, the Rockefeller Foundation." (Eakman) (see E-File Number Six re: Frankfurt School).

1958: Wormser wrote his book about his findings as general counsel to the Reece Committee. He said that foundation grants had become so important that college and university presidents couldn't "afford to ignore the opinions and wishes of the executives who distribute foundation largess." Much research depended on the support by grants. Foundations could control what research was done through the selection of grantees and the rejection or approval of suggested subjects and methods of research. Wormser found the foundation/government "interlock" made it impossible to criticize the foundations without being distorted, slanted, discredited and ridiculed by the media.

1964: Carnegie Corporation appointed Ralph Tyler chair of the Committee on Assessing the Progress of Education, which became in 1969 the National Assessment of Educational
Progress (NAEP). Now funded by the federal government, NAEP, which "tracks conformity to government-generated goals" (Iserbyt), is widely used in the U.S.

1965: Carnegie Corporation and Ford Foundation awarded a grant to Terry Sanford, ex-governor of N. Carolina, to create a new venture in "cooperative federalism". This became the Education Commission of the States (ECS). The purpose was to bring "some degree of order out of this chaos" (referring to education policy-making in the states).

1965: Eakman noted: "Francis Keppel, another Carnegie Foundation president, author of 'The Necessary Revolution in American Education', documented the Carnegie Foundation's role in creating, writing and passing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), the mother of all boondoggles which was again reauthorized by Congress in 1994." (Eakman) The legislation was written primarily to be indefinitely expandable. ESEA brought in education labs, early childhood education, social workers and child psychiatrists in schools, data collection, community education, bilingual education, ethnic heritage programs, etc.

1966: McGeorge Bundy became president of the Ford Foundation, "determined to use Ford's $3.7 billion in assets to leverage change in America". He had $200 million a year to give to whomever he wished. Between '66 and '79, he spent much on long-established civil rights organizations such as NAACP and SLCC, but also funded groups promoting black nationalism. Bundy was inspired by the Carnegie-funded Gunnar Myrdal study. (Bird).

1968: Ford Foundation gave over $500,000 to the Southwest Council of La Raza, $2.2 million for the Mexican-American Legal Defence and Education Fund (MALDEF), and a grant to the Mexican American Youth Organization (MAYO). The president of MAYO, Jose Angel Gutierrez, gave speeches criticizing "gringos" and advocating eliminating their influence by killing them if necessary. Members of MAYO frequently went to Cuba, and disseminated pro-Castro propaganda to Mexican-Americans back home.

1968: Carnegie Corporation financed controversial textbooks in Project Read for culturally-deprived areas, produced by Behavioural Research Laboratories in Palo Alto, California. These inflammatory (excuse the pun) books contained phonics lessons in which a picture depicted a burning torch touching a porch. A student was to note how "torch" rhymed with "porch" (one example of several). Critics feared that children would be indoctrinated in anti-social ideas.

1968: Ford Foundation funded "Agenda For the Nation", which recommended replacing the high school diploma with a Certificate of Mastery, implementation of outcome-based education, etc. It was a forerunner of the later National Centre of Education and the Economy and SCANS, the restructuring of the economy and education to the German and Soviet-style School-to-Work model (see E-File Number One.)

1969: By this year, Bird wrote, "Bundy was clearly putting Ford money into the pockets of people who described themselves as social activists, progressives and agents of radical change." Holcombe wrote: "The Ford Foundation also supported the National Student Association (NSA), which was not in fact an association of students at all but an interest group that confronted faculty and students in an attempt to change campus policies. Through the NSA, the Ford Foundation financed the campus rebellion that was a visible part of 1960s social activism." Jeffrey Hart, quoted by Holcombe, said that the Ford Foundation supported those "who spouted the most extreme rhetoric, who presented the most exotic appearance, who were foundations of anti-white racism..."

1969: NAEP was initiated. It collected background information from students, teachers and administrators. It called for the periodic assessment of students at ages 9, 11, 13 and 17, in the subject areas of reading, writing, math, science, citizenship, U.S. history, geography, social studies, art, music, literature, computers, and career/occupational development.
1976-1980: Rockefeller Foundation and others supported the "community schools" project, which laid out "still another plan for a vastly larger role in education on the part of the federal government, including regional and county health system working with local education agencies...replacing parents as primary caregivers and doling out expensive social services to entire families, including health clinic services, managed care, case management services for at risk, screening for medical, personality, mental counselling and treatment, rehabilitation services, home visitations to assess parenting skills, and expanded special education services for all kids." (Eakman)

1979: Rockefeller Foundation with others funded a series of four books written by John Goodlad in which he proposed a program in which all students take a core curriculum until age 16, then graduates, then enters a new 4th phase of education which would combine work, study and community service. The books were provided to all 50 state school superintendents. Iserbyt said, "This provides an accurate picture of the role played by the tax-exempt foundations and the federal government in the restructuring/social engineering of American society and schools to accommodate the perceived needs of the 21st century."

1981: The president of the Rockefeller Foundation and many church, business, university, media, union, NGO, and government leaders took part in The President's Task Force on Private Sector Initiatives. It was created to make partnerships between the public and private sector. Iserbyt writes, "This totally new and un-American concept of partnerships has been readily accepted by our elected officials who ignore its roots in socialism and its implications for the discontinuation of our representative form of government and accountability to the taxpayers. Under the "partnership" process determining responsibility when something goes wrong is like pinning Jello to the wall."

1983: Educational Testing Service took over the contract of administering NAEP. This gave Carnegie Corporation and Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching control over the direction and content of American education as a whole, and individual state education policy making in particular.

1985: Carnegie Corporation negotiated education agreements with the Soviet Academy of Science. These produced an agreement to exchange computer specialists involved in the improvement of elementary and secondary education. This was a first step toward cooperation among educational reformers from a number of countries, including Britain and Japan. (More U.S./U.S.S.R. agreements were signed in 1989).

1985: Carnegie Corporation created the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, a multi-million dollar initiative designed to help chart U.S. education policy during the next ten years. It became the NCEE, future promoter of School-to-Work (see E-File Number One).

1986: Carnegie Corporation awarded two major grants, totalling nearly $900,000 to forward the recommendations of the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. This solidified the methodology which teachers would be required to use in order to obtain board certification. It also developed assessments for use in the future. Task Force members included officials from business, unions, and government.

1988: A seminar on the federal role in education was held at the Aspen Institute. Sponsored by Carnegie Corporation, Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Brothers Foundation, Hewlitt Foundation, and The Primerica Foundation, it reviewed research provided by the Carnegie-funded NCEE and the Office of Educational Research and Improvement of the USDOE. Participants discussed the transformation of the American economy, skill trends in employment by occupation, what students need to learn, who should learn, when they should learn, how the skills should be taught, the structure of industries, human capital supply and demand, and the federal role in education and the economy.

1989: Rockefeller Foundation, Sieman's Corporation, and Merrill Lynch funded The New American Schools Development Corporation, which presented a report to the Governors'
Conference with the suggestion that big business should foot the bill to fund 6,000 new American schools. At this conference, governors put together task forces to make sure that the national goals 2000 agenda would be promoted in their states.

1990: Carnegie Corporation, Control Data Corporation, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, American Express Foundation, ARCO Foundation, and BellSouth Foundation funded the creation of a “Road Map” for restructuring state education systems. This was performed by the Carnegie-and Ford-funded Education Commission of the States (ECS) and the National Governors’ Association, and included many STW features.

1990: Carnegie Corporation's David Hornbeck delivered a paper called "Technology and Students at Risk of School Failure." It promoted goals such as the use of technology, integration of knowledge, performance-based assessments, rewards and sanctions, and involvement of corporations in education. Hornbeck said The Business Roundtable has vital interest in American public education.

1991: Secretary of Education Lamar Alexander, under President Bush (Sr.), wrote America 2000 Plan", designed to implement Carnegie Corporation's restructuring agenda. This promoted the idea of a year round, 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. school, for children 3 months to 18 years.

1992: Rockefeller Foundation, Lauder Foundation, Exxon Education Foundation, Karen and Tucker Anderson, and Chase Manhattan Bank funded the Centre for Educational Innovation, a project of the Manhattan Institute for Policy Research. This developed ideas on choice in education, including vouchers.

HOW CAN WE WREST CONTROL FROM UNACCOUNTABLE FOUNDATIONS?

CHARLOTTE ISERBYT says that because all the massive school "reforms" like School-to-Work emanate from Washington, it is imperative to eliminate the U.S. Department of Education. She says if we don't do this, we might as well kiss our children's and grandchildren's freedom good-bye. (As a former USDOE insider, she should know. See www.deliberatedumbingdown.com).

BEVERLY EAKMAN has written on how to avoid being manipulated by education bureaucrats. She has also helped write legislation used in several states. Find these on her website www.BeverlyE.com.

JOHN TAYLOR GATTO suggests the approach of UC Berkeley '60s radical Mario Savio: "There is a time when the operation of the machine becomes so odious, makes you so sick at heart that you can't take part; you can't even passively take part, and you've got to put your bodies upon the gears and upon the wheels, upon the levers, upon all the apparatus and you've got to make it stop. And you've got to indicate to the people who own it that unless you are free the machine will be prevented from working at all."

(For all we know, Savio may have been backed by Rockefeller or Ford money to create social chaos, but the sentiment fits.) Gatto also advises creating a public debate about the purpose of education so that elites do not continue to set the agenda for public schooling.

ADDITIONAL ADVICE THE E-FILER WILL ADD is to seek out schools, colleges, organizations and media that have as little as possible to do with the foundations/government/industrial/media complex. This may mean they will be cash-poor, but at least they will be independent. Everyone should, as the proverb goes, beware of Greeks bearing gifts. Homeschool your children if no local schools will give them the education you would like them to receive.

MONITOR AND PROTEST LEGISLATION. There is always state and federal education legislation that implements bits and pieces of the whole School-to-Work/Community Schools/Lifelong Learning scheme that the daily newspaper and 6 o'clock news fail to report.
FINALLY, keep track of what the foundations are funding. This will help you discern which innovations are not of authentic local origin.

THE TRUTH IS OUT THERE. The E-Files Susan O'Donnell efiler@pacbell.net

We have covered the Rockefeller's in more detail than the other foundations up to this point so let's do some catching up with the others; we'll start with Mr Ford.

FOUNDATIONS AND A CLOSE LOOK AT FORD

By Dennis L. Cuddy, Ph.D. April 21, 2008 NewsWithViews.com

As I've written before, the power elite wants a World Socialist Government, and many of the health-care proposals over the past decade would move us closer and closer to socialized medicine. According to a Harvard School of Public Health (HSPH) February 14, 2008 press release, a survey showed 70 percent of Democrats believe we would be better off with socialized medicine. And the HSPH reported that "socialized medicine is not the scary bogeyman that it used to be." In addition to the RWJF, other major foundations have played important roles in shaping our future. In Rene Wormser's FOUNDATIONS: THEIR POWER AND INFLUENCE (1958), there is a section titled "Foundation-Promoted 'Globalism'," in which he refers to the Carnegie Endowment, Rockefeller Foundation, Rhodes Scholarship Trust, and Ford Foundation.

More recently (May 1, 2007), Phil Kent's FOUNDATIONS OF THE TRAIL: HOW THE LIBERAL SUPER-RICH UNDERMINE AMERICA was published and describes how Rockefeller, Carnegie and other foundations act as an invisible government moving us toward a world government. And globalist foundation activities do not stop at national borders, as powerful European foundations are currently promoting the Yukon to Yellowstone wildlife corridor involving growth-management projects that will mean rules and regulations regarding how people can and cannot use their own property.

In past columns I've written about Rhodes, Rockefeller and Carnegie, but this article will take a close look at the Ford Foundation, which was founded in 1936. In that same year, Dyke Brown, who would become the Foundation's first vice-president, became a Rhodes Scholar (named for Cecil Rhodes who formed a secret society 'to take the government of the whole world'). Brown would help to write "The Gaither Report," named for Ford Foundation president H. Rowan Gaither, who in 1953 told Norman Dodd (staff director of the Congressional Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations) that at the executive level of the Foundation they were operating under directives from the White House "the substance (of which) was to the effect that we should make every effort to so alter life in the United States as to make possible a comfortable merger with the Soviet Union."

Another Rhodes Scholar, Don Price (who would author AMERICA'S UNWRITTEN CONSTITUTION), would be Foundation vice-president from 1954-1958. Price would then be, from 1961-1971, a trustee of the Rand Corporation, which had H. Rowan Gaither as its chairman from 1948 until 1961 when Gaither died.

During this same period, from 1951-1954, Robert Hutchins was associate director of the Ford Foundation, as it gave 15 million dollars to set up the leftist Fund for the Republic (Hutchins would be chief executive of the Fund from 1954-1974 and its president from 1975-1977). Two years before 1951, Hutchins, along with G. A. Borgese and Walter T. Paepcke, founded the Aspen Institute for Humanist Studies (which has received major funding from the Ford Foundation) in 1949. Then, in 1951, the Ford Foundation created the leftist Fund for the Advancement of Education, which assisted Mortimer Adler (who was taught philosophy at Columbia University by John Dewey, and who had supported the concept of a World Socialist Government). In June 1952, Adler announced plans to found the leftist Institute for Philosophical Research, which has received grants from the Ford Foundation. And in 1953, Hutchins (who as president of the University of Chicago had
brought Adler there) authored CONFLICT IN EDUCATION IN A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY, in which he stated, “I am in favour of world government.”

That Hutchins supported world government had already been apparent from the University of Chicago Press’s 1948 publication of PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF A WORLD CONSTITUTION while Hutchins was chancellor of the University. It was produced by Hutchins, Mortimer Adler, Rexford Tugwell, and others, and advocated regional federation on the way toward the world federation of government. One commentator said the draft “does not contain a single paragraph that would run counter to socialism.” The “constitution’s” preamble contained the words “the governments of the nations have decided to order their separate sovereignties in one government of justice to which they surrender their arms; and to establish, as they do establish, this constitution as the covenant and fundamental law of the Federal Republic of the World.” The “constitution” itself also provided the world government with sweeping powers such as “the appropriation, under the right of eminent domain, of such private or public property as may be necessary for federal use.”

The same year as Ford Foundation’s president Gaither’s statement (quoted above) was made to Norman Dodd (1953), the Foundation established the Centre for the Advanced Study in the Behavioural Sciences (which would receive 6 million dollars from the Foundation in 1969) with Dr. Ralph Tyler as its first director (Tyler has said “the real purpose of education is... to bring about significant changes in the student’s pattern or behaviour,” and he served as the Centre’s director until 1967, and was also chairman of the Carnegie Corporation’s Committee on Assessing the Progress of Education, which would become the National Assessment of Educational Progress, NAEP). Also in 1953, John J. McCloy (Council on Foreign Relations Chairman 1953-1970) would become chairman of the Ford Foundation until 1965, and in 1956 said, “In my view we must be ready to consider the most far-reaching proposals, including those for total disarmament, universal, enforceable and complete with international inspection.”

In January of 1957, Dennis Healey (who would be Britain's Labour Minister of Defence 1964-1970) and others decided to set up a strategic think-tank. Healey had met Shepherd Stone, head of the social and political part of the Ford Foundation at a meeting of the Bilderberg group in Fiuggi, Italy, and Stone was interested in the idea. By the end of 1958, the think-tank, the Institute for Strategic Studies, had begun its work with the Ford Foundation contributing $150,000 over three years. By 1958, the Ford Foundation had also initiated grants in its programs in the behavioural sciences and mental health totalling over $21 million. The next year, the Foundation encouraged Mrs. J. Dickerman Hollister to found the syncretistic Temple of Understanding (the original idea for the temple was Mrs. Hollister’s, but the name for the temple was suggested by Mrs. Ellsworth Bunker, wife of the American ambassador to India). In 1960, the Temple was founded with partial funding by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

The next year (1961), Terrell Bell (future U.S. Secretary of Education who would support a proposal that would put Outcome-based Education in all schools) received his doctorate as a Ford Foundation fellow. The Ford Foundation would also support the Institute for Educational Leadership founded in 1964. That same year, the Committee on Assessing the Progress of Education, mentioned earlier, began its work and was funded by the Ford Foundation along with the Carnegie Corporation (they both financed ECAPE, Exploratory Committee on Assessing the Progress of Education, beginning in 1966). Also, in 1964, SIECUS (Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S.), which has supported the use of pornography, began to receive major funding from the Ford Foundation (which would also fund Catholics for a Free Choice and provide major funding for Planned Parenthood).

In 1965, the Centre for the Study of Democratic Institutions (CSDI) authored A CONSTITUTION FOR THE WORLD. The “constitution” was published by the Fund for the Republic (set up by the Ford Foundation), which had established the CSDI in 1959. And the CSDI also published a “modern” constitution for the U.S. in 1970. McGeorge Bundy (member of Skull & Bones, the CFR, and special assistant for National Security Affairs to

In 1968, Paul Ehrlich's POPULATION BOMB, financed by the Ford Foundation and advocating population control, was published (in fiscal 1982 alone, the Ford Foundation spent 10.2 million dollars on population control). In this same year (1968), the Centre for Educational Research and Innovation was created by the OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) with the help of grants from the Ford Foundation and the Royal Dutch/Shell group of companies. The Centre would print ALTERNATIVE EDUCATIONAL FUTURES IN THE UNITED STATES AND IN EUROPE (1972) in which New Age networker Willis Harman (Stanford University Research Institute, Planetarian Citizens, and the Institute of Noetic Sciences) would assert: “It is not enough to be intellectually aware that at this point in history nationalism is a suicidal course…. Educational experiences must be contemplated which are akin to psychotherapy... that result in a felt realization of the inevitability of one inseparable world, and a felt shift in the most basic values and premises on which one builds one’s life. In a sense this means bringing something like ‘person-changing technology’ into the educational system (e.g., meditation, hypnosis, sensitivity training, psychodrama, yoga, etc.).”

Another “values-changing” leader supported by the Ford Foundation was Abraham Maslow, father of Third Force Humanistic Psychology (and a founder of the Association of Humanistic Psychology in 1962). In the second edition of Maslow’s TOWARD A PSYCHOLOGY OF BEING (1968, with a single left eye on the cover), he said: “I wish to acknowledge the fellowship given me by the Ford Foundation’s Fund for the Advancement of Education.” The Foundation’s fellowship was for a year to reflect upon and write about humanistic education, some of the results of which Maslow had published in “Some Educational Implications of the Humanistic Psychologies” (HARVARD EDUCATIONAL REVIEW, Fall 1968). The next year, PACE magazine (December 1969) published an interview with Maslow (president of the American Psychological Association at the time) in which he pronounced: “Young people are looking for the kind of certainties that the religions and traditions used to give them. Now the religions have cracked up, the traditions have cracked up. It is not only God is Dead but Marx is Dead and Freud and Dead and Darwin is Dead. They have no sources of values to go by. So they have to work everything out for themselves. This new humanistic revolution has an alternative source of values.”

The next year, on June 8, 1970, Maslow died, and about the same time, NEW DIRECTIONS IN TEACHING (Volume 2, Number 2, 1970) printed his “Humanistic Education Vs. Professional Education: Further Comments” (reprinted in THE JOURNAL OF HUMANISTIC PSYCHOLOGY, Summer 1979). In the article, he described a seminar which was “an especially important learning experience for me because I had just completed a year-long fellowship grant given me by the Fund for the Advancement of Education of the Ford Foundation,” and he further stated: “I should point out that this challenging of authority is also having some effects that I consider beneficial. My students today, when I compare them with those of twenty-five years ago, are less nationalistic and more internationalistic... much less accepting of outworn institutions, etc.... a more mature person giving up childish ways of thinking in absolutes....”

Late in 1968 (November 28), THE HOUSTON TRIBUNE published Alice Widener's article “Ford Foundation Politics,” quoting United Federation of Teachers president Albert Shanker as saying that the Ford Foundation “is investing heavily in every major organization that has influence over the educational policies of the city (New York). That fact should cause concern for all of us. Why are they doing it? They are doing it to influence the educational policies of the city.” On the same day, THE WANDERER published Edith Kermit Roosevelt's nationally-syndicated column “Government Within A Government,” in which she related that
Albert Shanker has charged that “a very substantial number” of members of the New York board of education “are in such great debt to the Ford Foundation that they cannot act independently.” Roosevelt also indicated that Shanker said that the Foundation ought to be treated as a “political lobby” and should lose its tax-exempt status and be “required to fully disclose the extent” of its “activities in this field.” Actually, according William H. McIlhany II, in THE TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS (1980): “The blatant partisanship of the groups for which Ford has provided the bulk of support since 1970 was so overwhelming that for one month in that year the I.R.S. was embarrassed into removing the Foundation’s tax-exempt status, but the bureaucratic pressures for its restoration were either too powerful or tempting to the service.”

In the March 31, 1969 edition of THE OREGONIAN is an article, “Students Rate Revolution as Primary Task,” in which Michael Klonsky, executive secretary of the radical Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), is reported to have said, “Our primary task is to build a Marxist-Leninist movement.” The relevance of this statement is that according to the February 25, 1971, “SDS Infiltrator Talks,” in THE VALLEY TIMES, David Gumaer was a former undercover police intelligence agent who had participated in SDS demonstrations and said he had “wondered where the money was coming from for all this activity, and soon discovered it came from radicals via the United Nations, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation, United Auto Workers, as well as cigar boxes of American money from the Cuban embassy.” What he asserted was basically confirmed by James Kirk, who while a student at the University of Chicago, had on behalf of the FBI become active in SDS, the Communist Party and other groups, and in 1970 testified before the House and Senate Internal Security Committees as follows: "Young people... have no idea that they are playing into the hands of the Establishment they claim to hate. The radicals think they're fighting the forces of the super-rich, like Rockefeller and Ford, and don't realize it is precisely such forces that are behind their own revolution, financing it, and using it for their own purposes.”

The power elite one-worlders believe that more, not less, government is the solution to the world’s problems, and in 1969 the Ford Foundation published a “think piece” titled PLANNING AND PARTICIPATION, in which Ford’s National Affairs Division director Mitchell Sviridoff told the American Institute of Planners: “The times do not call for shrinkage of the responsibilities or powers of government.... The world is too complex for an abatement of government powers. If anything, the role of government must be strengthened.” Sviridoff continued in the Foundation’s THE FORD FOUNDATION AND NATIONAL AFFAIRS (1971): “Our third main goal: strengthening the capacity of government.... The fact is that the Ford Foundation and many others collaborate closely with government, especially in Washington. Very often federal agencies look to foundations to break new ground before the government is willing to embark on a collaborative effort.” Efforts like these facilitated the public-private partnerships we see today as part of the power elite’s plan.

During this same period, the Ford Foundation received Bulgarian scientist Dr. Georgi Lozanov to explain his “suggestology” method, which draws from various specialties such as Raja Yoga, music, sleep-learning, physiology, hypnosis, autogenics, parapsychology and drama. It is essentially “applied” altered states of consciousness for various purposes. According to Sheila Ostrander and Lynn Schroeder in SUPERLEARNING (1979), the two authors had met Lozanov in the Institute of Suggestology and Parapsychology in Bulgaria in 1968, and they wrote: “We had scarcely gotten back to America, when suddenly in 1969, though few Bulgarians were permitted to travel to the West, Dr. Lozanov arrived in New York.... Something was certainly working for him. On this and subsequent visits he made to America, we reviewed numerous films on suggestopedia and suggestology, read his thesis and many of his other publications, and saw the presentations for UNESCO and the Ford Foundation.”

Internationally, from 1969 to 1977, the Ford Foundation provided a grant for the publication of PUBLIC PAPERS OF THE SECRETARIES-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS,
including those of U Thant talking about “the myth of the absolute sovereign state” and “world citizens as they work steadfastly to usher in the new world order.” Earlier it was mentioned that an official of the Ford Foundation had attended a Bilderberg Group meeting, but even more than that, the Ford Foundation (and the Rockefeller Foundation) paid all the expenses for the Bilderberg meeting at Woodstock, Vermont in 1971. The next year, on July 23-24, 1972, Ford Foundation president McGeorge Bundy attended a 17-person planning group meeting at David Rockefeller's estate for the establishment of the Trilateral Commission. And in January-February 1973, a formal funding proposal was submitted to the Ford Foundation by Trilateral Commission representatives “to support a major share of the intellectual and research aspect of the Commission’s work and some of the administrative ‘selling’ aspects.” The result was that between June 30, 1974, and June 30, 1976, the Ford Foundation gave the Trilateral Commission $500,000.

There was a growing concern during the next decades (1980s) that American students' basic skills were lacking and that this would impact negatively upon the future workforce. Thomas Sticht had conducted major research on reading for the Ford Foundation (and the U.S. Army), and according to Lawrence Feinberg in THE WASHINGTON POST (August 17, 1987), Sticht along with David Harman said what may be crucial in the U.S. is the dependability of the labour force and how well it can be managed and trained, not its general education level although a small cadre of highly educated creative people is essential to growth.

The same year (1987), the Ford Foundation (and the Rockefeller and Exxon Foundations) financed “The United States Prepares for its Future: Global Perspectives in Education, Report of the Study Commission on Global Education,” printed by Global Perspectives in Education (GPE, name later changed to the American Forum for Global Education). In the Foreword to the Report, New Age networker Harlan Cleveland (Rhodes Scholar, C.F.R. member and with the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies) wrote: “A dozen years ago... teaching and learning ‘in global perspective’ was still exotic doctrine, threatening the orthodoxies of those who still thought of American citizenship as an amalgam of American history, American geography, American lifestyles and American ideas.... It now seems almost conventional to speak of American citizenship in the same breath with international interdependence... and the planetary environment.”

At the beginning of the 1990s, A WORLD IN NEED OF LEADERSHIP: TOMORROW’S UNITED NATIONS (1990) by Erskine Childers and Brian Urquhart was published. It was a study made possible by the Dag Hammarskjold Foundation and by the Ford Foundation, where Urquhart had been a scholar-in-residence since January 1986 after forty years with the U.N., where he had served as chief aide to the 5 Secretaries-General and director of many “peacekeeping” operations (Urquhart's parents were Fabian Socialists and committed internationalists, and Fabian Arnold Toynbee who supported Cecil Rhodes' world government efforts was a family friend).

Then in 1992, the Commission on Global Governance was established with Urquhart as a member. The Ford Foundation (along with the Carnegie Corporation, MacArthur Foundation and others) provided support for the work of the Commission, which in 1995 produced a report, “Our Global Neighbourhood,” that included the following words: “A new world order must be organized.... Nations have to accept that in certain fields, sovereignty has to be exercised collectively.... We strongly endorse community initiatives to... encourage the disarming of citizens. Acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court should surely be a condition for membership in the United Nations.... We are... in need of a mobilizing principle.... That principle could well be global governance, a genuine internationalism, a new world order that secures the ascendancy of global neighbourhood values over divisive nationalism.”

In 1993, the Ford Foundation provided funding for a study titled “Financing an Effective United Nations.” The study was led by Paul Volcker (CFR board member, Trilateralist, and former chairman of the Federal Reserve) and Shijuro Ogata (Trilateralist) of Japan, and it
stressed the importance of the U.N. and noted others’ recommendations that the U.N. be given the authority to tax certain international activities. The Ford Foundation in 1996 sponsored a major study on the “United Nations in its Second Half-Century.”

One of the specific organizations promoting “global governance” and a “genuine internationalism” which has been funded by the Ford Foundation (and Carnegie Corporation, Rockefeller Foundation, etc.) is Parliamentarians for Global Action (formerly Parliamentarians for World Order) with members like former Congressman Jim Leach. This organization supports such things as world-wide demilitarization and an International Criminal Court along with U.N. peacekeeping efforts.

In addition, the Ford Foundation has increasingly funded what has come to be called “political correctness.” A number of examples of this have been revealed in Evan Gahr’s “Paymasters of the PC Brigades” (THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, January 27, 1995). For example, Mariam Chamberlain, a former program officer of the Ford Foundation, estimated that Ford had donated $24 million to women’s studies projects from 1972-1992. In 1990 the Foundation launched its “Campus Diversity Project,” with “diversity panel” members like University of Wisconsin Chancellor Donna Shalala (former Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services) soliciting proposals to further campus diversity. By 1992, over $4 million in grants had been made with Ford promising $8 million more over the next five years. The $6 billion Ford Foundation also provided the University of Iowa with the funds for a multicultural reader for a mandatory rhetoric class which has included “Good-bye, Sexist Pig—Say Hello to the New Old Boy.”

Gahr related that University of Washington Prof. Johnella Butler, project director for several Ford Foundation grants, “finds curriculum transformation daunting. In an essay collection titled ‘Transforming the Curriculum: Ethnic Studies and Women’s Studies,’ Prof. Butler and co-editor John Walter write, ‘We are only beginning to undo the effects of the distortions set in motion 500 years ago when Columbus brought massacre and the most brutal form of slavery known to these shores, all in the interest of spreading “Western Civilization” with all its long-lasting assumptions of racial, cultural and male superiority.’... Outside the ivory tower, many organizations beating the drum for feminist thought receive ample foundation funding. The National Council for Research on Women, which has spearheaded curriculum transformation efforts, received $35,000 from the Rockefeller Foundation in 1972, and $300,000 from the Ford Foundation in 1993.... In other curriculum transformation efforts, Ford designates a ‘point woman’ to dole out the goodies Myrna Goldenberg, coordinator of woman’s studies at Montgomery College in Rockville, MD and project director for a $280,000 Ford Foundation grant to ‘mainstream the scholarship of women into the curriculum.’ She explains that more than individual courses are at stake. It’s ‘not add a woman and stir kind of stuff. We’re hoping for a transformation in how people evaluate and perceive subjects.’ Ms. Goldenberg, whose class syllabus always includes the ‘I am in the world to change the world,’ awarded the money to two Indian tribal and twelve community colleges.... Ms. Goldenberg’s vision fits Ford’s. Program officer Edgar Beckham has expounded the group-think mentality behind Ford’s diversity initiative: ‘Recruiting minorities, including minority issues classes, etc. is not enough. This isn’t about numbers. It’s about a new consciousness of group identities,’ he said in 1992 according to the University of Washington’s faculty newspaper. ‘It’s a myth that all Americans share the same culture. What we share are the terms of discourse. We should be teaching students how to understand difference and negotiate difference. We do a good job of that on an individual level, but not on a group level. The Ford Foundation wants to encourage colleges to use their environments as a laboratory for inquiring into this complex area of life.... After all, we’ve had a mono-cultural university for almost 800 years; the foundation wants to act as an accelerant in a process that’s long overdue.’” Apparently, the Ford Foundation is intent upon shaping our future in a “politically correct” manner.

In a pointed criticism of the foundation’s sponsorship of “political correctness,” Charles Sykes and K.L. Billingsley wrote “Multicultural Mafia” in the October 1992 edition of
HETEROODY, in which they stated: “The Pasadena Doubletree is an unlikely site for a conspiracy.... The dozens of scholars from campuses all over the country who met here late last month did not look like revolutionaries. But behind closed doors of the meeting rooms, the conference on ‘Cultural Diversity Enhancement’ had the tone of one of those ‘by any means necessary’ conventions staged by the SDS in the late 1960s. The subject was how to turn American higher education inside out. It was sponsored by the Ford Foundation, whose strategy for a radical transformation of the university one critic has called ‘the academic equivalent of an ethnic cleansing’.

The authors related that Henry Ford II resigned from the Foundation in disgust in 1977, and they noted that in talking to Mr. Ford, former Treasury Secretary William Simon indicated that by the late 1960s the Foundation was “engaged in a radical assault on traditional culture under the rubric of the ‘public interest’ and ‘systematic social change’.” Sykes and Billingsley went on to say that the Foundation gave politicized grants to such organizations as the Urban Institute ($3.5 million which it used to produce a 26-volume critique of Reagan Administration welfare policies) and the ACLU Foundation. The authors continued: “By the early 80s, Ford... saw that the university could be (that is, could be made to be) the battleground for an apocalyptic effort to force multiculturalism into the intellectual life of the nation. And this became one of the Foundation’s chief ends.... It was essentially a matter of using lucrative grants to bribe (university) administrators into making the desired changes. Ford is able to function as an invisible government in a field like education.... There is a phrase to describe the basis of the Ford Foundation’s meddling in higher education: the arrogance of power. The architects of its assault on higher education are armchair radicals creating a revolution from above.... But like other revolutions this one does not think in terms of serving informed consumers weighing the pros and cons of its products, but only of imposing its whims on passive victims who must buy whether they like it or not.”

The Foundation’s indirect connection to the “shaping” of education at the pre-college level can be seen in its founding (along with others like the El Pomar Foundation, which provided James Dobson with $5 million to move “Focus on the Family” from California to Colorado) of the Centre for the New West. The Centre (founded in 1988 and formerly called The Western States Strategy Centre) in 1992 submitted the New West Learning Centre Design Team’s proposal to the New American Schools Development Corporation. The team’s advisors included Kenneth Boulding and John Naisbitt (MEGATRENDS author), and the proposal called for lifelong learning as well as the use of William Spady’s Transformational Outcome-Based Educational Methods (Spady was a team member). The proposal also indicated that the Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory (where leftist Shirley McCune was located) “will help us in design, finance and governance changes and dissemination.” Prior to this, the Centre for the New West had held a $325 per head conference to introduce NAFTA to the Denver business community, including promotional speeches by Mexican President Carlos Salinas and Robert O. Anderson, former chairman of ARCO and the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies. Anderson, working with Joseph E. Slater (formerly of the Ford Foundation) who became president of the Aspen Institute in 1969, made that humanistic institution what it is today.

Today, with international trade (e.g., NAFTA, GATT) moving us ever closer to the New World Order, it was inevitable that the Ford Foundation would be involved in this enterprise, too. Late in 19th century, Cecil Rhodes established a secret society with the eventual goal being “to take the government of the whole world.” As part of Rhodes’ plan, semi-secret Round Table Groups were formed (1908-1913) after his death, and they established in England the Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA), which would have the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) as its counterpart in the U.S. And on the “Contents” page of the RIIA’s INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS for April 1996, it stated: “This edition of INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS arose out of a collaborative project on trade policy between the International Economics Programme at the Royal Institute of International Affairs and the Council on Foreign Relations in New York, funded by the Ford Foundation.” This edition contains such essays as
“The New Trade Agenda: Universal Rules Amid Cultural Diversity” and “Russia on the Way Toward the World Trade Organization.” Perhaps this will facilitate the “comfortable merger” of Russia and the U.S. mentioned by Ford Foundation president H. Rowan Gaither in 1953, as the prelude to the establishment of a World Socialist Government.

Another vehicle used to establish a world government is the breaking down of national borders. Relevant to this, the Ford Foundation nationally awarded grants to radical Hispanics from 1968 to 1992 totalling over $31 million. According to Henry Santiestevan (former head of the Southwest Council of La Raza, SWCLR), “It would hardly be an exaggeration to say the Ford Foundation is the Chicano movement.” SWCLR was founded in Phoenix, Arizona in 1968 with funding from the Ford Foundation and others. According to FOUNDATION WATCH (December 2007) published by the Capital Research Centre, “La Raza has relied on federal grants since the 1970s. It had two federally funded projects in 1976, and two years later the number had grown to fifteen. La Raza had received at least two congressional earmarks in 2005: $4,762,000 for housing programs and $496,000 for workforce development grants.... John Stone, president of the U.S. Freedom Foundation claims that La Raza has links to separatist ‘Reconquista’ (i.e., reconquest) groups... who agitate for ethnic Balkanization and dream about reclaiming Colorado, California, Arizona, Texas, Utah, New Mexico, Oregon and Washington State for indigenous Hispanic peoples.”

Voice of Citizens Together (www.americanpatrol.com) produced a video showing one of these Reconquista leaders in the western U.S. saying to 2 blacks “Why don’t you go back where you came from – Africa?” because this land belongs to Hispanics. On July 14, 2008, presidential candidate Sen. John McCain will address the annual convention of La Raza, which honoured him at its tenth annual Capital Awards in 1999.

The Carnegie Endowment and the Ford Foundation

by David Allen Rivera http://www.viewfromthewall.com/

Andrew Carnegie (1835-1919) came to the United States as a poor immigrant from Scotland in 1848, and never became an American citizen. He built the Carnegie Steel Corporation, which he sold to J. P. Morgan for $500 million, who incorporated the company into the United States Steel Corporation in 1901, enabling Carnegie to retire and concentrate on his philanthropic activities.

In 1889, William Torrey Harris, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, told a high-ranking railroad official that the schools were being scientifically designed not to overeducate children. He believed that the schools should alienate children from their parents and religion. In 1890, Carnegie wrote eleven essays which were published under the title The Gospel of Wealth. The underlying premise was that the free-enterprise system had been locked-up by men such as himself, J.P. Morgan, and John D. Rockefeller, and that they not only owned everything, but also controlled the government. His worry, was that subsequent generations would realize this, and work against them. His solution was to control the education system, and to create a direct relationship between the amount of education a person had, and how good of a job they could get. Therefore, this created a motivation for
children to attend school, where they would be taught only what the social engineers of this country wanted them to know.

This was to be accomplished by instituting the educational system developed by Prussia between 1808 and 1819. German Philosopher Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814) in his "Addresses to the German Nation" (1807-08) said that he did not trust parental influence and preferred education to be carried out in a "separate and independent" environment controlled by the state. Prussia became the first government to have compulsory education, setting up a three-tiered system. The children of the elite, about one-half of one percent, went to schools called academies, and were taught to think and be independent. About 5-1/2% went to Realschulen, where they were partially taught how to think. The other 94% went to Volkschulen, where the idea of being a follower and a good citizen was stressed.

This system of education was brought to the United States through the effort of a coalition of big business led by Carnegie, J.P. Morgan, and Rockefeller; major universities like Columbia, Johns Hopkins, the University of Wisconsin, the University of Michigan, and the University of Chicago; and large foundations like Carnegie, Rockefeller, Ford, Mellon, Peabody, Sage, and Whitney.

The success in creating an organized compulsory educational system in this country has allowed the elite of this country to prevent each generation from truly understanding how this country is actually run, thus keeping them from doing anything about it. This 'dumbing-down' has enabled the government to more easily assimilate the people of this country into a population which can be easily deceived and controlled.

John Dewey, known as the "Father of American Education," was a Socialist, and a founding member of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society (who changed their name to League for Industrial Democracy, which he became the President of), and one of the 34 signers of the Humanist Manifesto in 1933. In his My Pedagogic Creed (1897) and The School and Society (1899), he expressed his belief at how the schools should be instrumental in developing a socialist society in America." His system of 'progressive education' would deemphasize academics, and use psychology to do that. The July, 1908 Hibbert Journal quoted him as saying: "Our schools are performing an infinite significant religious work. They are promoting the social unity out of which in the end genuine religious unity must grow."

With a grant of $27,000,000, Carnegie established the Carnegie Institute of Technology in Pittsburgh, in 1900, which became the Carnegie-Mellon University in 1967, when it merged with the Mellon Institute, which had been founded in 1913. In 1905, he established the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, which, within a 20 year period, gave over $20 million to retiring teachers (and widows) at universities and technical schools in the United States and Canada to support the profession and encourage higher education. In 1904, in the U.S., and 1908 in the United Kingdom, he set up the Carnegie Hero Fund to reward heroic deeds by civilian citizens, and gave out close to $500,000,000. He also established the world renowned Carnegie Hall, and over 2,000 public libraries. He was also a major supporter of the Tuskegee Institute in Alabama, which was founded by Booker T. Washington.

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace was established in 1910, to promote international peace and bring about the abolition of war; and the Carnegie Corporation of New York in 1911 (with a grant of $125,000,000), was set up "to promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding among the people of the United States by aiding technical schools, institutions of higher learning, libraries, scientific research, hero funds, useful publications, and by such other agencies and means as shall time to time be found appropriate therefore."

With such a history of philanthropic contributions, the Carnegie Endowment, on its face, appeared to be innocent. However, its goal of promoting international peace, was just a ruse to disguise its true purpose to promote one-world government.
The first three Presidents of the group were: Elihu Root, socialist and former Secretary of
State under President Theodore Roosevelt, who was a leading advocate of the League of
Nations; he was succeeded in 1925 by Nicholas Murray Butler, the former President of
Columbia University; and then Alger Hiss, the communist who helped found the United
Nations. Their President during the 1960's, was Joseph E. Johnson (a member of the CFR),
a close friend of Hiss, who was known as the "permanent unofficial Secretary of State." He
worked closely with the Donner Foundation, which financed the Temple of Understanding,
an occult organization connected to the Lucis Trust in England (a group of Satan
worshipers with ties to the Theosophical Society). Members of the Temple met at the
Endowment headquarters in the United Nations Plaza. Among their members: Robert
McNamara (Secretary of Defence under Kennedy and Johnson), Eleanor Roosevelt, Thomas
Watson (President of IBM), Max Lerner, James Linen (of Time-Life), Norman Thomas, James
A. Pike, Ellsworth Bunker, and John D. Rockefeller IV.

The 1934 Yearbook of the Carnegie Endowment, said that they were "an unofficial
instrument of international policy, taking up here and there the ends of international
problems and questions which the governments find it difficult to handle, and ... reaching
conclusions ... which officially find their way into the policies of government."

The 1947 Yearbook recommended:

"...that the Endowment work for the establishment of the United Nations headquarters in New
York ... that the Endowment construct its programs primarily for the support of the United
Nations ... that the Endowment's programs should be broadly educational in order to
encourage public understanding and support of the United Nations at home and abroad ... that
Endowment supported organizations such as International Relations Clubs in colleges,
the Foreign Policy Association, the Institute of Pacific Relations, the Council on Foreign
Relations, and local community groups be utilized to achieve these goals, of achieving
broader understanding and support for the United Nations."

The Carnegie Endowment and Rockefeller Foundation gave over $3,000,000 to the Institute
of Pacific Relations, who used the media to convince the American people that the
Communists in China were agricultural reformers. The Endowment has also given money to
the Council on Foreign Relations, the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, the United
Nations Association of the U.S., and the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation.

Norman Dodd, who in July, 1953, was appointed as the research director of the Special
Congressional Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations, said he discovered that
the oldest tax exempt foundations were established before the initiation of income taxes,
therefore they existed for a different purpose. He examined minutes of the Board of
Trustees, and found that for the first year, the members concentrated on whether there was
any means more effective than war to alter the life of the people of a nation. They concluded
that to get America into an upcoming war, they had to control the diplomatic machinery of
the State Department.

Dodd discovered that all high-level appointments in the State Department took place only
after they had been cleared through a group called the Council of Learned Societies, which
was established by the Carnegie Endowment. He saw in the minutes of the Carnegie Board,
record of a note to President Wilson, requesting that he "see to it that the War does not end
too quickly."

