

THE
CRIMSON
CRIME
of
arrogance

"Single acts of tyranny may be ascribed to the accidental opinion of the day; but a series of oppressions, begun at a distinguished period, and pursued unalterably through every change of ministers, too plainly prove a deliberate systematical plan of reducing us to slavery".
Thomas Jefferson, 3rd US President. The cancer was already visible!

www.themindweb.com

The web site for those who care enough to work for social justice,
true democracy and the human future.

NOTES

NOTES

The text for this book is provided free
to all who defend the human future.

compliments

WWW.TheMindWeb.com

Frontispiece:

Heart & Mind

***Desire for freedom lives strong in the heart
But the way of the heart is confined
To achieve freedom's triumph
The way is through Truth
And Truth lives only in mind***

***The democracy need is a mighty fine steed
To gallop in the way of mankind
But if you're to know
what direction to go
Then with mind you seek Truth to find***

***Life's so sweet a way when the heart strings play
and we love being free of the mind
but where do you end
when you come to a bend
and you find that your poor heart is blind***

For earlier development of the theme of this book
see literature on
www.TheMindWeb.com

THE
CRIMSON CRIME
of
arrogance

This, the first booklet written entirely for TheMindWeb.com is expected to be its most popular; partner with *Of TRUTH*.

Copyright note: Although there are no restrictions on quotation or publication of material presented here there is a moral obligation to quote accurately and in context and to inform your audience of the source of material quoted. This, be assured is in your own interests.

Dedication:

*“To all who hunger for the truth of life
and access to the human potential”*

Chapters:

- Chapter 1: Philosophy/Ideology/Religion**
- Chapter 2: The Child Seducers**
- Chapter 3: The Dilemma of Democracy**
- Chapter 4: Difficulties and Confusions**
- Chapter 5: We can Create a True Democratic Republic**
- Chapter 6: The war: all against all**
- Chapter 7: A Tale of Two Cities**
- Chapter 8: What have we come to?**
- Chapter 9: The Humanist Consequence**
- Chapter 10: Solving the crime – Who Benefits**
- Chapter 11: Hunt for the Anthrax Killer**
- End Piece**

Chapter 1:

Philosophy/Ideology/Religion

Philosophy, Ideology, Religion (PIR) three words with meanings so alike that they may be considered equal. These concepts, exclusive to humans, are important to our life attitudes. Animals cannot access such concepts.

It is fortunate perhaps, that there are many philosophies, religions and ideologies and in the normal way of things we take on a mixture. We, in part, adapt our “nurture” (the way we are raised) to our “human” natures so that we can, to some important degree, become our natural selves.

However people of excessive greed and arrogance are animalist and when in power favour their “animal” nature. In control of groups or nations they try to enforce PIR of their own design. As a result nurture turns to support of animal nature and human nature becomes increasingly enslaved to the attitudes and thought processes of animalist leaders.

Atrocious! Worse! Leaders have now learned that the quickest way to subdue and reshape community is to destroy its moral base and build a fake morality on a new base. That crime, as we will see, is the consequence of authoritarian Humanist arrogance.

This is an entirely new booklet written for TheMindWeb.com. Although most was first presented as editorials, important clarifications, unification's and imports make this a vital addition to our small book library. The additions will help make the matter of community enslavement more easily understood by more people. *The Crimson Crime of arrogance* says a lot that is overdue to be said and I hope it says it well enough to help all who read it.

New to TheMindWeb mainly quotes from two books by students of what I call “Social Order”. Perhaps we could call these insiders, not insiders to Globalist New World Order scheming but people who have worked within the system and, as traditionally educated investigators, see the development of social atrocity from conventional positions.

One of these witnesses saw the looming catastrophe of educating children to a contrived ideology that would reinforce our basic animal nature against our human nature, the other saw the catastrophe of increasingly undemocratic democracy. A democracy ‘dictated’ to serve humanist ideology.

Between them they reveal enslavement of people by the enslavement of minds being finally achieved by “people shapers” and consolidated by law. Neither, I expect, saw the two impositions together as part of the same inhuman scheme it so obviously is. Certainly neither plan evolved by chance.

As we will see these impositions were deliberately designed to deform the rational use of common intelligence and, by law, to then consolidate the deprivations gained. By such means human individuals became increasingly deprived of their right to natural development and also of ability to choose their behaviour in relation to their own best interests. Development of our human potential was gradually reduced. Both abortions of human potential are the deliberate designs of inhuman agencies.

“*The Child Seducers*” by John Steinbacher was printed in 1971. “*The Dilemma of Democracy*” by Lord Hailsham, was printed in 1978. Although these spoke to appreciative audiences (people were not then so brainwashed) the manipulators of minds, backed by the unimaginable power of the world financial system, won the day by simply crushing the opposition under weight of scientifically designed propaganda and privately ‘accredited’ authorities.

This also applied to other attempted exposure of moral subversion such as the Dr. Wertham book “*Seduction of the Innocent*”: an exposure of comic books as conveyors of sick deformities into the child mind. The thought processes of children are turned to a simple animalist ideology then reinforced by use of the latest scientific understanding of human behaviour.

For myself I spent the first half of my life (counting life-span as 80 years) in personal search of social truth for my own benefit. I was not interested in awakening those who do not seem to care and are satisfied to live blind. I sought to avoid the corrupting influences of convenient ‘authorities’ and public opinion. It was only around mid-life that I became aware of my duty – that humanity and I are as one. It thus came about that my life, in its entirety, became devoted to the human cause.

There was much to learn and need to clarify meaning of what I ‘knew’. What you have now, let us say, is the fruiting of my life’s work, but it represents much more than myself and those I quote – it represents all who hunger for the truth of life and for access to the wonders of the human potential.

The master planners have convinced humans that man can be remade to any design: but their design is in service to their personal benefit. The humanity they create is artificial, stagnant and without human potential because they

delete our human right of choice. The suffering now expanding around the world is the result of these delusions deforming the behaviour of those who have them and these then creating misery for those who do not want them.

Everything from sex to sanity; from health to humanity; from politics to pastimes, has been redefined and deformed to fit the plans of people who think themselves Gods but are too short-sighted to see that they are not.

They have redesigned, by deformity, the behaviour of millions of young people more lovely than the most cuddly of animals but, by reducing their behaviour options to animal instincts these young people are being robbed of their potential for developing in the glory of human life. This is the result of scientific public relations expertise being used to set in mind a belief that human ability is merely an extension of primitive animal responses.

The Humanist *arrogance*

The humanist sect is totally arrogant in its god complex. Unable to conceive of a Creator, they think they are quite entitled to remake humanity into what, in their arrogance, is their idea of a better mould. To fix their ideology into the public mind so that all behave as programmed animals is their ideal.

Humanists, especially in teaching the young, claim authoritarianism is bad. They have a fetish for complicated words. Because they have to relate their language to that of their victims they often build a word on a word in common use to deform its common use meaning. Authoritarianism degrades authority and substitutes for the Christian “judgmental”.

Those are two interesting words because, in most cases, when we use them we become self-damning. Whenever people say that someone is ‘judgmental’ or ‘authoritarian’ they are themselves, almost inevitably, making a judgement or projecting their authority for their own view or judgement.

Humanist ideology claims there is no truth but, at the same time, also claim it is true that creation is/was a chance event. They are also happy to believe it true this self-contradiction is not a self-contradiction; but if you believe there is no truth then to present anything as truth must be a self-contradiction. It seems they either have not the moral strength to face reality or not the intelligence to understand it. Alternatively they are zombie-slaves mind-bound to live in a dream world of their own programming.

Christians believe in truth, but may not see that this belief also becomes a self-contradiction when they claim it only relates to God or the Church of

their favour. Many are now so bound to humanist ideology that they do not see that if their Creator represents the truth of their creation then they must also live by the rational truth or be in denial of their Creator.

If a Christian makes a statement on behalf of truth honestly sought, this is not made as a personal desire. This statement is based on what, to their best ability, they have found to be truth as expressed by the creation of which they are part. So the authority for their statement is not their own arrogance but the reality of the law of the creation. So long as they do not defer to other human authority they are not being judgmental, they only express the scientific truth as available to them.

So we see there is a big gap between arrogance and honesty! The person who presents human nature independent of personal preference is deferring to truth and not being judgmental or pushing personal authority.

On the other hand those of Humanist religion, unable to claim the backing of a truth whose existence they deny, base every statement or claim on their own authority or judgement. Their claims are always authoritarian or judgmental. Their “arrogance” combines selfish pride, and all anti-human desires.

That was/is the crime of the “people shapers”, the self-made gods of arrogance. They would, as Jesus said, have been better to have had a stone tied to their necks and tossed into the ocean. Let us now look more closely at some of their work.

CORE ISSUES:

This book is about core issues of the New World Order (NWO). The religion of the NWO is Humanism and God, as we see by their actions, is the ideology they created. They see themselves as re-designers of humanity in service to their arrogance. Their religion and its politics are intimately entwined around the Hegelian Dialectic concept (basically the socialist principle of creating conflict within a culture so as to achieve a desired change) – an operating mechanism for divide and conquer. This is the inhumanity and the plan that must be exposed.

This may seem a big order but humanists have destroyed much of their own ability to see truth. They will not admit of an existence their ideology denies. They live inside their own limits. Filled with arrogant certainties they cannot see truth. Were they open minded they would see that animals do not have human needs, abilities, potentials or aspirations and that a physical body is not the entirety of the human creation; they would see through their delusions.

Although their masters use the latest of scientific P.R. to promote humanism, humanism itself is just a denial of the existence of human intellect or spirit. It claims for itself only animal instincts. The philosophy is basic but the needs of fixing mass indoctrination do require scientific understanding of the human mind and from this its mass manipulation. Mass-mind manipulation needs modern technology.

As the science of 'public relations' is part of the *Globalism Brainwash* book, further exposure of how the plan has been put into effect should not take large space. Just realise that though the 'NWO' mammoth may be a very large beast the principles it scientifically imprints are common and primitive.

What we want with this booklet is to clarify our mind manipulated situation and the inhuman plan behind it. We want a useful booklet that is unified and easy to understand. Nevertheless it will be an advantage, for those who have not read "MindWeb" articles and books, to include that literature. This is written with the assumption that readers already have some grounding in social corruption and sense the danger of our situation.

Note: Ideology is a parcel of beliefs, usually authoritarian and based on failure to appreciate human nature, therefore usually harmful. But this does not mean an ideology could not be based on truth, it is just not needed.

Chapter 2:

***THE CHILD SEDUCERS* -- by John Steinbacher**

Quotes:

"Even though the idea that any EXPERT in conditioning techniques may set out deliberately to shape behavior to conform to some individually pre-conceived particular pattern is repugnant to all thinking Americans, this in no manner dissuades the zealots dedicated to the cause of reshaping human behavior. Even though operant conditioning carries such accurately derogatory labels as 'mind-bending' and 'brain washing' you will find this technique being implemented with great speed in many of the schools of our land. Operant conditioning is such a highly controversial psychological technique that its ethical, and other ramifications, of scientifically controlling human behavior, has long been debated.

Under normal circumstances of day to day living, each individual is relatively free to select that behavior which is meaningful to him as an individual. Under operant conditioning, individual behavior patterns can be drastically altered, for here behavior patterns are selected FOR the individual BY a trainer, or an experimentalist, or eventually by the State. This is a frightening form of human intervention, and manipulation, being promoted in our government controlled schools.

The rationale under which sex education has been introduced into the schools may be found in the following statements. According to Sigmund Freud (Social Medicine and Hygiene, 1907) "I should prefer that parents NOT concern themselves at all with any explanations regarding matters of sexuality. Above all, schools should not evade the task of mentioning sexual matters. Schools should present lessons about the animal kingdom which should include the great facts of reproduction. These facts should be given their due significance and emphasis should be laid on the fact that man shares with the higher animals EVERYTHING essential to his own organization." And "In those countries which leave the education of children either wholly or in part in the hands of religious the above method urged, would of course, NOT be practicable. For NO religion will ever admit the IDENTITY in NATURE of MAN and BEAST, since to the religious person the IMMORTALITY of the soul is an absolute foundation for MORAL training, which they cannot forego."

[Anyone of free human mental ability will see that man does not share "everything essential to his own organisation" with animals. We also see that Humanism itself is a religion as it is based on faith in an idea, not on truth.]

