


TRILATERALS OVER AMERICA



By Antony Sutton



CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
ONE	What is the Trilateral Commission? 1
TWO	Membership of the Trilateral Commission 11
THREE	New World Order as the Objective 27
FOUR	Policies for Monopoly Control..... 35
FIVE	Two Decades of Trilateral Scheming in Agriculture 49
SIX	Trilateral Don't Like Taxation. . . For Themselves 61
SEVEN	Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace 75
EIGHT	Politics of New World Order..... 91
NINE	Friends of the New World Order..... 101
TEN	Transcending Marxism: Old and New Marxists..... 107
ELEVEN	Where the Trilateral Commission Went Wrong 119
TWELVE	Conclusions: A More Likely Future Scenario..... 127
APPENDIX	
A	Membership October 1978 and July 1993 . . 131
B	Officers and Directors of Council on Foreign Relations..... 142
C	Statement by Colonel "Bo" Gritz on Drug Policy 157

CHAPTER ONE: WHAT IS THE TRILATERAL COMMISSION?

The Trilateral Commission was founded in 1973 by New York banker David Rockefeller, then Chairman of Chase Manhattan Bank, and Harvard University academic Zbigniew Brzezinski, later to become National Security Assistant to President Jimmy Carter.

What it is depends on one's viewpoint. According to the Trilateral Commission itself:

The Trilateral Commission was formed in 1973 by private citizens of Western Europe, Japan and North America to foster closer cooperation among these three regions on common problems. It seeks to improve public understanding of such problems, to support proposals for handling them jointly, and to nurture habits and practices of working together among these regions.

However, in populist political circles the Trilateral Commission is a transparent device to achieve New World Order, which sound suspiciously like other dictatorial "World Orders." From this viewpoint Trilaterals are enemies of freedom and intent on gaining a monopoly of world political power for their own benefit.

Twenty years ago the Trilateral Commission had very little history; one could not track its intentions from its actions.

Today, in 1994, one can look at 20 years of Trilateral history and more accurately assess their objectives in the light of past political actions and member appointments to various Administrations.

The original 1972 membership chosen by Rockefeller and Brzezinski comprised about 200 members worldwide of whom about one-third were North Americans, one-third Europeans and one-third Japanese. In 1993 this had expanded to about 325 members worldwide, termed "distinguished citizens" by the Trilateral Commission but in fact representing an extremely narrow spectrum of world opinion and culture and completely unelected or representative of anything but David Rockefeller's personal views.

From the start the Commission has been termed "private" and "unofficial" with the stated objective to "draw together the highest level unofficial group possible to look together at the common problems facing our three areas" and to "foster cooperation."

Throughout Trilateral Commission's reporting one finds a consistent confusion between "private" and "public." The Commission is promoted as a private group founded by a private citizen. David Rockefeller. Yet its objectives and operations are public policy oriented.

In the words of the Trilateral Commission:

The full Commission gathers once each year—in Lisbon in 1992, in Washington in 1993, in Tokyo in 1994. In addition to special topical sessions and reviews of current developments in our regions, a substantial portion of each annual meeting is devoted to consideration of draft reports to the Commission. These reports are generally the joint product of authors from each of the three regions who draw on a range of consultants in the course of their work. Publication follows discussion in the Commission's annual meeting. The authors are solely responsible for their final text. A separate publication contains the principal presentations at the annual meeting. Occasionally informal papers appear from regional activities.

Each regional group has a Chairman and Deputy Chairman, who all together constitute the leadership of the Commission. The Executive Committee draws together a further 36 individuals from the wider membership.

In brief, this group of private citizens is precisely organized in a manner that ensures its collective views have significant impact on public policy. They meet, they review, they discuss, they report and after this discussion make their recommendations public.

For what purpose? The Trilateral Commission would hardly expend all this energy and funding for an academic exercise. . the objective has to be to establish public policy objectives to be implemented by governments worldwide.

Further, the members are not elected. . they are chosen. The Chairman of the Executive Committee, the committee that chooses members, is David Rockefeller, who is also founder and Chairman of the overall Trilateral Commission. The entire structure reflects Rockefeller choices, not impartial or representative choices.

This phenomenon of a David Rockefeller front organization has not been lost on observers. On July 27,1979, radio station KLMG, Council Bluffs, Iowa, ran an interview of George Franklin, then Coordinator of the Trilateral Commission. This author was a guest on the program. Here from the transcript is how Franklin answered the question of Rockefeller influence.

COMMENTATOR: Why is it, in the Trilateral Commission that the name David Rockefeller shows up so persistently, or [the name of] one of his organizations?