Syndicated columnist Joseph Kraft, writing in Harper's in July, 1958, said that records
indicated that the Carnegie trustees hoped to involve the U.S. in a world war to set the stage
for world government. Dodd said they wanted "to bring the idea of 'one-world' (government)
to the point where it is acceptable to the people of this country. That is the primary aim,
and everything that has happened since then is a means to that one end." Their memos
indicated that they believed their efforts were successful, because the war "had brought
about a change in the American psyche."
In the archives of the Endowment, Dodd discovered that they felt that the "only way to maintain control of the population was to obtain control of education in the U.S. They realized this was a prodigious task so they approached the Rockefeller Foundation with the suggestion that they go in tandem and that portion of education which could be considered as domestically oriented be taken over by the Rockefeller Foundation and that portion which was oriented to international matters be taken over by the Carnegie Endowment." Dodd said that "they decided that the success of this program lay in an alteration in the matter in which American history was to be presented."

The Guggenheim Foundation agreed to award fellowships to historians recommended by the Carnegie Endowment, and a group of 20 were assembled, and sent to London, where they were briefed and became founding members of the American History Association. In 1928, the A.H.A. was given a grant of $400,000 by Carnegie to write a 7-volume study on the direction the nation was to take. The secret of its success would be that it would be done gradually.

Rene Wormser, legal counsel to Reece's Committee, said that the Carnegie Endowment was attempting to mould the minds of our children by deciding "what should be read in our schools and colleges." He also described how the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Carnegie Endowment, and the Carnegie Corporation jointly sponsor conferences to push the goals of the United Nations.

The investigation by Reece's Special House Committee, found that the Carnegie Corporation financed the writing and publication of the Proper Study of Mankind by Stuart Chase, the book praised by the communist agents Harry Dexter White and Lauchlin Currie, which outlined an "ideal" society in which the individual is suppressed. Over 50,000 copies of the book were distributed by the foundation to libraries and scholars. They also gave a $340,000 grant to print a 17-volume study on American education by Dr. George Counts, which was later called "an educational program for a socialist America."

The Ford Foundation

In 1903, Henry Ford, Sr. (1863-1947) founded the Ford Motor Company, and in 1907, he bought out all of his partners, so his family would control the entire company. In 1924, he was so popular, that various polls indicated that he would be elected President if he ran.

In 1936, with his son Edsel, he established the Ford Foundation as an inheritance tax dodge, which he saw as a plot to take money away from Americans; and for his family to retain control after his death. An enemy of the establishment, Ford wanted American hero Charles A. Lindbergh (who supported the conservative 'America First' movement) to be the Director of his Foundation, but Lindbergh refused. Ford, and his son Edsel, died before the Foundation's leadership could be placed in safe hands, and control passed to Edsel's widow, and grandson Henry Ford II (who later married into the Rothschild family), who brought in such 'insiders' as William Benton, Dr. Robert M. Hutchins (who became Associate Director), and Paul G. Hoffman (who became the Chief Administrator).

The Ford Foundation, with assets of $4 billion, is the world's largest endowment. They own 90% of Ford Motor's stock. Ford also established the Edison Institute; and the Henry Ford Hospital, which gave two-thirds of its grants to education, and one-third to communications, public health, economic development, science, engineering, senior citizens, the humanities and the arts.
The Foundation financed a Black voter registration drive in Cleveland, which helped elect the city's first Black mayor ($175,000); financed the pro-Castro Mexican-American Youth Organization in Texas; gave grants to the Marxist Black group known as C.O.R.E. ($475,000); the leftist National Students Association ($315,000); the socialist Citizens Crusade Against Poverty ($508,500); the communist-controlled Southern Christian Leadership Conference ($230,000); the leftist Urban League ($1,600,000); the pro-Vietcong American Friends Service Committee, which encouraged pacifism, resistance to military service and preparedness, and conscientious objectors ($100,000); National Council of Churches ($108,000); Anti-Defamation League ($35,000); National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice ($552,000); American Jewish Congress ($100,000); American Council for Nationalities Service ($200,000); National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing ($162,000); Council on Foreign Relations ($1,000,000); Adlai E. Stevenson Institute of International Affairs ($1,000,000); UNESCO ($200,000); United Nations Association ($552,000); Institute for International Education ($1,625,000); United Nations Association ($150,000); Institute for International Education ($1,625,000); American Assembly ($166,000); World Affairs Council ($102,000); Congress for Cultural Freedom ($1,500,000); the Committee for Economic Development's Foreign Policy Research ($275,000); National Committee on U.S.-China Relations ($250,000); the communist-staffed Southern Regional Council ($648,000); the leftist National Educational Television and Radio Centre ($6,000,000); and the Public Broadcast Laboratory ($7,900,000).

In November, 1953, Norman Dodd, Director of Research for the House Special Committee investigating the tax-exempt foundations, was told by Roman Gaither, President of the Ford Foundation,

"that most of the men who are now running the foundations, formerly worked for the State Department, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Association, the Marshall Plan or other foreign relief agencies, and that in those capacities, they were working under instructions from the White House to bring about such sociological, economic, and political changes, as would make union with communist Russia easy and comfortable for the American people. Now, in the foundations, we are working toward the same objectives."

He said that the Ford Foundation operated under directives which "emanate from the White House," and that the "substance of the directives under which we operate is that we shall use our grant-making power so to alter life in the United States that we can be comfortably merged with the Soviet Union."

The Fund for the Republic (one of the six other Ford-controlled foundations), founded in 1953 under the direction of Robert G. Hoffman and Robert M. Hutchins, are known for their attacks on the internal security program of America, and criticism towards the FBI and Congressional committees investigating communism. They were responsible for ending the anti-communist fervour that was sweeping the country. They were also responsible for the establishment of the Centre for the Study of Democratic Institutions, in Santa Barbara, California, who developed a Constitution for one-world government.

Robert McNamara, an executive with the Ford Motor Co., became the Foundation's President in 1960, later resigning to serve as the Secretary of Defence (1961-68) in the Kennedy and Johnson Administration. He helped lay the foundation for the SALT treaty. In 1968, he became President of the World Bank. McGeorge Bundy, a CFR member, the Chief Advisor for Foreign Affairs for Kennedy and Johnson, became President of the Foundation in 1966. He ushered in an era of social unrest by announcing that the Negro movement, "the first of the nation's problems," would be his top priority.
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More by Mr Gatto now, this time on the General Education Board.

The General Education Board And Friends
Reading through the papers of the Rockefeller Foundation’s General Education Board—an endowment rivalled in school policy influence in the first half of the twentieth century only by Andrew Carnegie’s various philanthropies—seven curious elements force themselves on the careful reader:

1) There appears a clear intention to mould people through schooling. 2) There is a clear intention to eliminate tradition and scholarship. 3) The net effect of various projects is to create a strong class system verging on caste. 4) There is a clear intention to reduce mass critical intelligence while supporting infinite specialization. 5) There is clear intention to weaken parental influence. 6) There is clear intention to overthrow accepted custom. 7) There is striking congruency between the cumulative purposes of GEB projects and the utopian precepts of the oddball religious sect, once known as Perfectionism, a secular religion aimed at making the perfection of human nature, not salvation or happiness, the purpose of existence. The agenda of philanthropy, which had so much to do with the schools we got, turns out to contain an intensely political component.

This is not to deny that genuine altruistic interests aren’t also a part of philanthropy, but as Ellen Lagemann correctly reflects in her interesting history of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Private Power for the Public Good, "In advancing some interests, foundations have inevitably not advanced others. Hence their actions must have political consequences, even when political purposes are not avowed or even intended. To avoid politics in dealing with foundation history is to miss a crucial part of the story."

Edward Berman, in Harvard Education Review, 49 (1979), puts it more brusquely. Focusing on Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Ford philanthropies, he concludes that the "public rhetoric of disinterested humanitarianism was little more than a facade" behind which the interests of the political state (not necessarily those of society) "have been actively furthered." The rise of foundations to key positions in educational policy formation amounted to what Clarence Karier called "the development of a fourth branch of government, one that effectively represented the interests of American corporate wealth."

The corporate foundation is mainly a twentieth-century phenomenon, growing from twenty-one specimens of the breed in 1900 to approximately fifty thousand by 1990. From the beginning, foundations aimed squarely at educational policy formation. Rockefeller’s General Education Board obtained an incorporating act from Congress in 1903 and immediately began to organize schooling in the South, joining the older Slater cotton/woollen manufacturing interests and Peabody banking interests in a coalition in which Rockefeller picked up many of the bills.

From the start, the GEB had a mission. A letter from John D. Rockefeller Sr. specified that his gifts were to be used "to promote a comprehensive system." You might well ask what interests the system was designed to promote, but you would be asking the wrong question. Frederick Gates, the Baptist minister hired to disburse Rockefeller largesse, gave a terse explanation when he said, "The key word is system." American life was too unsystematic to suit corporate genius. Rockefeller’s foundation was about systematizing us.

In 1913, the Sixty-Second Congress created a commission to investigate the role of these new foundations of Carnegie, Rockefeller, and of other corporate families. After a year of testimony it concluded:

The domination of men in whose hands the final control of a large part of American industry rests is not limited to their employees, but is being rapidly extended to control the education and social services of the nation.

Foundation grants directly enhance the interests of the corporations sponsoring them, it found. The conclusion of this congressional commission:
The giant foundation exercises enormous power through direct use of its funds, free of any statutory entanglements so they can be directed precisely to the levers of a situation; this power, however, is substantially increased by building collateral alliances which insulate it from criticism and scrutiny.

Foundations automatically make friends among banks which hold their large deposits, in investment houses which multiply their monies, in law firms which act as their counsels, and with the many firms, institutions, and individuals with which they deal and whom they benefit. By careful selection of trustees from the ranks of high editorial personnel and other media executives and proprietors, they can assure themselves press support, and by engaging public relations counsellors can further create good publicity. As René Wormser, chief counsel for the second congressional inquiry into foundation life (1958) put it:

All its connections and associations, plus the often sycophantic adulation of the many institutions and individuals who receive largesse from the foundation, give it an enormous aggregate of power and influence. This power extends beyond its immediate circle of associations, to those who hope to benefit from its bounty.

In 1919, using Rockefeller money, John Dewey, by now a professor at Columbia Teachers College, an institution heavily endowed by Rockefeller, founded the Progressive Education Association. Through its existence it spread the philosophy which undergirds welfare capitalism— that the bulk of the population is biologically childlike, requiring lifelong care.

From the start, Dewey was joined by other Columbia professors who made no secret that the objective of the PEA project was to use the educational system as a tool to accomplish political goals. In The Great Technology (1933), Harold Rugg elucidated the grand vision:

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

Through the schools of the world we shall disseminate a new conception of government— one that will embrace all the activities of men, one that will postulate the need of scientific control...in the interest of all people.

In similar fashion, the work of the Social Science Research Council culminated in a statement of Conclusions and Recommendations on its Carnegie Foundation–funded operations which had enormous and lasting impact upon education in the United States. Conclusions (1934) heralded the decline of the old order, stating aggressively that "a new age of collectivism is emerging" which will involve the supplanting of private property by public property" and will require "experimentation" and "almost certainly...a larger measure of compulsory cooperation of citizens...a corresponding enlargement of the functions of government, and an increasing state intervention... Rights will be altered and abridged." (emphasis added)

Conclusions was a call to the teachers colleges to instruct their students to "condition" children into an acceptance of the new order in progress. Reading, writing, and arithmetic were to be marginalized as irrelevant, even counterproductive. "As often repeated, the first step is to consolidate leadership around the philosophy and purpose of education herein expounded." (emphasis added) The difficulties in trying to understand what such an odd locution as "compulsory cooperation" might really mean, or even trying to determine what historic definition of "education" would fit such a usage, were ignored. Those who wrote this report, and some of those who read it, were the only ones who held the Rosetta Stone to decipher it.

In an article in Progressive Education Magazine, Professor Norman Woelfel produced one of the many children and grandchildren of the Conclusions report when he wrote in 1946: "It might be necessary for us to control our press as the Russian press is controlled and as the
Nazi press is controlled...", a startling conclusion he improved upon in his book Moulders of the American Mind (1933) with this dark beauty: "In the minds of men who think experimentally, America is conceived as having a destiny which bursts the all too obvious limitations of Christian religious sanctions."

The Rockefeller-endowed Lincoln Experimental School at Columbia Teachers College was the testing ground for Harold Rugg's series of textbooks, which moved 5 million copies by 1940 and millions more after that. In these books Rugg advanced this theory: "Education must be used to condition the people to accept social change....The chief function of schools is to plan the future of society." Like many of his activities over three vital decades on the school front, the notions Rugg put forth in The Great Technology (1933), were eventually translated into practice in urban centres. Rugg advocated that the major task of schools be seen as "indoctrinating" youth, using social "science" as the "core of the school curriculum" to bring about the desired climate of public opinion. Some attitudes Rugg advocated teaching were reconstruction of the national economic system to provide for central controls and an implantation of the attitude that educators as a group were "vastly superior to a priesthood":

Our task is to create swiftly a compact body of minority opinion for the scientific reconstruction of our social order.

Money for Rugg's six textbooks came from Rockefeller Foundation grants to the Lincoln School. He was paid two salaries by the foundation, one as an educational psychologist for Lincoln, the other as a professor of education at Teachers College, in addition to salaries for secretarial and research services. The General Education Board provided funds (equivalent to $500,000 in year 2000 purchasing power) to produce three books, which were then distributed by the National Education Association.

In 1954, a second congressional investigation of foundation tampering (with schools and American social life) was attempted, headed by Carroll Reece of Tennessee. The Reece Commission quickly ran into a buzzsaw of opposition from influential centres of American corporate life. Major national newspapers hurled scathing criticisms, which, together with pressure from other potent political adversaries, forced the committee to disband prematurely, but not before there were some tentative findings:

The power of the individual large foundation is enormous. Its various forms of patronage carry with them elements of thought control. It exerts immense influence on educator, educational processes, and educational institutions. It is capable of invisible coercion. It can materially predetermine the development of social and political concepts, academic opinion, thought leadership, public opinion.

The 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 education and the social sciences, with a gigantic aggregate of capital and income. This Interlock has some of the characteristics of an intellectual cartel. It operates in part through certain intermediary organizations supported by the foundations. It has ramifications in almost every phase of education.

It has come to exercise very extensive practical control over social science and education. A system has arisen which gives enormous power to a relatively small group of individuals, having at their virtual command huge sums in public trust funds.

The power of the large foundations and the Interlock has so influenced press, radio, television, and even government that it has become extremely difficult for objective criticism of anything the Interlock approves to get into news channels—without having first been ridiculed, slanted and discredited.
Research in the social sciences plays a key part in the evolution of our society. Such research is now almost wholly in the control of professional employees of the large foundations. Even the great sums allotted by federal government to social science research have come into the virtual control of this professional group.

Foundations have promoted a great excess of empirical research as contrasted with theoretical research, promoting an irresponsible "fact-finding mania" leading all too frequently to "scientism" or fake science.

Associated with the excessive support of empirical method, the concentration of foundation power has tended to promote "moral relativity" to the detriment of our basic moral, religious, and governmental principles. It has tended to promote the concept of "social engineering," that foundation-approved "social scientists" alone are capable of guiding us into better ways of living, substituting synthetic principles for fundamental principles of action.

These foundations and their intermediaries engage extensively in political activity, not in the form of direct support of candidates or parties, but in the conscious promotion of carefully calculated political concepts.

The impact of foundation money upon education has been very heavy, tending to promote uniformity in approach and method, tending to induce the educator to become an agent for social change and a propagandist for the development of our society in the direction of some form of collectivism. In the international field, foundations and the Interlock, together with certain intermediary organizations, have exercised a strong effect upon foreign policy and upon public education in things international. This has been accomplished by vast propaganda, by supplying executives and advisors to government, and by controlling research through the power of the purse. The net result has been to promote "internationalism" in a particular sense—a form directed toward "world government" and a derogation of American nationalism. [emphasis added]

Here we find ourselves confronted with the puzzling duty of interpreting why two separate congressional committees convened fifty years apart to study the workings of the new foundation institutions, one under a Democratic Congress, one under a Republican Congress, both reached essentially the same conclusions. Both adjudged foundations a clear and present danger to the traditional liberties of American national life. Both pointed to the use of foundation influence to create the blueprint of American school life. Both saw that a class system in America had emerged and was being supported by the class system in schooling. Both called for drastic action. And both were totally ignored.

Actually the word "ignored" doesn't begin to do justice to what really occurred. These congressional investigations—like Sir Walter Scott's difficult to obtain Life of Napoleon Bonaparte—have not only vanished from public imagination, they aren't even alluded to in press discussions of schooling. Exactly as if they had never happened. This would be more understandable if their specific philanthropies were dull, pedestrian giveaways designed to distribute largesse and to build up good feeling toward the benevolence of colossal wealth and power. But the reality is strikingly different—corporate wealth through the foundations has advanced importantly the dumbing down of America's schools, the creation of a scientific class system, and important attacks on family integrity, national identification, religious rights, and national sovereignty.

"School is the cheapest police," Horace Mann once said. It was a sentiment publicly spoken by every name—Sears, Pierce, Harris, Stowe, Lancaster, and the rest—prominently involved in creating universal school systems for the coal powers. One has only to browse Merle Curti's The Social Ideas of American Educators to discover that the greatest social idea educators had to sell the rich, and which they lost no opportunity to sell, was the police function of schooling. Although a pedagogical turn in the Quaker imagination is the reason schools came to look like penitentiaries, Quakers are not the principal reason they came to
function like maximum security institutions. The reason they came to exist at all was to stabilize the social order and train the ranks. In a scientific, industrialized, corporate age, "stability" was much more exquisitely defined than ordinary people could imagine. To realize the new stability, the best breeding stock had to be drawn up into reservations, likewise the ordinary. "The Daughters of the Barons of Runnemede" is only a small piece of the puzzle; many more efficient and subtler quarantines were essayed.

Perhaps subtler of all was the welfare state, a welfare program for everybody, including the lowest, in which the political state bestowed alms the way the corporate Church used to do. Although the most visible beneficiaries of this gigantic project were those groups increasingly referred to as "masses," the poor were actually people most poorly served by this latter-day Hindu creation of Fabian socialism and the corporate brain trust. Subsidizing the excluded of the new society and economy was, it was believed, a humanitarian way to calm these troubled waters until the Darwinian storm had run its inevitable course into a new, genetically arranged utopia.

In a report issued in 1982 and widely publicized in important journals, the connection between corporate capitalism and the welfare state becomes manifest in a public document bearing the name Alan Pifer, then president of the Carnegie Corporation. Apparently fearing that the Reagan administration would alter the design of the Fabian project beyond its ability to survive, Pifer warned of:

A mounting possibility of severe social unrest, and the consequent development among the upper classes and the business community of sufficient fear for the survival of our capitalist economic system to bring about an abrupt change of course. Just as we built the general welfare state...and expanded it in the 1960s as a safety valve for the easing of social tension, so will we do it again in the 1980s. Any other path is too risky.

In the report quoted from, new conceptions of pedagogy were introduced which we now see struggling to be born: national certification for schoolteachers, bypassing the last vestige of local control in states, cities, and villages; a hierarchy of teacher positions; a project to bring to an end the hierarchy of school administrators—now adjudged largely an expenditure counter-productive to good social order, a failed experiment. In the new form, lead teachers manage schools after the British fashion and hire business administrators. The first expressions of this new initiative included the "mini-school" movement, now evolved into the charter school movement. Without denying these ideas a measure of merit, if you understand that their source is the same institutional consciousness which once sent river ironclads full of armed detectives to break the steel union at Homestead, machine-gunned strikers at River Rouge, and burned to death over a dozen women and children in Ludlow, those memories should inspire emotions more pensive than starry-eyed enthusiasm.
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So there you have it, you now know the true “Foundation’s” of American (and British) education.

We will round up this second part of my first section by looking at the results of all these people’s hard work.
Chapter Thirty

The greatest discoveries in all of the sciences, during all of recorded history were generally found by people who were essentially non-experts and who were usually self-taught.

Many kids were often able to speak perfectly well, they even had time for manners, and some even possessed the capability to write, and all of this was before joining school a century ago, yet now with ever rising grades year on year why is it that so many children today actually leave school unable to read or write, or for that matter even have a decent conversation with anyone, and where the hell did the manners go to? Why is it that the exam for an 8th grade child in the USA from nearly a century ago probably couldn’t be passed today by many of the teachers, or the kids parents, never mind by 13/14 year old children?

And for those who just deridedly snorted at that suggestion, unfortunately for smug smart arse you, here is the 8th grade test for an American student in 1895. It, like so much of the other material mentioned by me, was taken from the inimitable web-site of Jordan Maxwell, a site you will find that doesn’t give you answers as much as it has you asking questions, highly utilised by me and warmly recommended to you – jordanmaxwell.com

1895 TEST

This is the eighth-grade final exam from 1895 from Salina, Kansas. It was taken from the original document on file at the Smoky Valley Genealogical Society and Library in Salina, Kansas and reprinted by the Salina Journal.

8th Grade Final Exam: Salina, Kansas – 1895

Grammar (Time, one hour)

2. Name the Parts of Speech and define those that have no modifications.
3. Define Verse, Stanza and Paragraph.
4. What are the Principal Parts of a verb? Give Principal Parts of do, lie, lay and run.
5. Define Case, Illustrate each Case.
7-10. Write a composition of about 150 words and show therein that you understand the practical use of the rules of grammar.

Arithmetic (Time, 1.25 hours)

1. Name and define the Fundamental Rules of Arithmetic.
2. A wagon box is 2 ft. deep, 10 feet long, and 3 ft. wide. How many bushels of wheat will it hold?
3. If a load of wheat weighs 3942 lbs., what is it worth at 50 cts. per bu, deducting 1050 lbs. for tare?
4. District No. 33 has a valuation of $35,000. What is the necessary levy to carry on a school seven months at $50 per month, and have $104 for incidentals?
5. Find cost of 6720 lbs. coal at $6.00 per ton.
6. Find the interest of $512.60 for 8 months and 18 days at 7 percent.
7. What is the cost of 40 boards 12 inches wide and 16 ft. long at $.20 per inch?
8. Find bank discount on $300 for 90 days (no grace) at 10 percent.
9. What is the cost of a square farm at $15 per acre, the distance around which is 640 rods?
10. Write a Bank Check, a Promissory Note, and a Receipt.

U.S. History (Time, 45 minutes)
1. Give the epochs into which U.S. History is divided.
2. Give an account of the discovery of America by Columbus.
3. Relate the causes and results of the Revolutionary War.
4. Show the territorial growth of the United States.
5. Tell what you can of the history of Kansas.
6. Describe three of the most prominent battles of the Rebellion.
7. Who were the following: Morse, Whitney, Fulton, Bell, Lincoln, Penn, and Howe?
8. Name events connected with the following dates: 1607, 1620, 1800, 1849, and 1865?

Orthography (Time, one hour)

1. What is meant by the following: Alphabet, phonetic orthography, etymology, syllabication?
2. What are elementary sounds? How classified?
3. What are the following, and give examples of each: Trigraph, subvocals, diphthong, cognate letters, linguals?
4. Give four substitutes for caret 'u'.
5. Give two rules for spelling words with final 'e'. Name two exceptions under each rule.
7. Define the following prefixes and use in connection with a word: Bi, dis, mis, pre, semi, post, non, inter, mono, super.
8. Mark diacritically and divide into syllables the following, and name the sign that indicates the sound: Card, ball, mercy, sir, odd, cell, rise, blood, fare, last.
9. Use the following correctly in sentences, Cite, site, sight, fane, fain, feign, vane, vain, vein, raze, raise, rays.
10. Write 10 words frequently mispronounced and indicate pronunciation by use of diacritical marks and by syllabication.

Geography (Time, one hour)

1. What is climate? Upon what does climate depend?
2. How do you account for the extremes of climate in Kansas?
3. Of what use are rivers? Of what use is the ocean?
4. Describe the mountains of N.A.
5. Name and describe the following: Monrovia, Odessa, Denver, Manitoba, Hecla, Yukon, St. Helena, Juan Fernandez, Aspinwall and Orinoco.
6. Name and locate the principal trade centres of the U.S.
7. Name all the republics of Europe and give capital of each.
8. Why is the Atlantic Coast colder than the Pacific in the same latitude?
9. Describe the process by which the water of the ocean returns to the sources of rivers.

Put your pencil down. Now contemplate just how dumb you really are...

...I said contemplate dummy, no more reading until you admit how thick YOU truly are.

Imagine a college student who went to public school trying to pass this test, even if the few outdated questions were modernized. Imagine their professors even being able to pass the 8th Grade. Can Americans or Britain’s, students and professors alike, get back up to the 8th Grade level of 1895?

I seriously doubt there is many people in America or the U.K. who could pass this test.

Some professors could pass the subjects they have a doctorate in, but they would probably fail the rest.

This I think is absolute proof that the New World Order Gang you’ve occasionaly been haering bout has succeeded in dumbing down the American and British people.
As you can see Mr or Mrs super-sceptic, kids aged 13/14 (I think 8th grade is thirteen or fourteen,) had to pass this test in American schools over 100 years ago, how did you get on? Even if it was adapted for the U.K. or, wherever you are from, I bet only the top couple of percent of us could scrape a pass at this test as fully grown, seemingly educated adults.

Now every time you are told children are getting smarter consider that a child just becoming a teenager would have passed this a century ago just to go to high school, are the kids you are seeing being churned out yearly by our education system that smart when they are only 12? Are you that smart? Once again, on education this time, I rest my case, but just to hammer home the point - in case your inbuilt brainwashing has somehow convinced you that I am twisting the truth (although how I can make an exam from over a century ago harder in the future I don´t know). But just in case, here is conclusive proof that our children's IQs have dipped in the same period, they in fact in many cases now LEAVE school unable to read or write! Here is an extract to prove my point it was taken from an article recently in the Telegraph newspaper here in the UK:

“Teenagers in Britain have lower IQ scores than their counterparts did a generation ago, according to a study by a leading expert.

By Richard Gray, Science Correspondent
08 Feb 2009

Tests carried out in 1980 and again in 2008 show that the IQ score of an average 14-year-old dropped by more than two points over the period.

Among those in the upper half of the intelligence scale, a group that is typically dominated by children from middle class families, performance was even worse, with an average IQ score six points below what it was 28 years ago.

The trend marks an abrupt reversal of the so-called "Flynn effect" which has seen IQ scores rise year on year, among all age groups, in most industrialised countries throughout the past century.

Professor James Flynn, of the University of Otago in New Zealand, the discoverer of the Flynn effect and the author of the latest study, believes the abnormal drop in British teenage IQ could be due to youth culture having "stagnated" or even dumbed down."

So as you can plainly it is not just me who has noticed these phenomena, the fact is, I think you can all feel it too, you just prefer to lie to yourselves and say “that’s just the way it is” or “that’s the price of modern living”.

Dumbest Generation Getting Dumber

by Walter E. Williams

The Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) is an international comparison of 15-year-olds conducted by The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) that measures applied learning and problem-solving ability. In 2006, U.S. students ranked 25th of 30 advanced nations in math and 24th in science. McKinsey & Company, in releasing its report “The Economic Impact of the Achievement Gap in America's Schools” (April 2009) said, "Several other facts paint a worrisome picture. First, the longer American
children are in school, the worse they perform compared to their international peers. In recent cross-country comparisons of fourth grade reading, math, and science, US students scored in the top quarter or top half of advanced nations. By age 15 these rankings drop to the bottom half. In other words, American students are farthest behind just as they are about to enter higher education or the workforce." That's a sobering thought. The longer kids are in school and the more money we spend on them, the further behind they get.

While the academic performance of white students is grossly inferior, that of black and Latino students is a national disgrace. (In case you thought me racist I made damn sure I included a picture of the man who wrote this!) The McKinsey report says, "On average, black and Latino students are roughly two to three years of learning behind white students of the same age. This racial gap exists regardless of how it is measured, including both achievement (e.g., test score) and attainment (e.g., graduation rate) measures. Taking the average National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) scores for math and reading across the fourth and eighth grades, for example, 48 percent of blacks and 43 percent of Latinos are 'below basic,' while only 17 percent of whites are, and this gap exists in every state. A more pronounced racial achievement gap exists in most large urban school districts." Below basic is the category the NAEP uses for students unable to display even partial mastery of knowledge and skills fundamental for proficient work at their grade level.

The teaching establishment and politicians have hoodwinked taxpayers into believing that more money is needed to improve education. The Washington, D.C., school budget is about the nation's costliest, spending about $15,000 per pupil. Its student/teacher ratio, at 15.2 to 1, is lower than the nation's average. Yet student achievement is just about the lowest in the nation. What's so callous about the Washington situation is about 1,700 children in kindergarten through 12th grade receive the $7,500 annual scholarships in order to escape rotten D.C. public schools, and four times as many apply for the scholarships, yet Congress, beholden to the education establishment, will end funding the school voucher program.

Any long-term solution to our education problems requires the decentralization that can come from competition. Centralization has been massive. In 1930, there were 119,000 school districts across the U.S; today, there are less than 15,000. Control has moved from local communities to the school district, to the state, and to the federal government. Public education has become a highly centralized government-backed monopoly and we shouldn't be surprised by the results. It's a no-brainer that the areas of our lives with the greatest innovation, tailoring of services to individual wants and falling prices are the areas where there is ruthless competition such as computers, food, telephone and clothing industries, and delivery companies such as UPS, Federal Express and electronic bill payments that have begun to undermine the postal monopoly in first-class mail.

At a Washington press conference launching the McKinsey report, Al Sharpton called school reform the civil rights challenge of our time. He said that the enemy of opportunity for blacks in the U.S. was once Jim Crow; today, in a slap at the educational establishment, he said it was "Professor James Crow." Sharpton is only partly correct. School reform is not solely a racial issue; it's a vital issue for the entire nation.

Dr. Williams serves on the faculty of George Mason University as John M. Olin Distinguished Professor of Economics and is the author of More Liberty Means Less Government: Our Founders Knew This Well. -

Where you seem to be unable to apportion any blame for these things, I have no qualms about laying serious documentary evidence in front of you that makes it abundantly clear exactly who is culpable, what the aim of these changes was, and how it was accomplished.

The Bankers have realized that education is very important for the control of people.
If there is real knowledge & information taught, people might actually figure out what is going and make changes. So simple changes were made starting in the 1890's that on the surface didn't seem like much yet decades later, children read less, have less comprehension, hate school more and are less likely to actually do something to make real positive changes in the world.

Instead of time primarily spent really learning reading, arithmetic and writing, more time is spent on trivia and fluff subjects. Reading has been changed from phonetics to sight reading. The McGuffey readers that were straightforward and fit each grade level have changed to readers that have words up to 2 or 3 grades levels higher causing frustration and incomprenhesion amongst the children. Math is in a spiral approach so less time is spent on each area but moving faster through more problems with less explanation so kids end up punching numbers in a calculator without understanding why except the teacher did it this way. Writing on stories of interest to children has been changed to drudgery projects with various do it this way by different teachers and again, not learning the real basics of sentence structures and forming them.

From older children being responsible, encouraging and helping younger children in a multigrade school, it has changed along with removing the strap to an attitude of both teachers & students of just putting in time and trying to suffer as little as possible or cause as much trouble as possible as the teachers can't do anything. Those that don't break down from the 2 or 3 hours of extra school work assigned every day, will fit into the robotized job life that they will enter after school. Those that break down and can't keep up feel like failures and can end up juvenile delinquents, drinking, drugs &/or sex believing they are failures rather than realizing the system was designed to break them down and spit them out like boot camp in the army. Schools that provided nourishing meals along with removing soda pop & junk food have found that the children's attitudes, grades and interest have risen quite dramatically. Yet when parents try to talk and ask for changes such as these, they are made to feel like outdated fools compared to the experts that put the system together.

Home schoolers often spend only 2 or 3 hours per day and if in districts where they can choose what subjects, interests and time to spend on each are even more motivated and excited about learning in general. Pushing children ahead of their development causes more frustration for both them and parents and often in just waiting a year or two, the children will pick up something that much easier when their brain has developed sufficiently for processing that information. They can be learning practical things like cooking, cleaning, helping parents or having part time jobs. With more balance in physical, emotional and spiritual life instead of mostly mentally, they will be calmer and more likely to succeed in life.

They can be learning more practical subjects like starting your own business, saving & investing money, choices for products that produce versus being consumers of the latest gadget. They can learn the effort and time involved in raising and taking care of children versus the mass media of doing it any time anywhere and somehow it magically ends up all right. It is important for bankers to remove children from the troubling influence of knowledgeable parents so government money is poured into child care centres and detention centres rather than giving tax credits and support for parents or local controlled community schools and home schooling projects. It is paradoxical that public schools have government money tied up in carpentry, metal working and other trades that are barely used yet when parents try to get permission to use the facilities to work with their children, they are denied access.

The elite send their children to schools where the real information is taught on how to choose, manage and control people as the future leaders. Monopolies, connections for
beneficial government laws and the use of media to monitor and shift people's thinking are just some of the information they pick up along the way.

Mark Twain is more right than most people realize when he says, "I try to not let schooling interfere with my education".

In this rather long chapter we are going to look at the effect men like Wundt had on the educational system, vested interests that we shall get to in later sections put a lot of time, effort and money into dumbing our children down and turning them into well drilled robot's.

I will start by letting one of America’s most respected teacher's give you his honest and learned opinion on this subject.

Foundation’s like the one carrying the name of Mr Ford or Carnegie, or indeed the already mentioned one bearing the name Rockefeller are also very prominent in this field of endeavour, it appears to me that all of these entities have an important part to play in the formation, promotion and subsequent revisions of not only America’s education system, but that of most of the “civilised” world. One last point, if you can get hold of any of this next writer's work I seriously urge you to do so, as he knows the education system inside out. (this is why he has been popping up so much in this work) Plus what you will learn from him will truly shock you.

John Taylor Gatto, - Underground History of American Education

Prologue Bianca, You Animal, Shut Up!

Our problem in understanding forced schooling stems from an inconvenient fact: that the wrong it does from a human perspective is right from a systems perspective. You can see this in the case of six-year-old Bianca, who came to my attention because an assistant principal screamed at her in front of an assembly, "BIANCA, YOU ANIMAL SHUT UP!" Like the wail of a banshee, this sang the school doom of Bianca. Even though her body continued to shuffle around, the voodoo had poisoned her.

Do I make too much of this simple act of putting a little girl in her place? It must happen thousands of times every day in schools all over. I've seen it many times, and if I were painfully honest I'd admit to doing it many times.

Schools are supposed to teach kids their place. That's why we have age-graded classes. In any case, it wasn't your own little Janey or mine. Most of us tacitly accept the pragmatic terms of public school which allow every kind of psychic violence to be inflicted on Bianca in order to fulfil the prime directive of the system: putting children in their place. It's called "social efficiency." But I get this precognition, this flash-forward to a moment far in the future when your little girl Jane, having left her comfortable home, wakes up to a world where Bianca is her enraged meter maid, or the passport clerk Jane counts on for her emergency ticket out of the country, or the strange lady who lives next door. I picture this animal Bianca grown large and mean, the same Bianca who didn't go to school for a month after her little friends took to whispering, "Bianca is an animal, Bianca is an animal," while Bianca, only seconds earlier a human being like themselves, sat choking back tears, struggling her way through a reading selection by guessing what the words meant.

In my dream I see Bianca as a fiend manufactured by schooling who now regards Janey as a vehicle for vengeance. In a transport of passion she:

Gives Jane's car a ticket before the meter runs out.

Throws away Jane's passport application after Jane leaves the office.
Plays heavy metal music through the thin partition which separates Bianca's apartment from Jane's while Jane pounds frantically on the wall for relief.

Or, all the above.

You aren't compelled to loan your car to anyone who wants it, but you are compelled to surrender your school-age child to strangers who process children for a livelihood, even though one in every nine schoolchildren is terrified of physical harm happening to them in school, terrified with good cause; about thirty-three are murdered there every year. From 1992 through 1999, 262 children were murdered in school in the United States. Your great-great-grandmother didn't have to surrender her children. What happened?

If I demanded you give up your television to an anonymous, itinerant repairman who needed work you'd think I was crazy; if I came with a policeman who forced you to pay that repairman even after he broke your set, you would be outraged. Why are you so docile when you give up your child to a government agent called a schoolteacher?

I want to open up concealed aspects of modern schooling such as the deterioration it forces in the morality of parenting. You have no say at all in choosing your teachers. You know nothing about their backgrounds or families.

And the state knows little more than you do. This is as radical a piece of social engineering as the human imagination can conceive. What does it mean?

One thing you do know is how unlikely it will be for any teacher to understand the personality of your particular child or anything significant about your family, culture, religion, plans, hopes, dreams. In the confusion of school affairs even teachers so disposed don't have opportunity to know those things. How did this happen?

Before you hire a company to build a house, you would, I expect, insist on detailed plans showing what the finished structure was going to look like. Building a child's mind and character is what public schools do, their justification for prematurely breaking family and neighbourhood learning. Where is documentary evidence to prove this assumption that trained and certified professionals do it better than people who know and love them can? There isn't any.

The cost in New York State for building a well-schooled child in the year 2000 is $200,000 per body when lost interest is calculated. That capital sum invested in the child's name over the past twelve years would have delivered a million dollars to each kid as a nest egg to compensate for having no school. The original $200,000 is more than the average home in New York costs. You wouldn't build a home without some idea what it would look like when finished, but you are compelled to let a corps of perfect strangers tinker with your child's mind and personality without the foggiest idea what they want to do with it.

Law courts and legislatures have totally absolved school people from liability. You can sue a doctor for malpractice, not a schoolteacher. Every homebuilder is accountable to customers years after the home is built; not schoolteachers, though. You can't sue a priest, minister, or rabbi either; that should be a clue.

If you can't be guaranteed even minimal results by these institutions, not even physical safety; if you can't be guaranteed anything except that you'll be arrested if you fail to surrender your kid, just what does the public in public schools mean?

What exactly is public about public schools? That's a question to take seriously. If schools were public as libraries, parks, and swimming pools are public, as highways and sidewalks are public, then the public would be satisfied with them most of the time. Instead, a
situation of constant dissatisfaction has spanned many decades. Only in Orwell's Newspeak, as perfected by legendary spin doctors of the twentieth century such as Ed Bernays or Ivy Lee or great advertising combines, is there anything public about public schools.

I Quit, I Think

In the first year of the last decade of the twentieth century during my thirtieth year as a school teacher in Community School District 3, Manhattan, after teaching in all five secondary schools in the district, crossing swords with one professional administration after another as they strove to rid themselves of me, after having my license suspended twice for insubordination and terminated covertly once while I was on medical leave of absence, after the City University of New York borrowed me for a five-year stint as a lecturer in the Education Department (and the faculty rating handbook published by the Student Council gave me the highest ratings in the department my last three years), after planning and bringing about the most successful permanent school fund-raiser in New York City history, after placing a single eighth-grade class into 30,000 hours of volunteer community service, after organizing and financing a student-run food cooperative, after securing over a thousand apprenticeships, directing the collection of tens of thousands of books for the construction of private student libraries, after producing four talking job dictionaries for the blind, writing two original student musicals, and launching an armada of other initiatives to reintegrate students within a larger human reality, I quit.

I was New York State Teacher of the Year when it happened. An accumulation of disgust and frustration which grew too heavy to be borne finally did me in. To test my resolve I sent a short essay to *The Wall Street Journal* titled "I Quit, I Think." In it I explained my reasons for deciding to wrap it up, even though I had no savings and not the slightest idea what else I might do in my mid-fifties to pay the rent. In its entirety it read like this:

Government schooling is the most radical adventure in history. It kills the family by monopolizing the best times of childhood and by teaching disrespect for home and parents. The whole blueprint of school procedure is Egyptian, not Greek or Roman. It grows from the theological idea that human value is a scarce thing, represented symbolically by the narrow peak of a pyramid.

That idea passed into American history through the Puritans. It found its "scientific" presentation in the bell curve, along which talent supposedly apportions itself by some Iron Law of Biology. It's a religious notion, School is its church. I offer rituals to keep heresy at bay. I provide documentation to justify the heavenly pyramid.

Socrates foresaw if teaching became a formal profession, something like this would happen. Professional interest is served by making what is easy to do seem hard; by subordinating the laity to the priesthood. School is too vital a jobs-project, contract giver and protector of the social order to allow itself to be "re-formed." It has political allies to guard its marches, that's why reforms come and go without changing much. Even reformers can't imagine school much different.

David learns to read at age four; Rachel, at age nine: In normal development, when both are 13, you can't tell which one learned first--the five-year spread means nothing at all. But in school I label Rachel "learning disabled" and slow David down a bit, too. For a paycheck, I adjust David to depend on me to tell him when to go and stop. He won't outgrow that dependency. I identify Rachel as discount merchandise, "special education" fodder. She'll be locked in her place forever.

In 30 years of teaching kid's rich and poor I almost never met a learning disabled child; hardly ever met a gifted and talented one either. Like all school categories, these are sacred myths, created by human imagination. They derive from questionable values we never examine because they preserve the temple of schooling. That's the secret behind short-answer tests, bells, uniform time blocks, age grading, standardization, and all the rest of
the school religion punishing our nation. There isn't a right way to become educated; there are as many ways as fingerprints. We don't need state-certified teachers to make education happen—that probably guarantees it won't.

How much more evidence is necessary? Good schools don't need more money or a longer year; they need real free-market choices, variety that speaks to every need and runs risks. We don't need a national curriculum or national testing either. Both initiatives arise from ignorance of how people learn or deliberate indifference to it. I can't teach this way any longer. If you hear of a job where I don't have to hurt kids to make a living, let me know. Come fall I'll be looking for work.

The New Individualism

The little essay went off in March and I forgot it. Somewhere along the way I must have gotten a note saying it would be published at the editor's discretion, but if so, it was quickly forgotten in the press of turbulent feelings that accompanied my own internal struggle. Finally, on July 5, 1991, I swallowed hard and quit. Twenty days later the Journal published the piece. A week later I was studying invitations to speak at NASA Space Centre, the Western White House, the Nashville Centre for the Arts, Columbia Graduate Business School, the Colorado Librarian's Convention, Apple Computer, and the financial control board of United Technologies Corporation. Nine years later, still enveloped in the orbit of compulsion schooling, I had spoken 750 times in fifty states and seven foreign countries. I had no agent and never advertised, but a lot of people made an effort to find me. It was as if parents were starving for someone to tell them the truth.

My hunch is it wasn't so much what I was saying that kept the lecture round unfolding, but that a teacher was speaking out at all and the curious fact that I represented nobody except myself. In the great school debate, this is unheard of. Every single voice allowed regular access to the national podium is the mouthpiece of some association, corporation, university, agency, or institutionalized cause. The poles of debate blocked out by these ritualized, figurehead voices are extremely narrow. Each has a stake in continuing forced schooling much as it is.

As I travelled, I discovered a universal hunger, often unvoiced, to be free of managed debate. A desire to be given untainted information. Nobody seemed to have maps of where this thing had come from or why it acted as it did, but the ability to smell a rat was alive and well all over America.