Freud cites as the authority for these views the writings of the self-avowed atheistic Dutch dramatist 'Multatuli' who separated from his family, led a Bohemian life in Amsterdam, Brussels and elsewhere, finally settling in Germany. Multatuli particularly opposed the influence of church, and religion, on individual freedom of thought.

... The simple fact, is family life-sex education courses are vehicles of this philosophy, for they expound absolute permissiveness, designed to encourage atavistic behavior; the films invigorate the labile fantasies of even the dullest, not-yet-self-controlled child, and no child, so titillated, can learn the basics of education which properly should be the only material presented in a classroom setting. This can only be defined as an absolute usurpation of the child's right to be properly educated.

Sensitivity training, a technique employing 'psychological uppers and downers,' is a slough of Esalen, and National Training Laboratories (NTL) of the National Education Association (NEA). Initially, sensitivity training was eulogized as a promoter of "good interpersonal relations" and group cohesiveness. However, trainers insist that each individual must submerge his own integrity to that of the group, leaving the participant subject to the machinations of the trainer and/or the group.

In recent years, countless numbers of individuals have reported that depravity has become the epoxy of sensitivity training. And now word comes in from widely differing parts of the country that participation in sensitivity is becoming increasingly demanded of school administrators and of those who teach family life-sex education courses, those who are involved in physical education, the various branches of the social studies programs, home economics, etc.

It is as Dr. Charlotte Crabtree recently enthused to those attending a Social Studies Symposium in Portland, Oregon, 'You are pioneers; you are right out on the frontier when you teach this very dangerous material. To date, NO analyses of our programs are possible . . . analyses are still very primitive but we HOPE for some changes when Taxonomy is committed to PPBS (Planning Programming, Budgeting System data processing procedures).'

From variously designed sensitivity training sessions, most resembling nothing more than a witches' Sabbath, 'newly trained trainers' are spewed forth to spread their heresies, and to effect various forms of behavioral and attitudinal changes throughout the land and especially throughout the whole educational system of America, for in the words of Lester Kirkendall, "We have too many youth indoctrinated with the parochial attitudes of their families." (Basic Issues in Sex Education, California School Health, Vol. 3, No. 1, January, 1967).

And from NEA's Issues in Training comes this word, "Training, even though it has NOT reached professional status, and ill-defined as it is, has had good acceptance in many organizations. (Note: Notably in the field of education.)"

"There is NO clear-cut set of standards for trainers" (therefore no ethical absolutes) . . . "professionally, knowledge in the fields of sociology, psychology, social work, educational psychology, psychiatry, personnel or administration, whether gained from an academic situation OR whether self-taught, is considered to be helpful," and " 'Getting to know you, Getting to

feel, free and easy' is more than just a line from a popular song. It is BASIC to success in interpersonal relations."

[These paragraphs show that the animalism indoctrinated into young minds is so basic as to need no professional training or scientific reasoning ability. For the scientific side of indoctrination see *Globalism Brainwash*. Remember, this education has now been operational, world wide, for over thirty years so, today, most parents cannot see the problem.]

Through the mediums of education in sexuality, of sensitivity training, and of operant conditioning, trainers have learned that it is all too easy to manipulate a child by denigrating parents. By extolling amorality, they have also learned how to preclude the formation of individual conscience and individual integrity in a child, and how to effectively alienate a child from his parents through the changing of moral norms.

When sufficient downgrading of parental values has occurred a child will not identify with the appropriate, or like-sex parent. An ongoing study of child-parent identification has revealed fairly serious to severe maladjustment in 92% of those children not making proper identification with his or her parent(s). This is a frightening statistic.

Professor George Odiorne of the University of Michigan summed up the whole problem when he stated "Many trainers are 'amateur head shrinkers' that lack the proper psychological training, psychiatric damage may result" End Quotes.

This is from the "Foreword" by M. Royer, M.S. In the book proper (P93-7) we find side by side comparison between the 1939 National Socialist (NAZI) Sex Education Experiment and the 1969 Anaheim High School District (AUHSD) Sex Education Experiment. They can be seen as the same programs, details are only changed to mislead the innocent.

Sensitivity training is better described as "*sensitivity deprivation training*". It is designed to de-sensitise children of their human sensitivities in order to make way for behaviour indoctrination to primitive and animal responses.

A niggle with the above is use of the word EXPERIMENT. This appears to be the same 'experiment' used in the USSR to destroy and replace the existing culture. It may be 'text book' experimental but, in practical terms it is as scientific as time and tide. It is basic logic and tested on whole cultures. It is reliable enough to be accepted without need of further research.

Imprinting immature minds to a primitive base is so simple that, as we saw above, it does not need professionals. It is just a blockage of the human development. Any parrot will do; in fact will do it better because the parrot brain has not the human capacity to care or question what it is doing.

An important reminder is that in a culture where violent deletion of dissidents may be impractical, it does take a few generations for complete indoctrination. We have already had a few generations; has it been enough to prevent reversal or rebellion? It seems that those behind this program believe we are beyond awakening but, that may be their big mistake.

To do justice to John Steinbacher's book would need a very long review. That is impractical in present time and space, hence my quoting from the foreword. If you do not think that what is here is enough to awaken your human concerns, then you may need to search second-hand bookshops.

I am still surprised that it was so easy to trick parents into allowing this deformity into the minds of their children. But that most may now refuse to face the horror of what has been done is, well, about par for the course.

Of course it could not have been done without control of the political system and, through that, the education system. That would not itself be possible without historical time and an arrogance with access to virtually unlimited money.

Now useful comments from Alexander Solzhenitsyn (USSR) and William Bowen (USA) followed by quotes from *Dilemma of Democracy*.

Quote: *"To do evil a human must first of all believe that what he's doing is good... Ideology - that is what gives evildoing its long-sought justification and gives the evildoer the necessary steadfastness and determination. That is the social theory which helps to make his acts seem good instead of bad in his own and others' eyes, so that he won't hear reproaches and curses but will receive praise and honours. Solzhenitsyn.*

Bowen. *Globalism America's Demise: 1984*. Quote: *"The Globalists wield almost limitless power because of their wealth and position. They are convinced that what they are doing is for the eventual salvation of mankind and the planet earth. The greatest strength they possess is that the general public ... does not even know they exist."* Globalists are very honest except they do not reveal that the "mankind" they refer to is themselves and the planet earth as their own possession. ("mankind" is a pre human kind of man).

The Ideology they created was to give fools the confidence to sabotage human development and thus make way for Globalist ownership of earth.

Chapter 3:

The Dilemma of Democracy -- by Lord Hailsham

TWO KINDS OF DEMOCRACY: quotes:

"The genesis of this book lay in a desire to rethink my own political philosophy ... I no longer believed that a simple defence of my own party or its philosophy matched the needs of our time.

...

As I wrote, it gradually became clear to me what was in my mind. Our troubles derive from the fact that we are halting between two inconsistent opinions about the nature of democracy, indeed about the nature and function of government, and between the two we are unable to make up our minds. Both opinions claim to be democratic. Both assert they are libertarian. Both claim to rest upon the interest of the people. Yet each is wholly inconsistent with the other. The politics of the next twenty-five years may well depend upon the encounter between the two, and more will depend on the outcome than the future of the British Islands. The two theories are the theory of centralised democracy, known to me as elective dictatorship and the theory of limited government, in my language the doctrine of freedom under law. Between the two theories there can ultimately be no compromise. Both may depend upon universal adult suffrage. But the one will assert the right of a bare majority in a single chamber assembly, possibly elected on a first past the post basis, to assert its will over a whole people whatever that will may be. It will end in a rigid economic plan, and, I believe, in a siege economy, a curbed and subservient judiciary, and a regulated press. It will impose uniformity on the whole nation in the interest of what it claims to be social justice. It will insist on equality. It will distrust all forms of eccentricity and distinction. It will crush local autonomy. It will dictate the structure, form, and content of education. It may tolerate, but will certainly do its best either to corrupt or destroy, [theist] religion. It will depend greatly on caucuses or cadres to exert its will. Some will be directly appointed by patronage as in the increasing number of 'Quangos'. Others will be elected by a tiny minority of dedicated activists and apparatchiks relying on the apathy of the rest as a passport to office. This is already happening in some unions and local authorities. It will worship material values, but not succeed in producing

material plenty. When its policies fail, it will rely strongly on class divisiveness or scapegoats to distract attention from its failures.

[Hailsham did well in sorting out the confusions of his times and today we see that elective dictatorship (or communism) is the democracy being developed.]

Among the white races the present apostles of this type of democracy are mainly of the left. In Eastern Europe and in parts of Africa and Asia they have already succeeded in producing 'people's' democracies. In this country they still represent a small minority, though they include Privy Councillors amongst their number. My criticism of them may be resented ...

To such critics I will reply that their complacency is misplaced. Centralised democracy is not the prerogative of Socialism or of left-wing extremists. The reappearance of Fascism under the banner of the National Front should sound a warning, and, if history is any guide, such movements will not be sent away simply by abuse or attempts at suppression. The best modern exposition of centralised democracy so far may be 'The British Road to Socialism' issued by the Communist Party of Great Britain. But both Hitler and Mussolini and the various Quislings in Europe were apostles of the same creed. So was Sir Oswald Mosley in Britain. All were spawned from the loins of nineteenth century Liberalism, and although the progeny was manifestly illegitimate, it was none the less authentic. All these creeds are the natural offspring of two related humanist philosophies, utilitarianism and legal positivism. The belief of the first is that the common good is the only criterion of political action, and that talk of human rights and natural law or justice to borrow Bentham's luminous phrase is no more than 'nonsense on stilts'. The exponents of centralised democracy on the left should pause to reflect that the mirror image of their political methods and ideals is presented by the National Front, and their main constitutional dogmas are supported ever more explicitly as time goes on by Mr Enoch Powell.

Above all, I find it strange that they do not consider the example of South Africa. Apartheid was illegal under the entrenched clauses of the old South African constitution. One nationalist measure after another depriving the coloured community of its rights was struck down by the Supreme Court. Unhappily, there was one gap. The Senate was first packed and thereafter the Supreme Court was by-passed. The doctrine of centralised power had secured another triumph. If they reflect upon these sinister examples from the right, left-wingers will, I hope, consider my presentation of the alternative as something better than Tory special pleading.

But what is the alternative? I do not present it as a new thing invented by myself, but it may be that it is novel in this context. It is the old doctrine inherent from the very first, that is, from the time of Bracton onwards, in English Law, that those in a position of political authority may not rule absolutely, that, being human, even kings may not place themselves above the law, and may not make laws which affront the instructed conscience of the commonalty. This is the theory of limited government. Hitherto I have called it the doctrine of freedom under law, and, in some ways, and in other contexts, it may be the better name. But it is, I believe, the traditional doctrine of Western Christendom, indeed also of pre-Christian Western philosophers, running like a golden thread through the thinking of European writers from Plato onwards.

It reached its peak I believe, in England in the time of Burke before Bentham's Utilitarianism, the belief in the greatest happiness of the greatest number, married the legal positivism of his friend Austin, whose creed was that the command of the ruler was all that there was to be said to define the no law. From this union sprang all the various political ideologies which have sought to find intellectual justification in the unlimited authority of the state combined with a benevolent intention described as the common good.

The reason for the growth of centralised democracy is largely historical. For at least three centuries the question of politics revolved around the relationship between privileged rulers and the unrepresented ruled. During this period Parliament came to be regarded as the guardian of liberty, and the executive as the representative of lawful authority. But the conflict came to an end with the total victory of Parliament at the time of the Act of Settlement. (Thenceforward Parliament controlled the executive by way of Cabinet government.

But it did not take long for men to notice that the victorious Parliament was itself unrepresentative based as it was on an uneven franchise, unequal constituencies corrupt membership. So began the struggle for a reform of the franchise, attempted during the eighteenth century, interrupted by the French revolutionary wars, achieved to a limited extent by the Reform Bill but pursued thereafter and completed only in my lifetime by the grant of the so-called 'flapper vote' in 1925. If only Parliament could be made to represent the whole adult population, it was argued, abuses would be remedied, injustices expunged, inequalities abolished. So, at each stage, a proposed extension of the franchise moved hand in hand with the demand for progress.