Exactly what John Dewey heralded at the onset of the twentieth century has indeed happened. Our once highly individualized nation has evolved into a centrally managed village, an agora made up of huge special interests which regard individual voices as irrelevant. The masquerade is managed by having collective agencies speak through particular human beings. Dewey said this would mark a great advance in human affairs, but the net effect is to reduce men and women to the status of functions in whatever subsystem they are placed. Public opinion is turned on and off in laboratory fashion. All this in the name of social efficiency, one of the two main goals of forced schooling.

Dewey called this transformation "the new individualism." When I stepped into the job of schoolteacher in 1961, the new individualism was sitting in the driver's seat all over urban America, a far cry from my own school days on the Monongahela when the Lone Ranger, not Sesame Street, was our nation's teacher, and school things weren't nearly so oppressive. But gradually they became something else in the euphoric times following WWII. Easy money and easy travel provided welcome relief from wartime austerity, the advent of television, the new nonstop theatre, offered easy laughs, effortless entertainment. Thus preoccupied, Americans failed to notice the deliberate conversion of formal education that was taking place, a transformation that would turn school into an instrument of the leviathan state. Who made that happen and why is part of the story I have to tell.
School as Religion

Nothing about school is what it seems, not even boredom. To show you what I mean is the burden of this long essay. My book represents a try at arranging my own thoughts in order to figure out what fifty years of classroom confinement (as student and teacher) add up to for me. You'll encounter a great deal of speculative history here. This is a personal investigation of why school is a dangerous place. It's not so much that anyone there sets out to hurt children; more that all of us associated with the institution are stuck like flies in the same great web your kids are. We buzz frantically to cover our own panic but have little power to help smaller flies. Looking backward on a thirty-year teaching career full of rewards and prizes, somehow I can't completely believe that I spent my time on earth institutionalized; I can’t believe that centralized schooling is allowed to exist at all as a gigantic indoctrination and sorting machine, robbing people of their children. Did it really happen? Was this my life? God help me.

School is a religion. Without understanding the holy mission aspect you're certain to misperceive what takes place as a result of human stupidity or venality or even class warfare. All are present in the equation, it's just that none of these matter very much—even without them school would move in the same direction. Dewey's Pedagogic Creed statement of 1897 gives you a clue to the zeitgeist:

Every teacher should realize he is a social servant set apart for the maintenance of the proper social order and the securing of the right social growth. In this way the teacher is always the prophet of the true God and the usherer in of the true kingdom of heaven.

What is "proper" social order? What does "right" social growth look like? If you don't know you're like me, not like John Dewey who did, or the Rockefellers, his patrons, who did, too. Somehow out of the industrial confusion which followed the Civil War, powerful men and dreamers became certain what kind of social order America needed, one very like the British system we had escaped a hundred years earlier. This realization didn't arise as a product of public debate as it should have in a democracy, but as a distillation of private discussion. Their ideas contradicted the original American charter but that didn't disturb them. They had a stupendous goal in mind—the rationalization of everything. The end of unpredictable history; its transformation into dependable order.

From mid-century onwards certain utopian schemes to retard maturity in the interests of a greater good were put into play, following roughly the blueprint Rousseau laid down in the book Emile. At least rhetorically. The first goal, to be reached in stages, was an orderly, scientifically managed society, one in which the best people would make the decisions, unhampered by democratic tradition. After that, human breeding, the evolutionary destiny of the species, would be in reach. Universal institutionalized formal forced schooling was the prescription, extending the dependency of the young well into what had traditionally been early adult life. Individuals would be prevented from taking up important work until a relatively advanced age. Maturity was to be retarded.

During the post-Civil War period, childhood was extended about four years. Later, a special label was created to describe very old children. It was called adolescence, a phenomenon hitherto unknown to the human race. The infantilization of young people didn't stop at the beginning of the twentieth century; child labour laws were extended to cover more and more kinds of work, the age of school leaving set higher and higher. The greatest victory for this utopian project was making school the only avenue to certain occupations. The intention was ultimately to draw all work into the school net. By the 1950s it wasn't unusual to find graduate students well into their thirties, running errands, waiting to start their lives.

He Was Square Inside and Brown

Barbara Whiteside showed me a poem written by a high school senior in Alton, Illinois, two weeks before he committed suicide:
He drew... the things inside that needed saying. Beautiful pictures he kept under his pillow. When he started school he brought them... To have along like a friend. It was funny about school; he sat at a square brown desk like all the other square brown desks... and his room was a square brown room like all the other rooms, tight and close and stiff. He hated to hold the pencil and chalk, his arms stiff his feet flat on the floor, stiff, the teacher watching and watching. She told him to wear a tie like all the other boys, he said he didn't like them. She said it didn't matter what he liked. After that the class drew. He drew all yellow. It was the way he felt about morning. The teacher came and smiled, "What's this? Why don't you draw something like Ken's drawing?"

After that his mother bought him a tie, and he always drew airplanes and rocketships like everyone else.

He was square inside and brown and his hands were stiff. The things inside that needed saying didn't need it anymore, they had stopped pushing... crushed, stiff like everything else.

After I spoke in Nashville, a mother named Debbie pressed a handwritten note on me which I read on the airplane to Binghamton, New York:

We started to see Brandon flounder in the first grade, hives, depression, he cried every night after he asked his father, "Is tomorrow school, too?" In second grade the physical stress became apparent. The teacher pronounced his problem Attention Deficit Syndrome. My happy, bouncy child was now looked at as a medical problem, by us as well as the school. A doctor, a psychiatrist, and a school authority all determined he did have this affliction. Medication was stressed along with behaviour modification. If it was suspected that Brandon had not been medicated he was sent home. My square peg needed a bit of whittling to fit their round hole, it seemed.

I cried as I watched my parenting choices stripped away. My ignorance of options allowed Brandon to be medicated through second grade. The tears and hives continued another full year until I couldn't stand it. I began to homeschool Brandon. It was his salvation. No more pills, tears, or hives. He is thriving. He never cries now and does his work eagerly.

The New Dumbness

Ordinary people send their children to school to get smart, but what modern schooling teaches is dumbness. It's a religious idea gone out of control. You don't have to accept that, though, to realize this kind of economy would be jeopardized by too many smart people who understand too much. I won't ask you to take that on faith. Be patient. I'll let a famous American publisher explain to you the secret of our global financial success in just a little while. Be patient.

Old-fashioned dumbness used to be simple ignorance; now it is transformed from ignorance into permanent mathematical categories of relative stupidity like "gifted and talented," "mainstream," "special ed." Categories in which learning is rationed for the good of a system of order. Dumb people are no longer merely ignorant. Now they are indoctrinated, their minds conditioned with substantial doses of commercially prepared disinformation dispensed for tranquilizing purposes.

Jacques Ellul, whose book Propaganda is a reflection on the phenomenon, warned us that prosperous children are more susceptible than others to the effects of schooling because they are promised more lifelong comfort and security for yielding wholly:

Critical judgment disappears altogether, for in no way can there ever be collective critical judgment... The individual can no longer judge for himself because he inescapably relates his thoughts to the entire complex of values and prejudices established by propaganda. With
regard to political situations, he is given ready-made value judgments invested with the power of the truth by...the word of experts.

The new dumbness is particularly deadly to middle- and upper-middle-class kids already made shallow by multiple pressures to conform imposed by the outside world on their usually lightly rooted parents. When they come of age, they are certain they must know something because their degrees and licenses say they do. They remain so convinced until an unexpectedly brutal divorce, a corporate downsizing in midlife, or panic attacks of meaninglessness upset the precarious balance of their incomplete humanity, their stillborn adult lives. Alan Bullock, the English historian, said Evil was a state of incompetence. If true, our school adventure has filled the twentieth century with evil. Ellul puts it this way:

The individual has no chance to exercise his judgment either on principal questions or on their implication; this leads to the atrophy of a faculty not comfortably exercised under [the best of] conditions...Once personal judgment and critical faculties have disappeared or have atrophied, they will not simply reappear when propaganda is suppressed...years of intellectual and spiritual education would be needed to restore such faculties. The propagandee, if deprived of one propaganda, will immediately adopt another, this will spare him the agony of finding himself vis a vis some event without a ready-made opinion.

Once the best children are broken to such a system, they disintegrate morally, becoming dependent on group approval. A National Merit Scholar in my own family once wrote that her dream was to be "a small part in a great machine." It broke my heart. What kids dumbed down by schooling can't do is to think for themselves or ever be at rest for very long without feeling crazy; stupefied boys and girls reveal dependence in many ways easily exploitable by their knowledgeable elders.

According to all official analysis, dumbness isn't taught (as I claim), but is innate in a great percentage of what has come to be called "the workforce." Workforce itself is a term that should tell you much about the mind that governs modern society. According to official reports, only a small fraction of the population is capable of what you and I call mental life: creative thought, analytical thought, judgmental thought, a trio occupying the three highest positions on Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. Just how small a fraction would shock you. According to experts, the bulk of the mob is hopelessly dumb, even dangerously so. Perhaps you're a willing accomplice to this social coup which revived the English class system. Certainly you are if your own child has been rewarded with a "gifted and talented" label by your local school. This is what Dewey means by "proper" social order.

If you believe nothing can be done for the dumb except kindness, because it's biology (the bell-curve model); if you believe capitalist oppressors have ruined the dumb because they are bad people (the neo-Marxist model); if you believe dumbness reflects depraved moral fibre (the Calvinist model); or that it's nature's way of disqualifying boobies from the reproduction sweepstakes (the Darwinian model); or nature's way of providing someone to clean your toilet (the pragmatic elitist model); or that it's evidence of bad karma (the Buddhist model); if you believe any of the various explanations given for the position of the dumb in the social order we have, then you will be forced to concur that a vast bureaucracy is indeed necessary to address the dumb. Otherwise they would murder us in our beds.

The shocking possibility that dumb people don't exist in sufficient numbers to warrant the careers devoted to tending to them will seem incredible to you. Yet that is my proposition: Mass dumbness first had to be imagined; it isn't real.

Once the dumb are wished into existence, they serve valuable functions: as a danger to themselves and others they have to be watched, classified, disciplined, trained, medicated, sterilized, ghettoized, cajoled, coerced, jailed. To idealists they represent a challenge.
reprobates to be made socially useful. Either way you want it, hundreds of millions of perpetual children require paid attention from millions of adult custodians. An ignorant horde to be schooled one way or another.

Putting Pedagogy to the Question

More than anything else, this book is a work of intuition. The official story of why we school doesn't add up today any more than it did yesterday. A few years before I quit, I began to try to piece together where this school project came from, why it took the shape it took, and why every attempt to change it has ended in abysmal failure. By now I've invested the better part of a decade looking for answers. If you want a conventional history of schooling, or education as it is carelessly called, you'd better stop reading now. Although years of research in the most arcane sources are reflected here, throughout it's mainly intuition that drives my synthesis.

This is in part a private narrative, the map of a schoolteacher's mind as it tracked strands in the web in which it had been wrapped; in part a public narrative, an account of the latest chapter in an ancient war: the conflict between systems which offer physical safety and certainty at the cost of suppressing free will, and those which offer liberty at the price of constant risk. If you keep both plots in mind, no matter how far afield my book seems to range, you won't wonder what a chapter on coal or one on private hereditary societies has to do with schoolchildren.

What I'm most determined to do is start a conversation among those who've been silent until now, and that includes schoolteachers. We need to put sterile discussions of grading and testing, discipline, curriculum, multiculturalism and tracking aside as distractions, as mere symptoms of something larger, darker, and more intransigent than any problem a problem-solver could tackle next week. Talking endlessly about such things encourages the bureaucratic tactic of talking around the vital, messy stuff. In partial compensation for your effort, I promise you'll discover what's in the mind of a man who spent his life in a room with children. Give an ear, then, to what follows. We shall cross-examine history together. We shall put pedagogy to the question. And if the judgment following this *auto da fe* is that only pain can make this monster relax its grip, let us pray together for the courage to inflict it.

Reading my essay will help you sort things out. It will give you a different topological map upon which to fix your own position. No doubt I've made some factual mistakes, but essays since Montaigne have been about locating truth, not about assembling facts. Truth and fact aren't the same thing. My essay is meant to mark out crudely some ground for a scholarship of schooling, my intention is that you not continue to regard the official project of education through an older, traditional perspective, but to see it as a frightening chapter in the administrative organization of knowledge—a text we must vigorously repudiate as our ancestors once did. We live together, you and I, in a dark time when all official history is propaganda. If you want truth, you have to struggle for it. This is my struggle. Let me bear witness to what I have seen.

...The Rockefeller Foundation has been instrumental through the century just passed (along with a few others) in giving us the schools we have. It imported the German research model into college life, elevated service to business and government as the goal of higher education, not teaching. And Rockefeller-financed University of Chicago and Columbia Teachers College have been among the most energetic actors in the lower school tragedy. There is more, too, but none of it means the Rockefeller family "masterminded" the school institution, or even that his foundation or his colleges did. All became in time submerged in the system they did so much to create, almost helpless to slow its momentum even had they so desired.
The best advice in this book is scattered throughout and indirect, you'll have to work to extract it. It begins with the very first sentence of the book where I remind you that what is right for systems is often wrong for human beings. Translated into a recommendation, that means that to avoid the revenge of Bianca, we must be prepared to insult systems for the convenience of humanity, not the other way around.

"For instance, for those of you who believe in testing, school superintendents as a class are virtually the stupidest people to pass through a graduate college program, ranking fifty-one points below the elementary school teachers they normally "supervise," (on the Graduate Record Examination), and about eighty points below secondary-school teachers, while teachers themselves as an aggregate finish seventeenth of twenty occupational groups surveyed. The reader is of course at liberty to believe this happened accidentally, or that the moon is composed of blue, not green, cheese as is popularly believed. It's also possible to take this anomaly as conclusive evidence of the irrelevance of standardized testing. Your choice.

Take at hazard one hundred children of several educated generations and one hundred uneducated children of the people and compare them in anything you please; in strength, in agility, in mind, in the ability to acquire knowledge, even in morality—and in all respects you are startled by the vast superiority on the side of the children of the uneducated.

– Count Leo Tolstoy, "Education and Children" (1862)

Chapter One - The Art of Driving

Now come back to the present while I demonstrate that the identical trust placed in ordinary people two hundred years ago still survives where it suits managers of our economy to allow it. Consider the art of driving, which I learned at the age of eleven. Without everybody behind the wheel, our sort of economy would be impossible, so everybody is there, IQ notwithstanding. With less than thirty hours of combined training and experience, a hundred million people are allowed access to vehicular weapons more lethal than pistols or rifles. Turned loose without a teacher, so to speak. Why does our government make such presumptions of competence, placing nearly unqualified trust in drivers, while it maintains such a tight grip on near-monopoly state schooling?

An analogy will illustrate just how radical this trust really is. What if I proposed that we hand three sticks of dynamite and a detonator to anyone who asked for them. All an applicant would need is money to pay for the explosives. You'd have to be an idiot to agree with my plan—at least based on the assumptions you picked up in school about human nature and human competence.

And yet gasoline, a spectacularly mischievous explosive, dangerously unstable and with the intriguing characteristic as an assault weapon that it can flow under locked doors and saturate bullet-proof clothing, is still available to anyone with a container. Five gallons of gasoline have the destructive power of a stick of dynamite. The average tank holds fifteen gallons, yet no background check is necessary for dispenser or dispensee. As long as gasoline is freely available, gun control is beside the point. Push on. Why do we allow access to a portable substance capable of incinerating houses, torching crowded theatres, or even turning skyscrapers into infernos? We haven't even considered the battering ram aspect of cars—why are novice operators allowed to command a ton of metal capable of hurting school crossings at up to two miles a minute? Why do we give the power of life and death this way to everyone?

It should strike you at once that our unstated official assumptions about human nature are dead wrong. Nearly all people are competent and responsible; universal motoring proves that. The efficiency of motor vehicles as terrorist instruments would have written a tragic record long ago if people were inclined to terrorism. But almost all auto mishaps are
accidents, and while there are seemingly a lot of those, the actual fraction of mishaps, when held up against the stupendous number of possibilities for mishap, is quite small. I know it's difficult to accept this because the spectre of global terrorism is a favourite cover story of governments, but the truth is substantially different from the tale the public is sold.

According to the U.S. State Department, 1995 was a near-record year for terrorist murders; it saw three hundred worldwide (two hundred at the hand of the Tamil Tigers in Sri Lanka) compared to four hundred thousand smoking-related deaths in the United States alone. When we consider our assumptions about human nature that keep children in a condition of confinement and limited options, we need to reflect on driving and things like almost nonexistent global terrorism.

Notice how quickly people learn to drive well. Early failure is efficiently corrected, usually self-corrected, because the terrific motivation of staying alive and in one piece steers driving improvement. If the grand theories of Comenius and Herbart about learning by incremental revelation, or those lifelong nanny rules of Owen, Maculture, Pestalozzi, and Beatrice Webb, or those calls for precision in human ranking of Thorndike and Hall, or those nuanced interventions of Yale, Stanford, and Columbia Teachers College were actually as essential as their proponents claimed, this libertarian miracle of motoring would be unfathomable.

Now consider the intellectual component of driving. It isn't all just hand-eye-foot coordination. First-time drivers make dozens, no, hundreds, of continuous hypotheses, plans, computations, and fine-tuned judgments every day they drive. They do this skilfully, without being graded, because if they don't, organic provision exists in the motoring universe to punish them. There isn't any court of appeal from your own stupidity on the road. I could go on: think of licensing, maintenance, storage, adapting machine and driver to seasons and daily conditions. Carefully analyzed, driving is as impressive a miracle as walking, talking, or reading, but this only shows the inherent weakness of analysis since we know almost everyone learns to drive well in a few hours. The way we used to be as Americans, learning everything, breaking down social class barriers, is the way we might be again without forced schooling. Driving proves that to me.

The Schools of Hellas

Wherever it occurred, schooling through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (up until the last third of the nineteenth) heavily invested its hours with language, philosophy, art, and the life of the classical civilizations of Greece and Rome. In the grammar schools of the day, little pure grammar as we understand it existed; they were places of classical learning. Early America rested easily on a foundation of classical understanding, one subversive to the normal standards of British class society. The lessons of antiquity were so vital to the construction of every American institution it's hardly possible to grasp how deep the gulf between then and now is without knowing a little about those lessons. Prepare yourself for a surprise.

For a long time, for instance, classical Athens distributed its most responsible public positions by lottery: army generalships, water supply, everything. The implications are awesome—trust in everyone's competence was assumed; it was their version of universal driving. Professionals existed but did not make key decisions; they were only technicians, never well regarded because prevailing opinion held that technicians had enslaved their own minds. Anyone worthy of citizenship was expected to be able to think clearly and to welcome great responsibility.

As you reflect on this, remember our own unvoiced assumption that anyone can guide a ton of metal travelling at high speed with three sticks of dynamite sloshing around in its tanks.

When we ask what kind of schooling was behind this brilliant society which has enchanted the centuries ever since, any honest reply can be carried in one word: None. After writing a
book searching for the hidden genius of Greece in its schools, Kenneth Freeman concluded his unique study *The Schools of Hellas* in 1907 with this summary, "There were no schools in Hellas." No place boys and girls spent their youth attending continuous instruction under command of strangers. Indeed, nobody did homework in the modern sense; none could be located on standardized tests. The tests that mattered came in living, striving to meet ideals that local tradition imposed. The word *sköle* itself means leisure, leisure in a formal garden to think and reflect. Plato in *The Laws* is the first to refer to school as learned discussion. The most famous school in Athens was Plato's Academy, but in its physical manifestation it had no classes or bells, was a well-mannered hangout for thinkers and seekers, a generator of good conversation and good friendship, things Plato thought lay at the core of education. Today we might call such a phenomenon a salon. Aristotle's Lyceum was pretty much the same, although Aristotle delivered two lectures a day—a tough one in the morning for intense thinkers, a kinder, gentler version of the same in the afternoon for less ambitious minds. Attendance was optional. And the famous Gymnasium so memorable as a forge for German leadership later on was in reality only an open training ground where men sixteen to fifty were free to participate in high-quality, state-subsidized instruction in boxing, wrestling, and javelin.

The idea of schooling free men in anything would have revolted Athenians. Forced training was for slaves. Among free men, learning was self-discipline, not the gift of experts. From such notions Americans derived their own academies, the French their lycées, and the Germans their gymnasium. Think of it: In Athens, instruction was unorganized even though the city-state was surrounded by enemies and its own society engaged in the difficult social experiment of sustaining a participatory democracy, extending privileges without precedent to citizens, and maintaining literary, artistic, and legislative standards which remain to this day benchmarks of human genius. For its five-hundred-year history from Homer to Aristotle, Athenian civilization was a miracle in a rude world; teachers flourished there but none was grounded in fixed buildings with regular curricula under the thumb of an intricately layered bureaucracy.

There were no schools in Hellas. For the Greeks, study was its own reward. Beyond that few cared to go.

The Fresco at Herculaneum

Sparta, Athens' neighbour, was a horse of a different colour. Society in Sparta was organized around the concept of cradle-to-grave formal training. The whole state was a universal schoolhouse, official prescriptions for the population filled every waking minute and the family was employed as a convenience for the state. Sparta's public political arrangements were an elaborate sham, organized nominally around an executive branch with two legislative bodies, but ultimate decision-making was in the hands of *ephors*, a small elite who conducted state policy among themselves. The practical aspect of imitation democracy figures strongly in the thought of later social thinkers such as Machiavelli (1532) and Hobbes (1651), as well as in minds nearer our own time who had influence on the shape of American forced schooling.

Spartan ideas of management came to American consciousness through classical studies in early schooling, through churches, and also through interest in the German military state of Prussia, which consciously modelled itself after Sparta. As the nineteenth century entered its final decades American university training came to follow the Prussian/Spartan model. Service to business and the political state became the most important reason for college and university existence after 1910. No longer was college primarily about developing mind and character in the young. Instead, it was about moulding those things as instruments for use by others. Here is an important clue to the philosophical split which informed the foundation of modern schooling and to an important extent still does: small farmers, crafts folk, trades people, little town and city professionals, little industrialists, and older manorial interests took a part of their dream of America from democratic Athens or from republican
Rome (not the Rome of the emperors); this comprised a significant proportion of ordinary America. But new urban managerial elites pointed to a future based on Spartan outlook.

When the instructional system of Athens transferred to Imperial Rome, a few schools we would recognize began to appear. The familiar punishment practices of colonial America can be found anticipated vividly in the famous fresco at Herculaneum, showing a Roman schoolboy being held by two of his classmates while the master advances, carrying a long whip. Roman schools must have started discipline early in the morning for we find the poet Martial cursing a school for waking him up at cock's crow with shouts and beatings; Horace immortalizes pedagogue Orbilius for whipping a love of old poets into him. But we shouldn't be misled by these school references. What few schools there were in Rome were for boys of prosperous classes, and even most of these relied upon tutors, tradition, and emulation, not school.

The word pedagogue is Latin for a specialized class of slave assigned to walk a student to the schoolmaster; over time the slave was given additional duties, his role was enlarged to that of drill master, a procedure memorialized in Varro's instituit pedagogus, docet magister: in my rusty altar-boy Latin, The master creates instruction, the slave pounds it in. A key to modern schooling is this: free men were never pedagogues. And yet we often refer to the science of modern schooling as pedagogy. The unenlightened parent who innocently brings matters of concern to the pedagogue, whether that poor soul is called schoolteacher, principal, or superintendent, is usually beginning a game of frustration which will end in no fundamental change. A case of barking up the wrong tree in a dark wood where the right tree is far away and obscure.

Pedagogy is social technology for winning attention and cooperation (or obedience) while strings are attached to the mind and placed in the hands of an unseen master. This may be done holistically, with smiles, music, and light-duty simulations of intellection, or it can be done harshly with rigorous drills and competitive tests. The quality of self-doubt aimed for in either case is similar.

Pedagogy is a useful concept to help us unthread some of the mysteries of modern schooling. That it is increasingly vital to the social order is evinced by the quiet teacher-pay revolution that has occurred since the 1960s. As with police work (to which pedagogy bears important similarities), school pay has become relatively good, its hours of labour short, its job security first rate. Contrast this with the golden years of one-room schooling where pay was subsistence only and teachers were compelled to board around to keep body and soul together. Yet there was no shortage then of applicants and many sons of prominent Americans began their adult lives as schoolteachers.

With the relative opulence of today, it would be simple to fill teaching slots with accomplished men and women if that were a goal. A little adjustment in what are rationally indefensible licensing requirements would make talented people, many performance-tested adults in their fifties and sixties, available to teach. That there is not such fluid access is a good sign the purpose of schooling is more than it appears. The year-in, year-out consistency of mediocre teacher candidates demonstrates clearly that the school institution actively seeks, nurtures, hires, and promotes the calibre of personnel it needs.

The Seven Liberal Arts

When Rome dissolved in the sixth century, Roman genius emerged as the Universal Christian Church, an inspired religious sect grown spontaneously into a vehicle which invested ultimate responsibility for personal salvation in the sovereign individual. The Roman Church hit upon schooling as a useful adjunct, and so what few schools could be found after the fall of Rome were in ecclesiastical hands, remaining there for the next eleven or twelve centuries.
Promotion inside the Church began to depend on having first received training of the Hellenic type. Thus a brotherhood of thoughtful men was created from the demise of the Empire and from the necessity of intellectually defining the new mission.

As the Church experimented with schooling, students met originally at the teacher's house, but gradually some church space was dedicated for the purpose. Thanks to competition among Church officials, each Bishop strove to offer a school and these, in time to be called Cathedral schools, attracted attention and some important sponsorship, each being a showcase of the Bishop's own educational taste.

When the Germanic tribes evacuated northern Europe, overrunning the south, cathedral schools and monastic schools trained the invading leadership—a precedent of disregarding local interests which has continued ever after. Cathedral schools were the important educational institutions of the Middle Ages; from them derived all the schools of Western Europe, at least in principle. In practice, however, few forms of later schooling would be the intense intellectual centres these were. The Seven Liberal Arts made up the main curriculum; lower studies were composed of grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic. Grammar was an introduction to literature, rhetoric an introduction to law and history, dialectic the path to philosophical and metaphysical disputation. Higher studies included arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy. Arithmetic was well beyond simple calculation, entering into descriptive and analytical capacities of numbers and their prophetic use (which became modern statistics); geometry embraced geography and surveying; music covered a broad course in theory; astronomy prepared entry into physics and advanced mathematics.

Between the eleventh and the fourteenth centuries, an attempt to reduce the influence of emotionality in religion took command of church policy. Presenting the teachings of the Church in scientific form became the main ecclesiastical purpose of school, a tendency called scholasticism. This shift from emotion to intellect resulted in great skill in analysis, in comparison and contrasts, in classifications and abstraction, as well as famous verbal hairsplitting—like how many angels could dance on the head of a pin. Scholasticism became the basis for future upper-class schooling.

The Platonic Ideal

The official use of common schooling was invented by Plato; after him the idea languished, its single torchbearer the Church. Educational offerings from the Church were intended for, though not completely limited to, those young whose parentage qualified them as a potential Guardian class. You would hardly know this from reading any standard histories of Western schooling intended for the clientele of teacher colleges.

Intense development of the Platonic ideal of comprehensive social control through schooling suddenly reappeared two thousand years later in eighteenth-century France at the hands of a philosophical cultus known to history as philosophes, enthusiastic promoters of the bizarre idea of mass forced schooling. Most prominent among them, a self-willed man named Jean Jacques Rousseau. To add piquancy to Rousseau's thought, you need to know that when they were born, he chose to give away his own five offspring to strangers. If any man captures the essence of enlightenment transformation, it is Rousseau.

The Enlightenment "project" was conceived as a series of stages, each further levelling mankind, collectivizing ordinary humanity into a colonial organism like a volvox. The penetration of this idea, at least on the periphery of our own Founders' consciousness, is captured in the powerful mystery image of the pyramid on the obverse of our Great Seal. Of course, this was only one of many colours to emerge with the new nation, and it was not the most important, an inference that can be drawn from the fact that the pyramid was kept from public notice until 1935. Then it appeared suddenly on the back of our one dollar bill, signalling a profound shift in political management.
Oriental Pedagogy

The ideal of a levelling Oriental pedagogy expressed through government schooling was promoted by Jacobin orators of the French National Convention in the early 1790s, the commencement years of our own republic. The notion of forced schooling was irresistible to French radicals, an enthusiasm whose foundation had been laid in preceding centuries by utopian writers like Harrington (*Oceania*), More (*Utopia*), Bacon (*New Atlantis*), Campanella (*City of the Sun*), and in other speculative fantasy embracing the fate of children. Cultivating a collective social organism was considered the ingredient missing from feudal society, an ingredient which would allow the West the harmony and stability of the East.

Utopian schooling is never about learning in the traditional sense; it's about the transformation of human nature. The core of the difference between Occident and Orient lies in the power relationship between privileged and ordinary, and in respective outlooks on human nature. In the West, a metaphorical table is spread by society; the student decides how much to eat; in the East, the teacher makes that decision. The Chinese character for school shows a passive child with adult hands pouring knowledge into his empty head.

To mandate outcomes centrally would be a major step in the destruction of Western identity. Management by objectives, whatever those objectives might be, is a technique of corporate subordination, not of education. Like Alfred's, Charlemagne's awareness of Asia was sharpened in mortal combat. He was the first secular Western potentate to beat the drum for secular schooling. It was easy to ignore Plato's gloomy forecast that however attractive utopia appears in imagination, human nature will not live easily with the degree of synthetic constraint it requires.

Counter-Attack On Democracy

By standards of the time, America was utopia already. No grinding poverty, no dangerous national enemies, no indigenous tradition beyond a general spirit of exuberant optimism, a belief the land had been touched by destiny, a conviction Americans could accomplish anything. John Jay wrote to Jefferson in 1787, "The enterprise of our country is inconceivable"—inconceivable, that is, to the British, Germans, and French, who were accustomed to keeping the common population on a leash. Our colonial government was the creation of the Crown, of course, but soon a fantastic idea began to circulate, a belief that people might create or destroy governments at their will.

The empty slate of the new republic made it vulnerable to advanced utopian thinking. While in England and Germany, temptation was great to develop and use Oriental social machinery to bend mass population into an instrument of elite will, in America there was no hereditary order or traditional direction. We were a nation awash in literate, self-reliant men and women, the vast majority with an independent livelihood or ambitions toward getting one. Americans were inventors and technicians without precedent, entrepreneurs unlocked from traditional controls, dreamers, confidence men, flim-flam artists. There never was a social stew quite like it.

The practical difficulties these circumstances posed to utopian governing would have been insuperable except for one seemingly strange source of enthusiasm for such an endeavour in the business community. That puzzle can be solved by considering how the promise of democracy was a frightening *terra incognita* to men of substance. To look to men like Sam Adams or Tom Paine as directors of the future was like looking down the barrel of a loaded gun, at least to people of means. So the men who had begun the Revolution were eased out by the men who ended it.

As early as 1784, a concerted effort was made by the Boston business community to overthrow town meetings, replacing them with a professionally managed corporation.
Joseph Barrell, a wealthy merchant, claimed that citizen safety could be enhanced this way—and besides, “a great number of very respectable gentlemen” wished it.

Timothy Dwight, longtime president of Yale after 1795, and a pioneer in modern education (advocating science as the centre of curriculum), fought a mighty battle against advancing democracy. Democracy was hardly the sort of experiment men of affairs would willingly submit their lives and fortunes to for very long.

This tension explains much about how our romance with forced schooling came about; it was a way to stop democracy aborning as Germany had done. Much ingenuity was expended on this problem in the early republic, particularly by so-called liberal Christian sects like Unitarians and Universalists. If you read relics of their debates preserved from select lyceums, private meetings at which minutes were kept, journals, recollections of drawing room conversations and club discussions, you see that what was shaping up was an attempt to square the circle, to give the appearance that the new society was true to its founding promise, while at the same time a sound basis could be established for the meritorious to run things. Once again, the spirit of Sparta was alive with its ephors and its reliance on forced instruction. In discussions, speeches, sermons, editorials, experimental legislation, letters, diaries, and elsewhere, the ancient idea of mass forced schooling was called forth and mused upon.

How Hindu Schooling Came To America (I)

By the end of the first quarter of the nineteenth century, a form of school technology was up and running in America's larger cities, one in which children of lower-class customers were psychologically conditioned to obedience under pretext that they were learning reading and counting (which may also have happened). These were the Lancaster schools, sponsored by Governor DeWitt Clinton of New York and prominent Quakers like Thomas Eddy, builder of the Erie Canal. They soon spread to every corner of the nation where the problem of an incipient proletariat existed. Lancaster schools are cousins of today's school factories. What few knew then or realize now is that they were also a Hindu invention, designed with the express purpose of retarding intellectual development.

How Hindu schooling came to America, England, Germany, and France at just about the same time is a story which has never been told. A full treatment is beyond the scope of this book, but I'll tell you enough to set you wondering how an Asiatic device specifically intended to preserve a caste system came to reproduce itself in the early republic, protected by influential's of the magnitude of Clinton and Eddy. Even a brief dusting off of schooling's Hindu provenance should warn you that what you know about American schooling isn't much.

First, a quick gloss on the historical position of India at the time of the American Revolution—for Lancaster schools were in New York two decades after its end. India fell victim to Western dominance through nautical technology in the following fashion: When medieval Europe broke up after its long struggle to reconcile emergent science with religion, five great ocean powers appeared to compete for the wealth of the planet: Portugal, Spain, France, the Netherlands, and England. Portugal was the first to sail for treasure, leaving colonies in India, China, and South America, but its day in the sun was short. Spain emerged as the next global superpower, but after 1600, her character decayed rapidly from the corrupting effects of the gold of the Americas, which triggered a long national decline. The Netherlands, turn followed because that nation had the advantage of a single-minded commercial class in control of things with one aim in mind: wealth. The Dutch monopolized the carrying trade of Europe with globe-trotting merchant ships and courageous military seamanship, yet as with Portugal before it, the Dutch population was too small, its internal resources too anaemic for its dominance to extend very long. Beginning in the seventeenth century, England and France gradually built business in the East, both balked for a time by the Dutch who controlled the spice trade of the Indies. Three
naval wars with the Dutch made the Royal Navy master of the seas, in the process
developing tactics of sea warfare that made it dominant for the next two centuries. By
1700, only France and England remained as global sea powers with impressive fighting
ability, and during the last half of that century these giants slugged it out directly in
Canada, India, and in the territory which is today the United States, with the result that
France went permanently into eclipse.

In India, the two contended through their commercial pseudopodia, the British and French
East India Companies: each maintained a private army to war on the other for tea, indigo,
turmeric, ginger, quinine, oilseeds, silk, and that product which most captivated British
merchants with its portability and breakaway profit potential—opium. At Plassey,
Chandernagor, Madras, and Wandiwash, this long corporate rivalry ended. The French
abandoned India to the British. The drug monopoly was finally England's. (covered later)

Out of this experience and the observations of a wealthy young Anglican chaplain in India,
the formula for modern schooling was discovered. Perhaps it was no more than coincidence
this fellow held his first gainful employment as a schoolteacher in the United States; on the
other hand, perhaps his experience in a nation which successfully threw off British shackles
sensitized him to the danger an educated population poses to plutocracies.

How Hindu Schooling Came To America (II)

Andrew Bell, the gentleman in question, used to be described in old editions of the
*Britannica* as "cold, shrewd, self-seeking." He might not have been the most pious cleric.
Perhaps like his contemporary, Parson Malthus, he didn't really believe in God at all, but as
a young man following the flag he had an eye out for the main chance. Bell found his
opportunity when he studied the structure Hindus arranged for training the lower castes,
about 95 percent of the Indian population. It might well serve a Britain which had driven its
peasantry into ruin in order to create an industrial proletariat for coal-driven industry.

Bell was fascinated by the purposeful nature of Hindu schooling. It seemed eminently
compatible with the goals of the English state church. So as many another ambitious young
man has done throughout history when he stumbles upon a little-known novelty, he swept
it. Before we turn to details of the Hindu method, and how Bell himself was upstaged by an
ambitious young Quaker who beat him into the school market with a working version of
Bell's idea, you should understand a little about Hindu religion.

The caste system of Hinduism or Brahmanism is the Anglican class system pushed to its
imaginative limits. A five-category ranking (each category further subdivided) apportions
people into a system similar to that found in modern schools. Prestige and authority are
reserved for the three highest castes, although they only comprise 5 percent of the total;
inescapable servility is assigned the lowest caste, a pariah group outside serious
consideration.

In the Hindu system one may *fall* into a lower caste, *but one cannot rise*.

When the British began to administer India, Hindus represented 70 percent of a population
well over a hundred million. Contrast this with an America of perhaps three million. In the
northern region, British hero Robert Clive was president of Bengal where people were
conspicuously lighter-skinned than the other major Indian group, having features not unlike
those of the British.

Hindu castes looked like this:

The upper 5 percent was divided into three "twice-born" groups.
Brahmins—Priests and those trained for law, medicine, teaching, and other professional occupations.

The warrior and administrative caste.

The industrial caste, which would include land cultivators and mercantile groups.

The lower 95 percent was divided into:

The menial caste.

Pariahs, called "untouchables."

The entire purpose of Hindu schooling was to preserve the caste system. Only the lucky 5 percent received an education which gave perspective on the whole, a key to understanding. In actual practice, warriors, administrators, and most of the other leaders were given much diluted insight into the driving engines of the culture, so that policy could be kept in the hands of Brahmins. But what of the others, the "masses" as Western socialist tradition would come to call them in an echoing tribute to the Hindu class idea? The answer to that vital question launched factory schooling in the West.

Which brings us back to Andrew Bell. Bell noticed that in some places Hinduism had created a mass schooling institution for children of the ordinary, one inculcating a curriculum of self-abnegation and willing servility. In these places hundreds of children were gathered in a single gigantic room, divided into phalanxes of ten under the direction of student leaders with the whole ensemble directed by a Brahmin. In the Roman manner, paid pedagogues drilled underlings in the memorization and imitation of desired attitudes and these underlings drilled the rest. Here was a social technology made in heaven for the factories and mines of Britain, still uncomfortably saturated in older yeoman legends of liberty and dignity, one not yet possessing the perfect proletarian attitudes mass production must have for maximum efficiency. Nobody in the early years of British rule had made a connection between this Hindu practice and the pressing requirements of an industrial future. Nobody, that is, until a thirty-four-year-old Scotsman arrived in India as military chaplain.

How Hindu Schooling Came To America (III)

Young Bell was a go-getter. Two years after he got to India he was superintendent of the male orphan asylum of Madras. In order to save money Bell decided to try the Hindu system he had seen and found it led students quickly to docile cooperation, like parts of a machine. Furthermore, they seemed relieved not to have to think, grateful to have their time reduced to rituals and routines as Frederick Taylor was to reform the American workplace a hundred years later.

In 1797, Bell, now forty-two, published an account of what he had seen and done. Pulling no punches. A twenty-year-old Quaker, Joseph Lancaster, read Bell's pamphlet, thought deeply on the method, and concluded, ironically, it would be a cheap way to awaken intellect in the lower classes, ignoring the Anglican's observation (and Hindu experience) that it did just the opposite. Lancaster began to gather poor children under his father's roof in Borough Road, London, to give them rudimentary instruction without a fee. Word spread and children emerged from every alley, dive, and garret, craving to learn. Soon a thousand children were gathering in the street. The Duke of Bedford heard about Lancaster and provided him with a single enormous schoolroom and a few materials. The monitorial system, as it was called, promised to promote a mental counterpart to the productivity of factories. Transforming dirty ghetto children into an orderly army attracted many observers. The fact that Lancaster's school ran at tiny cost with only one employee raised interest, too. Invitations arrived to lecture in surrounding towns, where the Quaker expounded on what had now become his system. Lancaster schools multiplied under the
direction of young men he personally trained. So talked about did the phenomenon become, it eventually attracted the attention of King George III himself, who commanded an interview with Joseph. Royal patronage followed on the stipulation that every poor child be taught to read the Bible.

But with fame and public responsibility, another side of Lancaster showed itself—he became vain, reckless, improvident. Interested noblemen bailed him out after he fell deeply in debt, and helped him found the British and Foreign School Society, but Lancaster hated being watched over and soon proved impossible to control. He left the organization his patrons erected, starting a private school which went bankrupt. By 1818 the Anglican Church, warming to Bell's insight that schooled ignorance was more useful than unschooled stupidity, set up a rival chain of factory schools that proved to be handwriting on the wall for Lancaster. In the face of this competition he fled to America where his fame and his method had already preceded him.

Meanwhile, in England, the whole body of dissenting sects gave Lancaster vociferous public support, thoroughly alarming the state church hierarchy. Prominent church laymen and clergy were not unaware that Lancaster's schools weren't playing by Hindu rules—the prospect of a literate underclass with unseemly ambitions was a window on a future impossible to tolerate. Bell had been recalled from his rectory in Dorset in 1807 to contest Lancaster's use of Hindu schooling. In 1811, he was named superintendent of an organization to oppose Lancaster's British and Foreign School Society, "The National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church." Since those principles held that the poor were poor because the Lord wanted it that way, the content of the society's schooling leaves little about which we need to speculate. Bell was sent to plant his system in Presbyterian Scotland, while the patronage advantage of Bell-system schools contained and diminished the reach of Lancaster. For his services to the state, Bell was eventually buried in Westminster Abbey.

At first, Lancaster was welcomed warmly in the United States, but his affection for children and his ability to awaken pride and ambition in his charges made him ultimately unacceptable to important patrons who were much more interested in spreading Bell's dumbed-down method, without its Church of England baggage attached. Fortunately for their schemes, Lancaster grew even more shiftless, unmethodical, and incapable of sustained effort (or principled action). In the twenty remaining years of his life, Lancaster ranged from Montreal to Caracas, disowned by Quakers for reasons I've been unable to discover. He once declared it would be possible to teach illiterates to read fluently in twenty to ninety days, which is certainly true. At the age of sixty he was run over by a carriage in New York and died a few hours later.

But while he died an outcast, his system outlived him, or at least a system bearing his name did, albeit more Bell's than Lancaster's. It accustomed an influential public to expect streets to be clear of the offspring of the poor and to expenditures of tax money to accomplish this end. The first Lancaster school was opened in New York City in 1806; by 1829 the idea had spread to the Mexican state of Texas with stops as far west as Cincinnati, Louisville, and Detroit. The governors of New York and Pennsylvania recommended general adoption to their legislatures. What exactly was a "Lancaster" school? Its essential features involved one large room stuffed with anywhere from three hundred to a thousand children under the direction of a single teacher. The children were seated in rows. The teacher was not there to teach but to be "a bystander and inspector"; students, ranked in a paramilitary hierarchy, did the actual teaching:

What the master says should be done. When the pupils as well as the schoolmaster understand how to act and learn on this system, the system, not the master's vague discretionary, uncertain judgment, will be in practice. In common school the authority of the master is personal, and the rod is his sceptre. His absence is an immediate signal for
confusion, but in a school conducted on my plan when the master leaves the school, the business will go on as well in his absence as in his presence. [emphasis added]

Here, without forcing the matter, is our modern pedagogus technologicus, harbinger of future computerized instruction. In such a system, teachers and administrators are forbidden to depart from instructions elsewhere written. But while dumbing children down was the whole of the government school education in England, it was only part of the story in America, and a minor one until the twentieth century.

Montaigne’s Curriculum

Between the fall of Rome in the late fifth century and the decline of monarchy in the eighteenth, secular schooling in any form was hardly a ripple on the societies of Europe. There was talk of it at certain times and places, but it was courtly talk, never very serious. What simple schooling we find was modestly undertaken by religious orders which usually had no greater ambition than providing a stream of assistants to the ecclesiastical bureaucracy, and perhaps moulding the values of whatever future leaders proved susceptible; the few exceptions shouldn't be looked upon as the spark for our own schools. School was only a tiny blip on the radar until the last half of the eighteenth century.

If you and I are to have a productive partnership in this book you need to clear your mind of false history, the type that clogs the typical school chronicle written for teacher training institutes where each fact may be verifiable but the conclusions drawn from them are not. Turn to typical school history and you will learn about the alleged anticipation of our own schools by Comenius, of the reformed Latin Grammar School founded by Dean Colet at St. Paul's in London in 1510, of the ”solitaries of Port Royal,” whoever those lonely men may have been; each instance is real, the direction they lead in is false. What formal school experimentation the West provided touched only a tiny fraction of the population, and rarely those who became social leaders, let alone pioneers of the future.

Chapter two

One way to see the difference between school and real (life) is to examine different procedures which separate librarians, the custodians of real books, from schoolteachers, the custodians of schoolbooks. To begin with, libraries are usually comfortable, clean, and quiet. They are orderly places where you can actually read instead of just pretending to read.

For some reason libraries are never age-segregated, nor do they presume to segregate readers by questionable tests of ability any more than farms or forests or oceans do. The librarian doesn't tell me what to read, doesn't tell me what sequence of reading I have to follow, doesn't grade my reading. The librarian trusts me to have a worthwhile purpose of my own. I appreciate that and trust the library in return.

Some other significant differences between libraries and schools: the librarian lets me ask my own questions and helps me when I want help, not when she decides I need it. If I feel like reading all day long, that's okay with the librarian, who doesn't compel me to stop at intervals by ringing a bell in my ear. The library keeps its nose out of my home. It doesn't send letters to my family, nor does it issue orders on how I should use my reading time at home.

The library doesn't play favourites; it's a democratic place as seems proper in a democracy. If the books I want are available, I get them, even if that decision deprives someone more gifted and talented than I am. The library never humiliates me by posting ranked lists of good readers. It presumes good reading is its own reward and doesn't need to be held up as an object lesson to bad readers. One of the strangest differences between a library and a school is that you almost never see a kid behaving badly in a library.
The library never makes predictions about my future based on my past reading habits. It tolerates eccentric reading because it realizes free men and women are often very eccentric. Finally, the library has real books, not schoolbooks. I know the *Moby Dick* I find in the library won't have questions at the end of the chapter or be scientifically bowdlerized. Library books are not written by collective pens. At least not yet. Real books conform to the private curriculum of each author, not to the invisible curriculum of a corporate bureaucracy. Real books transport us to an inner realm of solitude and unmonitored mental reflection in a way schoolbooks and computer programs can't. If they were not devoid of such capacity, they would jeopardize school routines devised to control behaviour. Real books conform to the private curriculum of particular authors, not to the demands of bureaucracy.

Intellectual Espionage

At the start of WWII millions of men showed up at registration offices to take low-level academic tests before being inducted. The years of maximum mobilization were 1942 to 1944; the fighting force had been mostly schooled in the 1930s, both those inducted and those turned away. Of the 18 million men were tested, 17,280,000 of them were judged to have the minimum competence in reading required to be a soldier, a 96 percent literacy rate. Although this was a 2 percent fall-off from the 98 percent rate among voluntary military applicants ten years earlier, the dip was so small it didn't worry anybody.

WWII was over in 1945. Six years later another war began in Korea. Several million men were tested for military service but this time 600,000 were rejected. Literacy in the draft pool had dropped to 81 percent, even though all that was needed to classify a soldier as literate was fourth-grade reading proficiency. In the few short years from the beginning of WWII to Korea, a terrifying problem of adult illiteracy had appeared. The Korean War group received most of its schooling in the 1940s, and it had more years in school with more professionally trained personnel and more scientifically selected textbooks than the WWII men, yet it could not read, write, count, speak, or think as well as the earlier, less-schooled contingent.

A third American war began in the mid-1960s. By its end in 1973 the number of men found noninductible by reason of inability to read safety instructions, interpret road signs, decipher orders, and so on—in other words, the number found illiterate—had reached 27 percent of the total pool. Vietnam-era young men had been schooled in the 1950s and the 1960s—much better schooled than either of the two earlier groups—but the 4 percent illiteracy of 1941 which had transmuted into the 19 percent illiteracy of 1952 had now had grown into the 27 percent illiteracy of 1970. Not only had the fraction of competent readers dropped to 73 percent but a substantial chunk of even those were only barely adequate; they could not keep abreast of developments by reading a newspaper, they could not read for pleasure, they could not sustain a thought or an argument, they could not write well enough to manage their own affairs without assistance.

Consider how much more compelling this steady progression of intellectual blindness is when we track it through army admissions tests rather than college admissions scores and standardized reading tests, which inflate apparent proficiency by frequently changing the way the tests are scored.

Looking back, abundant data exist from states like Connecticut and Massachusetts to show that by 1840 the incidence of complex literacy in the United States was between 93 and 100 percent wherever such a thing mattered. According to the Connecticut census of 1840, only one citizen out of every 579 was illiterate and you probably don't want to know, not really, what people in those days considered literate; it's too embarrassing.

Popular novels of the period give a clue: *Last of the Mohicans*, published in 1826, sold so well that a contemporary equivalent would have to move 10 million copies to match it. If you
pick up an uncut version you find yourself in a dense thicket of philosophy, history, culture, manners, politics, geography, analysis of human motives and actions, all conveyed in data-rich periodic sentences so formidable only a determined and well-educated reader can handle it nowadays. Yet in 1818 we were a small-farm nation without colleges or universities to speak of. Could those simple folk have had more complex minds than our own?

By 1940, the literacy figure for all states stood at 96 percent for whites, 80 percent for blacks. Notice that for all the disadvantages blacks laboured under, four of five were nevertheless literate. Six decades later, at the end of the twentieth century, the National Adult Literacy Survey and the National Assessment of Educational Progress say 40 percent of blacks and 17 percent of whites can't read at all. Put another way, black illiteracy doubled, white illiteracy quadrupled. Before you think of anything else in regard to these numbers, think of this: we spend three to four times as much real money on schooling as we did sixty years ago, but sixty years ago virtually everyone, black or white, could read.

In their famous bestseller, *The Bell Curve*, prominent social analysts Charles Murray and Richard Herrnstein say that what we're seeing are the results of selective breeding in society. Smart people naturally get together with smart people, dumb people with dumb people. As they have children generation after generation, the differences between the groups gets larger and larger. That sounds plausible and the authors produce impressive mathematics to prove their case, but their documentation shows they are entirely ignorant of the military data available to challenge their contention. The terrifying drop in literacy between World War II and Korea happened in a decade, and even the brashest survival-of-the-fittest theorist wouldn't argue evolution unfolds that way. *The Bell Curve* writers say black illiteracy (and violence) is genetically programmed, but like many academics they ignore contradictory evidence.

For example, on the matter of violence inscribed in black genes, the inconvenient parallel is to South Africa where 31 million blacks live, the same count living in the United States. Compare numbers of blacks who died by violence in South Africa in civil war conditions during 1989, 1990, and 1991 with our own peacetime mortality statistics and you find that far from exceeding the violent death toll in the United States or even matching it, South Africa had proportionately less than one-quarter the violent death rate of American blacks. If more contemporary comparisons are sought, we need only compare the current black literacy rate in the United States (56 percent) with the rate in Jamaica (98.5 percent)—a figure considerably higher than the American white literacy rate (83 percent).

If not heredity, what then? Well, one change is indisputable, well-documented and easy to track. During WWII, American public schools massively converted to non-phonetic ways of teaching reading. On the matter of violence alone this would seem to have impact: according to the Justice Department, 80 percent of the incarcerated violent criminal population is illiterate or nearly so (and 67 percent of all criminals locked up). There seems to be a direct connection between the humiliation poor readers experience and the life of angry criminals.2 As reading ability plummeted in America after WWII, crime soared, so did out-of-wedlock births, which doubled in the 1950s and doubled again in the '60s, when bizarre violence for the first time became commonplace in daily life.

When literacy was first abandoned as a primary goal by schools, white people were in a better position than black people because they inherited a three-hundred-year-old American tradition of learning to read at home by matching spoken sound with letters, thus home assistance was able to correct the deficiencies of dumbed-down schools for whites. But black people had been forbidden to learn to read under slavery, and as late as 1930 only averaged three to four years of schooling, so they were helpless when teachers suddenly stopped teaching children to read, since they had no fall-back position. Not helpless because of genetic inferiority but because they had to trust school authorities to a much greater extent than white people.
Back in 1952 the Army quietly began hiring hundreds of psychologists to find out how 600,000 high school graduates had successfully faked illiteracy. Regina Wood sums up the episode this way: After the psychologists told the officers that the graduates weren't faking, Defence Department administrators knew that something terrible had happened in grade school reading instruction. And they knew it had started in the thirties. Why they remained silent, no one knows.

The switch back to reading instruction that worked for everyone should have been made then. But it wasn't. In 1882, fifth graders read these authors in their Appleton School Reader: William Shakespeare, Henry Thoreau, George Washington, Sir Walter Scott, Mark Twain, Benjamin Franklin, Oliver Wendell Holmes, John Bunyan, Daniel Webster, Samuel Johnson, Lewis Carroll, Thomas Jefferson, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and others like them.

In 1995, a student teacher of fifth graders in Minneapolis wrote to the local newspaper, "I was told children are not to be expected to spell the following words correctly: back, big, call, came, can, day, did, dog, down, get, good, have, he, home, if, in, is, it, like, little, man, morning, mother, my, night, off, out, over, people, play, ran, said, saw, she, some, soon, their, them, there, time, two, too, up, us, very, water, we, went, where, when, will, would, etc. Is this nuts?"

1 The discussion here is based on Regina Lee Wood's work as printed in Chester Finn and Diane Ravitch's Network News and Views (and reprinted many other places). Together with other statistical indictments, from the National Adult Literacy Survey, the Journal of the American Medical Association, and a host of other credible sources, it provides chilling evidence of the disastrous turn in reading methodology. But in a larger sense the author urges every reader to trust personal judgment over "numerical" evidence, whatever the source. During the writer's 30-year classroom experience, the decline in student ability to comprehend difficult text was marked, while the ability to extract and parrot "information" in the form of "facts" was much less affected. This is a product of deliberate pedagogy, to what end is the burden of my essay.

Looking Behind Appearances

Do you think class size, teacher compensation, and school revenue have much to do with education quality? If so, the conclusion is inescapable that we are living in a golden age. From 1955 to 1991 the U.S. pupil/teacher ratio dropped 40 percent, the average salary of teachers rose 50 percent (in real terms) and the annual expense per pupil, inflation adjusted, soared 350 percent. What other hypothesis, then, might fit the strange data I'm about to present?

Forget the 10 percent drop in SAT and Achievement Test scores the press beats to death with regularity; how do you explain the 37 percent decline since 1972 in students who score above 600 on the SAT? This is an absolute decline, not a relative one. It is not affected by an increase in unsuitable minds taking the test or by an increase in the numbers. The absolute body count of smart students is down drastically with a test not more difficult than yesterday's but considerably less so.

What should be made of a 50 percent decline among the most rarefied group of test-takers, those who score above 750? In 1972, there were 2,817 American students who reached this pinnacle; only 1,438 did in 1994—when kids took a much easier test. Can a 50 percent decline occur in twenty-two years without signalling that some massive levelling in the public school mind is underway?

In a real sense where your own child is concerned you might best forget scores on these tests entirely as a reliable measure of what they purport to assess. I wouldn't deny that mass movements in these scores in one direction or another indicate something is going on, and since the correlation between success in schooling and success on these tests is
close, then significant score shifts are certainly measuring changes in understanding. This is a difficult matter for anyone to sort out, since many desirable occupational categories (and desirable university seats even before that) are reserved for those who score well. The resultant linkage of adult income with test scores then creates the illusion these tests are separating cream from milk, but the results are rigged in advance by foreclosing opportunity to those screened out by the test! In a humble illustration, if you only let students with high scores on the language component of the SATs cut hair, eventually it would appear that verbal facility and grooming of tresses had some vital link with each other. Between 1960 and 1998 the nonteaching bureaucracy of public schools grew 500 percent, but oversight was concentrated into fewer and fewer hands. The 40,520 school districts with elected boards this nation had in 1960 shrivelled to 15,000 by 1998.

On the college rung of the school ladder something queer was occurring, too. Between 1960 and 1984 the quality of undergraduate education at America's fifty best-known colleges and universities altered substantially. According to a 1996 report by the National Association of Scholars, these schools stopped providing "broad and rigorous exposure to major areas of knowledge" for the average student, even at decidedly un-average universities like Yale and Stanford. In 1964, more than half of these institutions required a thesis or comprehensive for the bachelor's degree; by 1993, 12 percent did; over the same period, the average number of classroom days fell 16 percent, and requirements in math, natural science, philosophy, literature, composition, and history almost vanished. Rhetoric, most potent of the active literacies, completely vanished, and a foreign language, once required at 96 percent of the great colleges, fell to 64 percent.

According to The Journal of the American Medical Association (December 1995), 33 percent of all patients cannot read and understand instructions on how often to take medication, notices about doctor's appointments, consent forms, labels on prescription bottles, insurance forms, and other simple parts of self-care. They are rendered helpless by inability to read. Concerning those behind the nation's prison walls (a population that has tripled since 1980), the National Centre for Education Statistics stated in a 1996 report that 80 percent of all prisoners could not interpret a bus schedule, understand a news article or warranty instructions, or read maps, schedules, or payroll forms. Nor could they balance a checkbook. Forty percent could not calculate the cost of a purchase.

Once upon a time we were a new nation that allowed ordinary citizens to learn how to read well and encouraged them to read anything they thought would be useful. Close reading of tough-minded writing is still the best, cheapest, and quickest method known for learning to think for yourself. This invitation to commoners extended by America was the most revolutionary pedagogy of all.

Reading, and rigorous discussion of that reading in a way that obliges you to formulate a position and support it against objections, is an operational definition of education in its most fundamental civilized sense. No one can do this very well without learning ways of paying attention: from a knowledge of diction and syntax, figures of speech, etymology, and so on, to a sharp ability to separate the primary from the subordinate, understand allusion, master a range of modes of presentation, test truth, and penetrate beyond the obvious to the profound messages of text. Reading, analysis, and discussion are the way we develop reliable judgment, the principal way we come to penetrate covert movements behind the facade of public appearances. Without the ability to read and argue we're just geese to be plucked.

Just as experience is necessary to understand abstraction, so the reverse is true. Experience can only be mastered by extracting general principles out of the mass of details. In the absence of a perfect universal mentor, books and other texts are the best and cheapest stand-ins, always available to those who know where to look. Watching details of an assembly line or a local election unfold isn't very educational unless you have been led in careful ways to analyze the experience. Reading is the skeleton key for all who lack a
personal tutor of quality. Reading teaches nothing more important than the state of mind in which you find yourself **absolutely alone** with the thoughts of another mind, a matchless form of intimate rapport available only to those with the ability to block out distraction and concentrate. Hence the urgency of reading well if you read for power. Once you trust yourself to go mind-to-mind with great intellects, artists, scientists, warriors, and philosophers, you are finally free. In America, before we had forced schooling, an astonishing range of unlikely people knew reading was like Samson's locks—something that could help make them formidable, that could teach them their rights and how to defend those rights, could lead them toward self-determination, free from intimidation by experts. These same unlikely people knew that the power bestowed through reading could give them insight into the ways of the human heart, so they would not be cheated or fooled so easily, and that it could provide an inexhaustible store of useful knowledge—advice on how to do just about anything.

By 1812, Pierre DuPont was claiming that barely four in a thousand Americans were unable to read well and that the young had skill in argumentation thanks to daily debates at the common breakfast table. By 1820, there was even more evidence of Americans’ avid reading habits, when 5 million copies of James Fenimore Cooper's complex and allusive novels were sold, along with an equal number of Noah Webster's didactic *Speller*—to a population of dirt farmers under 20 million in size.

In 1835, Richard Cobden announced there was six times as much newspaper reading in the United States as in England, and the census figures of 1840 gave fairly exact evidence that a sensational reading revolution had taken place without any exhortation on the part of public moralists and social workers, but because common people had the initiative and freedom to learn. In North Carolina, the worst situation of any state surveyed, eight out of nine could still read and write.

In 1853, Per Siljestromm, a Swedish visitor, wrote, "In no country in the world is the taste for reading so diffuse as among the common people in America." The *American Almanac* observed grandly, "Periodical publications, especially newspapers, disseminate knowledge throughout all classes of society and exert an amazing influence in forming and giving effect to public opinion." It noted the existence of over a thousand newspapers. In this nation of common readers, the spiritual longings of ordinary people shaped the public discourse. Ordinary people who could read, though not privileged by wealth, power, or position, could see through the fraud of social class or the even grander fraud of official expertise. That was the trouble.

In his book *The New Illiterates*, author Sam Blumenfeld gives us the best introduction to what went wrong with reading in the United States. He also gives us insight into why learning to read needn't be frustrating or futile. A typical letter from one of his readers boasts of her success in imparting the alphabet code to four children under the age of five by the simple method of practice with letter sounds. One day she found her three-year-old working his way through a lesson alone at the kitchen table, reading S-am, Sam, m-an, man, and so on. Her verdict on the process: "I had just taught him his letter sounds. He picked [the rest] up and did it himself. That's how simple it is."

1 The critics of schooling who concentrate on fluctuations in standardized test scores to ground their case against the institution are committing a gross strategic mistake for several reasons, the most obvious of which is that in doing so they must first implicitly acknowledge the accuracy of such instruments in ranking every member of the youth population against every other member, hence the justice of using such measures to allocate privileges and rewards. An even larger folly occurs because the implicit validation of these tests by the attention of school critics cedes the entire terrain of scientific pedagogy, armouring it against strong counter-measures by recruiting the opposition, in effect, to support teaching to the test. The final folly lies in the ease with which these measures can be rigged to produce whatever public effects are wanted.
In a fascinating current illustration of the power of books, black female tennis star Venus Williams' father acknowledged in a press interview for the Toronto Globe that he had, indeed, set out to create a tennis millionaire from his infant daughter even before her birth. Mr. Williams, who had no knowledge whatsoever of the game of tennis, and who was reared in a poor home in the South by his single mother, had his ambition piqued by witnessing a young woman on television receiving a $48,000 check for playing tennis successfully. At that moment he proposed to his wife that they set out to make their unborn children tennis millionaires. How did he learn the game? By reading books, he says, and renting videos. That, and common sense discipline, was all that Venus and sister Serena needed to become millionaire teenagers.

The Sudbury Valley School

I know a school for kids ages three to eighteen that doesn't teach anybody to read, yet everyone who goes there learns to do it, most very well. It's the beautiful Sudbury Valley School, twenty miles west of Boston in the old Nathaniel Bowditch "cottage" (which looks suspiciously like a mansion), a place ringed by handsome outbuildings, a private lake, woods, and acres of magnificent grounds. Sudbury is a private school, but with a tuition under $4,000 a year it's considerably cheaper than a seat in a New York City public school. At Sudbury kids teach themselves to read; they learn at many different ages, even into the teen years (though that's rare). When each kid is ready he or she self-instructs, if such a formal label isn't inappropriate for such a natural undertaking. During this time they are free to request as much adult assistance as needed. That usually isn't much. In thirty years of operation, Sudbury has never had a single kid who didn't learn to read. All this is aided by a magnificent school library on open shelves where books are borrowed and returned on the honour system. About 65 percent of Sudbury kids go on to good colleges. The place has never seen a case of dyslexia. (That's not to say some kids don't reverse letters and such from time to time, but such conditions are temporary and self-correcting unless institutionalized into a disease.) So Sudbury doesn't even teach reading yet all its kids learn to read and even like reading. What could be going on there that we don't understand?

False Premises

The religious purpose of modern schooling was announced clearly by the legendary University of Wisconsin sociologist Edward A. Ross in 1901 in his famous book, Social Control. Your librarian should be able to locate a copy for you without much trouble. In it Ed Ross wrote these words for his prominent following: "Plans are underway to replace community, family, and church with propaganda, education, and mass media....the State shakes loose from Church, reaches out to School.... People are only little plastic lumps of human dough." Social Control revolutionized the discipline of sociology and had powerful effects on the other human sciences: in social science it guided the direction of political science, economics, and psychology; in biology it influenced genetics, eugenics, and psychobiology. It played a critical role in the conception and design of molecular biology.

There you have it in a nutshell. The whole problem with modern schooling. It rests on a nest of false premises. People are not little plastic lumps of dough. They are not blank tablets as John Locke said they were, they are not machines as de La Mettrie hoped, not vegetables as Friedrich Froebel, inventor of kindergartens, hypothesized, not organic mechanisms as Wilhelm Wundt taught every psychology department in America at the turn of the century, nor are they repertoires of behaviours as Watson and Skinner wanted. They are not, as the new crop of systems thinkers would have it, mystically harmonious microsystems interlocking with grand macrosystems in a dance of atomic forces. I don't want to be crazy about this; locked in a lecture hall or a bull session there's probably no more harm in these theories than reading too many Italian sonnets all at one sitting. But when each of these suppositions is sprung free to serve as a foundation for school experiments, it leads to frightfully oppressive practices.
One of the ideas that empty-child thinking led directly to was the notion that human breeding could be enhanced or retarded as plant and animal breeding was—by scientific gardeners and husbandmen. Of course, the time scale over which this was plotted to happen was quite long. Nobody expected it to be like breeding fruit flies, but it was a major academic, governmental, and even military item generously funded until Hitler's proactive program (following America's lead) grew so embarrassing by 1939 that our own projects and plans were made more circumspect.

Back at the beginning of the twentieth century, the monstrously influential Edward Thorndike of Columbia Teachers College said that school would establish conditions for "selective breeding before the masses take things into their own hands." The religious purpose of modern schooling was embarrassingly evident back when Ross and Thorndike were on centre stage, but they were surrounded by many like-minded friends. Another major architect of standardized testing, H.H. Goddard, said in his book Human Efficiency (1920) that government schooling was about "the perfect organization of the hive." He said standardized testing was a way to make lower classes recognize their own inferiority. Like wearing a dunce cap, it would discourage them from breeding and having ambition.

Goddard was head of the Psychology Department at Princeton, so imagine the effect he had on the minds of the doctoral candidates he coached, and there were hundreds. We didn't leave the religious purpose of modern schooling back in the early years of the century. In April of 1996, Al Shanker of the AFT said in his regular New York Times split-page advertisement that every teacher was really a priest.

A System Of State Propaganda

Something strange is going on in schools and has been going on for quite some time. Whatever it is does not arise from the main American traditions. As closely as I can track the thing through the attitudes, practices, and stated goals of the shadowy crew who make a good living skulking around educational "laboratories," think tanks, and foundations, we are experiencing an attempt, successful so far, to reimpose the strong-state, strong social class attitudes of England and Germany on the United States—the very attitudes we threw off in the American Revolution.

And in this counter-revolution the state churches of England and Germany have been replaced by the secular church of forced government schooling.

Advertising, public relations, and stronger forms of quasi-religious propaganda are so pervasive in our schools, even in "alternative" schools, that independent judgment is suffocated in mass-produced secondary experiences and market-tested initiatives. Lifetime Learning Systems, one of the many new corporations formed to dig gold from our conditions of schooling, announced to its corporate clients, "School is the ideal time to influence attitudes, build long-term loyalties, introduce new products, test-market, promote sampling and trial usage—and above all—to generate immediate sales."

Arnold Toynbee, the establishment's favourite historian in mid-twentieth-century America, said in his monumental Study of History that the original promise of universal education had been destroyed as soon as the school laws were passed, a destruction caused by "the possibility of turning education to account as a means of amusement for the masses" and a means of "profit for the enterprising persons by whom the amusement is purveyed." This opportunistic conversion quickly followed mass schooling's introduction when fantastic profit potential set powerful forces in motion:

The bread of universal education is no sooner cast upon the water than a shoal of sharks arises from the depths and devours the children's bread under the educator's very eyes.

In Toynbee's analysis "the dates speak for themselves":
The edifice of universal education was, roughly speaking, completed... in 1870; and the
Yellow Press was invented twenty years later—as soon, that is, as the first generation of
children from the national schools had acquired sufficient purchasing power—by a stroke of
irresponsible genius which had divined that the educational labour of love could be made to
yield a royal profit.

But vultures attending the inception of forced compulsion schooling attracted more
ferocious predators:

[The commercial institutions that set about at once to prey on forced mass schooling]
attracted the attention of the rulers of modern...national states. If press lords could make
millions by providing idle amusement for the half-educated, serious statesman could draw,
not money perhaps, but power from the same source. The modern dictators have deposed
the press lords and substituted for crude and debased private entertainment an equally
crude and debased system of state propaganda.

The Ideology Of The Text

Looking back on the original period of school formation in her study of American history
textbooks, America Revised, Frances Fitzgerald remarked on the profound changes that
emerged following suggestions issued by sociologists and social thinkers in the late
nineteenth and early twentieth century’s. The original history of our institutions and the
documents which protect our unique liberties gradually began to be effaced. Fitzgerald
raises the puzzle of textbook alteration:

The ideology that lies behind these texts is rather difficult to define.... it does not fit usual
political patterns....the texts never indicate any line of action....authors avoid what they
choose to and some of them avoid main issues....they fail to develop any original
ideas....they confuse social sciences with science....clouds of jargon....leave out
ideas....historical names are given no character, they are cipher people....there are no
conflicts, only 'problems'. [emphasis added]

Indeed, the texts may be unfathomable, and that may be the editorial intent.

The National Adult Literacy Survey

In 1982, Anthony Oettinger, a member of the private discussion group called the Council on
Foreign Relations, asked an audience of communications executives this question: "Do we
really have to have everybody literate—writing and reading in the traditional sense—when we
have means through our technology to achieve a new flowering of oral communication?"
Oettinger suggested "our idea of literacy" is "obsolete." Eighty-three years earlier John
Dewey had written in "The Primary Education Fetish" that "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."

For the balance of this discussion I'm going to step into deeper water, first reviewing what
reading in a Western alphabet really means and what makes it a reasonably easy skill to
transmit or to self-teach, and then tackling what happened to deprive the ordinary person of
the ability to manage it very well. I want to first show you how, then answer the more
speculative question why.

The National Adult Literacy Survey represents 190 million U.S. adults over age sixteen with
an average school attendance of 12.4 years. The survey is conducted by the Educational
Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey. It ranks adult Americans into five levels. Here is
its 1993 analysis:
Forty-two million Americans over the age of sixteen can't read. Some of this group can write their names on Social Security cards and fill in height, weight, and birth spaces on application forms.

Fifty million can recognize printed words on a fourth- and fifth-grade level. They cannot write simple messages or letters.

Fifty-five to sixty million are limited to sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-grade reading. A majority of this group could not figure out the price per ounce of peanut butter in a 20-ounce jar costing $1.99 when told they could round the answer off to a whole number.

Thirty million have ninth- and tenth-grade reading proficiency. This group (and all preceding) cannot understand a simplified written explanation of the procedures used by attorneys and judges in selecting juries.

About 3.5 percent of the 26,000-member sample demonstrated literacy skills adequate to do traditional college study, a level 30 percent of all U.S. high school students reached in 1940, and which 30 percent of secondary students in other developed countries can reach today. This last fact alone should warn you how misleading comparisons drawn from international student competitions really are, since the samples each country sends are small elite ones, unrepresentative of the entire student population. But behind the bogus superiority a real one is concealed.

Ninety-six and a half percent of the American population is mediocre to illiterate where deciphering print is concerned. This is no commentary on their intelligence, but without ability to take in primary information from print and to interpret it they are at the mercy of commentators who tell them what things mean. A working definition of immaturity might include an excessive need for other people to interpret information for us.

Certainly it's possible to argue that bad readers aren't victims at all but perpetrators, cursed by inferior biology to possess only shadows of intellect. That's what bell-curve theory, evolutionary theory, aristocratic social theory, eugenics theory, strong-state political theory, and some kinds of theology are about. All agree most of us are inferior, if not downright dangerous. The integrity of such theoretical outlooks—at least where reading was concerned—took a stiff shot on the chin from America. Here, democratic practice allowed a revolutionary generation to learn how to read. Those granted the opportunity took advantage of it brilliantly.

Name Sounds, Not Things

So how was the murder of American reading ability pulled off? I'll tell you in a second, but come back first to classical Greece where the stupendous invention of the alphabet by Phoenicians was initially understood. The Phoenicians had an alphabetic language used to keep accounts, but the Greeks were the first to guess correctly that revolutionary power could be unleashed by transcending mere lists, using written language for the permanent storage of analysis, exhortation, visions, and other things. After a period of experiment the Greeks came up with a series of letters to represent sounds of their language. Like the Phoenicians, they recognized the value of naming each letter in a way distinct from its sound value—as every human being has a name distinct from his or her personality, as numbers have names for reference.

Naming sounds rather than things was the breakthrough! While the number of things to be pictured is impossibly large, the number of sounds is strictly limited. In English, for example, most people recognize only forty-four.

The problem, which American families once largely solved for themselves, is this: in English, a Latin alphabet has been imposed on a Germanic language with multiple non-Germanic
borrowings, and it doesn't quite fit. Our 44 sounds are spelled 400+ different ways. That sounds horrible, but in reality in the hands of even a mediocre teacher, it's only annoying; in the hands of a good one, a thrilling challenge. Actually, 85 percent of the vast word stock of English can be read with knowledge of only 70 of the phonograms. A large number of the remaining irregularities seldom occur and can be remastered on an as-needed basis. Meanwhile a whole armoury of mnemonic tricks like "If a 'c' I chance to spy, place the 'e' before the 'i'" exists to get new readers over the common humps. Inexpensive dictionaries, spell-check typewriters, computers, and other technology are readily available these days to silently coach the fearful, but in my experience, that "fear" is neither warranted nor natural. Instead, it is engendered. Call it good business practice.

Also, communicating abstractions in picture language is a subtlety requiring more time and training to master than is available for most of us. Greeks now could organize ambitious concepts abstractly in written language, communicating accurately with each other over space and time much more readily than their competitors.

According to Mitford Mathews:

The secret of their phenomenal advance was in their conception of the nature of a word. They reasoned that words were sounds or combinations of ascertainable sounds, and they held inexorably to the basic proposition that writing, properly executed, was a guide to sound reading. A number of other good treatments are available for the newcomer.

Learning sound-sight correspondences comes first in an alphabetic language. Competence with the entire package of sounds corresponding to alphabet symbols comes quickly. After that anything can be read and its meaning inquired after. The substantial speaking vocabulary kids bring to school (6,000–10,000 words) can now be read at once, and understood.

When the Romans got the alphabet through the Etruscans they lost the old letter names so they invented new ones making them closer to the letter sounds. That was a significant mistake which causes confusion in novice readers even today. Through conquest the Latin alphabet spread to the languages of Europe; Rome's later mutation into the Universal Christian Church caused Latin, the language of church liturgy, to flow into every nook and cranny of the former empire.

The Latin alphabet was applied to the English language by Christian missionaries in the seventh century. While it fused with spoken English this was far from a perfect fit. There were no single letters to stand for certain sounds.

Scribes had to scramble to combine letters to approximate sounds that had no companion letter. This matching process was complicated over centuries by repeated borrowings from other languages and by certain massive sound shifts which still occupy scholars in trying to explain.

Before the spread of printing in the sixteenth century, not being able to read wasn't much of a big deal. There wasn't much to read. The principal volume available was the Bible, from which appropriate bits were read aloud by religious authorities during worship and on ceremonial occasions. Available texts were in Latin or Greek, but persistent attempts to provide translations was a practice thought to contain much potential for schism. An official English Bible, the Authorized King James Version, appeared in 1611, pre-empting all competitors in a bold stroke which changed popular destiny.

Instantly, the Bible became a universal textbook, offering insights both delicate and powerful, a vibrant cast of characters, brilliant verbal pyrotechnics and more to the humblest rascal who could read. Talk about a revolutionary awakening for ordinary people! The Bible was it, thanks to the dazzling range of models it provided in the areas of exegesis,
drama, politics, psychology, characterization, plus the formidable reading skills it took to grapple with the Bible. A little more than three decades after this translation, the English king was deposed and beheaded. The connection was direct. Nothing would ever be the same again because too many good readers had acquired the proclivity of thinking for themselves.

The magnificent enlargement of imagination and voice that the Bible's exceptional catalogue of language and ideas made available awakened in ordinary people a powerful desire to read in order to read the Holy Book without a priest's mediation. Strenuous efforts were made to discourage this, but the Puritan Revolution and Cromwell's interregnum sent literacy surging. Nowhere was it so accelerated as in the British colonies in North America, a place already far removed from the royal voice.

Printing technology emerged. Like the computer in our own day, it was quickly incorporated into every corner of daily life. But there were still frequent jailings, whippings, and confiscations for seditious reading as people of substance came to realize how dangerous literacy could be.

Reading offered many delights. Cravings to satisfy curiosity about this Shakespeare fellow or to dabble in the musings of Lord Bacon or John Locke were now not difficult to satisfy. Spelling and layout were made consistent.

Before long, prices of books dropped. All this activity intensified pressure on illiterate individuals to become literate. The net result of printing (and Protestantism, which urged communicants to go directly to the Word, eliminating the priestly middleman), stimulated the spread of roving teachers and small proprietary and church schools. A profession arose to satisfy demand for a popular way to understand what uses to make of books, and from this a demand to understand many things.

Why the United States Is Destroying Its Education System

A nation that destroys its systems of education, degrades its public information, guts its public libraries and turns its airwaves into vehicles for cheap, mindless amusement becomes deaf, dumb and blind. It prizes test scores above critical thinking and literacy. It celebrates rote vocational training and the singular, amoral skill of making money. It churns out stunted human products, lacking the capacity and vocabulary to challenge the assumptions and structures of the corporate state. It funnels them into a caste system of drones and systems managers. It transforms a democratic state into a feudal system of corporate masters and serfs.

Teachers, their unions under attack, are becoming as replaceable as minimum-wage employees at Burger King. We spurn real teachers—those with the capacity to inspire children to think, those who help the young discover their gifts and potential—and replace them with instructors who teach to narrow, standardized tests. These instructors obey. They teach children to obey. And that is the point. The No Child Left Behind program, modelled on the “Texas Miracle,” is a fraud. It worked no better than our deregulated financial system. But when you shut out debate these dead ideas are self-perpetuating.

Passing bubble tests celebrates and rewards a peculiar form of analytical intelligence. This kind of intelligence is prized by money managers and corporations. They don’t want employees to ask uncomfortable questions or examine existing structures and assumptions. They want them to serve the system. These tests produce men and women who are just
literate and numerate enough to perform basic functions and service jobs. The tests elevate those with the financial means to prepare for them. They reward those who obey the rules, memorize the formulas and pay deference to authority. Rebels, artists, independent thinkers, eccentrics and iconoclasts—those who march to the beat of their own drum—are weeded out.

“Imagine,” said a public school teacher in New York City, who asked that I not use his name, “going to work each day knowing a great deal of what you are doing is fraudulent, knowing in no way are you preparing your students for life in an ever more brutal world, knowing that if you don't continue along your scripted test prep course and indeed get better at it you will be out of a job. Up until very recently, the principal of a school was something like the conductor of an orchestra: a person who had deep experience and knowledge of the part and place of every member and every instrument. In the past 10 years we’ve had the emergence of both [Mayor] Mike Bloomberg’s Leadership Academy and Eli Broad’s Superintendents Academy, both created exclusively to produce instant principals and superintendents who model themselves after CEOs. How is this kind of thing even legal? How are such ‘academies’ accredited? What quality of leader needs a ‘leadership academy’? What kind of society would allow such people to run their children’s schools? The high-stakes tests may be worthless as pedagogy but they are a brilliant mechanism for undermining the school systems, instilling fear and creating a rationale for corporate takeover. There is something grotesque about the fact the education reform is being led not by educators but by financiers and speculators and billionaires.”

Teachers, under assault from every direction, are fleeing the profession. Even before the “reform” blitzkrieg we were losing half of all teachers within five years after they started work—and these were people who spent years in school and many thousands of dollars to become teachers. How does the country expect to retain dignified, trained professionals under the hostility of current conditions? I suspect that the hedge fund managers behind our charter schools system—which primary concern is certainly not with education—are delighted to replace real teachers with nonunionized, poorly trained instructors. To truly teach is to instil the values and knowledge which promote the common good and protect a society from the folly of historical amnesia. The utilitarian, corporate ideology embraced by the system of standardized tests and leadership academies has no time for the nuances and moral ambiguities inherent in a liberal arts education. Corporatism is about the cult of the self. It is about personal enrichment and profit as the sole aim of human existence. And those who do not conform are pushed aside.

“It is extremely dispiriting to realize that you are in effect lying to these kids by insinuating that this diet of corporate reading programs and standardized tests are preparing them for anything,” said this teacher, who feared he would suffer reprisals from school administrators if they knew he was speaking out. “It is even more dispiriting to know that your livelihood depends increasingly on maintaining this lie. You have to ask yourself why are hedge fund managers suddenly so interested in the education of the urban poor? The main purpose of the testing craze is not to grade the students but to grade the teacher.”

“I cannot say for certain—not with the certainty of a Bill Gates or a Mike Bloomberg who pontificate with utter certainty over a field in which they know absolutely nothing—but more and more I suspect that a major goal of the reform campaign is to make the work of a teacher so degrading and insulting that the dignified and the truly educated teachers will simply leave while they still retain a modicum of self-respect,” he added. “In less than a decade we been stripped of autonomy and are increasingly micromanaged. Students have been given the power to fire us by failing their tests. Teachers have been likened to pigs at a trough and blamed for the economic collapse of the United States. In New York, principals have been given every incentive, both financial and in terms of control, to replace experienced teachers with 22-year-old untenured rookies. They cost less. They know nothing. They are malleable and they are vulnerable to termination.”
The demonizing of teachers is another public relations feint, a way for corporations to deflect attention from the theft of some $17 billion in wages, savings and earnings among American workers and a landscape where one in six workers is without employment. The speculators on Wall Street looted the U.S. Treasury. They stymied any kind of regulation. They have avoided criminal charges. They are stripping basic social services. And now they are demanding to run our schools and universities.

“Not only have the reformers removed poverty as a factor, they’ve removed students’ aptitude and motivation as factors,” said this teacher, who is in a teachers union. “They seem to believe that students are something like plants where you just add water and place them in the sun of your teaching and everything blooms. This is a fantasy that insults both student and teacher. The reformers have come up with a variety of insidious schemes pushed as steps to professionalize the profession of teaching. As they are all businessmen who know nothing of the field, it goes without saying that you do not do this by giving teachers autonomy and respect. They use merit pay in which teachers whose students do well on bubble tests will receive more money and teachers whose students do not do so well on bubble tests will receive less money. Of course, the only way this could conceivably be fair is to have an identical group of students in each class—an impossibility. The real purposes of merit pay are to divide teachers against themselves as they scramble for the brighter and more motivated students and to further institutionalize the idiot notion of standardized tests. There is a certain diabolical intelligence at work in both of these.”

“If the Bloomberg administration can be said to have succeeded in anything,” he said, “they have succeeded in turning schools into stress factories where teachers are running around wondering if it’s possible to please their principals and if their school will be open a year from now, if their union will still be there to offer some kind of protection, if they will still have jobs next year. This is not how you run a school system. It’s how you destroy one. The reformers and their friends in the media have created a Manichean world of bad teachers and effective teachers. In this alternative universe there are no other factors. Or, all other factors—poverty, depraved parents, mental illness and malnutrition—are all excuses of the Bad Teacher that can be overcome by hard work and the Effective Teacher.”

The truly educated become conscious. They become self-aware. They do not lie to themselves. They do not pretend that fraud is moral or that corporate greed is good. They do not claim that the demands of the marketplace can morally justify the hunger of children or denial of medical care to the sick. They do not throw 6 million families from their homes as the cost of doing business. Thought is a dialogue with one’s inner self. Those who think ask questions, questions those in authority do not want asked. They remember who we are, where we come from and where we should go. They remain eternally sceptical and distrustful of power. And they know that this moral independence is the only protection from the radical evil that results from collective unconsciousness. The capacity to think is the only bulwark against any centralized authority that seeks to impose mindless obedience. There is a huge difference, as Socrates understood, between teaching people what to think and teaching them how to think. Those who are endowed with a moral conscience refuse to commit crimes, even those sanctioned by the corporate state, because they do not in the end want to live with criminals—themselves.

“It is better to be at odds with the whole world than, being one, to be at odds with myself,” Socrates said.

Those who can ask the right questions are armed with the capacity to make a moral choice, to defend the good in the face of outside pressure. And this is why the philosopher Immanuel Kant puts the duties we have to ourselves before the duties we have to others. The standard for Kant is not the biblical idea of self-love—love thy neighbour as thyself, do unto others as you would have them do unto you—but self-respect. What brings us meaning and worth as human beings is our ability to stand up and pit ourselves against injustice and
the vast, moral indifference of the universe. Once justice perishes, as Kant knew, life loses all meaning. Those who meekly obey laws and rules imposed from the outside—including religious laws—are not moral human beings. The fulfillment of an imposed law is morally neutral. The truly educated make their own wills serve the higher call of justice, empathy and reason. Socrates made the same argument when he said it is better to suffer wrong than to do wrong.

“The greatest evil perpetrated,” Hannah Arendt wrote, “is the evil committed by nobodies, that is, by human beings who refuse to be persons.”

As Arendt pointed out, we must trust only those who have this self-awareness. This self-awareness comes only through consciousness. It comes with the ability to look at a crime being committed and say “I can’t.” We must fear, Arendt warned, those whose moral system is built around the flimsy structure of blind obedience. We must fear those who cannot think. Unconscious civilizations become totalitarian wastelands.