[Only now is it becoming understood that franchise does not and cannot, make democracy when combined with a party political system]

Since 1925 the demand has been to put into practice the benefits already available in theory. The emphasis has been on welfare and social reform, and, despite recession and world war, much has been achieved, so much indeed that it seemed at first that nothing was amiss. But gradually people have come to realise that all is not well. Our society is not stable. Whole geographical units show signs of wishing to opt out. Organised minorities clamour to be heard, and, what they cannot win by the ballot box, seek to extract by violence or by depriving the population of their rightful needs. In a world of universal franchise, loyalty is at a discount. Self-discipline is a dirty word. Law and order have become objects of ridicule. Every restraint must be removed, and the anarchic total described as liberation, permissiveness, or even humanism. Worst of all, society is divided as never before.

It is only now that men and women are beginning to realise that representative institutions are not necessarily guardians of freedom, but can themselves become engines of tyranny. They can be manipulated by minorities, taken over by extremists, motivated by the self-interest of organised millions. We need to be protected from our representatives no less than from our former masters.

...

[The process of refining elected dictatorship has been going on for well over a century. Today we should be aware that no law or constitution can protect us if we elect the representatives of (or chosen by) others. The first step to true democratic freedom is the termination of the party political system.]

The alternative is the theory of limited government, familiar enough when men could recognise the distinction between government and governed because they were in different hands, but long obscured by anonymous majorities and rising standards of life.

The theory of limited government offers precisely what the dominant theory denies. In place of uniformity it offers diversity. In place of equality it offers justice. In place of the common good, it protects the rights of minorities and the individual. As an alternative to regulation it propounds the rule of law. It does not seek to overthrow governments or institutions, or abolish universal franchise or popular rule. But it prescribes limits beyond which governments and Parliaments must not go, and it suggests means by which they can be compelled to observe those limits. In place of concentrating, it diffuses power. It confers rights of self-government on previously ignored

communities. It offers protection against the oppressiveness of unions and corporations.

[Limited government can only come when people accept responsibility for their own governing. No alternative is offered by either intelligence or God]

Above all it corresponds with the general conscience of mankind. While the dominant theory propounds that a bare majority may pass what laws it wills, the doctrine of limited government asserts that individuals and minorities have rights against constituted authority, even when this is elected by universal franchise. Agamemnon was wrong to sacrifice Iphigenia to give a fair wind to the fleet. He would not have done right had he been authorised to do so by popular acclamation, as no doubt he was. Caiaphas spoke falsehood when he asserted it was expedient that one man should die for the people. He would not have spoken truth even had he a unanimous vote of the Sanhedrin, or the full approval of the majority, as perhaps he did when the crowd yelled for the release of the Barabbas and the crucifixion of the innocent Christ.” End Quotes. Emphasis added.

Do these long quotes tell us anything not already learned? We should know this but we are reluctant learners and we need reminders that dangers were seen. Different ways of expression and example help. We have had our chances but lessons have still to be learned.

It seems that most people in the English speaking world still (perhaps vaguely) have the idea that our democracy is that of “*freedom under law*” but I doubt that you will find a reliable authority, over the last half century, saying so. Even less likely will they tell us that they have denied our access to *freedom under law*! Most now think that the despicable communists are ousted and we live in capitalist countries but as we see there is something very wrong with that image.

Chapter 4:

Difficulties and Confusions

“One of the saddest lessons of history is this: If we have been bamboozled long enough we tend to reject any evidence of the bamboozle. We are no longer interested in finding out the truth. The bamboozle has captured us. It’s simply too painful to acknowledge even to ourselves that we have been taken.

Once you give a charlatan power over you, you almost never get it back. So the old bamboozles tend to persist as new ones arise." Carl Sagan.

Yes we have all been fooled! We have all gone along with the mob! We all hate to admit it; but ask yourself, is your family and future important to you? Its not too late. Matthew 20: 12-16, *thus will the last be first and the first last.*

How Pride and Prejudice blind us! Never forget that intelligence does not always mean wisdom! While the very wise need also be very intelligent the very intelligent can also be very unwise. Those not so gifted with intelligence may, within their limits, exhibit more wisdom than those more gifted. Mind-warp of pride and prejudice cause the downfall of many intelligent people.

Day after day, year after year, with monotonous repetition, professors write enlightening articles, mobs rampage, individuals complain. All know the facts, or enough of the facts to be aware of social injustice, but fail to reach crucial conclusions. WHY?

Over time many letters are written to champions of the people with the intent of trying to clarify their reasoning, but experience shows it wasted time. Few admit that the knowledge they display actually challenges the conclusions they reach. They know so much but have little understanding of it.

It is unlikely those people are moles knowingly working for our enemy, they take their stand with genuine concern. They know the situation but refuse to draw the rational conclusions. Ingrained convictions divert the flow of rational thought. Even when brainwashing is explained, as in *Globalism-Brainwash*, or natural loyalty forces are explained as they are in *The Stockholm Syndrome*, few will challenge their attitudes.

Few will admit to having been fooled or wrong or of any need to revise thinking and attitudes that fail the test of needed results. The following points may not appear important if we do not realise that the highlighted beliefs are widely shared among our most intelligent anti-Globalism campaigners. Only when we, at the same time, realise the difficulty of changing widely accepted mind-sets do we see what an effective blindfold ideology is in preventing us from seeing the true situation and its very serious implications.

Albert Einstein: *"the significant problems we face cannot be solved at the same level of thinking we were at when we created them."* We are at a vital crossroads in human development; new attitudes are now needed.

An old article gave me a typical example. A researcher, having uncovered a phenomenon not accepted by contemporary science, presented the evidence to a group of fellow scientists under conditions of their own choice so that they knew that no trickery was involved. All admitted the result proved the point however on the following day all denied it. Once educated to conventional beliefs we may lack the courage or motivation to sacrifice them.

Now examples of three Important Confusions.

As Bernays (*Globalism Brainwash*) showed: the common beliefs held by group leaders key our overall mindset. For truth lovers to advance we must look into the 'can of worms' created by deception and faith in indoctrinated belief. At present we defend with our lives those who manipulate our minds.

Following letters relate to delusions (set into our world-view) that need to be challenged and exposed. We comment on literature in attempt to break mindsets by logical explanation. For those who want to live in the safety of truth these matters are crucial to cultural understanding and survival.

Letter 1/ Your literature shows the strength of your arguments, others argue to the same conclusions even if in a different terms. Excuse me if I misread you but I think its time for straight talking, the problems we have to solve are not going to be solved by bending with the breeze.

You are well aware that the human world is heading for catastrophe but you fail to address the basic problem. You see that globalism is behind the market philosophy but do not admit that Globalist ideology/philosophy is created for a designed social goal. Can we believe that the huge (World Government) enterprise is merely for money or that Globalists are too stupid to understand the consequences of what they do? Can we believe, against all evidence of history that those very powerful care about the majority?

Should we not admit that although motivated by greed they are not stupid? Globalists, as you know, already have unlimited access to money and, although wisdom may not be their strength, they do have access to top brains for planning and social research. They plan thoroughly if not to wise ends.

We fail because we are blinded to the important part philosophy plays in directing our culture and motivation; deceit is basic but well camouflaged.

It is evident that few of us are willing to face challenge to ingrained beliefs. The thought is so traumatic that, to avoid confrontation between truth and pride, we misread or ignore evidence, but culturally alert people can see that it

is ‘the philosophy/ideology of an intelligent culture that shapes the culture’. Our philosophy of life creates our way of life just as surely as the kind of germ we catch decides the kind of illness we develop.

So all mob protests, all reasoning complaints and academic articles, backed by all the activists with all their good-will for creating a better culture, will continue to fail while the culture is governed by a belief system which, under the microscope of intelligence, tells us that life is without meaning or purpose. There is an unbreakable link between deception and injustice.

When we believe that life is a meaningless act of fate – that there is no truth, no right or wrong, no good or evil – then intelligent culture is set on the path to self-destruction. Removed from the rational intellectual base, thinking becomes erratic, confused and self-contradicting. Those misled by do-good attitudes can present no true intellectual argument to stem the tide of violence and frustration that results from the despair caused by intellectual confusion .

Philosophy based belief (even though that belief be false) directs culture. Emotion based morality (even though it may be honest) does not direct culture. Today we live in a culture governed by a philosophy of law and lies, and, to disguise its true nature, this philosophy is coupled with emotion-based ‘feel-good’ morality. Most people accept the feel-good morality because they then do not have to face the trauma of a plainly self-contradictory philosophy. This is possible because we are brainwashed to defend our indoctrination.

In this event the young, as is their nature, seek a life that is meaningful within the indoctrinated philosophy. However without truth the only meaning life then has is based on selfishness, personal pleasure and excitement, these they accept as their moral right because their morality is defended by emotion.

Three elements of indoctrination are involved: the first is to sedate sensibility and install conviction to philosophy/ideology/religion based on a false creation belief. The second adds a feel-good morality based on emotion. The third promotes an ego defence for pride and prejudice to deter victims (us) from making intelligent assessments that show our philosophy and our morality are incompatible.

So there it is; you know the kind of world we live in, you know where it is heading. Will you take up the challenge of Christian philosophy and help reveal the truth of life and a morality based on truth. Truth is the only force able to power rational reform.

Letter 2/ First let me congratulate you, so much good material. However I write in challenge to your correspondent.

This great writer offers good sense, good expression and a strong grip of the true nature of world government. However there is a blind spot and while it involves a small part of this writing, it undermines its value as enlightening, and exposing, literature. Example: quote: *“Humanity is being driven by fanatic fundamentalists to create money for those who already have it without limit – no obstruction is permitted.”*

All who study the problem, including, as we see, your correspondent, know that Globalism can ‘acquire’ whatever money it wants, it owns the banking system. So why plan and scheme and go through the trauma of enslaving the world for meaningless gain? How can we imagine that those who own and control the worldwide financial system, and can make billions just by saying; “the banks are going to sell gold”. Or by spreading rumours and dumping stock to create a market crash, buying back at a lower level and selling again on the rebound of confidence; how can these dedicate their lives to money?

How can we not see, if only from the horrendous nature of their planning that they are not so stupid? How can we fail to see that, in their situation, there is no point to living for money? Would intelligent people devote life and family future to worthless ledger entries?

Let us put ourselves in their place for a minute. We get lucky and work without scruples to get rich. What more can we want? Being greedy we at first want more and more money, but, after a generation or two we control the world of finance. Money has lost its glamour; but we now see that money gave us POWER. We love power! We can dictate to governments, we can choose who can be elected. By gifts to universities we can have them favour what we want taught. Control of news and government means we can send nations to war so – oh where can we go from here?

The world WE control is over-crowded and polluted. Valuable resources, OUR resources, are wasted. It’s OUR world and we want it for OUR families. We spend a lot of (other-peoples) time and money on pushing conservation but that does not solve our problem because we cannot get the freedom we need to enjoy our world so long as present population levels must be managed. We want a world for ourselves not for the enslaved.

But your correspondent says: *“they kill and terrorise innocent people for oil monopoly and profit ... “*

Back to being ourselves now. Can we imagine a group, even of mafia morality, who have access to infinite supplies of money wanting to sell a resource, valuable to the future of their families, for worthless figures in a bank ledger? Well, when someone tells me an incredible story, I say, “Well I can ALMOST believe that! But I cannot say, even jokingly that I can almost believe that people, who work with such dedication and skill for generations, do it just for gain they know is worthless. If I am wrong please enlighten me.

If we are to survive this undermining of human culture we just have to stop believing in the myths international ‘public relations’ and secret services spread. We need to see that this is war for life, not money. So long as we believe Globalism is only about profits we keep running in circles: we believe they need us for their profit. We must face that we are no longer their profit, we are now their liability.

Notes: 1/ Humanist philosophy/ideology/religion is taught, and incessantly reinforced throughout our lives by every form of mass media; generations now accept authoritarian Humanist ideas as our true nature.

The logic of this ideology is totally dependent on the theory of “*creation by chance evolution and natural selection*”. But this theory was never more than a theory and never has had a scientific base or sound logic to back its claims; it is believed because of massive, mass media promotion and teaching at all education levels as beyond question. (See *Of TRUTH*)

To ensure later generations did not challenge humanist philosophy a massive, scientifically designed program of mind manipulation, and sensitivity training, was forced on children through world wide education systems.

Humanism has nothing to do with human or humane! Humanism was named to supply a morality to replace the natural moral nature of human; a substitute destructive of human nature. Humanism is a carefully crafted deceit!