“The greatest evildoers are those who don't remember because they have never given thought to the matter, and, without remembrance, nothing can hold them back,” Arendt writes. “For human beings, thinking of past matters means moving in the dimension of depth, striking roots and thus stabilizing themselves, so as not to be swept away by whatever may occur—the Zeitgeist or History or simple temptation. The greatest evil is not radical, it has no roots, and because it has no roots it has no limitations, it can go to unthinkable extremes and sweep over the whole world.”
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“School sucks”

Most students will agree, and many have voiced their disgust concerning this abomination we call public education. They spite the good students who obey like little sheep, frown at imposed conformity, and laugh at the hypocritical nature of the system.

The same will be done here, but there is a big difference between these defiant students and me, the author. I was one of those good little sheep. I graduated high school with a 4.0, perfect attendance record, two years of student council under my belt, and a host of top scholarships to get me through college. Teachers loved me, students both feared and respected me, and the principal knew me better than I knew him.

It's enough to make you sick. I know it made me sick. So here I am, biting the hand that feeds because it's been feeding nothing but propaganda and sour grapes.

I'm not writing this article because of envy or spite against system-indoctrinated valedictorians, nor am I trying to put blame on my school for all my academic failures. In fact, I cannot because I was that valedictorian and had few if any academic failures.

I'm writing this article because the system itself is messed up. Having been to many different public school systems over the past 15 years, I have more than adequate credibility to make this claim.

What is taught is random, useless, and meaningless

In class, too much time is wasted on useless topics.
The quality of education has been sacrificed for quantity, and as a result, academic inflation and the devaluation of information has turned intellectual ambition into apathy and bright minds into gray mush.

In an effort to be multicultural and eclectic, class curricula have become shallow and disorganized in their effort to teach students a global viewpoint. Topics are taught piecemeal, and never do teachers spend time to help students integrate the pieces into a coherent picture that can be used or built upon. And even if within a class the ideas are put together, between classes the grand education still remains compartmentalized.

For example, both geometry and physics can be mastered by the average student, but the connection and communication between the two often are not. When physics is taught in a junior high or high school physics class, it involves only the most elementary of geometry concepts, and vice versa. Without synthesis of the two, each remains without purpose or effectiveness.

Such synthesis between topics is neglected in the school curriculum, and consequently one's experience in the public education system becomes a vague memory of random, meaningless, and useless facts, just as a disassembled engine is just a junk heap of random metal parts.

Most school subjects themselves aren't even real knowledge. History books are full of purposely engineered inaccuracies and distortions for the sake of corporate gain and political correctness.

Much of school is wasted time

The purpose of education is to make one an independent, competent thinker, one who can make a difference in the world for the better, and one who has the best chance for survival and success in the world.

So what the hell are we doing with such profundity of pep rallies, football and basketball games, proms, crazy hair days, sex education, death education, quiz bowls, and student council meetings?

Sure, without them, school would be dull.

But, school is supposed to be an incubator of young humans to prepare them for excitement in the real world. School is doing more than it's supposed to and has instead become a surrogate provider of such excitement, turning it artificial and socially harmful. Is your vacuum cleaner also supposed to do the dishes, trim your hair, balance your checkbook, and be your Friday night date?

So much in school concerns extracurricular activities that time which could be spent on real world activities is instead being wasted in these trivialities. The effect is the amassing of students dependent upon the system and isolated from the real world. Social, financial, and academic dysfunction result. Once again, quantity over quality has prevailed, because there is no profit for the supplier in quality. Quality only helps those in the demand, but when consumers of education have themselves been dumbed down to primal levels, discernment and appreciation of quality disappear.

Despite these problems, almost everyone is happy.

Parents are happy. Moms get to watch their soap operas and dads get to work while their kids are being babysat. They don't have to worry about teaching morality or ethics to their children because it's being done for them in school. They don't have to entertain them or spend genuine time with them because these children are too busy being entertained in
school functions. Moms just have to drive their girls to soccer practice, and dads toss the football a few times. Perfectionist parents keep their child competitive not by guiding them and helping them on a daily basis, but by yelling them once a school quarter when report cards come out.

Teachers are happy, as they have a secure job from 8 to 5, and the more they work, the more they get paid. The more school programs there are with federal or state funding, the more money they get. The more schools have the programs, the more funding and perks they receive from federal benefactors.

Everyone is happy, that is, except for the students.

But who cares? Who are they to complain?

Those with the gold make the rules, and all students have is some pocket change for cookies and milk. As is well known, in school, you spend more time learning how to obey and what to think, instead of and how to think and think for yourself.

Fact of the matter is that at least 3/4 of the time spent in school is waste.

Students are not at fault

But that’s not the worst part.

The worst part is that public schools not only have a crappy curriculum, they actually oppress their students by forcing them to participate in it. It is one thing to offer a profundity of shallow assignments, and quite another to make students do them.

Simply put, students are forcefully occupied with junk to prevent them from learning something useful.

Almost everything important I have learned, I learned on my own time outside school. During junior high, the assignments given to me were few, and I often completed them in class. This left me with enough time to go to the library to begin my study of metaphysics and the paranormal, to learn truth on my own and experiment with what I had learned to confirm the nature of absolute truth.

But as I progressed through high school, increasingly useless assignments were given to me which taught me nothing (and believe me, I searched for something useful in them), but occupied my time nonetheless. What was being taught to me was compartmentalized, full of holes and errors, shallow, and politically correct to the point of nonsense. Was it my duty to integrate the parts and learn the material well enough to be applied? Sure, but the sheer quantity of homework prevented me from finding time to do just that.

Quantity over quality once again.

Now I am in a state college, and it’s no different. The oppression continues, except now I’m getting wiser and have caught onto their tricky scheme to graduate robots instead of humans.

I wish I had more time to do research related to this site, to learn true physics and history, to continue writing music, and make a difference. But this time is eroded by the wasteful components of the school curriculum.

Students, except for a few genuine slackers, are not at fault when lagging in critical thinking skills.
They are not being held back by their own laziness, but by direct oppression from a system with the power to punish them or put a bad mark on their transcripts if they don’t give up their individual pursuits of knowledge in favour of hollow schoolwork.

Overloading creates dysfunction

There are multiple consequences to this program of quantity over quality. Children are under a lot of stress nowadays in schools due to this, and as a consequence they shift into a survival mode.

This survival mode consists of taking shortcuts and getting by with the least amount of effort possible, but even this small amount of effort is too much and applied toward futile ends. Grades become an ends to a means, and the true goal of education is detached from daily work. Studying is only applied toward taking the test, but not for retention thereafter. Escapism takes hold and watching television, taking drugs, engaging in delinquent behaviour, and over-socialization result. This further detracts a student from learning what’s truly needed.

Under such stress, the student body splits into two groups: those who conform and those who fail.

The ones who conform learn the rules of the game, no matter how illogical they are and play the game to the satisfaction of faculty. They become detached from reality, from what truly matters, and are stifled in their potential as they are stripped of their inspiration, creativity, and originality. Quantity over quality matters as part of the survival mode, and there is no profit in overdoing quality when the profits of doing so are decades away in the reaping. Due to this survival mentality, thinking that far into the future is neglected.

The ones who conform become robotized and are respected for how well they fit the mould. What was once innate curiosity to discover the world is turned into neurotic attempts to escape punishment.

The ones who do not conform fall behind unless they are clever enough to find another source of education that befits them. Their grades are mediocre as they are disillusioned with the system and no longer care about pleasing it. Chances of graduation and pursuing higher education is slim, and most of these either drop out or graduate and immediately acquire low paying jobs. The price of refusal to conform is rejection into substandard wage earning.

Either way, those entering public education leave either as robots or peasants, hyperbolically speaking.

The system itself

Teachers are not to blame either. They are like soldiers in the trenches fighting a war to educate the public, taking orders from their superiors who have no idea what the current conditions are on the front lines.

Teachers are overstressed, underpaid, and restricted in their ability to respond to what they perceive in the classroom. Due to political correctness, threat of legal action by parents, and contrite school-boards scared of disapproval by a vocal minority with big political clout, teachers are confined to a tight curriculum they are forced to follow.

They are forced to teach some things, and not allowed to teach others, such guidelines set by a panel of nodding puppets with no clue as to what the truth is, let alone initiative to spread it should they know the truth. These puppets are those who design the school curriculum, who despite once being teachers themselves, are for the majority removed
from the classroom feedback mechanism.

It’s the little things that contribute to an oppressive atmosphere in schools. Notwithstanding the social atmosphere, teachers on a strained school budget worry about saving paper, staples, or tape. When my high school received thousands of dollars of funding from the community, it used that money to expand its inventory of computers that weren’t even needed just to keep up with the politically correct trend for schools to be technologically current. That money should have been used for the little things, such as office supplies.

Disruptive students are put in the same class with well behaving ones, creating academic socialism whereby equality is maintained by dragging up the idiots at the expense of the smart ones. Separating students on the wrong criteria leads to incongruities and a breakdown of the system and its components. Putting them into grades by age, when they should be instead separated by level of knowledge and skill, results in academic entropy whereby the smart become dumb and the dumb learn how to waste other’s time.

Teachers spend more of this time teaching children how to shut up and sit still than to pay attention and think. Because they are very limited in their methods of discipline, teachers and students suffer as the idiotic and delinquent minority ruins it all for the rest.

Friction within the system from misplacement of resources induces hatred among its components, as each is suffering and blaming one another instead of blaming the system itself. In fact, the system is set up such that the components feed off one another in a long term downward spiral.

Teachers have contempt for the students, and often make an effort to take out aggression upon them, seeing them as the enemy and cause of their own stress. Students see authority as something to be defied, unless they are already broken by it. Teachers make up illogical rules to test how well students obey, such as making them walk a certain way through the library, or not enter or leave certain exits at certain times, and other minor things which irritate students and allow faculty to feel good when they exert their powers. This tension between student and teacher shatters trust between them, and any teaching and learning between them enters the domain of negative reinforcement. Instead of them loving and respecting one another, they hate each other but do what they are supposed to, to avoid consequences if they do otherwise.

When you see a student, what you’re really seeing is someone low on ambition and initiative, but starving for recognition and self-esteem. This is a symptom of a system that is anti-life, anti-individualism, and anti-spirit. Compressing a wonderful human into a precise block to fit perfectly into cubicle induces the survival mode of life. Knowledge, having been made into the source of his distress, is put at the bottom of his list of priorities, as he has to do whatever is possible to regain his self esteem, recognition, and peace of mind.

However, he must do so within the confines of the system.

Dysfunction results. Instead of individualism meaning thinking for oneself and seeking one’s own truth and sense of morality, individualism becomes wearing freaky clothing, having funny hair, and garnering attention via infantile vulgarity no matter if it is for fame or infamy. These superficial methods are all that are still legal within the system. The true human spirit, however, is suppressed.

Those who are broken follow the teacher’s illogical rules and learn to trust authority over their own potentials. In this, they become a cog in the wheel. Breaking orders is taboo to them, something they get very nervous about when it happens, and they certainly don’t do it willingly. They become neurotics and unstable perfectionists who stand high on shaky
Once their individuality is broken, they become robots very good at their tasks. Many go on to college, absorb what's fed to them well, and become academicians with a groovy little niche and nice income in their fields of research. But however wonderful that sounds, they are robots and nothing more. Or to make another analogy, they are cows. They don't know that being the best cow still doesn't make you a cowboy.

The straight track

We hear stories of entrepreneurs who strike it rich after dropping out of college and pursuing their dreams. We hear stories of those who go from rags to riches, of those who defied convention and revolutionized the world.

But what do we hear in school?

We hear that these people are the exception not the rule. That is certainly true, but what the system is implying is that you are the rule, not the exception, so don't even try to deviate from the straight track.

The straight track is what students are being taught by the system, concerning the course of their lives. The straight track told to high school students goes as follows: You need to do your assignment to get a good grade. When you get good grades, your transcript will be favoured by employers and colleges. You might even get scholarships to go to a good college.

If you're good in college, you'll get a degree and have good chances of getting a good job. And with a good job you'll have a good wife, good kids, and a good life. What they're really saying is this:

Don't worry about changing the world, just concentrate on getting good grades because that is the only measure of what you're worth in the eyes of those you'll serve. Go to college and find your quiet niche in the world, where you'll be secure in your job because you're so specialized, there's no one else in the world who can take your place.

You'll be working to maintain the system as you're seen fit. Focus all your energy into this specialized area and don't worry about making an impact on the world because as long as you stay specialized and compartmentalized, we'll clothe you, feed you, give you a good family, and bury you in a good plot of land.

Deviating from the track is abhorred by the system. If you show initiative and take risks, you become a statistical outlier, an anomaly in their statistical models, someone who poses a threat to the system because you are a seed with the potential to overturn the mirrors and reveal the truth behind this silent war.

Defy

In this lies the point of the article. You cannot be successful, recognized, or a true human being unless you defy the system. If you only do what you're told, you'll be no better than average.

The system has been designed by the biggest corporation of all, the state. Public schools either turn out worker drones who serve the state and its partnering greedy corporations, or else they turn out welfare recipients who are an excuse for the state to maintain its colossal parasitic size and an idiotic consumer base to buy these corporations useless toys and poisons.
So many students are under this illusion, the illusion being that they either follow the straight track, try to be the best cow in the herd to maintain financial and social security, or else defy the system and fail miserably, ending up as a bum on the street.

You are seen as a social failure if you defy the system. If you measure your success by what the system deems is successful, then you fear deviating from the straight track because that is a sign of failure.

However, you must therefore redesign your standards of success.

Would dropping out of a state college make you a failure? In the eyes of other cows, maybe, but pursuing a better education elsewhere be it independently or real world experience would more than make up for it.

How many famous people do you know who did everything they were told and nothing more, who never took risks for fear of defying the status quo?

Not very many.

Conclusion

The lesson is that not only must you take risks and utilize your innate initiative, you must also get over your fear of defying the system and do so to get ahead of the herd.

You are the exception, not the rule, because you have the power to be.

Now, the robots in the system are definitely needed. We still need employees, soldiers, and scientists who are specialized in what they do, but presently there is an overabundance among these. Therefore, the emergence of individualists, generalists, and entrepreneurs is encouraged.

And the only way for them to increase in numbers is for people like you to break out of the mould and fulfil your destiny as a human, not a machine.

Destroying Public Education in America

by Stephen Lendman

Diogenes called education "the foundation of every state." Education reformer and "father of American education" Horace Mann went even further. He said: "The common school (meaning public ones) is the greatest discovery ever made by man." He called it the "great equalizer" that was "common" to all, and as Massachusetts Secretary of Education founded the first board of education and teacher training college in the state where the first (1635) public school was established. Throughout the country today, privatization schemes target them and threaten to end a 373 year tradition.

It's part of Chicago's Renaissance 2010 Turnaround strategy for 100 new "high-performing" elementary and high schools in the city by that date. Under five year contracts, they'll "be held accountable....to create innovative learning environments" under one of three "governance structures:"

- charter schools under the 1996 Illinois Charter Schools Law; they're called "public schools of choice, selected by students and parents....to take responsible risks and create new, innovative and more flexible ways of educating children within the public school system;" in 1997, the Illinois General Assembly approved 60 state charter schools; Chicago was authorized 30, the suburbs 15 more, and 15 others downstate. The city bends the rules by operating about 53 charter "campuses" and lots more are planned.
Charter schools aren't magnet ones that require students in some cases to have special skills or pass admissions tests. However, they have specific organizing themes and educational philosophies and may target certain learning problems, development needs, or educational possibilities. In all states, they're legislatively authorized; near-autonomous in their operations; free to choose their students and exclude unwanted ones; and up to now are quasi-public with no religious affiliation. Administration and corporate schemes assure they won't stay that way because that's the sinister plan. More on that below.

George Bush praised these schools last April when he declared April 29 through May 5 National Charter Schools Week. He said they provide more "choice," are a "valuable educational alternative," and he thanked "educational entrepreneurs for supporting" these schools around the country.

Here's what the president praised. Lisa Delpit is executive director of the Centre for Urban Education & Innovation. In her capacity, she studies charter school performance and cited evidence from a 2005 Department of Education report. Her conclusion: "charter schools....are less likely than public schools to meet state education goals." Case study examples in five states showed they underperform, and are "less likely than traditional public (ones) to employ teachers meeting state certification standards."

Other underperformance evidence came from an unexpected source - an October 1994 Money magazine report on 70 public and private schools. It concluded that "students who attend the best public schools outperform most private school students, that the best public schools offer a more challenging curriculum than most private schools, and that the private school advantage in test scores is due to their selective admission policies."

Clearly a failing grade on what's spreading across the country en route to total privatization and the triumph of the market over educating the nation's youths.

In 1991, Minnesota passed the first charter school law. California followed in 1992, and it's been off to the races since. By 1995 19 states had them, and in 2007 there were over 4000 charter schools in 40 states and the District of Columbia with more than one million students in them and growing.

Chicago's two other "governance structures" are:

- contract (privatized) schools run by "independent nonprofit organizations;" they operate under a Performance Agreement between the "organization" and the Board of Education; and

- performance schools under Chicago Public Schools (CPS) management "with freedom and flexibility on many district initiatives and policies;" unmentioned is the Democrat mayor's close ties to the Bush administration and their preference for marketplace education; the idea isn't new, but it accelerated rapidly in recent years.

Another part of the scheme is in play as well, in Chicago and throughout the country. Inner city schools are being closed, remaining ones are neglected and decrepit, classroom sizes are increasing, and children and parents are being sacrificed on the altar of marketplace triumphalism.

Consider recent events under Mayor Richard Daley in Chicago. On February 27, the city's Board of Education unanimously and without discussion voted to close, relocate or otherwise target 19 public schools, fire teachers, and leave students out in the cold. Thousands of parents protested, were ignored and denied access to the Board of Ed meeting where the decision came down pro forma and quick. And it wasn't the first time. For years under the current mayor, Chicago has closed or privatized more schools than anywhere else in the country, and the trend is accelerating. Since July 2001, the city closed 59 elementary
and secondary schools and replaced many of them with charter or contract ones.

Nationwide Education "Reform"

Throughout the country, various type schemes follow the administration's "education reform" blueprint. It began with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) that became law on January 8, 2002. It succeeded the 1994 Goals 2000: Educate America Act that set eight outcomes-based goals for the year 2000 but failed on all counts to meet them. Goals 2000, in turn, goes back to the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and specifically its Title I provisions for funding schools and districts with a high percentage of low-income family students.

NCLB is outrageous. It's long on testing, school choice, and market-based "reforms" but short on real achievement. It's built around rote learning, standardized tests, requiring teachers to "teach to the test," assessing results by Average Yearly Progress (AYP) scores, and punishing failure harshly - firing teachers and principals, closing schools and transforming them from public to charter or for-profit ones.

Critics denounce the plan as "an endless regimen of test-preparation drills" for poor children. Others call it underfunded and a thinly veiled scheme to privatize education and transfer its costs and responsibilities from the federal government to individuals and impoverished school districts. Mostly, it reflects current era thinking that anything government does business does better, so let it. And Democrats are as complicit as Republicans.

So far, NCLB renewal bills remain stalled in both Houses, election year politics have intervened, and final resolution may be for the 111th Congress to decide. For critics, that's positive because the law failed to deliver as promised. Its sponsors claimed it would close the achievement gap between inner city and rural schools and more affluent suburban ones. It's real aim, however, is to commodify education, end government responsibility for it, and make it another business profit centre.

Last October, the New York Times cited Los Angeles as a vision of the future. It said "more than 1000 of California's 9500 schools are branded chronic failures, and the numbers are growing." Under NCLB, "state officials predict that all 6063" poor district schools will fail and will have to be "restructured" by 2014, when the law requires universal proficiency in math and reading." It's happening throughout the country, and The Times cited examples in New York, Florida and Maryland. Schools get five years to deliver or be declared irredeemable, in which case they must "restructure" with new teachers and principals.

In Los Angeles and around the country, "the promised land of universal high achievement seems more distant than ever," and one parent expressed her frustration. Weeks into the new school year, she said teachers focus solely on what's likely to appear on exams. "Maybe the system is not designed for people like us," she complained. Indeed it's not.

New Millennium Education

That's the theme of Time magazine's December 9, 2006 article on the National Centre on Education and the Economy (NCEE). It's on NCEE's New Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce. Time called it "a high-powered, bipartisan assembly of Education Secretaries, business leaders and a former Governor" and the pre-K to 12 education blueprint they released. It's called "Tough Choices or Tough Times," was funded by the (Bill) Gates Foundation, and below is its corporate wish list:

- moving beyond charter schools to privatized contract ones; charter schools are just stalking horses for what business really wants - privatizing all public schools for their huge profit potential;
- ending high school for many poor and minority students after the 10th grade - for those who score poorly on standardized tests intended for high school seniors; those who do well can finish high school and go on to college; others who barely pass can go to community colleges or technical schools after high school;

- ending remediation and special education aid for low-performance students to cut costs;

- ending teacher pensions and reducing their health and other benefits;

- ending seniority and introducing merit pay and other teacher differentials based on student performance and questionable standards;

- eliminating school board powers, all regulations, and empowering private companies;

- effectively destroying teacher unions; and

- ending public education and creating a nationwide profit centre with every incentive to cut costs and cheat students for bottom line gains; this follows an earlier decades-long corporate - public higher education trend that one educator calls a "subtle yet significant change toward (university) privatization, meaning that private entities are gradually replacing taxpayers as the dominant funding source as state appropriations account for a lower and lower percentage of schools' operating resources;" corporations now want elementary and secondary education control for the huge new market they represent.

The Skills Commission's earlier 1990s work advanced the scheme and laid the groundwork for NCLB. It came out of its "America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages" report on non-college-bound students. It called them "ill-equipped to meet employer's current needs and ill-prepared for the rapidly approaching, high-technology, service-oriented future." It recommended ending an "outmoded model" and adopting a standards-based learning and testing approach to enforce student - teacher accountability.

Both Commission reports reflect a corporate wish list to commodify education, benefit the well-off, and consign underprivileged kids to low-wage, no benefit service jobs. It's a continuing trend to shift higher-paying ones abroad, downsize the nation, and end the American dream for millions. So why educate them.

School Vouchers

They didn't make it into NCLB, but they're very much on the table with a sinister added twist. First some background.

It's an old idea dating back to the hard right's favourite economist and man the UK Financial Times called "the last of the great (ones)" when he died in November 2006. Milton Friedman promoted school choice in 1955, then kick-started it in the 1980s under Ronald Reagan. He opposed public education, supported school vouchers for privately-run ones, and believed marketplace competition improves performance even though voucher amounts are inadequate and mostly go to religious schools in violation of the First Amendment discussed below.

Here's how the Friedman Foundation for Education Choice currently describes the voucher scheme: it's the way to let "every parent send their child to the school of their choice regardless of where they live or income." In fact, it's a thinly veiled plot to end public education and use lesser government funding amounts for well-off parents who can make up the difference and send their children to private-for-profit schools. Others are on their own under various programs with "additional restrictions" the Foundation lists without explanation:
- Universal Voucher Programs for all children;
- Means-Tested Voucher Programs for families below a defined income level;
- Failing Schools, Failing Students Voucher Programs for poor students or "failed" schools;
- Special Needs Voucher Programs for children with special educational needs;
- Pre-kindergarten Voucher Programs; and
- Town Tuitioning Programs for communities without operating public schools for some students' grade levels.

What else is behind school choice and vouchers? Privatization mostly, but it's also thinly-veiled aid for parochial schools, mainly Christian fundamentalist ones, and the frightening ideology they embrace - racial hatred, male gender dominance, white Christian supremacy, militarism, free market everything, and ending public education and replacing it with private Christian fundamentalist schools.

In March 1971, the Supreme Court ruled in Lemon v. Kurtzman against parochial funding in what became known as the "Lemon Test." In a unanimous 7 - 0 decision, the Court decided that government assistance for religious schools was unconstitutional because it violates the First Amendment's Establishment Clause. It prohibits the federal government from declaring and financially supporting a national religion, and the First Amendment states: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;..."

That changed in June 2002 when the Court ruled 5 - 4 in Zelman v. Simmons-Harris that Cleveland's religious school funding didn't violate the Establishment Clause. The decision used convoluted reasoning that the city's program was for secular, not religious purposes in spite of some glaring facts. In 1999 and 2000, 82% of funding went to religious schools, and 96% of students benefitting were enrolled in them.

The Court harmed democracy and the Constitution's letter and spirit. It also contradicted Thomas Jefferson's 1802 affirmation that there should be "a wall of separation between church and state." No longer for the nation's schools.

Nationwide Efforts to Privatize Education

In recent years, privatization efforts have expanded beyond urban inner cities and are surfacing everywhere with large amounts of corporate funding and government support backing them. One effort among many is frightening. It's called "Strong American Schools - ED in '08" and states the following: it's "a nonpartisan public awareness campaign aimed at elevating education to (the nation's top priority)." It says "America's students are losing out," and the "campaign seeks to unite all Americans around the crucial mission of improving our public schools (by using an election year to elevate) the discussion to a national stage."

Billionaires Bill Gates and Eli Broad put up $60 million for the effort for the big returns they expect. Former Colorado governor and (from 2001 - 2006) superintendent of the Los Angeles Unified School District Roy Romer is the chairman. The Rockefeller (family) Philanthropy Advisors are also involved as one of their efforts "to bring the entire world under their sway" in the words of one analyst. Other steering committee members include former IBM CEO and current Carlyle Group chairman Lou Gerstner; former Michigan governor and current National Association of Manufacturers president John Engler; and Gates Foundation head Allan Golston.

"Ed in '08" has a three-point agenda:
- ending seniority and substituting merit pay for teachers based on student test scores;

- national education standards based on rote learning; standards are to be uniformly based on "what (business thinks) ought to be taught, grade by grade;" it's to prepare some students for college and the majority for workplace low-skill, low-paid, no-benefit jobs; and

- longer school days and school year; unmentioned but key is eliminating unions or making them weak and ineffective.

In addition, the plan involves putting big money behind transforming public and charter schools to private-for-profit ones. It's spreading everywhere, and consider California's "Program Improvement" initiative. Under it, "All schools and local educational agencies (LEAs) (must make) Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)" under NCLB provisions nearly impossible to achieve. Those that fail must divert public money from classrooms to private-for-profit remediating programs. It's part of a continuing effort to defund inner city schools and place them in private hands, then on to the suburbs with other "innovative" schemes to transform them as well.

Under the governor's proposed 2008 $4.8 billion education budget cut, transformation got easier. As of mid-March, 20,000 California teachers got layoff notices with State Superintendent of Public Instruction Jack O'Connell saying this action puts student performance "in grave jeopardy." Likely by design.

Plundering New Orleans

Nowhere is planned makeover greater than in post-Katrina New Orleans, and last June 28 the Supreme Court made it easier. Its ruling in Meredith v. Jefferson County (KY) and Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District effectively gutted the landmark 1954 Brown v. Board of Education decision that affirmed: segregated public schools deny "Negro children the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th Amendment."

In two troubling 5 - 4 decisions, the Roberts Court changed the law. They said public schools can't seek to achieve or maintain integration through measures taking explicit account of a student's race. They rewrote history, so cities henceforth may have separate and unequal education. Then it's on to George Wallace-style racism with policies like: "segregation now, segregation tomorrow, segregation forever" with the High Court believing what was good for 1960s Alabama is now right for the country.

The Court also made it easy for New Orleans to become a corporate predator's dream, and it didn't take long to exploit it. Consider public schools alone. The storm destroyed over half their buildings and scattered tens of thousands of students and teachers across the country. Within days of the calamity, Governor Kathleen Blanco held a special legislative session. Subject - taking over New Orleans Public Schools (NOPS) that serve about 63,000 mostly low-income almost entirely African-American children. Here's what followed:

- two weeks after the hurricane, US Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings cited charter schools as "uniquely equipped" to serve Katrina-displaced students;

- two weeks later, she announced the first of two $20 million grants to the state, solely for these schools;

- then in October 2005, the governor issued an executive order waiving key portions of the state's charter school law allowing public schools to be converted to charter ones with no debate, input or even knowledge of parents and teachers;

- a month later in November, the state legislature voted to take over 107 (84%) of the city's
128 public schools and place them under the state-controlled "Recovery School District (RSD);" and

- in February 2006, all unionized city school employees were fired, then selectively rehired at less pay and fewer or no benefits; it affected 7500 teachers as well as custodians, cafeteria workers and others.

Within six months of Katrina, the city was largely ethnically cleansed, the public schools infrastructure mostly gutted, and a new framework was in place. It put NOPS into three categories - public, charter and the Recovery School District with the latter ones run by the state as charter or for-profit schools.

New Orleans Loyola University law professor Bill Quigley described the plunder and called it "a massive (new) experiment....on thousands of (mostly) African American children...." It's in two halves.

The first half based on Recovery School District's estimated 30,000 returning students in January 2007:
- "Half of (these children were) enrolled (in) charter schools." They got "tens of millions of dollars" in federal money, but aren't "open to every child....Some charter schools have special selective academic criteria (and can) exclude children in need of special academic help." Others "have special administrative policies (that) effectively screen out many children." This latter category has "accredited teachers in manageable size classes (in schools with) enrollment caps....These schools also educate far fewer students with academic or emotional disabilities (and) are in better facilities than the other half of the children...."

"The other half:"

These students were "assigned to a one-year-old experiment in public education run by the State of Louisiana called the 'Recovery School District (RSD) program." Their education "will be compared" to what first half children get in charter schools. "These children are effectively....called the 'control group' of an experiment - those against whom the others will be evaluated."

RSD "other half" schools got no federal funds. Its leadership is inexperienced. It's critically understaffed. Many of its teachers are uncertified. There aren't enough of them, and schools assigned students hadn't been built for their scheduled fall 2007 opening. In addition, some schools reported a "prison atmosphere," and in others, children spent long hours in gymnasiums because teachers hadn't arrived. In addition, there was little academic counselling; college-preparatory math; or science and languages; and class sizes are too large because returning students are assigned to too few of them.

Many RSD schools also have no "working kitchens or water fountains (and their) bathroom facilities are scandalous....Hardly any white children attend this half of the school experiment." RSD schools are for poor black students getting short-changed and denied a real education by an uncaring state and nation and corporations in it for profit.

Quigley described a system for "Haves (and) Have-Not," and race defines it. He also exposed the lie that charter schools are public ones. Across the country, but especially in New Orleans, school officials are unaccountable, can pick and choose their students, and can decide who gets educated and who doesn't.

Separate and Unequal

state and local education agencies, interviews with researchers and policy makers, and the Harvard Civil Rights Project, his account is disturbing at a time of NCLB and other destructive initiatives.

Harvard Civil Rights researchers captured the problem in their Brown v. Board of Education 50th anniversary assessment stating: "At the beginning of the twenty-first century, American public schools are now 12 years into the process of continuous resegregation." Desegregation from the 1950s through the late 1980s "has receded to levels not seen in three decades." The percent of black students in majority-white schools stands at "a level lower than in any year since 1968" with conditions worst of all in the nation's four most segregated states - New York, Michigan, Illinois and California. "Martin Luther King's dream is being celebrated in theory and dishonoured in practice" by what's happening in inner-city schools. King would be appalled "that the country would renege on its promises," and the Supreme Court would authorize it in their two above cited decisions and an earlier 1991 one:

- Board of Education of Oklahoma City v. Dowell that ruled for resegregating neighbourhood schools mostly in areas of the South where desegregation was most advanced.

According to recent National Centre for Education Statistics (NCES) data, blacks and Latinos now comprise about 95% of inner-city students in the nation's 100 largest school systems - accounting for more than one-third of all public school students. Kozol writes about "hypersegregation" with "no more than five or 10 white children (in) a student population of as many as 3000," and this is the "norm, not the exception, in most northern urban areas today." It's "fashionable," he says, to declare integration "failed" and settle for a new millennium version of "Plessy" and its "separate but equal" doctrine that "Brown" repudiated until now.

Despite high-minded political posturing and programs like NCLB, the truth is these youngsters are forgotten and abused. They're warehoused in decrepit facilities, curricula offerings ignore their needs, testing is unrelated to learning, teachers don't teach, the whole scheme is swept under the rug, and "educating" the unwanted is "standardized" to produce good workers with pretty low skill levels for the kinds of jobs awaiting them. Kozol refers to "school reform" as a "business enterprise with goals, action plans, implementation targets, and productivity measures," and above all what marketplace potential there is.

Separate and unequal is the current inner city school standard. Unless it's exposed, denounced and reversed, (and there's no sign of it), millions of poor and minority children will be denied what the "American dream" increasingly only offers the privileged. And no one in Washington cares or they'd be doing something about it.

Disturbing New Dropout Data

A new Editorial Projects in Education (EPE) Research Centre report released April 1 is revealing, disturbing but not surprising. It states only 52% of public high school students in the nation's 50 largest cities completed the full curriculum and graduated in 2003-2004. This compares to the national average of 70%. Below are some of the findings:

- 1.2 million public high school students drop out each year;

- 17 of the 50 troubled cities have graduation rates of 50% or lower; in Detroit it's 24.9%; Indianapolis is 30.5%; Cleveland at 34.1%; Baltimore - 34.6%; Columbus - 40.9%; Minneapolis - 43.7%; Dallas - 44.4%; New York - 45.2%; Los Angeles - 45.3%; Oakland - 45.6%; Kansas City - 45.7%; Atlanta - 46%; Milwaukee - 46.1%; Denver - 46.3%; Oklahoma City - 47.5%; Miami - 49%; and Philadelphia - 49.6%;
- Chicago barely came in at 51.5%);
- the data show public education in the 50 largest cities' principal school districts in a virtual state of collapse;
- dropout rates for blacks and Latinos are significantly higher than for white students;
- dropouts are eight times more likely to end up in prison; family income is the main problem; in cities most affected, it goes hand in hand with a lack of good jobs and a sub-standard social infrastructure;
- key to understanding the overall problem nationwide is the gutting of social services, widening income gap between rich and poor, exporting manufacturing and other high-paying jobs abroad, and politicians and business exploiting the needs of the many to benefit the few;
- NCLB "reform" is called the solution; Democrats and Republicans are complicit in promoting it, and no one in government explains the truth - the report reveals a sinister scheme to end public education, say it causes poor student performance, and privatize it so the "market" can provide it to well-off communities and merely exploit the rest for profit.

Why else would the (Bill) Gates Foundation have funded the study and Colin Powell's America's Promise Alliance have sponsored it. APA is partnered with business, faith-based (Christian fundamentalist) groups, wealthy funders, and organizations like the American Bankers Association, right wing Aspen Institute, Business Roundtable, Ford Motor, Fannie Mae, Marriott International, National Association of Manufacturers, US Chamber of Commerce and many other for-profit ones and NGOs.

Educational Maintenance Organizations

It's a new term for an old idea that's much like their failed HMO counterparts. They're private-for-profit businesses that contract with local school districts or individual charter schools to "improve the quality of education without significantly raising current spending levels." They're still rare, but watch out for them and what they're up to.

An example is the Edison Project running Edison (for-profit) Schools. It calls itself "the nation's leading public school partner, working with schools and districts to raise student achievement and help every child reach his or her full potential." In the 2006-2007 school year, Edison served over 285,000 "public school" students in 19 states, the District of Columbia and the UK through "management partnerships with districts and charter schools; summer, after-school, and Supplemental Educational Service programs; and achievement management solutions for school systems."

Edison Schools, and its controversial charter schools and EMO projects, hope to cash in on privatizing education and is bankrolled by Microsoft's co-founder Paul Allen to do it. The company was founded in 1992, its performance record is spotty, and too often deceptive. It cooks the books on its assessments results that unsurprisingly show far more than they achieve. That's clear when independent evaluations are made.

Kalamazoo's Western Michigan University's Evaluation Centre published one of them in December 2000. Miami-Dade County public schools did another in the late 1990s. Both studies agreed. They showed Edison School students didn't outperform their public school counterparts, and they were kind in their assessment.

Even more disturbing was Edison's performance in Texas. It took over two Sherman, Texas schools in 1995, then claimed it raised student performance by 5%. But an independent American Institutes for Research (AIR) study couldn't confirm it because Edison threatened legal action if its results were revealed. It was later learned that AIR's findings weren't
exactly glowing and were thus suppressed. However, Sherman schools knew them, and when Edison's contract came up for renewal, the company withdrew before being embarrassed by expulsion.

The city's school superintendent had this assessment. He said Edison arrived with promises to educate students at the same cost as public schools and would improve performance. In the end, the city spent an extra $4 million, and students test scores were lower than in other schools. The superintendent added: "They were more about money than teaching," and that's the problem with privatized education in all its forms - charter, contract or EMOs that place profits over students.

Unless public action stops it, Edison is the future and so is New Orleans in its worst of all forms. It's spreading fast, and without public knowledge or discussion. It's the privatization of all public spaces and belief that marketplace everything works best. Indeed for business, but not people who always lose out to profits.

Stephen Lendman lives in Chicago and can be reached at lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net.

Also visit his blog site at sjlendman.blogspot.com and listen to The Global Research News Hour on RepublicBroadcasting.org Mondays from 11AM to 1PM for cutting-edge discussions with distinguished guests.


Destroying Public Education In America - Part II
By Stephen Lendman
5-24-10

This writer's April 2008 article addressed the topic, accessed through the following link: http://sjlendman.blogspot.com/2008/04/destroying-public-education-in-america.html.

It covered the sordid scheme to destroy what Diogenes called "the foundation of every state," and what Horace Mann (the "father of American education") said was mankind's "greatest discovery, (the) great equalizer, common" to all.

Established in 1635, the first Massachusetts school began a 375 year tradition, today being incrementally destroyed to commodity education, end government's responsibility for it, make it another business profit centre, benefit the well-off, revive a separate and unequal nation, consign underprivileged kids to low-wage, no benefit service jobs with no future so why educate them, thus putting the American dream out of reach for millions.

The Obama administration is spearheading the effort to do it, led by its infamous Education Secretary Arne Duncan, who wrecked Chicago schools so well he was chosen to go nationwide. More on his scheme below.

This article updates the earlier one, reflecting a grave problem getting worse under an administration as perverse as its predecessor, using the economic crisis to destroy, not help society's most vulnerable and disadvantaged when they most need it - one way through improved public education for a better future they'll be denied by marketplace priorities.

Obama is doing Bush one better, replacing his "No Child Left Behind" (NCLB) scheme with his own "Race to the Top," using failed NCLB practices, including rote learning, testing, teaching to the test, school choice, and (short on real achievement) market-based reforms.

In an unprecedented assault on public education, he's pitting one state against another, promoting school closures, mass teacher-staff layoffs, and wage and benefit cuts - arguing for draconian measures and privatizations to qualify for federal funding.
Addressing a Chamber of Commerce audience on March 1, he defended firing the entire Central Falls, Rhode Island High School teaching and support staff for rejecting demands they work overtime without pay – signalling what's happening nationwide as states deal with budget problems by raising taxes and cutting jobs, including mass teacher-support staff layoffs.

(Note: Central Falls High teachers and staff will keep their jobs under a May 15 union-negotiated agreement, forcing them to accept demands as bad or worse than ones they rejected. Included are a longer school day, a new teacher evaluation process, up to 10 days of mandatory summer "professional development," elimination of strict seniority guidelines, one weekly hour of provided tutoring, a "streamlined" collective bargaining arrangement, and dropping the lawsuit challenging their February firings. The settlement shows what teachers and staff face nationwide, especially when unions side with school boards, not their members.)

Facing a persistently huge budget deficit (over $26 billion as of April 2010), California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger just announced his latest austerity program after earlier spending and staff cuts, and revenue enhancements. Besides other vital social services, it includes a freeze on public education, including for K-12, community colleges and universities. Earlier measures included layoffs, increased class sizes, University of California voluntary time off without pay and furloughs as an option becoming reality, given the state's fiscal challenges through mid-decade or longer.

Strapped California cities are as hamstrung with budget shortfalls. For example, the Los Angeles Unified School District, facing a $640 million gap, voted to lay off over 5,200 teachers, support staff and management. Overall, 22,000 state teachers are affected, more likely to follow.

At around $13 billion, Illinois' per capita budget deficit is worse than California's, forcing lawmakers to make hard choices as they deal with the FY 2011 state budget. Last winter, payments to multiple state agencies were suspended, including the University of Illinois owed over $436 million in unpaid bills, $125 million owed Southern Illinois University, and $62 million to Northern Illinois University.

As a result, over 11,000 faculty and administrators were furloughed for mandated unpaid 10-day periods through mid-June. Hiring and wage freezes followed, endemic throughout the state that's effectively bankrupt like California, Michigan and others at a time conditions are worsening, not improving, so more painful measures are coming.

Last March, state schools superintendent Christopher Koch warned Senate appropriation committee members that the proposed FY 2011 Board of Education budget will require another 13,000 layoffs, an estimate he called conservative as one-fourth of state schools hadn't submitted expected revenue losses, their numbers going up, not down.

For starters, it's why 17,000 jobs are affected. According to state budget director David Vaught, "This is the reality budget. This is what's really happening" with no choice but to enact draconian cuts and tax increases, $1.4 billion from education expected, an 11% decrease besides another $1 billion the state owes to schools.

Last March, Voices for Illinois Children, a child advocacy group, called expected FY 2011 budget cuts "doomsday" ones that include:

- $922 million from elementary and high schools, disproportionately harming low and middle income districts;

- $144 million from universities and community colleges;
- $254 million in scholarship awards; and
- $386 million in various services, including alternative education for teen parents, after-school activities for 25,000 at-risk youths, and other children's programs.

Given a deteriorating economy, these are for starters, much like for other states dealing with intractable budget crises, cuts so far haven't resolved nor will for the foreseeable future.

Education, of course, will be greatly harmed given the rage for privatizations at the expense of a bedrock public institution on the chopping block to be eliminated, the Obama administration spearheading it by forcing strapped states to go along. In New York, for example, 15,000 teacher and support staff cuts were announced, the same pattern throughout the country.

Last winter, the Kansas City, MO school board endorsed a plan to shut 28 of the city's 61 schools and cut 700 jobs, including 286 teachers. In Michigan, an "Excellent Schools Detroit" program calls for closing 70 public schools, replacing them with charter ones. The city's Public Schools Emergency Financial Director, Robert Bobb, wants to charterize the entire system, selling it to profiteers.

In Massachusetts, 35 schools are at risk and their staffs, and in Boston, Superintendent Carol Johnson's budget proposed painful cuts, including tens of millions of dollars, salary freezes or cuts, school closings, reduced bussing, furloughed days, less heat in winter, and other measures to save $57.7 million. At the same time, charter school expansion continues, to be permanent at the expense of public schools - the system that educated this writer in the 1940s and 50s, headed for extinction.

Today, a shell of its former self, this writer's grade, junior high and high school no longer exist, a testimony to public education's destruction. In late 2009, the city closed another six schools. More will follow given the rage to cut costs, privatize, and consign millions of disadvantaged kids to oblivion, on their own and out of luck.

According to Boston Municipal Research Bureau's Samuel Tyler, school closings are inevitable, a pattern throughout the country in disturbing transition, demanded by Washington, reinforced by refusal to provide emergency funding in deference to other priorities - the usual earmarks for wars, Wall Street, Big Oil, Big Pharma, Big Agriculture, Big Telecom, Big Auto, and other corporate interests, the public be damned.

A new American Association of School Administrators (AASA) study titled, "Cliff Hanger: How America's Public Schools Continue to Feel the Impact of the Economic Downturn" highlights the problem, based on a March 2010 survey of 453 school administrators.

It showed school districts more strapped than in the previous two years. More than two-thirds cut staff in 2009-10, and 90% plan them in 2010-11. The same holds for benefits, affecting health care, pensions, libraries, and other educational tools and supplies. In addition, class sizes will be increased, and discretionary programs cut or eliminated like music, other arts, physical education and sports. In some districts, consideration is being given for a four-day week, and lower-paid temps replacing full-time teachers.

Further, Washington's proposed FY 2011 budget has new funding guidelines for low-income concentration schools, based on "performance," not need, or in other words, obey (bogus on their face) federal mandates, be judged by the results, and lose out if disobey or fail poorly - the idea being to rig the game to assure a new profit-driven, reactionary, class-based system. Poor families needn't apply, nor unions, teachers wanting good pay, benefits, and job security, and others with progressive ideas about an egalitarian America heading
for extinction on the altar of marketplace education replacing an earlier nation now gone.

It's showing up in expected hundreds of thousands of lost teacher and support staff jobs, a virtual blizzard of pink slips from New York to California with many more in prospect - as many as 300,000 near-term, according to Education Secretary Arne Duncan.

As Chicago Public Schools CEO, he wrecked them by closures, teacher firings, budget cuts, militarizing city high schools, and privatizations, including nearly 100 quasi-private charter schools, many run by for-profit companies. He plans the same for America, why Obama tapped him to destroy a 375 year tradition, replacing it with marketplace inequality.

Stephen Lendman lives in Chicago and can be reached at lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net. Also visit his blog site at sjlendman.blogspot.com and listen to cutting-edge discussions with distinguished guests on the Progressive Radio News Hour on the Progressive Radio Network Thursdays at 10AM US Central time and Saturdays and Sundays at noon. All programs are archived for easy listening.


What follows are examples of the process and end product of this carefully crafted dumbing down exercise. Note how so many of your so called experts and establishment organisation's, that you trust, are mystified, not one of them tells anything even resembling the truth as to the cause of this, - it's just the way it is, - well how come a Scottish hill-billie can find out the cause in two minutes, why can't any of these so called experts do so? But you'll insist there is no conspiracy because they taught you so well! This first article deals with the common sweeping answer to all our problems - screening at a young age.

Two-year-olds 'to be screened for speech problems'

Toddlers could be screened for speech problems after evidence that many are so addicted to television and video games that they are failing to learn basic communication skills.

The Telegraph By John Bingham Last Updated: 8:55AM GMT 02 Jan 2009

Insufficient stimulation and too little interaction with young children could have an effect on their ability to communicate properly

An ambitious nationwide screening programme for two-year-olds is reportedly being considered to tackle the problem which experts say is now more prevalent than dyslexia or autism.

The decline of the traditional family meal time, the long-hours culture in the parents' workplaces, poor childcare with little stimulation and social deprivation are also being blamed.

Barely a 10th of children in some areas can repeat even one nursery rhyme and, in extreme cases, some do not even know their own name.

The screening programme is being considered after a review into services for children with speech problems led by the Tory MP John Bercow.

Tests could be carried out by health visitors in a similar way to that in which they check eyesight, hearing and general development.
Mr Bercow concluded that children with untreated speech difficulties are at risk of ending up unemployed, experiencing mental health problems and involved in crime.

"If children are in a home in which they are getting insufficient stimulation, where there is not enough interaction, or where communication through the spoken word is not as common or extensive or imaginative as it might be, that is bound to have an impact," he told the Daily Mail.

"The reality is that for far too long, speech and language problems have been under-recognised."

Two in five leave primary school with poor English, maths and science

Nicola Woolcock from The Times August 5, 2009

Two in every five children are leaving primary school without reaching the required level in English, maths and science, despite government efforts to push up standards.

Figures published yesterday show that more than 225,000 11-year-olds will enter secondary school next month without a proper grounding in these key subjects.

Results in English fell for the first time since the Key Stage tests, known as SATs, were introduced 15 years ago, with a quarter of boys and 15 per cent of girls failing to reach Level 4. Standards also flatlined in maths and science. More than one in five children did not achieve the correct level in maths and one in eight in science.

Ministers insisted that they were still pushing towards their target of getting 78 per cent of pupils up to Level 4 in English and maths, even though only 72 per cent did this year — one per cent down on last year. They appeared to acknowledge, however, that bringing all children up to this standard was unrealistic, emphasising that just because pupils had not reached Level 4 did not mean that they were illiterate or unable to do basic maths.

Diana Johnson, the Schools Minister, said: "As the number of young people achieving Level 4 has increased, it is getting tougher to get the final 20 per cent to the expected level and we need to do more to sustain progress." She said that there had been great progress, but added: "We should not be complacent about the small drop in English results compared to last year.

"Parents, headteachers and governing bodies will be rightly concerned that we have not seen an improvement this year, and we are too. This year's results demonstrate loud and clear that we are going to have to ask some hard questions and redouble our efforts if we are to make further progress in national curriculum tests next year."

Schools are to be encouraged to devote more time to one-on-one tuition for children falling behind in English and maths, in an attempt to improve the results. The Government is also introducing programmes such as Every Child a Reader and Every Child Counts, in which teachers with specialist training adapt their teaching techniques with the aim of bringing out the best in each individual child.

The gender gap was particularly pronounced this year in English and head teachers’ complaints about inaccurate and variable marking were borne out by the noticeable difference between achievement in writing and reading.

Whereas 82 per cent of boys reached the required level in reading, only 60 per cent did so in writing. For girls the results were 86 per cent and 67 per cent respectively. The
proportion of children reaching a higher standard than that expected for their age — Level 5 — rose in maths, but fell in English and science.

The Tories said the figures were proof that Labour had broken its promise to raise standards in education. Michael Gove, the Shadow Schools Secretary, said: “This is the final proof that Labour, elected on a platform to raise standards in education, has failed to deliver. We have seen a historic drop in English results, the brightest students are not being stretched and the weakest are being failed the most. It is also concerning that the number securing the highest grades is declining.”

David Laws, the Liberal Democrat schools spokesman, said: “Progress in primary schools has clearly stalled and in some cases has even slipped backwards. The yawning gap between girls and boys in literacy is also very worrying. The Government has failed to get a grip on the basics.”

Teaching unions said that the Key Stage tests should be scrapped. Martin Johnson, the deputy general secretary of the Association of Teachers and Lecturers, said: “These results are further evidence that we have reached a ceiling for primary pupils’ performance within the current assessment and curriculum regime. Primary staff have again worked themselves into the ground to achieve the best results for their pupils. We know test-dominated learning leads to children forgetting much of what they have been taught.”

A spokesman for the National Association of Head Teachers, which says it could boycott the Key Stage 2 tests next year if they are not abolished, said: “We believe that the system is simply being maintained through political obduracy and that there are better ways to gain a broad picture of primary education in England. We encourage parents to ignore this meaningless nonsense.”

Tens of thousands of 11-year-olds leave primary school practically illiterate

About 35,000 11-year-olds left primary school this year unable to read and write properly, test results are expected to show today.

Telegraph Aug 3, 2009 By Jon Swaine

The figure will bring to half a million the number of pupils who have left primary school without attaining basic language skills since Labour came to power in 1997.

The pupils are those who have failed to obtain a level three in their national curriculum English tests, meaning that they will enter secondary school with “no useful literacy”.

About 600,000 primary school leavers will today receive their results in the controversial Sats tests in English, maths and science, which are used to compile annual league tables.

Teaching unions said that they expected results to have improved slightly overall. Yet critics said that Labour had failed to lift standards among the worst pupils.

David Laws, the Liberal Democrat schools spokesman, said: “These children are far more likely to fall further behind and be turned off education altogether.

“Ministers need to cut class sizes and ensure schools receive additional funding so that teachers can give struggling children the extra support they desperately need.”

Those awaiting the results face having their records tainted after the tests were condemned by teachers as “unacceptably narrow” and poorly marked.
Thousands of their test papers have already been sent back by schools to be marked again. Teachers, who had already seen their pupils’ results, described some of the marking as “bizarre and petty”.

Some of the most talented pupils were penalised because the formulaic marking did not allow for flair. Others were punished for not dotting the letter i, while some had is dotted for them by markers.

The National Association of Head Teachers (NAHT) said that “considerable numbers” of heads had complained about marking of English writing tests.

Mick Brookes, the general secretary of the NAHT, said: “We need to know whether the complaints we received were the tip of the iceberg.”

Kathleen Tattersall, the chairman of Ofqual, the exams watchdog, said that she was “continuing to monitor the quality control of the marking of this year’s papers”.

Today’s results are expected to show that about one in five of the pupils failed to reach the level four target in English and Maths.

Last year saw a slump in results for the brightest pupils, with the number of top grades suffering its biggest year-on-year drop since Labour came to power in 1997.

Teachers across the country have such little confidence in the tests that they are preparing to refuse to teach the courses in the new school year, which begins next month.

Earlier this year, two of the biggest teaching unions voted to boycott next year’s tests for both 11- and seven-year-olds, which they said have become “unacceptable for the future of children’s education”.

The NAHT and the National Union of Teachers (NUT), which together represent most of the teachers in English schools, both agreed to industrial action.

The unions yesterday declined to comment on when industrial action would commence.

However it has been suggested that it may have to begin soon after the start of the school year, when teachers are asked to start teaching material for the tests.

John Bangs, the NUT’s head of education, said yesterday: “The tests are unacceptably narrow. We are arguing for a completely different approach, in which teachers have a bank of different tests and have the time and space to assess pupils individually.

“What these results will again illustrate is the utterly inappropriate way that they have damaged the curriculum and put enormous pressure on kids, parents and teachers.”

Mr Brookes said: “Children are simply having to rehearse the tests. You can train them to jump through hoops, and they’ll jump through hoops, but that’s training, not education.”

He reiterated that the teachers would “pursue every avenue” in pushing Ed Balls, the Children’s Secretary, to abandon the tests in favour of a new system.

The corresponding tests for 14-year-olds were scrapped last year, after a disastrous marking process.
Hundreds of thousands of pupils’ results were delayed after ETS, an American firm contracted to oversee the tests, failed to deliver.

Diana Johnson, a schools minister, said that many pupils not reaching the literacy level had special educational needs.

“Thousands more children have started secondary school with a firm foundation in the basics” under Labour, she said.

Traditional subjects such as history and geography are disappearing from state schools, according to new research.

Telegraph | Nov 14, 2008

Traditional subjects ‘disappearing’ from school

By Graeme Paton, Education Editor

Many secondary schools are slashing time devoted to the humanities to make more room for “lifestyle” classes, it was claimed.

It follows an overhaul of the secondary curriculum this year.

From September, new “flexible” timetables have been introduced in all state schools, reducing the number of prescribed lessons.

Teachers are given less detailed instructions on subject matter to free up more time to teach issues such as British identity, citizenship and sex and relationships education.

But the Royal Geographical Society said the move has resulted in a drop in exposure to traditional subjects.

It surveyed 200 schools and found 70 per cent had cut the amount of time spent on geography.

Rita Gardner, society director, said the picture was similar with history.

“We worry about the maintenance of a broad and balanced curriculum as we go forward, and as increasing pressures continue to be placed on it,” she said.

Rebecca Sullivan, chief executive of the Historical Association, told the Times Educational Supplement: “There is some indication that there may be a drop in the time spent teaching history because of the way some schools are adopting the new curriculum and going for a cross curricular approach.”

GCSE pupils asked to name illegal drug: New dumbing-down row over this year's exams

By Laura Clark the Daily Mail Last updated at 6:09 PM on 24th August 2009

Pupils taking this year’s GCSE science exams were awarded marks for simply being able to name an illegal drug.

And those taking languages were allowed to take a cue card to prompt them in their oral tests.
The latest revelations are sure to intensify the debate over the 'dumbing down' of the exam system.

Watchdog Ofqual revealed in March that rigorous science standards had been compromised by reforms to the exams.

But it warned improvements towards a more acceptable standard will be gradual and that this year's results will still be tainted.

Science exams were changed to make the subject more 'relevant' to teenagers, but Ofqual said some questions were no longer challenging enough.

Now an analysis of this year's papers has renewed criticism that some questions are not a sufficient test of pupils' knowledge, particularly in the sciences.

One chemistry question asked candidates, for two marks, to give an example of 'a legal recreational drug' and 'an illegal recreational drug'.

Meanwhile, a physics question asked what uses there were for microwave energy, other than in mobile phones

It comes just days before more than 500,000 teenagers across the country discover their GCSE results.

The Conservative schools spokesman Michael Gove said: 'Since the last curriculum changed, experts have warned that science GCSE is no longer as rigorous as it should be.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHEMISTRY (2009)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Many people use recreational drugs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give one example of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) a legal recreational drug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) an illegal recreational drug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some recreational drugs are addictive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Give one example of a recreational drug that is very addictive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Explain how the action of a drug makes a person become addicted to it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHYSICS (2009)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phone networks send digital signals using microwaves. Give:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIOLOGY (2008)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When we sweat, water leaves the body through:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Kidneys</td>
<td>b) Liver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Lungs</td>
<td>d) Skin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCIENCE (2006)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Many people observe the stars using:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) A telescope</td>
<td>b) A microscope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) An X-Ray tube</td>
<td>d) A synthesiser</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'Ve have seen questions that are not a proper test of scientific reasoning crop up in exam paper after exam paper.

'It's important we keep up with other nations that are pulling ahead in maths and science and making sure that our students sit exams that properly stretch and test them.'

The Mail revealed last month that eminent scientific bodies which investigated science GCSEs had found there are questions that have 'no relation to science' and that vital maths is 'woefully represented' in question papers.
The questions emerged in an analysis by the Tories as they announced plans to create an online library of exam papers from past years.

Their findings also reveal how pupils are not required to commit key scientific formulae to memory. This year's GCSE physics paper supplied a list of basic equations to help pupils with calculations, whereas those taking the International GCSE were expected to have learned the formulae by heart.

Elsewhere, candidates were allowed to take a cue card with up to five headings into modern language oral examinations.

There was no literature or extensive translation in modern language GCSEs to test the extent of their fluency. The archive also shows that the 2009 biology exam contains papers as short as 45 minutes.

By contrast, the IGCSEs, which are increasingly offered by private schools, are typically one hour and 15 minutes long.

Multiple choice questions appear in the physics GCSE, but not in the IGCSE.

Only one in four students passes 'core subjects'. Almost half a million 16-year-olds a year fail to achieve five GCSE passes that include the core subjects of English, maths, science and a language, it has emerged.

Fewer than a quarter finish compulsory schooling with the basic set of qualifications - down from nearly a third in 2001.

Tory spokesman Nick Gibb said: 'These are the core academic subjects that are highly valued by universities and employers. The fact that the number of children-attaining these GCSEs has fallen year on year since 2001 is a terrible indictment of the Government's record.'

The figures, obtained by the Conservatives, showed the proportion with five passes fell from 30.4 per cent in 2001 to 23.7 per cent last year.

GCSE results released on Thursday are expected to show yet another set of record-breaking performances. Pupils are predicted to pass one in five exams at A* or A.

'Dismal picture' of adult literacy in UK

Despite Labour's £5bn programme, numbers are unacceptably high, says watchdog

Peter Kingston guardian.co.uk, Thursday 29 January 2009 10.45 GMT

The number of adults unable to read or count remains unacceptably high in England despite £5bn spent by Labour trying to improve the situation, according to an influential parliamentary spending watchdog.

Even if the government, which has made greater efforts than previous administrations to tackle this problem, hits its targets, the country's basic skills will still not match the best in the world, concludes the Public Accounts Committee (PAC).
Progress on numeracy has been particularly disappointing. The government's Skills for Life programme has helped barely one in 10 people with maths skills below the level of a good GCSE.

Even among the captive prison population progress has been relatively slow, the committee notes. Only one in five offenders with an identified literacy or numeracy problem has enrolled on a basic skills course.

The committee's chair, Edward Leigh MP, said: "This is a dismal picture, both for the many who face diminished prospects in what they can achieve in life and for the competitiveness of our country in the world economy."

The prison service should provide more incentives to get more offenders on to courses to improve their reading, writing and arithmetic, it recommends in its report Skills for Life: Progress in Improving Adult Literacy and Numeracy.

In 2001, the former Department for Education and Skills launched the Skills for Life strategy with the aim of helping 2.25 million adults by 2010. Two years later, it established by survey that 75% of the working-age adult population had numeracy skills below the level of a good pass at GCSE and 56% had similar literacy skills. At that time, the OECD ranked the UK 14th in international literacy and numeracy league tables.

In 2007, the government set a new target, to help 95% of the adult population achieve enough literacy and numeracy to get by in life by 2020. "Achieving this ambition would, however, only raise England to the standards currently achieved by the top 25% of OECD member countries," says the PAC report.

An estimated 550,000 benefit claimants have poor literacy, language and numeracy skills and, despite their contact with different public services, very few start courses, it says.

The Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills (Dius), which took over the programme in 2007, is working closely with other departments to try to make sure that Jobcentre Plus applicants take up basic skills courses. This situation should improve, the report says, in 2010 when all new benefits claimants will have their skills assessed.

The government must follow up its 2003 survey to get an accurate picture of current levels of illiteracy and innumeracy, said Leigh. Without up-to-date figures, ministers cannot be sure that the programme is giving people the skills that the economy needs.

Dius has promised to boost the numbers of numeracy teachers, but the PAC suggests it adopt better recruitment methods. Latest figures show that the programme has fewer than 6,100 teachers, compared with 9,300 literacy teachers.

A Dius spokesman said the report acknowledged significant progress although there was more to do. "No government has done more to tackle improving the nation's literacy and numeracy skills, despite the scale of the challenge being so large and historic. "We have revolutionised the way in which basic skills are dealt with, and through the Skills for Life strategy, have helped more than 5.7 million adults to improve their numeracy and literacy skills."

Here are a few choice quotes and my opinion on the matter to end this part on education.

In school we were encouraged not to think, but merely to memorize. We were pressured to submit unquestioningly to the materialist-capitalist worldview and absorb so-called “facts” which were not facts at all, but outright lies and political propaganda.
There is no place for independent, free-thinking individuals within the American or British school systems. From the first year or grade all the way through university post-graduate work, American and British schools reward you for mental obedience, above all else. Intellectual conformity is valued above real intelligence. Intelligence is rewarded only if it is applied within approved boundaries. For those with independent, creative minds, school curriculum is a mental coffin.

“How is it that little children are so intelligent and men so stupid? It must be education that does it.” — Alexandre Dumas

All those impressionable, critically important years of children’s lives — wasted in school. Innocent souls are mutatied into apathetic, immoral citizens in an assembly-line of mass-produced minds. Day after day, year after year they are steadily conformed to an evil, decaying system. Children are trained to become obedient taxpayers, flag-saluting sheep, while their corporate and government rulers, wolves in sheep’s clothing, feed upon their labour. A mind is a terrible thing to waste, indeed.

“You must adjust... This is the legend imprinted in every schoolbook, the invisible message on every blackboard. Our schools have become vast factories for the manufacture of robots.” — Robert Lindner

“My schooling did me a great deal of harm and no good whatever; it was simply dragging a child’s soul through the dirt.” — George Bernard Shaw

“And what is a good citizen? Simply one who never says, does or thinks anything that is “unusual”.

Schools are maintained in order to bring this uniformity up to the highest possible point. A school is a hopper into which children are heaved while they are still young and tender; therein they are pressed into certain standard shapes and covered from head to heels with official rubber-stamps.” — H. L. Mencken

A bell began the school day, a bell told you when you could escape for recess, a bell told you to come back from recess, a bell told you when you could eat lunch, a bell told you to come back from lunch. When the final blasted bell rang it was always a magic moment. All the little robots were permitted to come alive again and flee into the waiting arms of life outside. But whatever other “extracurricular” activities there might be, upon returning home our impressionable minds were further programmed by hours of tacky televised twaddle until it was time to go to sleep.

All that these people want is a compliant and docile workforce who never question their masters, in that respect I feel they have been unbelievably successful, you will fight for these people, you will die for them, you never question their motives, and even if you do, all it takes is a couple of TV shows or Newspaper articles to reassure you that it was just a one off mistake, by the end of this media examination of the “facts” once again you are 100% sure that your government is still reliable, and that the system still works just fine.

Quite frankly the vast majority of you are no more articulate or intelligent than zombie´s.

Zombie´s who get up everyday, get ready, and then drive for a few hours just to get to your slave plantation - (sorry meant to say place of work) – A place where you allow yourself to be treated like dirt constantly. And all so that you can earn just enough money to keep your head above water. Don’t worry about that though, you will be offered so much credit that debt will allow you to pretend to the Jones´s that you can keep up with them. - Because we all know how important this is don’t we? In the next chapter we end this work by proving that mental illness is not hereditary. One last point to ponder: imagine if Dyslexia was an excuse for not teaching your kid to read. I don’t remember dyslexia in my time in school.
Chapter Thirty One

No Genetic Proof of Mental Illnesses

“No claim for a gene for a psychiatric condition has stood the test of time, in spite of popular misinformation.” —Dr. Joseph Glenmullen, Harvard Medical School psychiatrist

“….modern psychiatry has yet to convincingly prove the genetic/biological cause of any single mental illness.” —David Kaiser, psychiatrist

“In forty years, ‘biological’ psychiatry has yet to validate a single psychiatric condition/diagnosis as an abnormality/disease, or as anything ‘neurological,’ ‘biological,’ ‘chemically-imbalanced’ or ‘genetic.’” —Dr. Fred Baughman Jr., child neurologist, Fellow of the American Academy of Neurology

The “Missing Heritability” of Psychiatric Disorders:

Elusive Genes or Non-Existent Genes?

Jay Joseph Oakland, California

The psychiatric genetics field is currently undergoing a crisis due to the decades-long failure to uncover the genes believed to cause the major psychiatric disorders. Since 2009, leading researchers have explained these negative results on the basis of the “missing heritability” argument, which holds that more effective research methods must be developed to uncover presumed missing genes. According to the author, problems with the missing heritability argument include genetic determinist beliefs, a reliance on twin research, the use of heritability estimates, and the failure to seriously consider the possibility that presumed genes do not exist. The author concludes that decades of negative results support a finding that genes for the major psychiatric disorders do not appear to exist, and that research attention should be directed away from attempts to uncover “missing heritability” and toward environmental factors and a reassessment of previous genetic interpretations of psychiatric family, twin, and adoption studies.

THE MISSING HERITABILITY ARGUMENT

At the dawn of the 21st century, genetic researcher Neil Risch (2000, p. 847) expressed concern that “human genetics is now at a critical juncture” because the methods used in molecular genetics to identify the genes “underlying rare Mendelian syndromes are failing to find the numerous genes causing more common, familial, non-Mendelian diseases.” At that time the Human Genome Project (HGP) was nearing completion, and Risch saw “new opportunities . . . for unravelling the complex genetic basis of non-Mendelian disorders based on large-scale genome-wide studies” (Risch, 2000, p. 847). Other researchers (e.g., Hyman, 2000) expected the completion of the HGP to speed up the identification of genes for major psychiatric disorders such as schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, attention-deficit-hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), depression, borderline personality disorder, autism, obsessive-compulsive disorder, and anxiety disorders. Around the same time, psychiatric genetic researcher Lynn DeLisi (2000) wrote that her field “appears to be at a crossroads or crisis” (p. 190). Psychiatric molecular genetic researchers view most psychiatric conditions as “multifactorial complex disorders,” meaning that they view them as being caused by a complex interacting admixture of multiple genes and multiple environmental risk factors.

Over a decade later, human genetic research into “complex disorders”—and “multifactorial complex psychiatric disorders,” in particular—finds itself at an even more critical juncture. A generation of psychiatric genetic researchers have tried, yet have failed, to identify the genes that they believe underlie the major psychiatric disorders (Collins et al., 2102; Gershon, Alliey-Rodriguez, & Liu, 2011; Joseph, 2011; Turkheimer, 2011a), even though
many expected to discover these presumed genes by the end of the 1980s. Indeed, behavioural geneticist Robert Plomin and his colleagues (Plomin, DeFries, McClearn, & McGuffin, 2008) described the “euphoria of the 1980s,” which led to disappointment after some initial claims “could not be replicated” (p. 206). A generation later, and despite great technological progress, the story remains pretty much the same (Haworth & Plomin, 2010; Nisbett et al., 2012; Turkheimer, 2011a, 2011b). At the same time, some psychiatric genetic researchers argue that replicated gene discoveries have been made for some disorders (e.g., Craddock & Owen, 2010). Flint, Greenspan, and Kendler, in their 2010 book on genetic research in psychiatry, mentioned the ALDH2 gene, which appears to influence the risk for alcoholism. They cited this example to counter the possibility that their readers had heard “that ‘science has not yet found a gene that conclusively influences risk for psychiatric disorders’” (Flint, Greenspan, & Kendler, 2010, p. 58).

Nevertheless, the 100-year-old field of psychiatric genetics finds itself in a crisis due to the continuing failure to find the genes that the field has said along must be there. Molecular genetic research into psychiatric disorders dates back to at least 1969, which saw the publication of a study of “manic-depressive disease” (now known as bipolar disorder; Reich, Clayton, & Winokur, 1969). Thus, psychiatric molecular genetic research has a 43-year history. It also has a 43-year history of subsequently unsubstantiated gene finding claims for psychiatric disorders, as Reich and colleagues concluded, “Affective disorder in which mania occurs is probably linked on the X chromosome. . . .This finding clarifies some aspects of transmission. It also proves a genetic factor in manic-depressive disease” (Reich et al., 1969, p. 1367, emphasis added).

The “missing heritability” interpretation of negative results has been developed in the context of the ongoing failure to uncover most of the genes presumed to underlie common non-Mendelian medical conditions, and, with possible rare exceptions, all of the genes presumed to underlie the major psychiatric disorders. In the words of Francis Collins, current Director of the U.S. National Institutes of Health, and former Director of the National Centre for Human Genome Research, missing heritability “is the big topic in the genetics of common disease right now” (quoted in Maher, 2008, p. 18). As I write this, the topic had grown even bigger (Nisbett et al., 2012; Plomin, 2011; Turkheimer, 2011a; Zuk et al., 2012).

According to one group of prominent researchers, heritability is “missing” due to the finding that genome-wide association (GWA) studies “have explained relatively little of the heritability of most complex traits, and the variants identified through these studies have small effects” (Eichler et al., 2010, p. 446). Genome-wide association studies, which have been used extensively since 2005, involve rapidly scanning markers across the genomes of many people to find common genetic variants associated with particular diseases or traits. In the popular literature the word “gene” is shorthand for genetic variant, which refers to differing variations of a gene found among individuals or populations. GWA studies focus on common variants, which refer to variants found in 5% or more of the population. The dominant view in human genetics, and the rationale for GWA studies, has been that common variants underlie common diseases, which is known as the “common disease, common variant hypothesis.” Given the lack of findings from GWA studies, some now propose that research attention should focus on identifying rare variants which might underlie medical and psychiatric disorders. Rare variants are defined as variants found in less than 0.5% of the population (Manolio et al., 2009). It is important to remember that even if a variant is associated with a trait or disease, it does not necessarily mean that the variant causes the trait or disease. “Association” and “correlation” are synonymous concepts in this context, and it is axiomatic that correlation does not equal cause. A large group of genetic researchers in medicine, including Francis Collins and many other prominent investigators, published a 2009 article in Nature entitled, “Finding the Missing Heritability” (Manolio et al., 2009). This article has since served as a reference point for molecular genetic researchers, including those in psychiatry, who have attempted to come to terms with years of negative results. Manolio and colleagues recognized that “the identification of genetic
variants contributing to . . . ‘complex diseases’ has been slow and arduous” (p. 747), and they saw the few positive findings of variants for non-psychiatric medical conditions as explaining “only a small proportion of the estimated heritability” (p. 748). Turning to psychiatric disorders, the authors recognized “the lack of variants detected so far for some neuropsychiatric conditions” (p. 748). They had no doubt that the problem is missing heritability, as opposed to non-existent heritability, because “a substantial proportion of individual differences in disease susceptibility is known to be due to genetic factors” (p.748). Finding missing heritability is important, they wrote, in order to aid in “better prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of disease” (p. 748). Manolio et al. saw missing heritability as the “‘dark matter’ of genome-wide association in the sense that one is sure it exists, can detect its influence, but simply cannot ‘see’ it (yet)” (p. 748).

Manolio and colleagues’ (2009) position that they are “sure” that genes exist and await discovery was based on the results of family studies, which, at least as they pertain to psychiatric disorders and variation in psychological traits such as IQ and personality, are widely recognized as being unable to disentangle the potential roles of genes and environment (Bouchard & McGue, 2003; Faraone, Tsuang, & Tsuang, 1999; Plomin et al., 2008). Strikingly, the authors did not mention twin studies, which human genetic researchers believe are able to disentangle these influences (see below for an analysis of this claim).

Manolio and colleagues believed that current heritability estimates are roughly accurate, and suggested several research strategies to uncover the genetic “dark matter” they are sure exists. They saw this as an important task that will “illuminate the genetics of complex diseases and enhance its potential to enable effective disease prevention or treatment” (p. 747). From the “missing heritability” standpoint, genetic variants that cause disorders have found good hiding places that require better methods and larger sample sizes to flush them out.

Challenging the Missing Heritability Position

The missing heritability interpretation of GWA results was challenged by Jonathan Latham and Allison Wilson (2010, para. 4), who concluded that the “genetics revolution . . . is in big trouble” due to the inability of GWA studies, with a few notable exceptions, to find important disease genes. “Instead of invoking missing genes,” wrote Latham and Wilson, if “we take the GWA studies at face value, then apart from the exceptions . . . genetic predispositions as significant factors in the prevalence of common diseases are refuted” (2010, para. 8). They concluded, “The dearth of disease causing genes is without question a scientific discovery of tremendous significance” (Latham & Wilson, 2010, para. 17).

Latham and Wilson (2010) pointed to the “plentiful evidence” that environmental factors cause many common diseases, even as the popular press and science journals continue to focus on genetics and the need to keep looking for genes. Manolio and colleagues’ (2009) position, as Latham and Wilson described it, was that “since heritability measurements suggest that genes for disease must exist, they must be hiding under some as-yet-unturned genetic rock” (Latham & Wilson, 2010, para. 25).

Addressing the larger picture, Latham and Wilson (2010) wrote that although the “evidence for genetic causation has always been weak” because it is based mainly on “disputed” studies of twins and other relatives, it is “necessary to understand the role that genetic determinism plays in consolidating the social order” (para. 37). Writing mainly about genetic research in medicine, but with much relevance to psychiatry, they identified groups in society with an interest in promoting genetic determinist theories of disease causation.

Among these they included politicians and corporations “because it substantially reduces their responsibility for people’s ill health,” and medical researchers, who in turn “can raise research dollars with relative ease” with the help of these politicians and corporations (Latham & Wilson, 2010, para. 37).
“The history of scientific refutation,” wrote Latham and Wilson (2010), “is that adherents of established theories construct ever more elaborate or unlikely explanations to fend off their critics” (para. 41). We will soon see how this has been carried out in the area of twin research. Currently, the missing heritability position has provided psychiatric and behavioural genetic researchers with a ready-made explanation for their continuing failure to discover genes. To cite one example, a group of researchers looking for the genes that they believe underlie human personality traits explained their negative results on the basis of “missing heritability,” as opposed to concluding that their findings might indicate that no such genes exist. Downplaying their negative findings, the researchers predicted that genes will be found in the future on the basis of “newer technologies . . . and novel statistical approaches combined with larger samples and meta-analyses . . . ” (Verweij et al., 2010, p. 314).

FOUR KEY PROBLEMS WITH THE MISSING HERITABILITY ARGUMENT

Four major problem areas in psychiatric molecular genetic research in general—and with the missing heritability concept in particular—are as follows:

1. It is based on the genetic determinist belief that we must identify genes in order to understand, treat (as opposed to simply removing symptoms), and prevent psychiatric disorders;

2. Although the claim that psychiatric disorders have an important genetic component is based mainly on twin studies (and to a lesser degree, family and adoption studies), obvious and invalidating environmental confounds in twin research are usually denied or overlooked;

3. It is based on the misused and frequently misunderstood concept of heritability. Heritability estimates were designed to predict the outcome of selective breeding programs. They are not an indicator of the relative influences of genes and environment. Moreover, most heritability calculations are derived from environmentally confounded (and otherwise biased) research methods; and

4. Researchers rarely give serious consideration to the possibility that years of negative gene finding results indicate that genes for psychiatric disorders do not exist.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I have argued that the four main problem areas in the current “missing heritability” stage of psychiatric molecular genetic research are

(1) the ideology of genetic determinism;

(2) a reliance on twin studies, which are unable to disentangle the potential roles of genes and environment;

(3) a reliance on heritability statistics; and

(4) the failure to recognize that decades of failure may well indicate that genes do not exist.

As stated previously, the purpose of the present review has been to question the missing heritability interpretation of failed gene finding attempts in the context of the problem areas of quantitative genetic research such as twin studies, and not to provide a comprehensive critical review of this body of research.

The issue researchers are grappling with is not missing heritability, but missing genes (Joseph, 2006; see also Crow, 2011), and there is good reason to believe that these “missing” genes are actually “non-existent” genes.
“Where are the genes?” asked Richard Lewontin in 2009, and this question remains even more relevant today.

The historical crimes committed by the decidedly non-apolitical “racial hygienist” founders of psychiatric genetics in Nazi Germany have been documented (Baron, 1998; Gutt, Rudin, & Rutke, 1934; Joseph, 2004, 2006; Lerner, 1992; Muller-Hill, 1998; Plötz & Rudin, 1938a, 1938b; Ritter & Roelcke, 2005; Weiss, 2010), as well as the massively flawed research the field has produced (Boyle, 2002; Jackson, 1960; Joseph, 2004, 2006, 2010a; Lewontin et al., 1984; Pam, 1995), which leads to the following question:

Has the field of psychiatric genetics contributed anything positive to the human condition in its roughly 100 years of existence?

A leading group of psychiatric genetic researchers has supplied at least a partial answer. According to Glatt, Faraone, and Tsuang (2008), although they believe that their field possesses “a powerful toolbox of methods,” the “major contributions of psychiatric genetic research to the diagnoses, treatment, prediction, and prevention of psychiatric disorders have yet to be realized” (pp. 24–25).

Paradoxically, it is becoming clearer every day that the only positive contribution that the field of psychiatric genetics has ever made to the human condition is its apparent finding that genes for the major psychiatric disorders do not exist.

Future historians may well view the missing heritability stage of the psychiatric genetics field as a station on the road to its eventual destination alongside other “null fields” in the history of science.

In a widely cited 2000 article, Turkheimer concluded, mainly on the basis of twin studies, that “all human behavioural traits are heritable” (p. 160). As we have seen, at that time behavioural genetic and psychiatric genetic researchers were pinning their hopes on the completion of the Human Genome Project. So was Turkheimer, writing that “Behaviour geneticists anticipate vindication” by the discovery of genes causing behavioural variation. On the other hand, wrote Turkheimer:

Critics of behaviour genetics expect the opposite, pointing to the repeated failures to replicate associations between genes and behaviour as evidence of the shaky theoretical underpinnings of which they have so long complained. (p. 163)

That was an accurate description of environmentalist critics’ expectations circa 2000 and earlier. A dozen years later, it appears that the critics have indeed been vindicated. As Turkheimer wrote in 2011, “to the great surprise of almost everyone, the molecular genetic project has foundered on the . . . shoals of developmental complexity . . . ” (2011a, p. 600). Going further, he proposed the creation of a “new paradigm” (p. 600). It appears that the real problem is, as Turkheimer described it in 2000, the “shaky theoretical underpinnings” provided by twin research.

I began with a passage from Neil Risch, a leading and highly respected genetic researcher in medicine and psychiatry. I will close with a passage from a 1996 article he published with Kathleen Merikangas in Science (Risch & Merikangas, 1996). The authors discussed the “limited power” of linkage studies to identify variant genes, and argued that “the future of the genetics of complex diseases is likely to require large-scale testing by association analysis” that utilize “candidate genes” (p. 1516). As it turned out, candidate gene studies (and later, GWA studies) also failed to bear fruit, despite an investment of over $250 million (Visscher, Brown, McCarthy, & Yang, 2012). I cite this 1996 article mainly as a reminder that then, as now, researchers downplay the implications of negative findings at the same time that they claim that some new technology or technique will finally deliver the promised genes. Currently, the focus on rare variants or the “1000 Genomes Project” plays a similar role.
We may indeed be, as researchers in genetics sometimes write, “at the dawn of a new era.” But the new era will be very different from the one they imagine. It will be an era in which it is recognized that genes for psychiatric disorders are either non-existent or irrelevant, and the attention of society and science will be focused mainly on the social, cultural, familial, economic, and political environments leading to, as Rose (1997, p. 296) put it, the “social and personal distress in advanced industrial societies.” At the present time, psychiatry and some areas of psychology choose to locate this distress within the bodies, brains, and genes of individuals, and then assign them the status of being “mentally ill.”

Psychiatry, It's A Killing.

"For What Possible Use Should You Keep Such A Treacherous And Savage Creature?" Marcus Tullius Cicero

Wednesday, February 22, 2012 Psychiatric Genetics: Still Batting Zero

Psychiatric Genetics remains as empty a bag as it was in Nazi Germany, and at Some point, someone, somewhere in the bureaucracy is going to understand that certain people are just too expensive/too much of a burden on the State, ...... and some other people (Psychiatric Genetics Researchers) whose paycheck depends upon making the people who sign that paycheck happy, are going to open the doors to cleansing all of those useless bread gobblers off of our Disability payment schedules, ...... that is, of course, unless somebody else tosses these Psychiatric Genetics Researching FRAUDS, who've come up with ZERO beyond intentionally misleading, send more money Promises for over 80 years now, ..... Out of the Public Trough, ..... Before the Cleansing begins, this time.

THE CRUMBLING PILLARS OF BEHAVIORAL GENETICS

By Jay Joseph

Schizophrenia researcher Timothy Crow wrote in 2008 that molecular genetic researchers investigating psychotic disorders such as schizophrenia had previously thought that "success was inevitable—one would 'drain the pond dry' and there would be the genes!" But as Crow concluded, "The pond is empty." Four years later the psychiatric disorder and psychological trait "gene ponds" appear to have been completely drained, and there are few if any genes to be found. Twenty years ago, however, leading behavioural geneticists had high expectations that molecular genetic research would soon "revolutionize" the behavioural sciences.

During that heady period of the early-1990s, leading behavioural genetic researchers such as Robert Plomin attempted to shift the field's focus towards gene finding efforts. After all, they reasoned, "quantitative genetic" studies of families, twins, and adoptees had established beyond question that variation in "normally distributed" psychological traits such as personality and cognitive ability (IQ), as well as psychiatric disorders and abnormal behaviour, had an important genetic component. The decade of the 1990s did in fact witness an explosion of molecular genetic research attempting to pinpoint the genes believed to underlie these traits and disorders. This was followed by the publication of the initial working draft of the human genome sequence in 2001, which many researchers believed would lead to rapid gene discoveries in psychiatry and psychology. According to a pair of prominent researchers, writing in 2003, "Completion of the human genome project has provided an unprecedented opportunity to identify the effect of gene variants on complex phenotypes, such as psychiatric disorders." As we approach 2012, however, behavioural genetics and the allied and overlapping field of psychiatric genetics are attempting to come to grips with the stunning failure to discover genes. These fields appear to be approaching a crisis stage, if they are not there already.

Critics, on the other hand, have argued all along that both twin studies and family studies are unable to disentangle the potential roles of genes and environment. They have pointed
out for decades that the validity of equal environment assumption (EEA) of the twin method is not supported by the evidence, and that the much more similar environments experienced by reared-together monozygotic (MZ) versus reared-together dizygotic (DZ) twin pairs confound the results of the twin method. Therefore, both family studies and twin studies prove nothing about genetics and their results can be completely explained by non-genetic factors. Most behavioural geneticists agree with this assessment as it relates to family studies, but continue to maintain that twin studies provide conclusive evidence that genes play an important role. Critics have also pointed to the massive methodological problems and untenable assumptions found in psychological and psychiatric adoption studies, as well as the major problems and environmental confounds in studies of purportedly reared-apart twins.

Behavioural geneticist Erick Turkheimer described the competing positions of behavioural geneticists and their critics in 2000: Gene discoveries to come would signify behavioural geneticists' "vindication," whereas "critics of behaviour genetics expect the opposite, pointing to the repeated failures to replicate associations between genes and behaviour as evidence of the shaky theoretical underpinnings of which they have so long complained." Turkheimer, however, recognized in 2011, "to the great surprise of almost everyone, the molecular genetic project has foundered on the...shoals of developmental complexity..."

Behavioural genetics and the related fields have recently adopted the "missing heritability" position to explain the ongoing failure to uncover genes. Proponents of this position argue that genes ("heritability") are "missing" because researchers must find better ways to uncover them, as opposed to some critics' contention that the failure to discover genes indicates that these genes do not exist. By the summer of 2011 it had reached the point where 96 leading psychiatric genetic researchers, in an open letter, asked potential funding sources not to "give up" on genome-wide association (GWA) studies.

In light of the ongoing failures of molecular genetic research, it is worthwhile to look back at the way that behavioural geneticists have written about the search for genes, including numerous claims and predictions published in textbooks and leading scientific journals. Here I focus mainly on the writings of the world's leading and most influential behaviour geneticist, Robert Plomin of King's College of London, Institute of Psychiatry, who is the lead author of a frequently cited multi-edition textbook on the subject: Behavioural Genetics.

Three Decades of Claims and Predictions

As far back as 1978, DeFries and Plomin claimed that "Evidence has accumulated to indicate that inheritance of bipolar depression involves X-linkage in some instances." Although these and other claims were not replicated, psychiatric molecular genetic research took off in the 1980s, a decade that witnessed many more highly publicized, yet subsequently unsubstantiated, gene finding claims. Nevertheless, another group of prominent behavioural geneticists wrote in a 1988 Annual Review of Psychology contribution, "We are witnessing major breakthroughs in identifying genes coding for some mental disorders."

In the 1990 second edition of Behavioural Genetics, Plomin and colleagues wrote, "During the past decade, advances in molecular genetics have led to the dawn of a new era for behavioural genetic research." They argued that "these techniques are already beginning to revolutionize behavioural genetic research in some areas, especially psychopathology." However, these "revolutionary advances" were not actual replicated gene findings. Also in 1990, Plomin predicted in Science that "the use of molecular biology techniques will revolutionize behavioural genetics."