Leaders of Christian denominations, having undergone sensitivity training, are now more humanist than Christian. They fail to promote improved understanding of scriptures but support humanist attitudes. By aborting natural human development, humanism now evades intellectual challenge.

As Hailsham forecast, the centralised democracy would undermine and try to humanise theist religion. Present leaders of Christian denominations have too little faith in Christianity to see that true Christianity has no choice other than to actively expose the fraudulent humanist philosophy and the destruction it

plans. Jesus said, “He who is not with me is against me.” Meaning that those who do not teach truth teach lies! Whether they do this by design or by default does not change the result.

Note 2/ The lie that Globalism works only for money and control of resources is promoted to defend Globalism. That so many of those who promote this belief know well that Globalism owns and controls the commercial banking system, demonstrates our difficulty when taught convictions come face to face with facts. It is urgent that we realise that only the truth can save us.

Our ‘prisons of mind’ melt when we see our *Humanist Emperor really has no clothes at all.*

"If you make peaceful change impossible ... you make violent revolution inevitable." – President John F Kennedy.

Chapter 5:

We CAN Create a True Democratic Republic

*Why do leaders, who claim to be truly concerned
for public rights and welfare,
not reveal our rights and our way to true democracy?
If they hide that, what else do they hide?
And WHY? And to what lengths will they go?
There are so many questions
kept unpublished and unanswered!*

Third in this group of public misconceptions is that related to the true nature of democracy. Democracy cannot be achieved until those who want justice and open government are prepared to be responsible for those they elect.

We have just discussed two important misunderstandings blinding us to the truth. Our third popular mind-warp deceit is vital. We need to equally understand the basic lie of manipulative philosophy; the plan behind its promotion and how we may escape the mess we are in.

To Create a True Democratic Republic!

The Australian Constitution says something important about democratic elections. It says (in regard to both Senate and House of Representatives) that

representatives shall be “directly chosen” – a clear, meaningful instruction stating the essential for both democracy and republic.

Is this “directly chosen” instruction unique to the Australian Constitution? Should it be that this is the only Constitution to specifically state the democratic essential, then Australians have a unique responsibility. Sadly, Australians are as brainwashed, misled and stubborn as the rest of the world.

On the other hand, any nation claiming to be a democracy or a republic, (both represent “government of the people by the people and for the people”) will also claim for its people an innate right of political choice. Any such government would, I think, find the going very hard if it tried to deny its electorates this right. To deny this right it would likely need martial law and an army willing, to kill its own citizens.

Even that is becoming less rare. Churchill comments to this effect: *If we will not fight when all the odds are with us and winning is easy then we may have to fight when our chances are slim and victory improbable.* In other words we may have to fight, not for victory but, once again, to defend our humanity.

It should be abundantly evident to politically alert people that it is not possible to have a “government of the people, by the people and for the people” if the people only choose from among the self-opinionated, arrogant and power seeking who push themselves forward. Equally we cannot have democracy if the people elect candidates put forward by special interest groups; both end as elective dictatorship.

If we elect the alien chosen then these are going to represent aliens no matter what they promise. We can threaten to vote these out if they serve badly but, they know that if they ignore those who chose them, then they will not be part of the next election. They will get no endorsement or support and, being the kind to be chosen as servants, will have neither the ability nor courage to stand alone.

So we cannot have a “government of, by and for the people” until we are responsible enough, mature enough and wise enough to know that freedom requires we, the people, accept our responsibility to “directly choose” candidates to represent our interests. We simply cannot elect candidates chosen to represent other interests. The one choosing the representative is the one represented. Only *direct electorate choice of candidates* can create a people’s government and true democratic republic.

Why do so many have such difficulty in understanding the imperative of public electorate pre-selection? This will become a life or death matter for millions, so why not do it while we can still do it easily?

As for Australian friends, they have to face that they vote for oppression and act in contempt of their National Constitution whenever they vote for either self-chosen ‘independents’ or party-chosen candidates. Party government may have made this legal but party government is itself unconstitutional.

Throughout the ages intelligent, observant people have warned of the dangers of the party-political system. We have had opportunity to observe its lies and treachery in our own lifetimes. Democracy requires we “directly choose” representatives of known ability, honesty and intelligence. People seeking power and aggrandisement are not the people we want running our lives.

In “*Plato: The Laws*” we note items that could have been written today rather than near 2,500 years ago. Quote: *When offices are filled competitively, the winners take over the affairs of state so completely that they totally deny the losers ... Each side passes its time in narrow scrutiny of the other ... Of course, our position is that this kind of government is very far from being a genuine political system; we maintain that laws which are not established for the good of the whole state are bogus laws, and when they favour particular sections of the community, their authors are not citizens but party men; and people who say that these laws have a claim to be obeyed are wasting their breath.* E Q.

Just one sample from many to show that, for over 2000 years, the party system has been known to be no more than a vehicle for elective dictatorship.

Parties combine the small-minded greed of the stooge with the stand-over power of the gang. Australian law says (as it should) that it is illegal to pressure members of parliament in their duties (Crimes Act: part II, 28)! Parties cannot exist without member pressure and can be neither legal nor democratic!

So how long will it be before we become mature enough to accept the simple democratic essentials? Are we so childish that we cannot imagine governing ourselves? In a democratic republic each electorate has to form a local “commission” or committee to facilitate the public choice of a candidate of known honesty and ability to represent the public interest.

Your electorate chosen candidate is neither an independent nor a servant. Those we “directly choose” have no divided loyalties! They know they are electorate nominated! When elected they will, as democracy requires, communicate with their electorate. Campaigns of bribe and lies will end. Who will vote for aliens in preference to their own?

Present representatives are not intellectually brilliant, they fill seats and obey orders. We can choose better. Elective dictatorship begins as a ‘mob rule’ party system misrepresenting itself as democracy or republic. We can only have a democratic republic after the party mob is eliminated.

Our chosen representatives will know that the combined electorates represent their own nation: they, as a parliament, have a united public purpose. Though basic operation of parliament appears similar, half will not be working to frustrate the other half. More than half will be encouraging the executive to its best effort or replacement. Our MPs will be of better quality and have a clear mandate. Any pressure to serve individual, sectional or alien interests will not be tolerated in a parliament of community chosen representatives.

Surely: After so many elections of undemocratic parties to serve fake democracies; after all attempts by caring people throughout the ages to warn of party dangers; after all experience of party stupidity and treachery in our own time; we must, by now, surely be ready to face our responsibilities.

How can we fail to see that ‘big brother’ does not work to serve us? If we want government of, by and for the people, then how can we not see we must accept our responsibility to choose our representatives? As it is truly said: “Those who cannot learn from history are doomed to forever repeat it.”

Action: We know why the world is in turmoil and we know what can, and must, be done; but we should also know that no democratic republic is possible while citizens know nothing of true democracy.

Will the blind abandon blind leaders! Not while they do not know where they are being lead! If groups campaigning for a better world were to do no more than explain true democratic process, can you imagine that people would not make the effort to organise a small staff to facilitate the choosing of their community candidate? Can you believe that they would not vote for their own chosen candidate in preference to aliens?

The barrier against a true democratic republic is a barrier in mind! It is a barrier created by ideology/philosophy. Time is short! The Internet fragile!

This file can be easily converted into attractive booklets by a good photocopy service to the benefit of many. Is there a community notice board – in your public library perhaps? Can you pin up a small notice such as:

www.themindweb.com

The www site for those who care enough to work for social justice, and learn to regain true democratic republic and the human future.

No community action can be successful if community does not understand its duties, its rights and its means of achievement. If people are never told then people will never know!

Note: If you want an important person to visit you should clean your home and make it comfortable for your expected guest. If you say to yourself, “This great person helps those sick or in bad situations, I pray for his visit so that he can clean up the mess I have made,” you will be disappointed. Matthew 4:5-7 The devil: “*..throw yourself down; for scripture says, ‘He will put his angels in charge of you, and they will support you in their arms, for fear you should strike your foot against a stone.’*” Jesus: “*Scripture says again, ‘You are not to put the Lord your God to the test.’*”

We have intelligence to behave intelligently, if we do not use it then the consequences are our own. Why do so many follow the Devil’s tempting? Why do so many think that they can leave it to God to clean up their mess? We may be adolescent; we should not be childish. So many act as though political life is separate from Christian duty. Did not God, many years ago, accept our petition for an earthly king but warn us of the consequences?

Chapter 6:

The war: all against all

*When war is called peace
Hate will be called love
War then will be called terrorism
And truth become crime*

George Orwell warned us! Perceptive readers become increasingly alarmed at talk of war, 'pre-emptive' strikes and threats between 'leaders'. War has changed its nature and today we must realise that true national governments are long past: powerful nations are servants of global, not national, interests. War is now undeclared and ungoverned! War is not 'politically correct'! To the humanist going to war is unthinkable: fighting is to maintain the peace.

Terrorism is brought about by the greed of some who, wanting to own the world for their families, see a need to eliminate pollution and dangers (to them) of excess population. How this is achieved will be visible only in events but AIDS increases its victories by the year and terrorism will help.

The following may well be found disturbing! However, if we do not know of a danger, then we cannot defend against it. Following ideas are not of my creation nor secrets newly discovered, we deal with matters of established knowledge. Many know but do not understand what they know! Many are aware of danger but few give in-depth consideration of the consequences or simply misread the signs. The reason for lack of public concern may be no more than that such matters get no headlines.

We are sedated to believe that things of great national or human importance will be massively publicised by news media. If they appear only occasionally in short 'middle pages' items then we ignore them. Be warned! Dr. Brock Chisholm, in his book, "*Can Society Keep Pace With Science*" lifted a veil back in 1946. He was in a position to see developments that are only now coming to public notice; quote: "*Any country reasonably free to visitors can be neutralised as an effective fighting force within a few weeks. If any government becomes convinced that it will have to fight any other country at any time it would be very foolish indeed not to neutralise that other country at once. Any realistic government can be counted on to take that action. A thousand or so of visitors could spread bacteria or toxins to paralyse any country's power of aggression.*" End quote.

Are new diseases and new strains of old diseases natural developments or related to experiments to develop weapons that could be more dangerous than nuclear weapons? i.e. AIDS has killed far more people than atomic weapons.

Will governments keep to international agreements? As Dr. Chisholm presents it, any nation that is seen as a 'possible' threat must be treated as deadly and 'neutralised'. A nation that attacks secretly, may be, in this view, justified – provided it is your nation.

Although an attack may not expose the attacker, the world will still make its own judgements. Unfortunately we cannot defend ourselves against paranoid or aggressive leaders unless we exercise our right of true self-government, and that, so far, we have failed to do.

Now it is easy for the 'toads' in their ideological 'toad halls' to agree with the nice Doctor: if you see someone is planning to attack you, then it makes sense to hit first. However he does not actually say that. What he said was that "*If any government becomes **convinced** that it will have to fight any other country at **any time***". Where does it end – or, more to the point, begin? When national government are the stooges of Global government from where do our convictions originate?

OUR NEW WORLD ORDER

Is there any nation today that might not be 'convinced' *that it will have to fight another*, or others? In recent news we have seen the pre-emptive strike scenario advocated and proclaimed; this is no longer war. Do we realise that this means that leaders, having access to weapons overwhelming in mass destruction, can claim existence of threat as excuse to destroy (in modern terms defenceless) nations? Or; alternatively, hold a nation in poverty for exploitation so long as that nation can be restrained in 'hit-back' ability?

Is the only answer left that the most powerful must eliminate all opponents? Well that is the natural law according to humanists/evolutionists. To plan to terminate an opposing leader is unusual: national leaders are usually clever enough realise their own vulnerability and follow a self-interest agreement to not attack each other. Before making public such plans it would seem wise to be sure the victim lacks power to strike first.

While the new moral attitude may appear reasonable to those confident of being with the strength, the possibilities for terrorism today are so vast that even those involved may not think of all options. Have civilians ever been more vulnerable or more "in the front line"? For this reason I offer no list,

but the balance between nations may not be so one-sided as may seem – despair can produce unexpected results. The real potential of both terrorism of despair and terrorism of power is yet to be revealed.

The *New World Order* seldom makes news unless Globalists mention it, but, 55 years after the Chisholm statement we have an even newer world-order and today many nations are able to produce toxins and deadly bacteria. At the same time, in a ‘modern’ fragile culture, great damage and loss of life can be achieved with simple tools.