Plomin and his colleagues published a 1994 molecular genetic study in which they found DNA markers associated with IQ. However, this study, as well as all subsequent molecular genetic IQ studies, was not replicated. In another Science publication, Plomin and
colleagues reported genetic linkages and associations for reading disability, sexual orientation, alcoholism, drug use, violence, paranoid schizophrenia, and hyperactivity.18

In the third edition of *Behavioural Genetics*, published in 1997, the authors repeated their position that psychology is "at the dawn of a new era" on the basis of "molecular genetic techniques."19 For these authors, "nothing can be more important than identifying specific genes involved" in psychological traits and psychiatric disorders. In the same year, Rutter and Plomin wrote that although gene discoveries had not yet been made in psychiatry, "it is obvious that these are likely to be forthcoming very soon as findings with respect to schizophrenia...affective disorder...and dyslexia...all show."20

Plomin and Rutter published a 1998 article in *Child Development*, where they informed developmental psychologists that "Genes associated with behavioural dimensions and disorders are beginning to be identified."21 They added, "as associations between genes and complex behavioural traits are found, they are beginning to revolutionize research." The authors were attempting to prepare psychologists for gene discoveries-in-the-making which they believed would soon revolutionize their field. In another 1998 publication, Plomin and colleagues wrote that a pair of 1996 studies claiming an association between genes and the personality trait of "novelty seeking" constituted a "watershed" event for the field.22

At the dawn of the new millennium, Plomin and Crabbe predicted in 2000 that "within a few years, psychology will be awash with genes associated with behavioural disorders as well as genes associated with variation in the normal range." They also predicted that in the future, clinical psychologists would routinely collect patients' DNA "to aid in diagnosis and to plan treatment programs."23 Elsewhere in 2000, Plomin wrote that genes "are being found for personality...reading disability...and g [general intelligence]...in addition to the main area of research in psychopathology."24 In 2001, at the time of the publication of the first draft of the sequence of the human genome, McGuffin, Riley, and Plomin published an article in *Science* entitled "Toward Behavioural Genomics,"25 repeating the 1994 claim that gene linkages and associations had been discovered for traits such as aggression, schizophrenia, attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), male homosexuality, and dyslexia. In the same year, Plomin and colleagues published the fourth edition of *Behavioural Genetics*.26 Here they claimed that "ADHD is one of the first behavioural areas in which specific genes have been identified," and they continued on their theme that "one of the most exciting directions for genetic research in psychology involves harnessing the power of molecular genetics to identify specific genes responsible for the widespread influence of genetics on behaviour."

Having entered the "postgenomic era," in 2003 Plomin and McGuffin claimed "progress...towards finding genes....although progress has nonetheless been slower than some had originally anticipated."27 They wrote that the identification of genes for schizophrenia "remains elusive," and the "story for major depression and bipolar depression is similar to schizophrenia." Nevertheless, they continued to believe that the future of molecular genetic research in psychiatry "looks bright because complex traits like psychopathology will be the major beneficiaries of postgenomic developments,"28 although they wrote a year later that researchers would need "very large samples" to uncover genes.29

In the period 2003-2004, Plomin began to write more about gene discoveries as something that had not yet occurred, and less about discoveries that had been made or were in the process of being made. He wrote about "future...molecular genetic studies of DNA that will eventually identify specific DNA variants responsible for the widespread influence of genes in psychological development."30 Elsewhere, he recognized that "no solid" gene associations for IQ "have yet emerged," and that "the road ahead will be much more difficult than generally assumed..."31

Plomin's frustration became more apparent the following year, when he publically asked, in relation to gene finding attempts, "When are we going to be there?" Plomin answered, "Being
an optimist, my response is 'soon,'" and recognized that his readers might be "sceptical, because they have heard this before." Although Plomin claimed as always that the field was moving toward gene discoveries, he believed that behavioural genetics remained only "on the cusp of a new post-genomic era..." He and his colleagues had decided not to produce a new edition of *Behavioural Genetics,* he wrote, "until we had some solid DNA results to present." Although the next (fifth) edition did report some purported gene associations, the fact that none was replicated meant that they were not so "solid" after all. Currently, some continue to believe, and lament, that we are still on this "cusp."

In a 2010 publication, Haworth and Plomin appeared to give up hope that GWA studies would uncover genes anytime soon, writing that "it seems highly unlikely that most of the genes responsible for the heritability for any complex trait will be identified in the foreseeable future." They added, "we hope that our prediction about GWA research is wrong..." In the process, they fell back on the *ad hoc* "missing heritability" theory to explain GWA failures. Indeed, they recognized that genome-wide association studies "are struggling to identify a few of the many genes responsible for the ubiquitous heritability of common disorders" and psychological traits. In the face of the unexpected and disappointing failures of GWA studies and previous molecular genetic research methods, Haworth and Plomin argued that the field should return its focus to quantitative genetic studies of families, twins, and adoptees, which have a "bright future." Thus, they called for a retreat to previous kinship studies in light of the failures of molecular genetic research, never considering the possibility that the critics were right all along that the massive flaws and untenable theoretical assumptions of these methods explain these failures.

Plomin could not name any replicated gene findings in a 2011 publication, and continued to explain these negative results on the basis of "missing heritability." According to Plomin, "The big question now in molecular genetics is how to identify the 'missing' heritability; the big question for non-shared environment is how to identify the 'missing' non-shared environment." As critics have argued, both are "missing" because behavioural geneticists have mistakenly interpreted twin studies as providing unequivocal evidence in favour of genetics. Plomin and his colleagues continue to place total faith in twin research, and continue to ignore the implications of other evidence, which includes Plomin's own carefully performed 1998 longitudinal adoption study that found a non-significant .01 personality test score correlation between birthparents and their 245 adopted-away biological offspring. According to Plomin and his colleagues, this birthparent-biological offspring correlation is "the most powerful adoption design for estimating genetic influence," which "directly indexes genetic influence."

**Conclusion**

Science writer John Horgan published a critical appraisal of behavioural genetics in a 1993 edition of *Scientific American.* Horgan noted that although there were many gene finding claims for traits such as crime, bipolar disorder, schizophrenia, alcoholism, intelligence, and homosexuality, none of these claims had been replicated. He presented the results under the heading, "Behavioural Genetics: A Lack-of Progress Report." We can now update Horgan's "progress report" and issue the field of behavioural genetics its apparent final report card: The evidence suggests that genes for the major psychiatric disorders, as well as for IQ and personality, do not exist. As Turkheimer concluded in 2011, in light of the failures of molecular genetic research, it is time to develop a "new paradigm."

Simply put, the gene finding claims and predictions by Plomin and other leading behavioural geneticists turned out to be wrong. The best explanation for why this occurred is not that "heritability is missing," but that previous and current claims that psychiatric and psychological twin studies prove something about genetics are also wrong.

We cannot expect the proponents of behavioural genetics to recognize that the historical positions of their field are mistaken, that their prized research methods and "landmark" studies are massively flawed and environmentally confounded, and that family, social,
cultural, economic, and political environments—and not genetics—are the main causes of psychiatric disorders and variation in human psychological traits. Because most leaders of the field will not allow themselves to see this, it is left to others to show that the pillars of behavioural genetics are crumbling before our very eyes.

We are indeed at the "dawn of a new era," but it will be an era very different than the one that Plomin and his colleagues envisioned.
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ABSTRACT

The past three decades have witnessed the failure of gene finding efforts in psychiatry and psychology. One rarely considered explanation for this failure is that the genes presumed to underlie psychiatric disorders and psychological traits do not exist. Recently, leading molecular genetic researchers have developed the "missing heritability" concept to explain these failures. Although the search for genes is based on the results of previous studies of families, twins, and adoptees, the authors argue that these studies are subject to environmental biases which may have confounded researchers' conclusions in favour of genetics. They conclude by calling on the scientific community to embark on a serious reassessment of the validity of family, twin, and adoption studies in light of the dramatic failures of gene finding efforts, and to consider non-reductionist culturally-oriented psychological theories that will lead to a more fruitful understanding of the origins of psychiatric disorders and psychological trait variation.

The Fruitless Search for Genes in Psychiatry and Psychology

The June, 2009 edition of The Journal of the American Medical Association reported the results of a meta-analysis by Neil Risch and his colleagues.[1] These researchers showed that a 2003 study by Caspi and colleagues, where the investigators believed they had found a genetic variant associated with depression when combined with stressful life events, did not stand up to replication attempts. Caspi and colleagues' original study had been widely reported in the media and elsewhere as constituting a major genetic discovery in psychiatry.[2]

However, to the critical observers of genetic research in psychiatry and psychology, including those who had pointed to several glaring problems in Caspi and colleagues' study,
the failure to replicate these results came as no surprise at all. [3] This study merely suffered the same fate as other gene-finding claims in psychiatry over the past thirty-five years, such as the much publicized yet subsequently non-replicated claims of nearly a generation ago for bipolar disorder, and for schizophrenia.[4] Clearly, some type of systematic error is common to these subsequently unsubstantiated findings.

Previously, a group of leading psychiatric genetic researchers had recognized in 2008, "It is no secret that our field has published thousands of candidate gene association studies but few replicated findings."[5] And in the same year behavioural geneticist Robert Plomin and his colleagues could not cite any substantiated gene findings for personality or IQ (cognitive ability).[6] A pair of personality trait molecular genetic researchers wrote in 2009 that their field "has evidently not escaped the conundrum of non-replication that continues to plague the genetics of complex human phenotypes,"[7] and the authors of a 2010 article on cognitive ability and genetics noted, "it is difficult to name even one genetic locus that is reliably associated with normal-range intelligence in young, healthy adults..."[8] Risch and colleagues concluded that "few if any of the genes identified in candidate gene association studies of psychiatric disorders have withstood the test of replication." They further concluded:

Despite progress in risk gene identification for several complex diseases, few disorders have proven as resistant to robust gene finding as psychiatric illnesses. The slow rate of progress in psychiatry and behavioural sciences partly reflects a still-evolving classification system, absence of valid pathognomonic diagnostic markers, and lack of well-defined etiologic pathways. Although these disorders have long been assumed to result from some combination of genetic vulnerability and environmental exposure, direct evidence from a specific example has not been forthcoming.[9]

Thus, the fields of behavioural genetics and psychiatric genetics are rapidly approaching a period of crisis and re-examination

There are two broad explanations for the ongoing failure to discover genes in psychiatry and psychology. The first, which is favoured by genetic researchers and their backers, is that genes for "complex disorders" exist (although each gene may be of small effect size) and will be discovered once researchers improve their methods and increase their sample sizes. The second explanation, though rarely considered in mainstream works, is that genes for psychiatric disorders and for normal variation in psychological traits do not exist. The latter explanation is consistent with Latham and Wilson's position that, apart from a few exceptions, "genetic predispositions as significant factors in the prevalence of [most] common diseases are refuted," and that the "dearth of disease-causing genes is without question a scientific discovery of tremendous significance."[10]

Over the past two decades the popular and scientific literature has been filled with discussions of how improved methods in molecular genetic research will lead to gene discoveries. Although we cannot rule out such possibilities, our purpose here is to suggest that the misreading of previous kinship studies of families, twins, and adoptees has led the scientific community to the premature conclusion that genes for psychiatric disorders and psychological trait variation must exist.

In the past few years, molecular genetic researchers have adopted the position of "missing heritability" as an explanation for their failure to discover genes.[11] The missing heritability interpretation of negative results has been developed in the context of the ongoing failure to uncover most of the genes presumed to underlie common medical disorders, and virtually all of the genes presumed to underlie psychiatric disorders and psychological trait variation. In 2008, Francis Collins, current Director of the U.S. National Institutes of Health and former Director of the National Centre for Human Genome Research, stated that missing heritability "is the big topic in the genetics of common disease right now."[12] Subsequently, the topic has grown even bigger.[13]
Heritability is "missing," according to one group of prominent researchers, because genome-wide association (GWA) studies "have explained relatively little of the heritability of most complex traits, and the [gene] variants identified through these studies have small effects."[14] A prominent group of researchers (including Francis Collins) headed by Teri Manolio, Director of the U. S. Office of Population Genomics, published a 2009 article in Nature entitled, "Finding The Missing Heritability."[15] This article has since served as a reference point for molecular genetic researchers, including those in psychiatry and psychology, who have attempted to come to terms with decades of negative results. Manolio and colleagues recognized that only a few gene variants had been discovered for non-psychiatric medical conditions, and pointed to the "the lack of variants detected so far for some neuropsychiatric conditions." They had no doubt that the problem is missing heritability, as opposed to non-existent heritability, because "a substantial proportion of individual differences in disease susceptibility is known to be due to genetic factors." Manolio et al. saw missing heritability as the "dark matter" of genome-wide association in the sense that one is sure it exists, can detect its influence, but simply cannot 'see' it (yet).[16]

The reason that scientists are certain that "missing" genes exist and await discovery is their belief that previous family, twin, and adoption studies have provided conclusive evidence that genetic factors play a major role. But even if researchers eventually discover specific genes that play a role in intelligence or personality, or that predispose some people to develop psychiatric disorders, society could still choose to focus attention on changing psychologically unhealthy family, social, and political arrangements that impede human growth and learning, and that contribute to emotional problems and psychiatric disorders. Genetic determinist ideas divert society's attention from these environmental conditions, and shift blame onto people's brains and bodies. Even in the case of medical disorders such as type 2 diabetes, where poverty and malnutrition are well known causes, supporters of genetic determinism continue to press for research dollars to be directed towards genetic research, as opposed to improving social and health conditions.[17]

Kinship studies of families, twins, and adoptees are known collectively as "quantitative genetic research." While constituting a necessary first step, family studies are widely seen as being unable to disentangle the potential role of genetic and environmental factors. Because family members share a common environment as well as common genes, finding that a trait "runs in the family" can be explained on either genetic or environmental grounds. As Plomin and colleagues recognized, "Many behaviours 'run in families,' but family resemblance can be due to either nature or nurture."[18] They concluded, correctly in our view, that "[l]amily studies by themselves cannot disentangle genetic and environmental influences.'[19]

Twin Studies

Twin studies and adoption studies, which have been carried out since the 1920s, constitute the main quantitative genetic results cited in support of genetics. We will touch on some problem areas in adoption research later, but for now we focus on twin studies, which provide the most frequently cited evidence in support of important genetic influences on psychiatric disorders and variations in "normally distributed" traits such as IQ and personality. There are two main types of twin research methods: studies of twins reared-together, and studies of twins reared-apart.

Reared-Together Twins. Studies of twins reared-together, which use a technique called the "twin method," compare the trait resemblance of reared-together monozygotic (MZ) versus reared-together same-sex dizygotic (DZ) twin pairs. If monozygotic pairs resemble each other more than dizygotic pairs (on the basis of correlations or concordance rates), twin researchers conclude that the trait has a genetic component, and then go on to calculate heritability estimates based on the magnitude of the difference. They reach this conclusion on the basis of several theoretical assumptions about twins, the most important and controversial of which is the assumption that MZ and same-sex DZ twin pairs experience
roughly equal environments. This is known as the "equal environment assumption" (EEA). The logic appears straightforward, since MZ pairs share a 100% genetic similarity, whereas DZs share only 50% of their genes on average.

There is, however, a fatal flaw in this logic: The equal environment assumption of the twin method is obviously not correct, since most research in this area finds that MZ twin pairs experience much more similar environments than do DZ pairs.[20] Moreover, because they are more similar genetically, MZ pairs resemble each other more anatomically than DZ pairs, and this clearly will elicit different treatment from the social environment.[21] Therefore, a plausible interpretation of twin method findings is that the greater psychological trait resemblance of MZ versus DZ twin pairs, a result found by most twin researchers, is completely explainable on the basis of non-genetic factors related to MZ pairs’ greater environmental and treatment similarity. From the standpoint of environmental confounds, the twin method has precisely the same problem as family studies because in both, the comparison groups experience far different environments.

Interestingly, most contemporary twin researchers recognize that the environments experienced by MZ pairs are more similar than those experienced by DZs.[22] However, on the basis of two main arguments, they continue to hold that the EEA is valid and that the twin method reliably measures genetic influences.

The first argument is that, although MZ and DZ environments are different, these environments must be shown to differ in aspects relevant to the trait in question. Furthermore, twin researchers often implicitly or explicitly suggest that twin method critics bear the burden of proof for demonstrating that these admittedly unequal environments differ on trait relevant dimensions.[23]

The second argument twin researchers put forward in defence of EEA and the twin method is that MZ pairs tend to "create" or "elicit" more similar environments for themselves by virtue of their greater genetically-caused similarity of behaviour.[24] For example, according to one group of behavioural genetic researchers, although MZ twins "may well be treated more similarly" than DZs, "this is far more a consequence of their genetic similarity in behaviour (and of ensuing responses by parents and others) than a cause of such similarity.”[25] And in 2009, behavioural geneticists Segal and Johnson wrote, "It is important to note that if MZ twins are treated more alike than DZ twins, it is most likely associated with their genetically based behavioural similarities.”[26]

Regarding the first argument, the proponents of a scientific theory or technique, rather than their critics, bear the burden of proof for showing that their theory or technique is correct.[27] Although twin researchers have carried out a series of tests of the equal environment assumption, these studies have done little to uphold the validity of the twin method.[28] Ironically, although EEA test researchers usually conclude that their findings support the EEA, most find that MZ twin pairs experience much more similar environments than do DZ pairs. What they fail to understand is that the differing environments that automatically and without qualification invalidate genetic interpretations of family studies also invalidate genetic interpretations of twin method data.

We have seen that the second argument modern twin researchers put forward in defence of the twin method is that MZ twin pair environments are more similar than those of DZ pairs because MZs "create" more similar environments for themselves on the basis of their greater genetic similarity. However, researchers putting forward this "twins create their own environment" position use circular reasoning, in that they assume the very thing they need to demonstrate. According to the Penguin Dictionary of Psychology, circular reasoning is "Empty reasoning in which the conclusion rests on an assumption whose validity is dependent on the conclusion.”[29] Twin researchers have used "empty reasoning" of this type since the 1950s to validate the twin method, as they circularly assume that twins’ behavioural resemblance is caused by genetics in order to conclude that twins’ behavioural resemblance is caused by genetics.[30] Thus the only relevant question in determining the
validity of the EEA and the twin method is whether—not why—MZ pairs experience more similar environments than those experienced by DZ pairs.[31]

Buried within the schizophrenia twin research literature, which is frequently cited in support of a genetic basis for the condition, is a finding that the pooled concordance rate for same-sex DZ twin pairs is 2-3 times greater than that of opposite-sexed DZ pairs (11.3% vs. 4.7%).[32] Because the genetic relationship of same-sex and opposite-sex DZ twin pairs is the same, from the genetic standpoint we should find no significant difference between these pooled rates.[33] Moreover, the pooled schizophrenia concordance rate for DZ twins is almost double what it is for ordinary (non-twin) siblings, despite the fact that the genetic relationship between DZ twins and ordinary sibling pairs is the same.[34] These findings are consistent with non-genetic explanations of the causes of schizophrenia, since pairs who share the same degree of genetic relatedness, but who experience more similar environments and a closer emotional bond, are consistently more concordant for schizophrenia than are pairs experiencing less similar environments and a weaker emotional bond. These results provide additional evidence that—as we have seen with family studies—the twin method is unable to disentangle potential genetic and environmental causes of schizophrenia and other psychiatric disorders.[35]

Thus, there are two main conclusions one can reach on the basis of twin method data:[36]

(1) Contemporary Twin Researchers’ Conclusion: The greater resemblance of MZ vs. same-sex DZ twin pairs provides solid evidence that a sizable portion the population variance for psychiatric disorders and psychological traits can be explained by genetic factors, or

(2) Twin Method Critics’ Conclusion: The twin method is a faulty instrument for assessing the role of genetics, given the likelihood that MZ vs. same-sex DZ comparisons measure environmental rather than genetic influences. Therefore, all previous interpretations of the twin method’s results in support of genetics are potentially wrong.

We argue here that the available evidence calls for the acceptance of Conclusion #2, and we agree with three generations of critics who have written that the twin method is no more able than a family study to disentangle the potential roles of nature and nurture. As the Nobel Prize winning chemist Wilhelm Ostwald wisely lectured his students in the early 20th century, ”Among scientific articles there are to be found not a few wherein the logic and mathematics are faultless but which are for all that worthless, because the assumptions and hypotheses upon which the faultless logic and mathematics rest do not correspond to actuality.”[37]

Reared-Apart Twins. Because many scientists and commentators have had doubts about the validity of the twin method, some have pointed to studies of twins reared-apart (TRA studies), such as the Minnesota TRA research published by Bouchard and colleagues.[38] These investigations look mainly at psychological traits such as IQ and personality. However, problems with the methodology and underlying logic of these studies have been outlined by several reviewers.[39] Problem areas include: (1) it is doubtful that most reared-apart MZ pairs (known as MZAs) deserve the status of having been ”reared-apart,” since most pairs had significant contact with each other for many years; (2) in several studies, there were biases favouring the recruitment of MZA pairs who resembled each other more for behavioural traits than MZA pairs as a population; (3) there is controversy about whether ”intelligence” and ”personality” are valid and quantifiable constructs; (4) the Minnesota researchers failed to publish life history information for the twins under study, and then denied independent reviewers access to raw data and other unpublished information; and (5) there was likely researcher bias in favour of genetic explanations of the data. [40]

Perhaps the most important problem is the original TRA researchers’ failure to control for several critical environmental influences shared by MZA pairs, including even those extremely rare cases in which studied MZA pairs were reared apart since early life and grew
up without knowing that they had a twin sibling. In the study containing the highest percentage of MZA pairs of this type, the author found, in all 12 pairs there were marked intra-pair differences in that part of the personality governing immediate psychological interaction and ordinary human intercourse. . . . the twins behaved, on the whole, very differently, especially in their cooperation, and in their form of and need for contact. Corresponding with these observations, the twins gave, as a rule, expression to very different attitudes to life, and very divergent views on general culture, religion and social problems. Their fields of interest, too, were very different. . . . Those twins who had children treated, on the whole, their children differently, and their ideas on upbringing were, as often as not, diametrically opposed. Characterologically, the twins presented differences in their ambitions and in their employment of an aggressive behaviour. Emotionally, there was a deep-going dissimilarity with regard to the appearance of spontaneous emotional reactions or to the control of affective outbursts. Various traits of personality found their expression in differences in taste, mode of dress, hair style, use of cosmetics, the wearing of beard or of glasses.

Original descriptions of this type have not prevented the authors of numerous books attempting to popularize genetic research, exemplified by Steven Pinker's *The Blank Slate* and Judith Harris's *The Nurture Assumption*, from claiming that TRA studies and individual stories reported in the media "suggest that genes can cause striking similarities in personality characteristics, even in the face of substantial differences in rearing environments." Environmental influences shared by even perfectly separated MZA pairs include common age, common sex, common ethnicity, common physical appearance, common socioeconomic class, common culture, and common prenatal environment. Reared-apart twin pairs (as well as genetically unrelated people born at the same time) are subject to the social and historical influences of their birth cohort. As behavioural genetic researcher Richard Rose once observed, "Were one to capitalize on cohort effects by sampling [genetically] unrelated but age-matched pairs, born, say, over a half-century period, the observed similarities in interests, habits, and attitudes might, indeed, be 'astonishing.'"

Thus, for reasons unrelated to heredity, we should expect to find a much higher “video game playing behaviour” correlation in the United States among pairs of randomly selected 11-year-old middle-class Caucasian boys than we would expect to find among randomly selected pairs drawn from the entire 11- to 100-year-old male and female population of the United States. This hypothetical example illustrates one of the central fallacies of TRA studies. (Bouchard and colleagues were the first TRA researchers to address age and sex confounds, but their adjustments were inadequate to deal with this problem.) On purely environmental grounds, therefore, we would expect MZA pairs to correlate well above zero for psychological and behavioural traits. This means that the appropriate control group with which to compare MZA correlations would be a group consisting of genetically unrelated strangers matched on the environmental influences experienced by MZA pairs. Most previous MZA studies, however, mistakenly used reared-together MZs as controls. Thus we see that, like the twin method, studies of twins reared-apart are subject to their own set of invalidating environmental confounds.

Adoption Studies

Although twin research has been called the "Rosetta Stone' of behaviour genetics," adoption studies are also used to assess the role of genetic influences on various traits and disorders. Adoption studies investigate people who receive the genes of their birthparents, but are reared in the family environment of people with whom they share no genetic relationship. Adoption research originally focused on IQ, and was extended to include personality and psychiatric disorders such as schizophrenia, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, and bipolar disorder. In particular, the Danish-American
adoption studies are widely cited as having established schizophrenia as a genetic disorder.[52] Several commentators, however, have pointed to a number of crucial errors and biases in these studies.[53] In Tienari and colleagues' Finnish schizophrenia adoption studies, the researchers concluded that both genes and family environment play important causative roles.[54]

Like family and twin studies, adoption studies are subject to their own set of environmental confounds and biases which cast doubt on their ability to separate the potential influences of nature and nurture. Included among these biases are late separation (and accompanying attachment disturbance), range restriction, whether adoptees and family members are representative of their respective populations, and the selective placement of adoptees.[55]

Tienari and colleagues investigated the adoptive families of Finnish adoptees whose biological mothers were diagnosed with schizophrenia, and the adoptive families of control adoptees, whose biological mothers were not so diagnosed.[56] Although 7% of the index adoptees became psychotic, in contrast to 1% of the control adoptees (which can be accounted for by selective placement factors, see below), Tienari and colleagues' analysis of the families of index adoptees diagnosed as psychotic reveals that 6 of 43 (14%) adoptees who were reared in "seriously disturbed adoptive families" were diagnosed psychotic. In striking contrast, none of the 48 index adoptees reared in "healthy or mildly disturbed adoptive families" was diagnosed psychotic. Moreover, 19 of the 32 adoptees (60%; index and control combined) raised in "severe disturbance" Finnish adoptive families developed a major psychological dysfunction (which included "character disorders," "borderline syndrome," and "psychotic"), whereas none of the 15 adoptees reared in Finnish "healthy" adoptive families developed such a dysfunction.[57]

Looking more closely at the "no selective placement assumption" of adoption studies, psychiatric adoption researchers must assume that factors relating to the adoption process did not lead agencies to place certain groups of adoptees into environments contributing to a higher rate of the disorder in question. However, the evidence suggests that adoption studies of schizophrenia were confounded by environmental factors on the basis of the perceived genetic undesirability of adoptees with a biological family history of mental disorders placed in early-to-mid 20th century Europe.[58]

For example, Finland (like Denmark) had a long history of eugenics-inspired legislation aimed at curbing the reproduction of "hereditarily tainted" people.[59] The Finnish government created a commission in 1926 to study the possibility of sterilizing people seen as "mentally retarded," "mentally ill," or epileptic. In 1935, the Finnish parliament passed the Sterilization Act, which allowed the compulsory eugenic sterilization of "idiots," "imbeciles," and the "insane," which included people diagnosed with schizophrenia and manic-depression. In fact, compulsory eugenic sterilization was not abolished in Finland until 1970. The Finnish adoptees Tienari and colleagues studied were born between 1927 and 1979, and were therefore placed in an era in which the biological offspring of people diagnosed with a psychotic disorder were seen as undesirable "tainted" adoptees. Clearly, few prospective Finnish adoptive parents would have wanted to adopt such a child.

Selective placement has also been identified as a confounding factor in IQ adoption research, since adoption agencies frequently attempt to match adoptees and adoptive families for socioeconomic status, in addition matching on the basis of the assumed intelligence potential of the adoptee.[60]

Thus, despite adoption studies' theoretical potential to disentangle genetic and environmental influences, most adoption studies published to date have been plagued by methodological problems and potential environmental confounds.

However, it is possible that a well-designed adoption study could disentangle genetic and environmental factors and put the nature-nurture issue to the test. The researchers performing such a study must, at a minimum, (1) choose as participants only those...
adoptees who were placed into their adoptive homes at or shortly after birth; (2) determine in advance, and publish or submit to a research register prior to undertaking the study, the specific hypotheses, methods, definitions, and comparison groups that will be used; (3) make a serious attempt to come to grips with problems such as selective placement and range restriction, and be willing to refrain from concluding in favour of genetics if such problems are found; (4) publish, or place with a research register, raw case history information and data relating to participants, and make this data and information available to qualified reviewers for inspection; (5) ensure that all interviews, tests, diagnoses, and ratings are performed blindly, and (6) study only those traits and disorders whose reliability and validity have been demonstrated by previous research.[61]

Conclusions About the Genetic Paradigm and the Need for an Alternative

We have suggested that the body of quantitative genetic research in psychiatry and psychology is contaminated by environmental factors.[62] In addition, these studies contain many glaring methodological problems and other biases. Although the relatives in these studies frequently manifest traits and disorders in patterns predicted by genetic theories, these patterns usually match the predictions made by theories of non-genetic causation as well.[63] Thus, it is likely that family, twin, and adoption studies have been unable to disentangle the potential roles of genetic and environmental influences on traits and disorders, and that the researchers who typically perform this research have greatly underestimated the potential role of environmental confounds. It has been left to critics to focus on these problems, yet their voices have been lost in the vast literature produced in the past few decades by authors claiming major genetic influences on these traits.

We call on researchers in psychiatry and psychology, and other behavioural scientists, to suspend the current "missing heritability" interpretation of negative molecular genetic findings and to embark on a serious reassessment of the validity of twin and adoption studies. Latham and Wilson concluded that a reasonable interpretation of the failure to identify genes is that "heritability studies of twins are inherently mistaken or misinterpreted," and that the "dark matter" of missing heritability "becomes simply an artefact arising from overinterpretation of twin studies."

In 1994, behavioural geneticists Robert Plomin, Michael Owen, and Peter McGuffin wrote in Science of a genetic variant associated with Alzheimer's Disease, and continued, "We predict that QTL [quantitative trait loci, or genes of various effect sizes] associations will soon be found for other complex human behaviours."[64] However, this prediction has turned out to be wrong.[65] Indeed, three genetically-oriented Nobel prize winning researchers and their colleagues, in a 2010 'Policy Forum' article also appearing in Science, recognized the "frustrating lack of progress" in understanding the genetics of mental disorders.[66]

A final issue to consider is the broader context of genetic research into psychiatric disorders. This context includes scientific and social issues that form the assumptions which guide this work; the context also includes the scientific and social consequences of this work. This inquiry into the context of research is a branch of philosophy of science known as Social Studies of Science. It is pursued in The Society for Social Studies of Science, and in journals such as Social Epistemology and Social Studies of Science. The social and intellectual context affects the quality of particular research (just as social context affects all behaviour). It is also an important avenue for assessing the plausibility and validity of the research.

Research into possible genetic causes of psychiatric disorders partakes of a system of superordinate scientific issues. These include the nature of human psychology and its relation to biochemical mechanisms. If genes cause psychiatric disorders in some specific manner then they must work through biochemical mechanisms. This raises the broader, superordinate question whether psychiatric disorders are caused by (reducible to) biochemical mechanisms – i.e., how can biochemical mechanisms cause someone to experience particular symptoms of, for example, depression, eating disorders, risky
behaviour, or social phobia? This question about biochemical mechanisms and psychiatric disorders depends upon a still broader, superordinate question of whether psychology in general is determined by biochemical mechanisms. Research into these two superordinate questions strengthens or weakens the genetic hypothesis of psychiatric disorders. If research demonstrates that psychology is not determined by biochemical mechanisms, then psychiatric disorders cannot be determined by genes. [67] Conversely, research into the subordinate issue of whether genes cause psychiatric disorders strengthens or weakens the superordinate issues. Researchers and the authors of authoritative textbooks who claim that genes play a major role in causing psychiatric disorders help strengthen superordinate theories that these disorders have biochemical causes, and that psychology has biochemical causes.

While pursuing these corollary issues is outside the bounds of this chapter, we recommend that readers do so in order to better understand the question of genetic causes of psychiatric disorders. We believe that research into these issues will support the rejection of the genetic paradigm of psychiatric disorders, and will give grounds for an alternative paradigm that emphasizes the role of familial, social, cultural, and political influences. The reason that research has failed to demonstrate genetic influences on mental illness is because the genetic, naturalistic paradigm of mental illness is wrong.

In a 2000 article entitled "Three Laws of Behavioural Genetics and What They Mean," behavioural geneticist Eric Turkheimer concluded, mainly on the basis of twin studies, that "all human behavioural traits are heritable." [68] At that time, behavioural genetic and psychiatric genetic researchers believed that the completion of the Human Genome Project would rapidly lead to gene discoveries. [69] So did Turkheimer, who wrote that "Behaviour geneticists anticipate vindication" by the discovery of genes causing behavioural variation. On the other hand, wrote Turkheimer,

Critics of behaviour genetics expect the opposite, pointing to the repeated failures to replicate associations between genes and behaviour as evidence of the shaky theoretical underpinnings of which they have so long complained. [70]

A dozen years later the critics indeed appear to have been vindicated, and the real problem may well be, as Turkheimer described it, the "shaky theoretical underpinnings" provided by genetic theories based on family, twin, and adoption studies.


[9] Risch et al., "Interaction," 2463. The term "pathognomonic" in this case refers to a biological marker characteristic or indicative of a particular disease.


[18] Plomin et al., "Behavioural Genetics," 70.
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[41] Farber, "Identical Twins."
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back in 1920s. You steal the key language of the person or group you want to overthrow has done what Orwell clearly saw that you do or what Walter Lippmann said you do better you want to be part of the larger group else sort of dissolves as an allusion, and you stand absolutely alone or you can select when yourself is to find the uniqueness where your apparent physical resemblance to everybody else from fingerprint or from DNA, that no two people are alike and education is diametrically opposite to that.

And they are wonderful to watch, when one fin moves, thousands of fins move a

deliver. We only use the expression one other way commonly and that's the “school of fish”.

What do you think you believe about schooling?

JTG: I think I believe that the metaphor of schooling clearly tells you what it is expected to deliver. We only use the expression one other way commonly and that's the “school of fish”. And they are wonderful to watch, when one fin moves, thousands of fins move and they're instantly receptive to what the group wishes. I don't know who gives the original signal, but it's instantly receptive to what the group wishes. I don't know who gives the original signal, but it's instantly receptive to what the group wishes.

Now to end this part of the work I will once again lean on the genius and insight of Mr J. Gatto. The reason I do this is because it links directly to all of the subject matter that you have just read, and it also conveniently sets the stage for the book that follows this one. The people I have been warning you about since the first page merely want to invent semi-plausible reasons for their totally insane actions, “Genetics” (as you will discover) is just the modern flavour of this same age old bullshit.

Pay particular attention to the parts talking about Darwin and Galton because their shared “philosophy” created the modern field of genetic research. Not to help or better the human race in any way you understand, no, no, no, far from it, instead it was once again created to divide. Not only that, as I have said, it was also engineered to put a scientific veneer onto their obviously racist and classist policy. Basically they invented a “science” that cemented their already long held belief that the poor and less well off should be treated as less than human. Not because the rich were saying so of course, no no, it was because both god and more importantly for these guys science had said so. (Because we all know that we can't possibly argue with the 100% unbiased and rational findings of science can we?)

SOURCED TRANSCRIPT: THE ULTIMATE HISTORY LESSON / A WEEKEND WITH JOHN TAYLOR GATTO

What do you think you believe about schooling?
and you redefine it and people then become confused. It's "newspeak" in 1984. So, the schooling transformation occurs when they see that the language of education is highly regarded, is highly respected even in people who don't participate. There is an urge in that direction. So you simply take the concepts and you claim that that's why people are being ritualized.

RG: So you describe that individual beings, when in groups, kind of subvert their own individual thinking power. And the law of identity—none of us can change who we are and we have to be ourselves—and that is constant throughout life. So it's about figuring out how to remain individually self-reliant and self-sufficient while going through the systems that are trying to change us and make us less self-reliant and more...

JTG: Very much so and I think the awareness of these contrary dynamics is what gives rise to the theories of dialectic. I mean, Aristotle all the way through history, there's a variety of them, but they participate in the same way as essentially asking you for your own self-defence, not to assume that what anyone says, especially as they climb the authority ladder, is the truth.

Often the misinformation comes from innocent self-delusion, but just as often as you move up the power pyramid it comes from a malign intent towards your own individuality.

RG: Is the school system designed to get kids to grow into a thriving self-reliant adult, or is it to whittle away curiosity and to kind of stop them from thinking for themselves?

JTG: It's certainly not the former, in any way, for the simple reason that the route history management doesn't know how to manage independent units, even partially independent units. Why shouldn't we ask, and any school people watching your film should begin immediately to ask politely why are we doing this? It's a question you never hear because it's heresy. I mean the beleaguered classroom teacher doesn't know why he or she is doing this. They are told to do it! Maybe they can give it 5% personal spin, that's why they're doing it. Does it make sense for this particular life? It is asking the question. You don't know, if you started to care, the logic of schooling would dissolve. No one is able. You can answer the question for yourself. I used to say to my classes, and over the course of 30 years teaching I taught kids from the Gold Coast of the Upper West side of Manhattan, and I thought kids from the centre of Harlem and Spanish Harlem, and I would say to all of them, you have a right to any time—you've got to be polite though—I'm just human... to say, why are we doing this? And if I can't produce an answer that convinces you that I believe it, then you have a right to opt out and do something else as long as you don't run wild and bring the whole house down. It helped me grow year after year, not that they asked very often because they're conditioned not to do that. But enough did ask that I was put on my own mantle and they say, "why am I doing this?". It was a continual expansion of my own insight until politically I couldn't do it any longer. The school oddly enough made me so internally famous that it drew extra attention and my system couldn't survive under the scrutiny, because they would see the disparity between what I was doing and what the protocols were.

JTG: School's intention is to artificially extend childhood. And there really is no practical terminance for that, if they can extend it through graduate school, postgraduate...

RG: What is the actual reason that their childhoods are being extended?

JTG: I think what we never discuss, or that the extreme left is preempted to discuss so they marginalize themselves, is the intimate inner relationships between the economy and the way we train the young. To the extent that we once had a wildly variegated economy; I'm quoting Abraham Lincoln in 1859, a famous speech to the Wisconsin Agricultural Association. Lincoln said—I call this mud sill theory because he used that term. Lincoln said that the British are financing the whole western movement and they're attempting to reinstall their class system. And so they send their young sons over to make sure that not a
whole lot of attention is paid ordinary people—people who live in simple homes that have mud sills. He said they're not, according to the British thinking, they're not worth training or worrying about because there's no way they can possibly improve. Lincoln said, look around you, three quarters of our population has an independent livelihood and the quarter who doesn't works to put a little stake together to set up on their own and write their own script in life. He said, as a consequence we don't have proletariat as they do in Britain and Germany in the European nations and we aren't able to have a factory system. Where it exists in this country, which is in New England in the textile industries, a factory will have 30 or 40 employees. They will usually be young women awaiting marriage. They will be served tea at their machines, and they'll be offer performance of stage just to keep them at the machine. Because these independent livelihoods lead to totally private independent systems of value. So the British are wrong but of course the Civil War changed that. We're told that it was a great crusade against slavery, by the school system. The major historians who have turned their attention toward that say, I mean to a person, that slavery was already dead. It was staggering through its last couple of generations, not because of a moral transformation on the part of plantation owners, but because the wives of the plantation owners were scratching their heads and saying, “you know the boss, my husband, vanishes for a couple of days; we have all these new slaves and they are not black anymore. They are various shades of brown.” So they, I'm thinking right now of Vern Parrington, but a number of historians 50 years ago said slavery was on its last leg because the southern womanhood wouldn't stand for it any longer. Russia, I believe, had freed the surfs; Britain and the continent had done this thing; we were going to do it too. But it gave a nobility to the necessity to get rid of the Southern politicians who were trained in dialectical thinking, in rhetoric, and could run circles around the Northern politicians in Congress. They could produce the most compelling arguments for this or that. And so, the South had to be gotten rid of.

RG: From my understanding, those dry goods, like cotton from the South, that were produced by slaves were then going to factories in the north. And the factory owners in the north figured out that the slave owners were paying too much overhead. It costs a lot to keep a whole family fed, etc. and there were letters exchanged and they actually discovered it was cheaper... Why not make everyone a slave who doesn't know they're a slave...

JTG: A wage slave!

JTG: And think only about the welfare idea. If you have a plantation family and you require harmony; even though some people are very subordinate; somebody gets sick or too old to work, you can't in fact do that Simon Lagree bit and get rid of them—or what happens if morale collapses? So you have to care for them. The discussions on the highest level among northern industrialists—why should we have to support deadwood here? And we could do that if they were wage slaves. Yeah, yeah. And furthermore people like Count Tolstoy who was well aware of the hardcore underneath the romantic arguments (and so were a number of other people), but the public was dependent upon media and pulpits which were subsidized by the owners.

RG: Earlier forms of mass media or propaganda from the pulpit or newspaper...

JTG: Well the Chautauqua's, oh absolutely, the Chautauqua's were put together by intent...the family that began Harper's publishers and had the very prestigious journal of the time, Harper's Weekly...

RG: Lewis Lapham? The Lapham Family? Well Lapham’s a very latter day...his grandfather was in charge of Harper's though and was the mayor of San Francisco I believe...

JTG: Yes he was. When the UN came in, he told me his boyhood was filled with foreign dignitaries in the home as houseguests. They were throwing back glasses of wine. So, you can actually trace the small number of families behind the Chautauqua’s, which were the
most compelling mass media of the day and you'd hear about what was going on in Boston and Cincinnati, and you'd want that. And selectively ideas and ways of thinking were introduced to the best people and they used it to their local prestige and to make sure that...you know, it's a natural process. So what we got was a second American Revolution between, oh I don't know, 1865 and about 1910. This time the British won! Again, they didn't win by force of arms but by force of insight into the way opinion is created. And when the skilled workers who had intense pride and really were the key to the prosperity of early industrial operation, commercial operations, when the skilled workers understood their power, then industry and commerce were mechanized intensely and you wiped out the need for skilled labour. You took less quality but now you had less contention, less argument. Carnegie was instrumental in eliminating the influence of skilled labour and it continued right to the 20th century.

RG: What influence did the Rockefellers have on organized labour, skilled labour, education?