With weapons easier produced than nuclear, an attack may be without warning or identification of the attacker. Genocide by one can be blamed on another. This was the danger Chisholm foresaw but his defence strategy would, to be effective, have had to be carried out before smaller nations were alert to ‘alternative weapons’ potential and also before they became alert to their desperate need. Would not the cheapest and most humane defence against terrorism be to eliminate injustice and despair?

Today, many small nations will be fearful for their future and seeking weapons for defence – or revenge. So I ask you: “What government, or group, if it can develop an effective genetic or biological weapon, may not strike once the seed of fear is planted”?

Who dares wait to see who will be hit next? Who will not want to place his weapons where a first strike will not harm them – in the enemy heartland! The world may fear to admit that the first, first-strike event is really a first-strike event and may not be willing to openly admit it even of the second, but many now know the fire has been lit.

Who may feel forced to ever more desperate action? When national death seems imminent then national suicide, if mutually destructive, may seem a better, if futile, option. Do you think that, with so many so desperately seeking, a disease, deadly and highly infectious, is not a possibility? Could it be hidden in your city as an option for revenge by some targeted nation?

Do Globalists plan genocide using the excuse of national interest? There will be many people of the same race, nationality and religion with the moral fortitude to rebel against Globalist serving ‘leaders’ who would practice mass murder. Will it be father V son: sister V brother? Will the last survivor turn out the lights or – are the lights already going out?

WHAT can we DO?

We are educated to believe we are just behaviour programmed animals and that there is no Creator, no truth, no right or wrong; all is just a meaningless struggle for survival; the future is for the strong – most ruthless. It appears that religious leaders now secretly believe this and ignore their intellectual capacity. They proclaim caring but don't care enough to seek truth; to them religion is just a 'cushy' job. World leaders, unchallenged, say good is evil and evil good: their god is power and they work for global meltdown.

The earth trembles! The smell of fear rises! Pre-emptive strike is policy! A philosophy of war by mutual terror openly stated. Even so, there is still a way to escape disaster. We must reveal the evidence that we are not mere biological animals unable to distinguish between good and evil. We must explain, and expose to the world in a "realistic" way, (no religious ideology) that there is a Creator beyond all man-made religions and that an incredible future is open to our choice!

We must choose our own representatives and elect them to parliaments. If we do these things then neighbours, knowing our citizens control their own government and have reason for sincerity, will agree to destroy and never use terrorist weapons or tactics – yes, they will agree, they too want to live.

We have the way! Do we have the will? If we are to survive we have to use the two-edged sword of truth, it cuts both ways. If we do not use truth in human service then we will find ourselves cut down by inhumanity.

Oh yes! Some may be asking "Who is this Brock Chisholm M.D."? Well he was the first director of the World Health Organisation and lauded by the Humanist Association as Humanist of the year. He represents, very well, the amoral attitude of humanism and those 'New World Order' directors his words were meant to enlighten. And others perhaps – to frighten.

No nation controlled by its people would have the need or the authority, the power or the audacity, to want to dictate to the world. Only in a world driven by the lust of elitist controlled governments do leaders have the arrogance and the ignorance to dare advocate and promote injustice as moral philosophy.

Yes it is a frightening picture but however bad problems may become no problem is as dangerous as the one which causes the problem. Our future is our choice! We can take responsibility for our lives or be used.

Chapter 7:

A tale of Two Cities:

A different view of the world financial system.

*When knowledge is power and ignorance deadly
we must ask ourselves:
Why are the rich getting richer
and the poor poorer?
Is there a plot to drastically reduce world populations
and to conserve resources to an elitist benefit?
Our Future is our business!*

Let's use the Stock Market as an example. The market is behaving erratically in our new century and the pundits are saying things like, "If you haven't sold don't worry too much so long as you are in for the long haul. Good stocks will always come good, there has never been a ten year period when prices have not advanced; now is the time to look for good buying opportunities."

Parrots sitting in a 1,000 year old tree might give each other similar advice. But, when rot is in the heartwood and the most severe storm in memory is brewing; or when the axe-man stands at the base and says, "I can get a few homes out of this one" then all past history of the tree becomes irrelevant.

Stock-market waves come and go irrespective of the tide coming in or going out but the usurious commercial system is rotten to the core and it seems likely that there is an axe-man standing by saying the tree of usurious commerce stands in the path of human progress. Intelligence must tell us that this tree is going to fall. It is a big tree, it may take some time to hit the ground, but its days are numbered and it will fall hard. This is not a time for nesting in the branches.

We are advised to take note of both old and the new knowledge. Old knowledge shows us that things not only follow patterns of change but that patterns also end. We need old history to know ourselves and we need new history to see that advancing achievement requires the courage for changing our lives and attitudes. A problem of community is that we get stuck in a groove of pride and prejudice and become afraid to admit of need to change. To save facing this leap of faith we sell our souls to political mercenaries.

Globalists are the families owning the world financial system; they plan a *New World Order*. The financial power of this group is based on a system of

corruption that is, in the Christian Bible, called usury. Usury is most commonly understood in relation to money but money represents labour; usury can be as simple as one person taking unfair advantage of another.

How does the usurious financial system operate? It operates similar to a gambling casino. A Gambling Casino is set up to take advantage of gamblers. A properly run casino does not itself gamble it makes its profit from the gambling of others by taking a percentage of the money gambled – each time it is gambled. The world financial ‘city’ is a system set up to take advantage of players in the game of life. Neither the ‘city’ nor the ‘Casino’ create value. each steals the production of others by legalised immoral services.

Example: Suppose a thousand gamblers with a \$million dollars each are locked in a Casino to gamble until one has all the money. In time half will have lost their money and been tossed out. Do you think that at this time the half remaining have an average of two \$million each? Of course not, the Casino, taking its percentage on each play will already have millions in profit.

The Casino owners observe the scene and think the game might possibly be over too soon, so they take some unlucky gamblers aside and offer loans, say at x%: losing gamblers jump at the chance? The game is now very pleasing to the casino owners! The owners are not actually risking any money; loans may appear as if from profits but, as we will see, they risk nothing.

So the game goes on, some losers are removed, others are loaned more money to keep them in the game; eventually only one is left. This ‘lucky’ player has several million dollars in chips, but wait, he owes most of it to the Casino plus x%. Even the winner could leave in debt.

Can things be arranged so cleverly that all loans will be repaid in full? No, but that doesn’t matter. Some gamblers may have been thrown out owing big debts to the casino. Who cares! The casino finishes with all, or almost all, the money brought into the game! Those ejected with debt leave with only debt; if the casino can squeeze repayment out of these it is not to recover losses, it is added profit. All that was given was gambling credit! The suckers were used to keep the game alive while the casino collected the real money. The casino gained all, or most, of 1,000 \$million dollars from the world and for that produced, in return, only misery. That’s usury!

So there it is: the tale of two cities: the city of finance and the city of the gambling Casino. Like our imaginary Casino, Globalists now possess most of what is of value in our world; they sell us credit to manipulate the game. Do

they still need us? The time when our wealthy nations become poor nations may be closer than we think. What nation is not in debt? What nation has escaped the mind manipulators?

It is now almost one hundred years since the international bankers showed their claws to bring Australian and the US governments into line. That story is in *Globalism Brainwash* under the heading “*Who Really Governs?*” It is not a pretty story and demonstrates the ruthless power of wealth/arrogance along with the pathetic weakness, or treacherous service, of party politics.

Do not imagine that those owning the world financial system do not have the money/power to wreck the world economy by causing the collapse of the Stock Market system and, if needed, any independent banks. They have done it before. Do not imagine it will hurt them. Only they know when! Some very rich people will go down but these are just pawns in the game. After the collapse Globalists plan to own the globe – will we give it to them?

We can't just sit back and leave it to God to fix. We turned a blind eye to truth and justice but still have the strength and ability to clean up our mess. Jesus said, “If you find something of great value in a field you should sell everything you have to buy that field”.

We do not have to live by imposed values or gamble life away in the Globalist casino! Freedom is our birthright to claim! We can govern ourselves in Truth! The fears and torments in our minds: we can overcome them. Truth is the thing of overwhelming value in our field of life! Globalists cannot own it! Let them and their ‘Great Whore’ meet justice! Life cannot progress in partnership with its own corruption! Life with truth will win this war!

Note: Some may think the casino simile simplistic! However, if you see comment in the financial press about huge debts to the world banking system: billions owed by 'third-world' countries, etc., you will now see more clearly.

If you see suggestions of a world-banking collapse you may feel less sorry for the Globalists who own the "world financial" casino. You may see these huge loans are not made because the bankers are too stupid to realise that they will never be repaid but because they need to keep players in the game until they, the Globalists, achieve their ends. They will lose nothing by closing the casino in exchange for owning the world.

Read Revelation 17: 1-18. You may also find it enlightening to read 18: 1-24 to see that the “*Great Whore*” is intimately tied to trade and commerce. The Great Whore does represent the usurious financial system: the ‘city’ of finance; she dates from Babylon; the ocean below her is the ocean of peoples. The seven hills are therefore seven nations of leading influence ruled by seven kings/leaders. Don’t be put off by 2000 year old language.

Chapter 8:

What have we come to?

"Beware the leader who bangs the drums of war in order to whip the citizenry into a patriotic fervour, for patriotism is indeed a double-edged sword. It both emboldens the blood, just as it narrows the mind. And when the drums of war have reached a fever pitch and the blood boils with hate and the mind has closed, the leader will have no need in seizing the rights of the citizenry. Rather the citizenry, infused with fear and blinded by patriotism, will offer up all of their rights unto the leader and gladly so. How do I know? For this is what I have done. And I am Caesar". Julius Caesar

Though the above quote is interesting it says nothing that today’s student of human behaviour should not know. What bothers is: “Why is this only known to those few who study behaviour as a specialised interest?”

Would it not be reasonable to think that in a modern civilisation all citizens should be enlightened to the potential and dangers of public manipulation? Is enslavement to despotism less important than rock music, sporting events or junk food? Have we made no human advance since Julius Caesar? Why are we so blind to this deceit?

Recent news tells of a thief awarded \$50,000 because the Judge said the force used to subdue him (bruises and a cracked skull) was excessive. If, had he been asked nicely to leave and then seized an advantage to kill in return for this kindness, he would not have earned \$50,000. Is this a brilliant crime prevention program?

Early 1980s, I moved into a high rise home unit. Thinking to install a deadlock I asked a policeman about security. “*You can’t do that*,” he said. “*Suppose a burglar climbs in over the balcony, collects his loot, sets a fire to cover his tracks, finds he can’t leave by the front door and dies in the fire.*”

You would be held responsible". Anti-discrimination and human rights are now taught as basic Ideology/Philosophy but – who is being fooled?

Example: a USA 1980s item.

Below extracts are from a long letter by book author Chip Elliott, written in response to an *Esquire Magazine* article entitled "Fifty Million Handguns". His letter so impressed the editors they published it in the September 1981 issue as the cover story. Elliott's comments have wider relevance today. Quotes (shortened for space saving):

The streets of America...are as dangerous as the roads and alleys of an earlier century. ... I went to carrying a 9mm Smith & Wesson automatic in ten weeks. My wife is a psychiatrist. Very attractive, very easy to intimidate, very abstracted, a likely target for muggers both outside, because she's lost in her thoughts, and at home, because punks think doctors keep drugs in their houses (they don't). She has a gun, too, a .38, and she knows how to use it. We are not hillbillies: we are people who went to Radcliffe and Stanford, respectively. Appalling, huh? It used to appall us too, until we were forced to realize that our lives ... were worth protecting. ...

[1978]

... we moved to Los Angeles. ... all was not as it seemed in Venice. For starters, we had moved to the intersection of turfs of two rival Mexican gangs. We got along with them. When they shot at each other—as they did less than a week after we had moved in—they shouted to us in Spanish to get out of the way. We did. There were other clues. Walking, I would occasionally see brown spots on the sidewalk that, from my experience as a police reporter, I could recognize as bloodstains. I would notice this the way you might notice a scruff of feathers where something has gotten a small bird: a tiny memorial to violence.