JTG: The Rockefeller family can actually be traced way back in Dutch history. There is an ancestor of the Rockefellers who set up a rather detailed plan for global government. Hundreds and hundreds of years ago it had one of these flowcharts that showed how you are to do that or not. But the great irony, of course, is that Rockefeller and Carnegie families were fringe people in the United States. But using their brilliant insight into leverage and how it works, both were able to take nothing and pyramid it into quite a bit. Rockefeller actually, his father I believe, but it may have been his grandfather, fled a rape charge sort of like Strauss Khan is, up in Bainbridge, New York. He had been charged with rape with a maid and fled. The Rockefellers threw their weight behind, this is emblematic of how they work, behind Horatio Alger who had also been charged with rape up here in Connecticut in the news boys' lodging house. And if you read a wonderful book that exists, a limited edition but it is kept continuously in print called The Rise of the Dangerous Classes in New York City by the creator of American adoption. When I started to research school, I kept running into the same people who put the adoption institution together and the school institute. One much more important than the other but still the same names float in and out of one another. Charles Loring Brace--I believe his father was the publisher of the Hartford Currant. I'm almost sure. And in his early diaries says, “I must find a way to become nationally famous.” I mean, Yale--he wrote this! He didn't have any idea how he was going to do that but finally it occurred to him that these masses of immigrants being brought in to break the Irish labour monopoly in the mines and the mills, that the easiest way to lower the unit cost of labour was to bring the husband and wife into the labour force. You double the size of the labour force; you cut the unit value of the labour in half. But you couldn't do that as long as they were worried about their kids. So now you have the impetus to enlarge the social work industry, to corrupt the legislatures to give it the power to break families apart, and what you do with the kids? Well, the expression “put up for adoption tells you.” You don't want them anywhere in the neighbourhood. You want them far away. So you put them in boxcars; this great secret monstrous event in American history that goes on for 40 or 50 years. Boxcars full of the children of the labour sent West. They started upstate New York but that was too close. They kept going farther and farther west then they'd stop at whistle stop and a platform would be brought out, the boxcar would open and the children would be put up for adoption. They had a preference for who they wanted to adopt. They wanted Lutherans to adopt because they had the episcopal idea of hierarchy. But they were just dumb farmers, they couldn't think clearly. Here was free labour, hey. And that will end the future career of these immigrants. What stopped putting children up for adoption was the police chiefs of the West. I think the year was 1888 but give me a few years either way. They wrote a stinging attack on this practice, not on moral grounds but they said crime is everywhere in the West. And if you go to the psychological abstracts you will find that an enormous number of adopted children, for example 6 out of 10 leading mass murderers in American history, but all forms of crime because when you break the bond with a natural parent; you can't put substitutes in place. You cannot morally...there's a recent physiological theory called mirror neurons--that you learn to use your own biological equipment by
watching people who have the same or nearly identical biological equipment. When you remove that, even if the family that you're transferred to has money and *savoir faire* (a French noun phrase that means being adaptable, graceful and adroit) and are more civil, it doesn't matter. You're actually imitating things that your physiology can't accommodate. As a consequence it gets incrementally more and more crazed inside and angry. One of the things, of course, school does is it prevents these kinds of connections between different areas from occurring. That's what the short answer test is about, and Oxford and Cambridge got rid of it a hundred years ago. One hundred years ago! Because they said, people who do well on short answer tests memorized bits of information, but they don't connect the bits of information. But when they seem to be able to connect the bits of information it's because they've memorized someone else's connections! The better the school, the more sets of connections you memorize but you can't do that for yourself. You know, it's like these machines, you all are probably too young to remember, they used to sell machines that would relieve the stress of lifting weights. You put the weight in your hand but the machine would lift your arm and the weight. The only trouble was your muscle knew the difference. The people buying the machine didn't! Well, it's exactly the same. Anyway, put me back on course here.

RG: In China they have the outcome based education system but they're seeking to tweak it so they can kind of improve it. They say we want to keep our people under control but we want them to be more creative and productive and efficient and happy while they're doing it, right? Now, the question is if America has become more incoherent would that be a function of the Prussian education system, outcome based education being used to control the workers and make more profits and now it's just run its course.

JTG: Of course! It's run its course, we're exhausted now. Our schooling is exhausted, the national vitality's been exhausted. I'm glad you used the term incoherence. About three or four years ago the *Financial Times of London* on the editorial page accused us of being—you have read the same piece I did—an incoherent society, that we lost a reason to be a nation at all. Because subsidizing bankers and drug companies wasn't a sufficient reason to proceed in history. Yeah, we're incoherent. Nation comes from the root, family, and we no longer have a concern other than a rhetorical concern with one another. I mean obviously there are many individual exceptions to that, but the government clearly has no such concern. We have evolved an economy that depends upon constant warfare and even though it was stretching it in Iraq and Afghanistan, when those are over we must have another conflict. We're going to have to stretch it even further—maybe attack small islands, Fiji maybe—because they represent a menace. Being a child of World War II, the idea of calling something a war where the enemy has no army, navy, air force, intelligence service and they blow up their feet and their underwear, it just stretches the bounds of the ridiculous to call it a war. But we got an object lesson from a television comedian who said “when you fly planes into a building it certainly shows you have courage,” and that was temporarily the end of his career. You do not speak in opposition to the main force that's driving events. Yeah, yeah, no. To look at America between, let me roughly say 1800 and 1865, and then for momentum right up to the first world war, there is this explosion of invention and it comes from the unlikeliest places. It does not come from the university trained inventors. It comes from everywhere. It's the way people saw the world around them, they saw the elements, the raw material. They processed in a slightly different way and then they had the expanse, the rhetorical capacity to say “hey look, there's a better way to do this”. It was happening so frequently that a crisis occurred in capitalism. And without understanding this crisis you really can't understand why our schools are the product of the Rockefeller family, the Carnegie family, the Astor family, the Vanderbilt family, the great capitalist families. They understood that the real problem in successful capitalism is assembling capital, getting people to give you their savings on the promise that you'll give them more back. But if you have people in an inventive matrix who can look at the way the expensive business is doing things, open up across the street and either do it cheaper, or better or simply open up somewhere else where no one is doing it, capital is always a great risk. Oddly enough, and I don't want to claim credit for what really is a brilliant insight, but I want to claim
credit... It was openly discussed, let me say from 1880 to 1900, we were being forcibly converted from an economy of small farmers, small engineers, entrepreneurs into a corporate economy and these men doing it, they weren't intellectual dumkoffs. They could see that as long as the American inventiveness was loose like a wild beast, they were going to have a lot of trouble pulling capital. Someone would say, and I saw Jack any went belly up, so... Prussian schooling which had for a different reason been out to destroy the imagination—and let me say to anyone listening to this—when someone makes a reckless statement like that, you make sure they can document it, and I will document it is long as you're willing to walk to your local public library. Because in every public library worth its salt in the United States, and every college library, you will find a collection of essays by Prussian philosopher Johann Fichte who was the immediate heir to the University of Berlin's Philosophy Department which had been under Immanuel Kant. Fichte wrote a series, it was over a dozen public essays to the Prussian King from 1808 to about 1818. They're called addresses to the German nation and the provocative event except the first one off was the Prussian army, which was the Prussian economy, renting soldiers, stealing other people's stuff, had been whipped by Napoleon's amateur army at the Battle of Jena in 1806 and Fichte said it was because this demon imagination was loose among ordinary soldiers and in situations they would override the orders from headquarters about what to do and that's why we lost. Now what should fascinate anyone listening is, that's exactly what the so-called liberal philosopher Spinoza, in Holland, said in 1690 in a book called Tractatus Religico-Politicos (Tractatus Theologico-Politicus) Spinoza said that the ordinary population was so psychologically diseased, murderously so there was no way to heal it. Just as Fichte said 125 years later, he said there was no way to heal the disobedience gene in people who thought for themselves. Fichte said we have to set up a system of forced schooling, universal forced schooling in which we destroy the imagination. Bells, ordered lessons, constant testing, ranking... Now, if it were only those two major figures, but you now can go back a few hundred years in history to John Calvin's Institutes of the Christian Religion, which is this thick, tiny print, but if you ever go mad and actually force yourself to read it, rather than to read what an encyclopaedia tells you it says, you'll find that Calvin says that the saved are saved before they are born, the damned, who are 19 to 1, are damned before they're born and no amount of good works or behaviour can save the damned. And no amount of evil behaviour can damn the saved. The expression that used to be pretty common but it's vanished, I think on purpose, is justified sinners. The saved are justified sinners who can do anything, they can carpet bomb civilian populations whether they're Nazis or Americans. You know, you've done no harm according to Calvin. Calvin said the only way the elect, he called the saved, the elect will ever be safe because they are outnumbered so heavily, is to set up a system of universal compulsion schooling with the intention of destroying the imagination and filling the head with garbage. Spinoza said the same thing, Fichte said the same thing...

JTG: So we have this ominous continuity among major minds with a lot of influence, including trans-Atlantic influence on the states. We have, prior to the break, Fichte in Prussia, Spinoza in Holland, and Calvin really beginning in Geneva and spreading all over where his theology spread. But the father of this, at least in the form of written documentation that's easily available, has to be Plato. The Greek aristocrat who speaks through the mouth of Socrates and writes two influential utopias. One well-known, “The Republic” and one not so well known, “The Laws” which is the product of his mature reflections on what needs to be done. And all four of these men, and we could if we had time do 40, but these four major names spanning European history agreed that the ordinary population is a very dangerous to the social order if it learns how to think and if it's imagination remains intact. And furthermore we have this corollary; there is no way to improve this. And what I've left out is the killer app that occurs in the middle to the end of the 19th century, from one of the wealthiest families on planet Earth. The family of Charles Darwin and their former Anglican minister trained son Charles, who in his second major publication The Descent of Man says that the evolutionary retarded are fatally dangerous to the physical integrity of the human race, the advance of civilization because of the few evolutionary advance like the Scandinavian blondes and the English blonde crossbreed, God
forbid with the Irish or the Spanish, evolution will march backwards into the swirling mist of the dawn-less past and nothing can change that! Maybe a few million years might change it, certainly nothing that current generations can do. Darwin of course in every school including every elementary school in the United States, probably the world. And no one bothers to mention that he doesn't say the human race is evolving. There is a few! A fraction are evolving. Now put yourself, if you're watching this in the position of a responsible person who learns that. As someone who's made worldly success, as a little bit of time on their hands and resources and now you know that if these ordinary people walking around in the American democracy, if they happened... if they happened to crossbreed with your daughter evolution is going to march backwards. You now have a justification, beginning in 1871, second to none. You can argue with Calvin, you can argue with Spinoza, you can argue with Plato, you can argue with Fichte. This is science and mathematics. And furthermore, in an unknown connection that has for some reason escaped the attention of the Darwinians, Darwin's earlier cousin, Thomas Malthus had said there is no way mathematically to feed the poor. Because if you feed them, they'll reproduce more successfully and then there will be twice as many, and four times as many. That population expands geometrically, but food only arithmetically. And of course in Darwin's diary, he said that his pursuit of the secrets of biology are stimulated by the work of his cousin Malthus. Now we have, after Darwin's two blockbusters... the second of which...

RG: I'm going to raise my hand from now on... What's the full name of our Darwin's origin of species?

JTG: The Progress of the Favoured Races, and he does not use the term race the way we do. He recognizes about 57 separate races of which the Irish are on the very bottom. Thank goodness he said that because a respectable percentage of every audience I speak to... you'd otherwise be reluctant to say these things to them. Anybody here derived from or partial Irish background... (laughter) you know, he said the Irish are hopeless! There is no hope for the Irish. Of course what's left out is simply relating what Darwin said is his training as an Anglican minister, and if you happen to pick up the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, (which is) hundreds and hundreds of years preceding Darwin, you find that God's will is to divide all the living creatures and plants into an infinite number of layers and to attempt to leave the layer you're place in is the worst sacrilege of all. So that Darwin's theory fully explicated is the Anglican Homily of Obedience. The Homily of Obedience says exactly what Darwin says hundreds of years ago. Don't try to get out of your biological category, because it's hopeless! And prior to that your spiritual category, because it's hopeless. There's a great similarity between the two ideas. Now if you set out to find evidence that this is so... it's much easier than simply setting out to look at the, you know, the abundance of natural form. So the real actor in the piece... Darwin's a shy man, fantastically wealthy! That's been left out of all... fantastically wealthy! The high-tech, upper-class purchase of the day was Wedgewood Pottery and that's the source of the Darwin family wealth. So Darwin's first cousin is a man I was taught in high school, back in the early 1950s, is estimated to be the most intelligent single human being ever lived! I was told that over and over... his name Francis Galton. A world famous explorer, mathematician, inventing little statistical formulae to discriminate shades of quality that the schools were infested with. And he has, Mr. Galton, a worldwide following of Galton Clubs, including in the United States. He makes several pilgrimages to the US to spread the insight that a menace to the human race exists in 95% of the population and there has to be a way to put them, to render them harmless. School, recommended by Fichte, Spinoza, Calvin, and Plato. That's the way to do it! And we will defend this with precise mathematical science, we'll keep to ourselves the biological reasons. Meanwhile, we've got a find a way for the biologically advanced to breed with one another. If you will trace the founding years of the elite private boarding schools in the United States, with the exception of no more than six, you will discover that all of them, male and female, emerge in the 30 year,... including the women's colleges, the seven sisters, in the 30 years after The Descent of Man, which will be in every respectable library in the United States including overseas too. I urge you, especially if you're Irish to pick it up and read it. You will not be disappointed to find yourself at the
bottom of all the races on earth. Just as the English without Darwin would've agreed! You know... (laughter)

JTG: Well, so anyway... this package of high-level evidences, contentions, is cap stoned with scientific mathematical evidence and the proselytizing of Francis Galton. Vigorous, rigorous. Out of that comes, in the period right after the American First World War a phenomenon in country affairs all over America called the Better Families Competitions. You set up the criteria for ranking and you know you present your daughters like prize heifers to be rated by the judges. So, we have a series of these reinforcements of Darwinian theory which is really a reinforcement of Anglican theology or Calvinist theology or Platonic philosophy, or Fichte-ian philosophy or if you want to go liberal, of Spinozan philosophy. Until finally we get to this capstone. Now the cap is off the tunnel to hell because not only are people justified in setting up a form of schooling that anti-educational, but they're doing either nature's work or the Lord's work. You decide, you want to go Calvin you're doing the Lord's work, you want to go nature you go...

RG: Spinoza!

JTG: Yeah, yeah... so... all of this wonderfully rich fabric of foundation is right on the surface, someone has to point your attention to it. Please, no one watching say, oh this fellow Gatto has spun off, you know this phenomenally interesting, but wacky theory. I didn't spin off anything, I took the dots and I connected them. And I said they are identical from 300 BC until post-Darwin Galton comes a German, a Prussian psycho-physicist named Wilhelm Wundt, who is the premier behavioural psychologist on earth. And now let me spring a bombshell on all of you. The only place in the world, for a long, long, time you could get a PhD degree was either Prussia, University of Berlin, Leipzig. These little nests of Germanic countries, so from all over the world came the sons of the most powerful families. Beginning in 1814 or 1816 in the United States, when a guy who later became the governor of Massachusetts went over to get his PhD degree. By the 1870s, 1880s, was a flood from Japan, from Russia, from everywhere and now they return to their home countries, not because they have a PhD degree or they made presidents of universities, heads of government bureaus, (but) because their families have clout and now that's become the ticket to intellectual management. That's how these Prussian ideas spread like wildfire. There's only one University in the United States who doesn't have a president with a Prussian PhD and he's close. I think he has a French PhD, because the French scrambled to try to get that degree too. That's Titchener at Cornell... All the heads of Psych departments have Prussian PhDs. So you now get this kernel of ideas, whether fanciful or scientific everywhere. From Japan, I mean everywhere the same ideas. The Japanese Constitution in 1868 is scrapped and the Prussian Constitution translated into Japanese! I mean we're talking here, the domination of ideas that's so interesting that what should make you suspicious is that no one ever heard of it. They've heard of this detail, this detail, why hasn't anyone joined them together? Well I'll tell you what a big shot professor at Columbia teachers College told me 12 years ago when I bearded him in his den. I said Doug, surely you know these things? Why is a junior high school teacher left to beat the drum? He looked at me and he said, “not a good way to get tenure”. That's all he said and I knew, and I knew that financial finally prize or penalty is enough to control the way we all think. And these things have been studied since the collegia in ancient Rome. Armies have put together these insights; churches have put together these insights and passed them down in an unbroken strain to their sons usually. And, of course, the daughters “catch as catch can”, but eventually to both!

RG: If I can notice the pattern you're describing it seems that people are irrational, they come up with ideas of utopias and then they, in order to get this utopia... compulsory schooling. And then they found a bunch of different ways, and the latest using science to make people think that this is how it has to be. But when you look at the real effects of Darwin in the form of you say, eugenics and the role it played in America...
JTG: That's Galton! Galton is the inventor. His first cousin is the inventor of eugenics and the chief global distributor. There is one major exception to this and people who claim to be a follower of the exception claim to have read his book like the Bible have never seen him say what I'm about to say. I'm talking about the so-called father of capitalism. The Wealth of Nations, Adam Smith, who in the first 15 pages says there is no difference between the Duke's son and the street sweeper's son, except early training. A dead giveaway that this idea was known to be highly dangerous and I don't think this has ever occurred in publishing that I know of before or since. In the 1809 reprint of Wealth of Nations, because it immediately became an international must-read, the publisher of the book, a man with the ironic name of William Playfair, an economist, takes his own author to task in the preface of the book. He said the social order would be destroyed by telling people that they were all capable of intellectual development. The only way we progressed through thousands of years of history is to make them think they depend on our good will, you know for their bread and butter let alone their safety and everything else. It's a scathing upbraiding of his own immortal author Adam Smith. But Smith is as far as I can see, other than minor figures like Florence Nightingale and I'm not even sure about her, he's the only one who says what ought to be obvious on the face of it. It became obvious to me when I was given five classes a day to teach, in the middle of Manhattan's Gold Coast of the Upper West Side. So I taught the sons and daughters of the media darlings and the sons and daughters of the professoriate and the doctors and lawyers, but I also taught the kids from Spanish Harlem and from Black Harlem who had never eaten off the tablecloth in their life. Nor was I raised with a very democratic outlook. It wasn't an undemocratic outlook but it wasn't stressed. You can hardly call my family in modern terms liberal although I hope will discuss that's not a dirty word at all, it's what you ought to be aiming to be. And because my German Grandfather who cried out in the middle of the street in (inaudible) for German victory during the Second World War even though his son was an infantry commander at the Battle of the Bulge, but he was calling for German victory. Uh, let me see if I can tone down my enthusiasm for...

RG: Well, a large percentage of the population at that time was German...

JTG: Oh right now...

RG: There was a whole swing of pro-German up until 1913 and then all of a sudden the Germans were Huns and ad hominem attacks...

JTG: Adolf Hitler in Mein... The reason you don't find Mein Kampf ever isn't because it's a dull book. There's centre section that's a tribute to the United States as the most pure Germanic country on earth. The 10 foot portrait of Henry Ford behind Hitler's desk and Sigmund Freud's nephew...

RG: Bernays!

JTG: (continuing...) Edward L. Bernays was the public relations man for Nazi Germany! That's why you don't find that would disturb people to know. It's best they don't know that stuff... Anyway, partly out of a kind of natural egalitarianism that comes from a strong working-class population around Pittsburgh, who will break your nose if you insult them rather than beg for mercy. I decided, and partly because of laziness... I decided with my five classes a day to impose the same material on all five classes, the same quality of discourse, make no differentiation, it certainly made my life easier. But what I had done was throw away the assigned curriculum, which I believe was Jack London. And nothing wrong with Jack London, he's a lot of fun to read but if you want to exercise your mental muscles that's not the way to go. And I taken from Cornell in Columbia and Reed College in Oregon which are the major colleges I attended, I had taken a level of text fully equal to that, and what I discovered was, apart from cosmetic differences; maybe a little less grammatical, maybe shorter papers and stuff, but the level of intellect in the ghetto black populations and in the ghetto Hispanic populations was really quite equal to the others! There wasn't a political belief I wanted to impose. Let me give you one example; I had a little black kid named
Gregory Smith. Gregory I hope somehow or another you're alive and you're listening to this. And I'm replacing Jack London with Moby Dick, the most difficult American novel ever written that explores all the great ideas of European history, of predestination and all the rest, and I'm holding forth on those ideas, at the same time we are reading a book that's way beyond anything in difficulty that they've ever read. And I hear a crash, I look and Gregory Smith has fallen asleep and crashed to the floor. While I'm fresh out of Pittsburgh and the way we deal with people like that is to kick them in the soles of their feet, they wake up real quick, that's the way the cops do to us we were making out under cars around Pittsburgh. If our feet stick out, they kick our feet. Anyway, then he wakes up and I'm very insulting and he said “I don't need to pay attention, I learned that stuff in third-grade!” We're in eighth grade now and I'm really insulting, but I say what you mean you learn that in third-grade? He said well “I learned that there are these sets of ladies who weave your future and you can't change it. Either the Norns in Scandinavia or the Fates in Greece” and I was reeling back from that cause he's made a connection that Cornell and Columbia never made for me, between predestination and these... and he said “and I learned there are these things from the visiting science teacher called genes and chromosomes and they dictate the colour of your hair and how you scratch your nose, you can't change that! So I don't need to listen to you talk about predestination.” Well, at that minute, I mean at that exact second, I said “this kid has written a PhD thesis that'll become a book... you know, that'll make his living for the rest of his life, and he's Gregory Smith, the stupid kid!” You know, and then I completely opened my eyes and sure enough, behind the street idiom was active mentality, fresh ideas, it just had been treated with such disrespect for so many years it wasn't worth bothering to waste it on a schoolteacher. It revolutionized my teaching. But then over the balance of the...that was the first year I taught...of the 29 years I taught I decided to use the fresh eyes and perspectives of the so-called hopeless ghetto kids and huge benefits flowed to me, and I hope some to them too because I took what they wanted to do seriously. If Jamal Watson wanted to do nothing but draw comic books in the back of the class, I would go back and use my superior experience not intelligence to say,” listen Jamal, I used to read comic books, and if you want to do this seriously you're doing it wrong. And he'd get angry and say “I'm the best in the school”, I said “yeah, maybe” I said “but in a real comic book all the panels are the same size, looked at the one you're copying from, they're all different sizes to show movement and in real comic books the figures don't stay inside of the box. The head comes out, the first comes out”, I said “look you're copying and you don't see that.” Why don't you take a week out of school, go to the local public library. I'll cover for you, take down a stack of books on graphic arts and learn what you're doing. I mean, that's a worthwhile use of your time.” So, I found out that each person...one girl wanted to do nothing but swim and she snored in class and when I finally said to her what's going on, she said I've devoted my life to being an Olympic swimmer, she was 13. I said well why don't you do that for the rest of the year you can't do it in school, we don't have a swimming pool, but there are about 150 public swimming pools in New York City. Why don't you plot them out on a map with pins or stickers, visit every one of them, and set up a rating for these swimming pools. Concentration of chemicals in the water, depth of the pool, length of the lane and lighting, access, cost and you'll produce an information reference that'll make you somebody. Go around to the local public library and say you're doing it and could you be catalogued, cause who else has such a reference as this. Well she was... her life was transformed because I treated her time with respect, but meanwhile if you took any, I mean any of the subject areas you could find that she was developing muscles and each one of them. We got a call from New York, that's the city magazine in New York, about midway through the school year and they said they had heard about this and they wanted to buy the data and they would pay $500 for it. I said you mean you want to publish her article... “Well no, we would put our own writers name on it”. This girl who I doubt if she'd ever seen a $10 bill in her life, I'm offering her $500 and she said “no it's mine, if they want to use it they'll put my name on it”, which they weren't willing to do, so.... I know that was the beginning of a transformation in her life. A famous American writer, somebody that the New York senator from Harvard, he had a fruity voice, what was his name...a very famous one... go back 10 years...
No prior to that but he coincided with Cuomo. No he was a... he'd written books about the plight of poverty but they weren't sympathetic books, he was nationally famous and he was so florid as a public figure, that he was... in any case... I had a friend who flunked out of Cornell, I'm reluctant to mention his name because he is a nationally famous writer about assassinations. And this famous New York senator said publicly that he was the world's foremost assassination expert. Well, you now know that he was a flunkout from Cornell, so how did this happen? Because he had saw the Kennedy assassination, I'd driven him to Cornell and he was trying to plead his way back in and Kennedy was assassinated. We stayed up all night; we both agreed that if anything happened to the assassin that none of the information could be trusted. And then the next morning or afternoon, that was it for the assassin. So he went back to Cornell as a flunkout, talked a big-time professor, Andrew Hacker, whose dad started the general studies program at Columbia into giving him a PhD or the beginning of one, without ever going to class, he would spend all his time writing the book about not the Kennedy assassination, about the composition of the Warren Commission, which I thought was a very clever way to sidestep, you know, all the yellow journalism stuff. It became, Inquest it was called, it became a national bestseller, it led to an all expenses paid PhD at Harvard and then he wrote a book about the DeBeers diamond mines. They took him in, in South Africa as a houseguest for a long, long time and he wrote a book saying diamonds are essentially worthless, because they have thousands of years of flawless diamonds already put away. Then he talked his way into the NBC newsroom and wrote this magnificent investigative study called News from Nowhere, about how the news actually is selected for transmission. In other words, everything he touched was... this is a flunkout from college. So, all these anomalies, from the Harlem kids, Spanish Harlem kids, from my flunk out Cornell friend, finally shook my belief in what I had been taught. That it's an orderly universe, merit determines and I could begin to see around me all the narratives that were disconnected from reality. They hardly were hidden at all! You know, they were all weapons of mass destruction narratives and they occurred over and over and over again in every aspect, including in the world of medicine and nutrition. You know there seems to be no ethical or moral brake on what insiders were able to say and all the other insiders would agree with, so that when I turned to what obviously was wrong with school is that we were creating, I as a schoolteacher was creating the hideous discipline problems that we then said we must have money to relieve. It seemed like a closed universe in which one hand washed the other one. That all these horrible kids from horrible ghettos were perfectly able to rise into valuable contributors and it wasn't a very long distance to go. For example, I remember one... I started a school year with, they were trying to get rid of me as a teacher, they gave me their worst class on the eighth-grade. The kids were huge, they had no tradition of scholarship at all, but I determined to utterly ignore that and to say that we were going to start with Shakespeare’s three most important plays and if they could master the parts, that I was willing to cut them loose from school for months and they could travel around to elementary schools, put these plays on and then talk about the problems of staging them, mastering the character, or something or another. And I'd say 10 days went by and it was as if I was in a Harvard seminar. All of a sudden some kid bursts out laughing in the middle of “O, that this too solid flesh would melt, Thaw and resolve itself into a dew!” What are you laughing about? “Don't you know” he said “we're the dumb class?” You know and from that point on it was no longer easy because the other “dumb kids” had had the illusion, but it wasn't an illusion; broken, but we still got some good work done. We invent the problems that we then have to solve, that is what I think all experts do. I don't think, including brain surgery, that there's anything that human skill is capable of that is very hard to learn, it takes some time and you can benefit from prior experience, but it doesn't take anywhere near the time, expense...

RG: So the point is that individuals have an innate infinite potential and that we're not limited by genes or species, or race?
JTG: And who wants to? People wish to learn. It used to be called emulation, you're around somebody they can do something well, of course you watch how they do it. You know, we talked earlier about the disadvantage adopted kids have. When you watch your mother and father and you are 14 months old and have no language, you're still seeing how they deal with frustration, how they merge with one another, or not, contend with one another. You're seeing so many hundreds of skills that in fact you are biologically programmed to imitate. Later when the mind kicks in, you have some selection, which ones to and which ones to... but we don't allow that to happen because the very first thing schools do is strip the experience base away. The easiest way to turn your kids into geniuses, I mean by the time they are seven, is just to front load huge amounts of experience including dangerous experience. And my favourite story as Richard Branson's tells it in his autobiography. His mother who was an airline stewardess in 1946 flying the Atlantic, not exactly the safest thing to do, she was desperate that he wouldn't become a dependent and so when he was four years old, picture 48 months, she drove him miles from their London home in Chamblee Green and asked him if he thought he could find his way home from there. He said that he thought he could. Get out and do so, then she said and now he's... where is he... he doesn't even have many words, you know so eight or nine hours later, when he finds his way he said nothing in his life ever seemed hard for him to do again. He dropped out of high school, never goes to college, has his first million bucks by the time he's 19, by figuring out what people need and want and giving it to them cheaper or better than anyone will offer it. What would our society be if we put millions of people through the same experience? I think it would be closer to what colonial America was, and the early federal America when nobody wanted to work for somebody else, they wanted an independent livelihood. It would be closer to that than the corporate hell that we have now. But the corporations, following perfectly rational logic, have begun to need less and less people, but they have such political control over the legislatures and federal government that there's no way to arrest this progress. Furthermore, I spoke at General Motors about 10 years ago and a mid-level executive told me when I asked him, you know “you guys had the world, there was't any competition, what happened?” You know, I remember when Jap cars came in they had names like the Bluebird in the Fair Lady, I mean it was a joke! What happened? And he said what happened was this, that engineering which used to be the fast track to the executive suite and profit sharing and all of those things and good stuff, stopped being this fast-track. Finance became this fast track, taking these huge profits, speculating in variable rate mortgages, in foreign currencies... that became the road... the same way that happened with the steel industry in Pittsburgh; it wasn't moved out of Pittsburgh because any of them were losing a penny, they were making great profit. It's that the Harvard B-School boys said look you can take this money, make a lot more, and not work. Of course that would get rid of 100,000 Steelworkers and truck drivers, but who the hell cares about them? Didn't Darwin say they're not evolving? They're all Irish anyway...

RG: This is the juxtaposition between eugenics and that type of mentality where people are under control and someone like Branson who gets to go on walkabout, which is a rite of passage which was around at the founding of this country with high literacy rates... and so when we get a high entrepreneurship, self-reliance, literacy rates, people who had critical thinking and knew how to deal with problems on their own, because if not you might die...

JTG: Or other people think badly of you if you say you want a job for...... what do you want to do? Right, right... but these different compartments are intimately interlocked. So by studying one and the other as if you're going to pass the short answer test, you're disabling your.....

RG: Fragmenting!

JTG: Yeah, yeah. ...the synthesizing power of your mind which is what enables you to strike out so that history doesn't infinitely repeat itself, but now that's been restricted to such a small fragment of the population that we are in desperate trouble internationally because the Chinese, the Japs, the Malaysians can do this brain paralysis much better than we can,
because they have traditions that allow that and we still turn out on the Fourth of July and say home of the free, land of the brave, whatever.

JTG: So if someone were to walk away from this segment saying what did he say? It's that the bad things done in school have been intellectually justified and you're not going to change that set of mind. So all the effort you make to systematically change schooling is a huge waste of time energy and resources, because now the majority of the important people in the country make their living either directly from that or indirectly because you no longer have a critical mind. What is the definition of marketing, that when I took marketing at Columbia they taught me? Its overcoming sales resistance! Well, if there is no sales resistance, you know, you do that by juggling balls and dancing, there is a pretty girl, buy the product, you can have her... you know, it's quite a pickle that we're in. Our managers don't think they are in a pickle, but they are too, because the Chinese for example, are so much more well-versed in screwing rival power. We've only been around a few hundred years, they are reeling us in very nicely thank you. If they cashed in the bonds they hold right now, just forget that the dollar is paper. “Give us our money back”... (laughter)

RG: How are populations, kind of prepared, indoctrinated and conditioned into receiving such... they provide such low resistance to the Ponzi scheme mentality of the predators.....?

JTG: Well, the interesting thing about leverage and it has been studied since ancient Rome is, you don't have to do everybody. You just have to do a few opinion makers, they do the rest. Here's how Andrew Carnegie did it with the Protestant churches of the United States. He simply in one fell swoop donated a brand-new organ to every church in the United States. This dyed in the wool atheist opened his purse and everybody got a new organ. Do you suppose there was much... that not anyone turned the organ down or that there was much resistance? Now, you accept the organ but, you grew up in the Christian tradition, don't you thank Mr. Carnegie for his organ? Don't you, being human, hope that something else will follow that organ? You bet you do! How did Carnegie and Rockefeller get a hold of the schools? There were no pensions for teachers, the government didn't set up the pension system. Rockefeller and Carnegie set up the pension system Out of their own pockets. And of course they didn't give it everybody. Your school had to conform with what they said was a balanced educational diet. Four credits of English, whatever they were, two credits of math, whatever they were. You could compete for the pensions if you followed the Carnegie Credit System. Is there any school in the country who didn't? I never heard of one. How could you? Because the local parents would say, “What are you nuts?” “You're not taking this free money? I mean, what you're doing isn't so great anyway, why don't you do it his way?” So this whole religion of leverage, (that has) accumulated over more than 2000 years is utterly unknown except to seminar courses at the most elite colleges. You know, you may have a rough idea what leverage means from a physics course and see how connections... but you don't have any idea how you can plan the future for an entire region or nation, or city, by using leverage. The Chautauqua's used the leverage. The best leverage available wasn't the newspapers, although it was good. It was the pulpits and so mixed in with the real things the Chautauqua wanted to teach, were travelling Christian ministers. The whole Harpers publishing empire is I think it's Methodist, but don't hold me to that maybe it's Baptist... and I think the Rockefellers are Baptist. But they're not Baptist like other... you know there's about 40 kinds of Baptist. There is one small fragment of Baptist who are like Episcopalians. I forget the name of it, but when I was studying the Quaker transformation from pious humble people to among the most powerful, certainly the most powerful small sect in the country. There's only 100,000 Quakers and they've had two American Presidencies out of 40, so that's 5%

RG: Nixon being the most recent right?

JTG: Nixon and Hoover! You can't think clearly and all you computer full know that, unless the data is available, you can't think clearly. Well someone knew that thousands of years ago and what data to remove, how to spin the local authority into your scheme. Let him do
the work. Schoolteachers, I was about to say by and large are innocent. They're all innocent because they are not innocent there gotten rid of. They're drawn out of a pool of college graduates (that) the New York Times says are the lowest single scoring graduates on standardized exams except for school administrators, who of all the coherent occupational groups in the country are 50 points below the teacher group. So the managers, so-called, are the dumbest people of all, they know that their paycheck depends on these 20 people to take their job. They don't want to... they may sit in a parents meeting and say we've got to do something different, but they're listening to the tom-toms telling them what to do different. And of course what to do different only says, identify the most influential parents, and they're always the richest and do something different for those people. They'll be gone in three or four years and then go back and do what we always did. If you look at schools in 1905 and in schools today, the correspondences are overwhelmingly similar. You would not say, wow... you would say “hey, history hasn't moved!”

RG: Frederick Gates helped out Rockefeller at a time when the family was getting a bad reputation and like Carnegie they were having a lot of labour disputes. How does the idea of philanthropy and altruism affect American education?

JTG: Philanthropy and altruism as it occurs through the institution of the private corporate foundation is the explanation for what's called American Education, let us call it American schooling. That's a pretty comprehensive condemnation. Do I have any evidence for that? Yes I do. The two congressional investigations of where schools came from, one in 1915 by a guy name Walsh, one in 1959 by a guy named Carol Reece, both came to the identical conclusion. That all of the mysteries vanish or at least source mysteries, when you see how the foundations, which don't spend very much money, use leverage to control the curriculum, the testing system, the public perception of what's going on. And of those foundations until very recently, Rockefeller Carnegie and Ford were the ringleaders. They had divided responsibility. Ford took... let me not misstep here.

RG: Rowan Gaither was in charge of a Ford at the time and he'd met with Norman Dodd. And Gaither says well Mr. Dodd we have directives from the White House, and we at the Ford foundation are the CIA or OSS...

JTG: The White House back in the 20s and 30s set up conferences of experts in order to homogenize expert opinion, because inside the expert body there were colossal names. And if they spoke all the other cards fell into line. I think Ford took over the psychological output of schooling, Rockefeller and Carnegie in different ways, were attempting to globalize. The same Carnegie foundation, still today if you go out to their library, I think it's in Ossining or around there and just read their annual report for the Carnegie Corporation, everything they ever saw on the front page of the New York Times in relation to schooling was cooked up in the project offices and then it's dumped on the world through the control of the media. How's the media controlled? Well is controlled through advertising, that's all, you can use your friends to buy more, or buy less, When they come and say why aren't you advertising, well you say, your point of view is so radical.

JTG: I think the mechanics of how it's done is the most useful thing to someone just new to this. Because they say well it seems like everyone would have to be in on this. No, only a few people...

When we left off we were talking about how the committees were investigating the foundations. So there was a Cox committee, there was a Reece committee, and they were looking into the origins of the educational system. What is it really doing versus what do people need to survive and thrive this world? And they discovered there is more than a crevasse, more than a Grand Canyon there was a gap between what we need to survive and thrive and be successful entrepreneurs, pursuing the American dream with a real hope of attaining it, versus being a servile class. And these committees kind of snapshot it and said
that there are some foundations and there are some things in action and they're trying to evoke real change and they're going after our children.

JTG: They were puzzled because they detected an agenda but they couldn't figure the agenda out and with the second commission, the Reece, a firestorm broke loose in fact Reese was never ever able to finish, thanks to the chief counsel, was that Cox?

RG: I know there was a lawyer involved with the Reece committee, Catherine Casey who was the lawyer sent by Norman Dodd to go into the archives of the Carnegie foundation. And after being brought up in a traditional status quo education, she went there and saw the actual minutes and words of these men in these meetings planning on how to take over this country and take over the diplomacy and power of...

JTG: Was Dodd the chief counsel for Reece?

RG: Dodd was the chief researcher and he was out of J.P. Morgan earlier, and he said you guys need to return to sound banking and they said Norm we're to let you go. Then, Carol Reece called him and said Norm we want you to head up research because we think... what they were describing as communist activity from my research in the comprehensive sense....

Now I happened to dig up a wonderful quote from William James Psychology. I think printed in 1890 the book is given for establishing psychology as an academic subject. And James was, of course... he had ambivalent feelings, but was the disciple of Wundt. Now this is a quote from William James' Psychology 121 years ago. "Habit is the enormous flywheel of society, its most precious agent. It alone saves the children of fortune from the envious uprisings of the poor. It alone prevents the most repulsive jobs from being deserted. It holds the miner in his darkness. It keeps different social strata from mixing." Wow!

One of the insights I am discovering that really electrified me when I was reading it was how frequently the great discovery in the scientific arena is not made by the specialists in that area, but by somebody from another area completely divorced who transfers into chemistry, or physics, has fresh eyes, cuts through the habits that lock the mind in place, and makes the discovery. It says freedom and flexibility is much more valuable than planning. Insight comes only by getting out of ruts and plugging into a variety of methods. So these great truths—it isn't that we are discovering them now. We're taking them out of the burial places and saying, "hey, look, wake up", you know. The world is much bigger and much different than you believe it is, because you have been conditioned to believe it's that way.

I have something here—I have the Six Purposes of Schooling as laid down in 1917 by the man who Harvard named their honour lecture in education for. So, far from being a fringe individual, this guy is the reason why the Harvard Honour Lecture in Education is named as it is. The Inglis Lecture looks like Inglis, but it is pronounced Engles. And I would like to read you the Six Purposes of Schooling. I moved heaven and earth and it took years to find this book, just like trying to find in past years a copy of Carroll Quigley's Tragedy and Hope. I learned about Inglis from the 20 year President of Harvard, James Bryant Conant, who was a poison gas specialist in World War I, was a very inner circle of the atomic bomb project, World War II, and was the High Commissioner of Occupied Germany after the war. So he wrote, it must be twenty books, about the institution of schooling which he was completely a proponent and unfortunately he was a very bad writer. I forced myself to read most of these books and in one of them he says that if you really want to know what school is about, you need to pick up the book that I am referring to here, Principles of Secondary Education. Two years it took me to find a copy of the book; 750 pages, tiny print, dull as your imagination can conceive. And furthermore, it is not until you get to the very middle of the book in an unlabeled section, that he spills the beans. Let me spill them for you. These are the six purposes or functions, as he calls them. The first he calls The Adjustive Function. Schools are to establish fixed habits of reaction to authority. That is their main purpose, habits of reaction to authority. That's why school authorities don't tear their hair
out when somebody exposes those that... that the atomic bomb wasn't dropped on Korea as a history book in 1990, printed by Scott Foresman, distributed and why each of these books have hundreds of substantive errors. Learning isn't the reason that texts are distributed. So first is the Adjustive Function, fixed habits. Now, here comes the wonderful insight that being able to analyze the detail will give you. How can you establish, if somebody has successfully developed this automatic reaction, because people have a proclivity, when they are given sensible orders to follow it. That's not what they want to reach. The only way you can measure this is to give stupid orders and people automatically follow those. Now you have achieved function one. Have you ever wondered why some of the foolish things schools do are allowed to continue? Number two he calls, he calls it the Integrating Function. But it is easier to understand if you call it the Conformity Function. It is to make children as alike as possible, the gifted children and the stupid children as alike as possible. Because market research uses statistical sampling and it only works if people react generally the same way.

The third function he calls the Directive Function. School is to diagnose your proper social role and then to log the evidence that here's where you are in the great pyramid, so that future people won't allow you to escape that compartment. The fourth function is the Differentiating Function, because once you have diagnosed kids in this layer, you do not want them to learn anything that the higher layers are learning. So you teach just as far as the requirements of that layer. Number five and six are the creepiest of all. Number five is the Selective Function. What that means is what Darwin meant by natural selection. You're assessing the breeding quality of each individual kid, you are doing it structurally because school teachers don't know this is happening and you are trying to use ways to prevent the poorer stock from breeding and those ways are hanging labels, humiliating labels around their neck, encouraging the shallowness of thinking. You know, I often wondered because I came from a very, very strict Scotch-Irish culture. That never allowed you to leer at a girl. Right when I got to New York City, the boys were pawing the girls openly and there was really no redress for the girls at all, except they kept not showing up in the classroom, you know, high absentee rates. Well, you're supposed to teach structurally that sexual pleasure is what you withdraw from a relationship and everything else is a waste of time and expensive. So the Selective Function is what Darwin meant by the favoured races. The idea is to consciously improve the breeding stock, schools are meant to tag the unfit with their inferiority by poor grades, remedial placement, humiliation, so that their peers will accept them as inferior. And the good breeding stock, among the females will reject them as possible partners. And the sixth is the creepiest of all, and I think it is partly what Tragedy and Hope is about. It is a fancy, Roman name, the Propaedeutic Function, because as early as Roman big-time thinkers, it was understood that to continue a social form required some people being trained that they were the custodians of this. So some small fraction of the kids are being readied to take over the project.

We are now going to draw this part of my work to a close. I genuinely hope that this second part of my work was of as much interest to you as the first part, and I also hope that you learned much from it. What I hope you have learned in these first two parts of section one should have provided you with the necessary grounding that is required to seriously study, and more importantly understand, the many other matters of a weird medical nature that I will look at in our next part. I touched upon some medical matters during this part of the work. I have exposed the role pharmaceuticals play in the massive con game with seriously malicious intent that is psychiatry. Apart from the nurses and carers who do a wonderful and thankless job, I hold the vast majority of the rest of the entire medical industry in contempt. I believe it is impossible for them ALL to have failed to notice ALL of the things I am about to reveal in our next book. They cannot ALL have been that blind. I repeat: I hold the entire industry, minus nurses carers etc, in contempt because many of you MUST have noticed something was wrong yet you have all kept your mouths shut for selfish reasons.

What happened to “First do no harm”? Today that's nothing but a hypocritical oath.

Do you remember in part one when I told you that it was all about population control? Well in the next work I'm going to prove it to you...Get ready to get really angry, or really scared.