One morning ... I watched a gang ... pour gasoline all over a parked car and set it on fire. ... Broad daylight. A few days later, I heard of a robbery two blocks from where we lived: A woman came to the door of a house and asked to use the telephone, said it was an emergency. When the man opened the door, her henchmen came in right behind her. The three of them stabbed the man to death and left his wife barely alive. In the next block a woman was raped twice after her nose and jaw were broken.

*Just to be on the safe side ... bought a .38 snub-nosed revolver. After all, this was Los Angeles. But a gun! Who had ever owned a gun? It cost \$160. ... I would rather have bought a painting. ... we went to the Fox Venice to see *Forbidden Planet* ... When we returned, the door had been broken in. The*

stereo was gone, the television was gone, the paintings and cameras and typewriters were gone. The dressers had been turned over and ransacked, the bed had been torn up and the revolver taken; the birdcage had been torn off the wall and the parakeet set free for a while until the cat got it and ate it, leaving the remains on the floor where a rug had been. ...

Our friends were robbed, burglarized. Carolyn, of her sewing machine, her typewriter, her clothes. Another couple, of all their photographic equipment, used not for a hobby but for their livelihood. Easygoing Boris bought a twelve-gauge riot gun and hid it in a trunk with his sixteen-millimetre movie equipment so no one would steal it. And a huge black shepherd dog to protect the trunk. Someone broke in anyway and slit the dog's throat.

We bought a new revolver ... had the handgrips filed down so my wife could hold it easily. ... my wife's work for Los Angeles County was more like a Clint Eastwood movie than a medical practice. One of her street patients quickly fastened on her and began writing her death threats with sexual overtones. There was no place to put him away because there was no money for any serious treatment, and there were no available psychiatric beds in any of the local hospitals. She began carrying the .38 in her briefcase along with her patient caseload progress notes. ... when she came home at night she would park her car and blow the horn; I would go outside and escort her into the house. It dawned on me for the first time that we might be killed. That it was possible we would die here.

I bought a second handgun, ... discovered where to go to practice with it. And I practiced. ... One night I was awakened by a noise outside on the street. I got up, peeped through the dining room curtains and saw a gang of teenagers taking the fog lights off my car. I raised the curtains and knocked on the window. The sight of a thirty-three year-old naked guy is not going to frighten very many people anymore, but ... an automatic ... They fled.

... We cut a safe into the floor of our dining room and hid our remaining valuables in it. It was never discovered, even though they took the Oriental rug that covered it.

We went to a wedding in San Francisco on a Friday night. The week before, I had prepped the house as you might prepare for medieval warfare: two-by-six boards bolted into doorframes with lag bolts six inches long and a socket wrench. That sort of thing. Anything we had left that was slightly portable ... I put into storage.

When we returned from the wedding there was no back door and no doorframe, only an enormous hole with smashed edges leading into a set of empty rooms. We were left with a bed, some pots and pans, and a bookcase. ... On the seventeenth of December in 1978, I saw a woman mugged for her purse—and I watched her run screaming after her assailant until she collapsed, crying in the street.

On the eighteenth or nineteenth of December, my wife was at a meeting, ... I walked alone to the Venice Sidewalk Cafe for some dinner. It occurred to me that it was silly to put on a shoulder holster just to go out for a beer and a sandwich, but I did it anyway, ...

Walking home about six-thirty at night, just off the corner of West Washington Boulevard and Westminster Avenue, I was confronted by five young, well-dressed uptown brothers. Black. Okay. ... They could just as easily have been white. We were directly under a streetlight and less than fifty feet from an intersection thick with traffic.

I was not dressed as a high roller. ... I look like exactly what I am, a middle-aged guy who's seen a little more than he needs to see. I thought, what are these guys doing? Their leader pulled a kitchen knife out of his two-hundred-dollar leather jacket. His mistake was that he wasn't close enough to me to use it, only to threaten me. He smiled at me and said, "Just the wallet, man. Won't be no trouble."

That was a very long moment for me. I remember it just as it happened. I remember thinking at the time that it was one of those moments that are supposed to be charged with electricity. It wasn't. It was hollow, silent, and chilly.

I looked at this guy and at his companions and at his knife, and I thought: Don't you see how you're misreading me? I am not a victim. I used to be a victim, but now I'm not. Can't you see the difference?

I pulled the automatic, levelled it at them and said very clearly, "You must be dreaming." The guy smiled at me and said, "Sheeit," and his buddies laughed, and he began to move toward me with the knife. I thought, this guy is willing to kill me for thirty-five dollars. I aimed the automatic at the outer edge of his left thigh and shot him.

He dropped like a high jumper hitting the bar and yelled "Goddamn!" three times, the first one from amazement, I guess, and the second two higher

pitched and from pain. He yelled at his buddies, "Ain't you gonna do nothing?" They did do nothing.

I backed off and walked away, right across busy West Washington Boulevard, with the gun still in my hand. I remember thinking, shouldn't I call a doctor? And then I thought, would he have called a doctor for me? And I kept right on walking.

I was not coming on like James Bond, ... I was simply protecting my right to walk around town with a lousy thirty-five dollars in my pocket and not be afraid for my life. ... I felt terribly strange, ... I realized that what I was doing—in our current state of affairs—was a cultural procedure no different from going to the grocery or getting a haircut or buying a shirt. And that I had balked over it and felt strange because it was a new procedure, something I was doing for the first time, ...and that if I wanted to stay alive, it was possible I would have to get used to it.

I am not proud of this. I did not swallow it easily. More than a year passed before I talked about it with anybody, not even my wife. But I did it. And I could do it again if I had to.

What happened to us, ... My world changed sometime between 1975 and 1980, ... We were lucky. We lost more than eleven thousand dollars of what we owned, but we weren't killed. We adapted. Now the guns are a normal part of our lives. ...

Sometimes I think, this is a stupid, abhorrent, exasperating situation. And it is. But we've adapted to other stupid, abhorrent, exasperating situations: ... We accept it as a fact of life and go right on. And it will stay a fact of life until our fellow countrymen get it out of their heads that they can do as they please, that there is no such thing as social responsibility, that they have a right not to behave. Because the way we see it, if they have the right to mug us, we have the right to shoot them.

I used to believe that these people had some justifications on their side. I used to feel that I ought to have some compassion for them, and I did. I used to believe that a job and some credit would put them on the right path. It isn't true. I also used to believe that much of the human wreckage—the millions upon millions of people with emotional damage—could be repaired. That isn't true either. They can't be, for the most part, because the effort necessary to straighten out a single one of them is enormous: four or five years perhaps

of therapy, in an age when there is no time for anything but emergency medicine.

Let's face it. ... not all of them are poor, not by a long shot. A lot of them make as much money, or a great deal more, than you or I do. They do it because it's easy. They do it because they believe no one will stop them. And they're right. End quote.

Now what was that you were saying about terrorism?

The above is just a small sample of everyday events. To 2004; Street crime has killed and maimed more people than political terrorism! What are leaders doing? Can they be ignorant of the mind virus they help promote – the cause of social disintegration and the fight-back of the desperate? Does no one think about the implications of what they know?

But do not put all the blame on politicians, they are only guilty of accepting their school taught ideology and a simple minded belief that if they remove guns from the law abiding then people will not feel betrayed and criminals will not commit crime or kill indiscriminately. Or, if they do, then they can be called terrorists and a whole new world of public restrictions opens up for humanist do-gooders’.

“Mind manipulation by People Shapers” is a true weapon of mass destruction infinitely more terrifying than anything now called terrorist. Fake ‘human rights’ and ‘anti-discrimination’ disguise the consequences of this manipulation! It is government backed, though it is, from a human viewpoint, both idiotic and horrific. Law helps blind us to manipulation! In the time since our massive indoctrination to humanist philosophy we have become pretenders to compassion and realists to accepting ever-growing crime, cruelty and contempt for human values – and, yes, we still claim to be civilised.

Had Chip known and expressed the cause of the problem in his letter would things now be different? No, his letter would have not been published.

Chapter 9:

The Humanist Consequence

*Can behavioural experts not know
that the Ideology they promote
is the cause
of the horrific cultural trends of our times?
Can professionals make so many 'honest' mistakes
so disastrous and intellectually stupid?
Our problems do have known cause!*

Why do national leaders promote policies against the overwhelming opposition of world public opinion and (more importantly) the comments of authorities who should have some idea of the consequences of adding terror to terrorism? How was it that Humanist Ideology begin world-wide if it was not planned? Who does not know that leaders lie? Why do WE not see that leaders serve alien interests?

Is not the example of on-going Jew/Arab conflict sufficient evidence that the “you kill one of ours we will kill ten of yours” attitude is neither civilised nor an effective response to those reduced to means of last resort to avenge injustice. It was the way of the Nazis in World War II and it did not do them any good either. The Old Testament advise “An eye for an eye” was for people of primitive human understanding and superseded 2000 years ago, but leaders still use the power of their positions and the overwhelming might of their weapons to ‘encourage’ ‘friends’ to follow their lead.

As a boy I lived in the country and a circus set up a rest camp nearby. Why now do I recall that their large elephant became terrified at sight of a mouse?

I can believe that a small and industrially backward nation could obtain materials for a crude nuclear or biological device, find a way to hide it in some large city and devise remote detonation. What is difficult to believe is that any small, industrially weak nation would (unless forced) dare use this weapon against a nation that would then be happy to wipe such fools off the face of the earth.

No group of small industrially poor nations can hope to match the world’s largest and richest nations in war technology; not even those that openly create, test and develop. Why are those who point this out not in the news?

Terrorism is horrific but, for the abused, no more than a response of last resort. So now let us suppose that a crude nuclear device, detonated in the centre of a large city, could kill, maim or otherwise destroy the lives of a million people. Is this weapon, or those who would use it, worse than a secretly designed, scientific, silent, mind-warp program – a program designed to deform human behaviour and bring war, crime, terror, death and misery to many millions? But this violence is spread through millions of little pictures and so we don't 'see the woods for the trees'.

Our worry should not be about mice trying to secretly create nuclear bombs and rockets to challenge the super powers, rather we need be concerned about mice that might carry diseases that neither they nor science yet understand. We should not continue to abuse these and force them to hide in holes where such diseases may be created.

The mind-enslavement weapon called 'Humanism' is our most fearful weapon of mass (human) destruction. Manipulation by lies creates injustice; injustice creates crime, terrorism and war.

Humanism is not a biodegradable! This monster has already destroyed the human potential and the lives of millions, it will grow in the human mind until we either die of it or expose and destroy it.

Can any weapon of terror be worse than education to deform human intellect and delete our birthright of human development? Without its human potential we become mere programmed animals having life without residual value.

Humanism has magnified caring, but removed our sense of what caring is about – it has shown us how to feel good, to have fun, think with our hearts and ignore intelligence. Humanism teaches that there is no truth so we find it easy to tune-out the consequences of mindless behaviour. When we believe life offers no more than the pleasures of the day what is worth striving for?

Not all are totally deceived so, to make exposing the truth difficult, the name Humanism was chosen as easy to promote as the human moral high ground. The majority are now convinced that humanism = humanity and fights the horrors it was designed to create: the deceived are blind to the truth.

Humanism is not bad because it promotes caring but because it deforms and misdirects caring; the more we care about the irrelevant the more grotesque our culture becomes. We are subdued by double talk like "making *convincing* progress" (they want to 'convince' us they are making progress against

‘poverty’ of one kind or another); they “plan to *make a difference*” (yes to make a difference but not the difference we expect).

They are clever and careful with words: “*how do you feel about that*” (you must feel, not think). They continually promote feelings and good intentions; ‘political correctness’ demands feel-good intentions. But, as it is said, the road to hell is paved with good intentions.

Mindless feel-good intentions carry a cost beyond human ability to pay! Politically correct philosophy has already ruined more lives and caused more destruction than vengeful terrorists would ever dream of. World leaders rave against less lethal terrors in order to manipulate people into war and the chaos of mutually accepted ignorance. We surrender our rights to ‘Caesar’ gladly and do not see that, today, to Caesar, we are a dangerous burden.

A well known past President of the USA said words to this effect, *In politics, if it happens, you can bet your life it was planned that way*. Politics in now more corrupt but his comment remains true.

Manipulation of the public mind would not be possible in an advanced culture because people living in a truly advanced culture would be self-governing and enlightened about manipulation by emotion and deceit. That we are not enlightened about mind manipulation is conclusive evidence of corrupt, world wide, manipulative government.

Our problems are within our ability to understand and fix, we only need care enough to make the effort. We are not really as stupid as we try to make ourselves believe but, have we become pathetically uncaring.

Mind blight does not just affect the odd town or city in the USA: or Canada, South America, or Australia; it is much, much more than two high rise buildings or the cruel cost of a few thousand victims; it is not something that has happened and is over. It is a blight that is growing and world-wide: it is rivers of deaths and mountains of misery – it is drugs, vandalising, burning – it is violence, poverty, injustice, indifference, terrorism and cruelty. It is a war against humanity that is creating our rising tide of blood.

Humanism is not a biological virus or poison gas; it is a sweet-tasting feel-good, mean little scam of ideology that is rotting the very fabric of an innocently trusting human culture – it is a little scroll (story book) that tastes emotionally sweet but sickens us when swallowed. (Revelation 10: 8-10.) It is robbery of pathetic poor by obscene rich. It is unaffordable insurance;

medical care; law! It is a growth of death and misery for world-wide millions! Because we think emotionally, not logically we are blind to cause and effect. Will the importance and justice of our need help us awake?

Jesus told us to sell our coat to arm ourselves. Crucified in place of a criminal; sacrificed for advance of our enlightenment; do we still not see the whole message? If we do not prefer death to life, injustice to justice, hate to love, pain to pleasure, then why, 2000 years later, do we still accept law to crucify the innocent and free the guilty? Is it because, fearful of responsibility, we sell our souls to political mercenaries?

Injustice emotionally enforced as human rights! Why? Our hearts care but we pay others to tell us what to care about. We have intellectual capacity to expose humanistic deceptions but are too smug to look past our emotions!

True human law can not oppose moral truth nor any law change any truth. Self-defence is a “basic right” of life, not a retreat for criminals. What right has a Judge to say that a bloodied head or cracked bones mean too much force when every day people are robbed, battered or murdered because criminals are encouraged by unearned human rights? Jesus of Nazareth truly does represent the Truth of life! You have no human right to give the criminal the option of killing you.

Who benefits from teaching that we are just common animals? How many children have been maimed or killed because they thought all animals were cuddly friends? How many teenagers now believe all ideas are equal, that our responsibility is to get what we want from a meaningless life or become ‘losers’? How many millions of parents have cried because their teenage children treat them with contempt, and they never know why?

Our ‘unity of governments’ neither enlightens nor protects us? The ‘New World Order’ does not work for our benefit! When we behave like animals it is because we are trained so to behave. We have made great advance; our shame is that we sell our birthright to thieves to evade our responsibility of self government.

Matthew 16: 19-20 “... *what you forbid on earth shall be forbidden in heaven, and what you allow on earth will be allowed in heaven.*” Are we being told that we are to become the masters of the universe – displace our creator?

A frightening thought? But wait! If creation’s plan is that we develop in the rational intellect of our creator we will then know our true nature? Will we

not then be trust-worthy? We must look for the rationality of the *Word* of Creation in both the spirit and the flesh if we are to advance as those deserving will.

Our world is saturated with mind-warp lies and enslaved to criminal Government! We can learn the truth of what is going on only by accepting responsibility for our lives and government. To lose our ability to act rationally in our own interests is the only fate worse than death; it leaves us with life shorn of its opportunity to gain from its living.

It may take time to clean up our mess but life climbing up is infinitely better than life running down. If what is here presented is not true then why is it we claim to care but look only for what we want to see?

Chapter 10:

Solving the crime -- Who Benefits?

*So long as those exposing social concerns
refuse to put out the social garbage
then all have to live with social garbage.
To take responsibility for our own governing
is our only safety
From teachings of liars we learn only lies.
But the way to life is through truth*

We have been looking with more confidence at our social problems, perhaps becoming aware that we have no human social life. Are we beginning to see that all we have now is a 'social life' mythology? Is Shakespeare's: "All the world is a stage", a wise or humorous comment?

We have looked at how we could escape our dictatorial government and also at a simplified explanation of how the world financial 'casino' operates.

We are hearing a lot of 'why does the world hate the US'. Well it's natural that the most powerful nation of the day will be viewed with a mixture of envy, admiration and jealousy; but what is happening today does go a little deeper. September 11 did create wide sympathy for the USA and also feelings of, "Well - serves them right" from areas where people feel that the US became rich by taking advantage of the poor and powerless.

This is not to disparage the USA or its people. www.themindweb.com is addressing world problems. There are good and bad everywhere. The US and its close supporting nations are not worse than the rest but we do have the power to promote the worst or the best. What do we have to be proud of, it may not be as much as we may like to claim.

What all peoples of our world need to learn is to do and to see things each from the others viewpoint: we all have try to see our world and ourselves with a far more intelligent caring. We need find our truth.

Though (at time of writing) themindweb.com is only approaching its second anniversary I think we, and I do include myself in this, have learned a lot. As said in *Of Truth*: we really do not know what we know until we think honestly to uncover the meaning and consequences of what we know. I believe I, and our readers, are gaining improved worldly and spiritual insight; that we are now beginning to see our world more clearly and honestly.

In 2002 ‘our’ leaders were adopting an extreme warlike attitude and the United Nations a conciliatory attitude. What does it mean? The Hegelian Dialectic Process, as mentioned in “Humanism-Brainwash” is a humanist/communist way of people control whereby designed social conflict is used to achieve planned social change. Example: The ‘right’ is named ‘capitalist’ and the ‘left’ communist; but both refer to the two wings of the same bird (A vulture no doubt); both govern by dictate and deceit. We may also recognise that the "Good cop; Bad cop" routine is just a domesticated variation of that Hegelian system.

Our world leaders are playing ‘bad cop’ under direction of the international government and the UN is playing ‘good cop’ directed from the same head. Why? Well, in solving crime we should first ask: “Who Benefits?”

It is not possible for mere mortals to look into the mind of the ‘world government’ crime syndicate, but behaviour does leave clues. We may know them by their actions! Hussein may prove to be only the “Fall Guy” or the bait for much bigger fish! Think about it: does this excuse for a war appear just too frail to be credible?

We turned on and demonised Iraq after having been supportive friends; Hussein was a good guy when it suited us. We create situations in which others have cause to hate us and may feel forced to build dangerous weapons for defence. A war to destroy Iraq on account of past performance would appear hard to justify in relation to the state of the world today. If Iraq does

have real weapons of mass destruction then forcing it to use or disperse them among terrorists does not make a lot of sense.

At least it does not make a lot of sense to the great majority of the world's people, the ones who will suffer the consequences. Other nations have done things as bad or worse than Iraq, some may be planning biological weapons. Will they be equally targeted? Who knows who is to be next in line! But will bullying reduce, or make worse, the terrorist threat? Can we admit that many have cause for fear and hate? Abuse and unjust violence, logically, will increase rather than reduce terrorist activity?

Hussein may be a pig but pigs run the world. If fundamentalists think that Armageddon will be a war between theist religions they know nothing of our Creator. When two of three relatives are at the others throat, look at the third.

To say that all this huffing and puffing is about oil is intelligently stupid. If this idea is quietly encouraged, then we must realise that world government wants us to believe it is about oil as a way of leading our minds away from more serious possibilities. Example: could Globalists be planning to close the banking casino under blame of terrorist activity they manipulate into being?

If the Globalist mafia want to bring the world of "common" people to a more easily manageable submission – reduce populations in a maelstrom of violence, poverty, hunger and disease – then well timed collapse of our world's commercial economy might appeal to them as a very smart move. When banks go 'broke' it is the customers and shareholders who lose.

So we now see there may be more benefits to looking at things from the viewpoint of others than simple human compassion. Looking at the world from the viewpoint of friends and enemies could be vital to our future; the better we understand our world the better our chance of survival.

We now know 'our' leaders are not ours! We elect from among alternatives offered by 'alien' Globalists. We choose from among the already chosen and in our blindness retain feelings of loyalty to those we call our own equally on the political-scam bandwagon as on the playing field. Should we all paint our faces to prove our primitive loyalties? Is our loyalty to quislings causing us to miss the point of this entire world-stage extravaganza?

"Who benefits?" A tender spot for Winston Churchill should not blind us to the fact that (if true) he may have made a grave error in allowing Coventry

(without warning) to suffer ‘saturation bombing’ (excused as not wanting to let the enemy know their ‘unbreakable’ communications code was broken).

Spies could have learned of the planned attack. Many lives and a valuable city may have been saved! A significant enemy force destroyed! Germany believed its code unbreakable – its leaders may, as humans so often do, have preferred to believe an alternative or a lie but, even if not, allied forces may have been better served by a crushing victory on the day.

How often in history have leaders sacrificed thousands of their own for some perceived advantage? Even in the last century there are surely more examples of leaders accepted losses of their own in order to create excuse for war; generate sympathy for some partisan cause or for other perceived advantage. Blindness is such good cover for complicity. To them we, the people, are always disposable.

Was, for example, Pearl Harbour a military mistake? Should not the garrison have been on war alert? Were warnings ignored! Alert people know that leaders ‘allow’ or ‘encourage’ things to happen so as to gain public support for their plans: manipulation is their trade and their lifestyle!

A few thousand lives for the ultimate good – well perhaps it might seem a reasonable trade so long as we do not honestly ask, “Who Benefits?” Lives saved later MIGHT replace lives sacrificed; but then again, might not. Should we forget old wisdom, “A bird in hand is worth two in the bush” or see that a life saved today may itself save two in the future?

Well it is as easy to blame and hate leaders as it is to love them but, to be honest, do we also not have to bear blame for voting in alien chosen mercenaries to run our government? Is that not also a betrayal? Are we not responsible for failing to make the self-sacrifice needed to just open our eyes to danger and make the small effort of organisation needed to choose and elect honest, reliable people to represent us in OUR Government?

Do we feel that only the ‘party system’ has the experience and expertise to govern in this complex world? Very true if we want to be governed out of our human existence; not true if we want progressive human advance.

Many may have seen the sense, as explained earlier, of choosing our own representatives, but became discouraged after trying to interest others; a small step for logic but such a huge leap for emotion.

As said: *“No community can be free without community understanding of its duties, rights and means of action. If people are never told then people will never know.”* If activists work only to this end they will make a positive difference.

It is no easy road! We need patience, but a little gain is better than a big loss. Can we see that most of those protesting corrupt undemocratic government or world-trade, do themselves reflect elitist attitudes? They do not fight for democracy! Honesty shows that protesters know only humanist ways: humanist values. Each group works to lift its own team up the ladder.

We now fear democracy because we fear the ideas of our group may not have majority support! We face death rather than compromise. Who now has faith in our human ability to understand and choose wisely for the human benefit?

How can we, the people, share power with each other if we do not trust our own nature? In not trusting our nature we show we fail to trust our Creator.

Today we live in an elitist world and, unknowing of any other, are enslaved to elitist induced thinking. We are trained from childhood; we must be loyal to our team, our peer group, our sect and our political party. Whether it is sport, politics, race or religion we mustn't applaud the other team. Our fear of self-government is reasonable only if people be given power without also being given truth! This humanist trap has to be exposed.

If we are to govern ourselves then all must have opportunity of inclusion! All who desire freedom must be allowed to share understanding of how much we have to gain and of how much to lose! That must be part of the deal! We will only trust each other when we share honesty and understanding.

Elitist culture is alien to democracy! Those who investigate honestly will find that, at grassroots, 'left' and 'right' have much in common. The same enemy is presented from a different view, but we find this difficult to admit. Each cannot talk to the other because “what if we were to agree about something”! We cannot agree with ‘that lot’, it would be disloyal; it would be contemptible.

People have to be shown some meaningful amount of the truth! Today our legitimate protest is against lies; our legitimate campaign is to reveal truth! Outside truth we cannot win. Only revelation of truth to fellow citizens will expose our desperate need and show all that the common good does include

all. Attitudes change when we see that truth is beyond pride and prejudice; it is a matter of life and death.

Today most think emotionally rather than rationally. We are mind-warped to accept peer pressures and self-opinionated attitudes. We need to learn and to adopt true Christian attitudes; trust our God-given humanity; learn the truth of self-sacrifice and have faith in the kind in which we were created.

Only with personal faith and generosity to seek and share truth comes responsible action of the whole. Remember: "There, but by the grace of God go I". Let's not be blinded by 'feelings' that we are more important or more human, than others! Let's be open to truth and transmit truth! Have faith in the humanity in which we were created! Don't condemn without trial!

So make-believe Christians and 'wanna be' Christians and "lukewarm" Christians and "sectarian" Christians all need take a hard look. Faith means trust in our Creator and the human creation. Belief in a man-carved image of God will not stand the light of truth. There may not be much time but any time is better than no time.

Chapter 11:

Hunt for the Anthrax Killer

*Quote: "Knowledge will forever govern ignorance:
and a People who mean to be their own governors,
must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives."*

James Madison (Former US President) to WT Barry, August 4, 1822.

It is surely time to start thus arming ourselves
for we now desperately need govern ourselves.

On the night of the 6th of November the Australian Broadcasting Commission played on TV an hour-long program of what claimed to be the report of a US investigation into anthrax terrorist attacks in the USA. Though the reliability of such reports is suspect the Australian National news service is more reliable than the commercial stations so it seemed worth a look.

Now I do not want to sit on the fence with this one but at my age I think I might be excused for just leaning on it a little. I certainly do not subscribe to the idea that any national government was involved with organising events

such as September 11 or the Gulf War. People chosen as quislings are just too unreliable for jobs of such importance and sensitivity.

However the situation regarding Globalist agencies is open. The warning of biological weapons potential was given by Dr. Brock Chisholm in 1946, just enough time to allow thinking through, detailing the plan and organising the torment of peoples. Enough time for planning but not too much. Could such a plan now be stopped? Why would planners see any reason to stop?

Should I use this TV program? There was also the point that, as this program was likely shown in the US the homeland viewer would know the story, if I made comment, those who watched would know what was reported so it would only need comment not reporting. The report did go into sufficient detail to be convincing and well worth watching.

Although, at time of the report the killer/s had not been found it had been found that the anthrax had come from heartland US bio-defence laboratories. This was tracked down by use of cutting-edge analytical equipment that was able to analyse the genetic structure in such detail as to distinguish not only between US anthrax and that known to be in the possession of Iraq but also between individual laboratories.

As might be expected, with the CIA and other high level investigators on the job, the trail to those actually responsible appeared to get a little muddy near the end and, at time of the report the culprit/s remain uncovered.

A leading commentator thought the culprits might be a small group of patriots who were unhappy with progress in bio-defence. If so these patriots were prepared to kill and put numerous American lives at risk for their cause. As pointed out 'sacrifice of homeland citizens for the greater good' is not uncommon but is of very dubious morality or public benefit.

The point that did not escape me and probably also has not escaped you, is that this report supports previous thoughts on terrorism expressed through themindweb.com . The skills shown by those involved, the very high level of science used and access to these, not only ruled out common terrorists but also ruled out Iraq as either the source of the anthrax or of the terrorist attack.

As was suggested, it may have involved a small group of US patriots. Certainly we have been prepared for such by a number of TV movies on the lines of crazy 'right wing' patriots. While it is not uncommon for dissident cells to appear in organisations we have to see with doubting eyes their

existence in the secret services and heartland defence research organisations. When they appear in such sensitive organisations of leading nations, well, as said, *in politics, if it happens you can bet your life it was planned that way.*

Dissident cells are allowed to form in such organisations to aid clandestine or illegal operations. If things go wrong these cells are disposable without much harm to the organisation itself. Such cells are too small to do much on their own but can be of vital service to devious interests or operations. Formation of such 'cells' is made easy by the influence of humanist amoral education.

The probability that such a cell was involved borders on certainty. But it is likely (not dared be said on National TV) that the action was part of the Humanist/Hegelian 'NWO' program of creating conflict and confusion, and was to advance the Globalist campaign for world ownership rather than be a dubious form of patriotic protest.

As with the use of aircraft as bombs, success of this anthrax campaign needed the planning of true professionals. People with access to science, technology and facilities far beyond the reasonable reach of common terrorists or dissident cells working on their own.

With the 'aircraft as bombs' strike, the importance of the mission and piloting skill needed would forbid that success be left in the hands of inexperienced trainee pilots. Such pilots could only be used to secure the controls and follow simple orders to direct the aircraft into range of an auto-pilot system that would fly the aircraft accurately and free of emotion to target.

The operation would need access to high level technology to create direction-finding equipment of like appearance to regular equipment and access to aircraft to install it, plus access to a terrorist group to provide a front and do the dirty work. It also needs access to the flight programs of airlines and scheduled use of aircraft. The 'doctored' aircraft would have to be at the right place for the right flight when the hi-jack crews boarded.

These highly complex operations are not for amateurs. This was not about learner pilots taking over aircraft to crash into any building in any convenient city. The only organisation with such internationally spread contacts, huge secret service army and devious purposes would be Globalism.

So I hope that a lot of readers did see the 'anthrax' program and become aware of the kind of contacts and breadth of skills needed to ensure success of operations as planned. We need to have a realistic appreciation of the kind of

authority and planning that must go into high-tech terrorism. Also, to those who thought I was being extremist with earlier suggestions, I hope you will now accept that I only gave realistic warning of what is possible or probable so that alert people may be better armed to defend their lives and interests.

There is elitist terrorism and common terrorism. Elitist terrorism, no matter what form the human sacrifice takes, is expertly planned to achieve specific public manipulation targets. However these planners do have human frailties and can make mistakes, they may also reveal themselves to knowledgeable people by the sophistication of their operations.

Common terrorism can also do horrific damage. It is possible for people with some training and access to less than the best equipment to produce, by chance, a new and deadly virus but, in the case under review, this was not the way of it. Both virus production and the way of use were genuinely hi-tech. The Indonesian Holiday Resort and suicide bombings exemplify common terrorist work. The Australian response to the holiday resort bombing seemed likely to increase the risk of further attacks.

If the anthrax attacks are the work of 'NWO' agents do not think this exposure will worry or cause a change of plan. The only way Globalists might be caused to think of aborting present plans would be an uprising of a nations people prepared to take government into their own hands. Globalists believe they have too tight control of the public mind for that to happen.

Globalist/humanists think they are gods but are not, nor are they infallible. In the aircraft as bombs episode they did overlook that passengers now have independent means of air to ground communication. They allowed too much time between the first and last impact and failed to allow for the human nature of passengers giving them the courage to sacrifice themselves deliberately for the common good rather than just huddle in terror and allow their lives to be wasted. Mind deformities do not destroy basic human nature.

Another point: when our 'three stooges' leaders first pushed frantically for war against Iraq they may have been in genuine fear of the anthrax terror getting out of control. Convinced the anthrax was produced in Iraq they would be reluctant to make public their true reasoning for fear of creating panic. Stooze political leaders rarely know the forces that they, with such dedication, serve.

We can now see relaxing of the propaganda war against Iraq happened as investigators cleared Iraq and incriminated the US bio-defence community.

However do not expect apologies or that unrealistic demands for weapons inspection may be cancelled or language modified.

If Iraq does have a deadly bio-weapon then we may find out its location only after a real attack is launched against it. However it seems unlikely that Iraq has any useful defence ability. This threat may have had to be created.

Did Globalist planners also fail in not knowing that new technology would track down the source of the anthrax? Or, as is more likely, did they at this time only want to go so far? Be sure that war scare will increase pressure for terrorist activity, planning urgency and sophistication. That certainty, and excuse for tightening controls over resident populations, could be all Globalism wants at this stage. We can only guess at the time scale they have for the plan in mind.

Now back a step. We cannot just accept that this anthrax report is not doctored. There are thousands of fake reports put out by secret services circulating to keep people agitated, confused, worried and distracted. Many such reports are too silly for worldly people to take seriously and when spread by gullible people give 'normal' community the belief that all frightening exposures are 'conspiracy theories'. This is good Globalist defence. But that does not mean that stories of very credible appearance, such as that above, will not also be deformed to serve political needs. Were it not doctored to serve some manipulative purpose it would probably not be released.

If doctored, the purpose may be to strengthen public credibility and reassure us that 'our' government is open and honest; or even as defence against doubts raised in some quarters as to who was really behind September 11. However we need not be too concerned, we can use it as an educating tool no matter if totally true or not. All we need know with certainty is that humanity is enslaved by an inhuman philosophy designed to serve a criminal world government.

We can and must escape. Only when we take responsibility for our own governing will we know political information is reliable. THAT'S our challenge and all who distract us from it aid our enemies.

.....

REVIEW:

So what have we uncovered? To start we find the worst crime possible, the crippling of human development aimed directly at children. Globalists knew they would have slim chance of success were they to try openly to convince

adults that this intrusion would be to human benefit. Next we see that our political system was of a corrupt design to allow achievement of this ultimate human abuse and genocide.

We then look at how the increased personal prides and prejudices inserted by ideology prevent us seeing three simple but essential truths: Chapters 4&5. In Chapter 6 we note rapidly increasing world dangers. In Chapter 7 we see how easily the usurious financial system works to rob us of our earned rewards. In Chapter 8 the breakdown of community morality. In Chapters 9 & 10 we ask the obvious questions that further expose the disaster of an imposed and deliberately misleading philosophy/ideology. In Chapter 11 we look further into the increasing dangers resulting from a genocidal world government turning our natural responses and strengths against us.

As the humanist mindset increases its hold we enter uncharted social storm waters. More and more people, including unbalanced citizens, will adopt terrorist tactics to become violently destructive of self and community! If we do not stop it soon, while we still have some intellectual freedom and democratic electoral law on our side, then we may not be able to stop it at all. We may soon face a future of financial collapse; huge uprisings of mindless violence; transport breakdown; starving cities; uncontrollable disease. As exposed in this booklet there are too many serious questions kept from public view because they cannot be honestly answered.

If you do not believe this then ask yourself why, in what we are told is a rapid cultural advance, war, injustice, inequality and violence so rapidly increases? Do you not hear alarm bells? If you saw a boat of partying people drifting to Niagara Falls and no one caring to start the motor, would you think there was something seriously wrong with the mental state of those on board?

The program of mind-warp cannot be imposed evenly. Small towns and country schools are more resistant, change more slowly. Also change itself changes itself, the situation described by Chip Elliott has probably now moved to some country towns.

As changeling children become street-smart, crime and violence, injustice and cruelty become less visible but more sophisticated, more disguised, more influential, more invasive. Law and statistics adapt. We get used to it and ignore its advance.

I sometimes quote George Orwell and Winston Churchill. Both educated but so entirely different. One, the gallant knight, does not admit that death is a

sacrifice to freedom; it is merely a bargain price to pay. The other, Orwell, looked into the black hole of humanist/communism and saw it end in the destruction of humanity. A jackboot grinding a human face into the dirt forever. In the end they both fought the same criminality.

Is this the final test of our human development? We have the power to stop Humanism now. If we do not demonstrate that we have reached a human level of perception and responsibility can we expect the help of our creator?

END PIECE

Awake! Awake!

***Oh child of mine awaken now
Give me your hand a minute
For to you child I'd make a vow
That life has much more in it.
That life has much more in it
than a dream that lasts a minute.***

***Awake! Awake to timeless time
To life beyond all limit
Awake to it that is divine
A virgin sea within it
Win your battle, leave your plough
Leave the life that you know now
End your fears, scorn your pride
to ride the great eternal tide.***

Awake! Awake!

Is a reminder of the coming new city, new earth and new Heaven:
Revelation 21:1.

Notes:

Back cover

Today a great many people see that there is something seriously wrong with our human culture but, if you talk to them will say things like: “Well we just have to make the best of it, there is nothing anyone can do about it.”

Offer something to read! They look with fear in their eyes and may say: “Well, even if it is true we can’t change it.”

The strange thing is that if one of these was being attacked and saw you standing by doing nothing to help, they would be very indignant if you made the excuses they make. They would claim their situation was very different; the attack on them was plain to see, together you would more than match the assailant! They would be even more annoyed should you say, “Well I was looking the other way, I ignored your call because I could not see there was anything I could do.”

Interesting isn’t it. The people with this attitude are quite right, they cannot do anything because they do not know what is going on. And they don’t know because they refuse to look.

We may get annoyed but those who read *themindweb* articles know that most people are defeated by the beliefs that they are, from childhood, brain-washed to believe in. We just have to try harder to explain, in clear and honest words, the true situation.

An easy way to help:

Promote www.themindweb.com

**The web site for those who care enough to work for
social justice, true democracy
and the human future.**