FRANKLIN: Well, this is very reasonable. David Rockefeller is the Chairman of the North American group. There are three chairmen: one is [with] the North American group, one is [with] the Japanese group, and one is [with] the European group. Also, the Commission was really David Rockefeller's original idea.

Franklin is aware of the Rockefeller criticism and tries to pass it off as unimportant, as "reasonable." The fact that Rockefeller is personally involved with member selection suggests that the Commission was formed to advance family or personal objectives. If not, then Rockefeller would have allowed others to make such choices.

The commentator then switches the discussion to the then current Carter Administration, in which co-founder Zbigniew Brzezinski is National Security adviser to Carter and numerous other Trilaterals had been appointed.

COMMENTATOR: On President Carter's staff, how many Trilateral Commission members do you have?

FRANKLIN: Eighteen.

COMMENTATOR: Don't you think that is rather heavy?

FRANKLIN: It is quite a lot, yes.

COMMENTATOR: Don't you think it is rather unusual? How many members are there actually in the Trilateral Commission?

FRANKLIN: We have 77 in the United States?

COMMENTATOR: Don't you think it is rather unusual to have 18 members on the Carter staff?

FRANKLIN: Yes, I think we chose some very able people when we started the Commission. The President happens to think well of quite a number of them.

This author then pursued with Franklin the question of membership choice and Rockefeller influence. Franklin denies the obvious. It is obvious to any reasonable person that the Trilateral Commission is a Rockefeller organization formed to advance his interest and that it most certainly has significant influence. Influence is the *raison d'être* for the Trilateral Commission.

SUTTON: DO you believe that the only able people in the United States are Trilateralists?

FRANKLIN: Of course not.

FRANKLIN: Well, when we started to choose members, we

did try to pick out the ablest people we could and I think many of those that are in the Carter Administration would have been chosen by any group that was interested in the foreign policy question.

SUTTON: Would you say that you have an undue influence on policy in the United States?

FRANKLIN: I would not, no.

SUTTON: I think any reasonable man would say that if you have 18 Trilateralists out of 77 in the Carter Administration you have a preponderant influence.

FRANKLIN: These men are not responsive to anything that the Trilateral Commission might advocate. We do have about two reports we put out each year and we do hope they have some influence or we would not put them out.

SUTTON: May I ask another question?

FRANKLIN: Yes.

SUTTON: Who financed the Trilateral Commission originally?

FRANKLIN: Uhh. . . The first supporter of all was a foundation called the Kettering Foundation. I can tell you who is financing it at the present time, which might be of more interest to you.

SUTTON: Is it not the Rockefeller Brothers' Fund?

FRANKLIN: The Rockefeller Brothers' Fund? The North American end of the Commission needs \$1.5 million over the next three years. Of this amount, \$180,000 will be contributed by the Rockefeller Brothers' Fund and \$150,000 by David Rockefeller.

COMMENTATOR: Does that mean that most of it is being financed by the Rockefellers?

FRANKLIN: NO, it means that about one-fifth of the North American end is being financed by the Rockefellers and none of the European and Japanese end

Moreover, the Rockefeller family had long-standing interests

in several public policy organizations of highly significant influence. The Trilateral Commission only extended the work and influence of the Council on Foreign Relations chaired for many years by the self-same David Rockefeller.

Another Rockefeller family-sponsored and financed group was the Commission on Critical Choices whose task was to identify the "critical choices" facing the United States at the turn of the 21st Century. Once again we have a commission appointed by the Rockefellers, to decide what is best for all Americans.

THE COMMISSION ON CRITICAL CHOICES FOR AMERICANS is a nationally representative, bipartisan group of 42 prominent Americans, brought together under the chairmanship of Nelson A. Rockefeller. Their assignment: To identify the critical choices which will confront America as it embarks on its third century as a nation and to determine the realistic and desirable objectives this nation can achieve by 1895 and the year 2000.

The Commission was established in the American tradition of voluntary effort. It is 42 citizens who have joined together to help determine the facts about the future of America.

Because of the complexity and interdependence of issues facing the world today, the Commission organized its work into six study panels, which emphasize the interrelationships of the critical choices rather than studying each one separately.

The six study panels are:

Panel I — Energy and Its Relationship to Ecology, Economics and World Stability;

Panel II — Food, Health, World Population and Quality of Life;

Panel III — Raw Materials, Industrial Development, Capital Formation, Employment and World Trade.

Panel IV — International Trade and Monetary Systems, Inflation and the Relationships Among Differing Economic Systems;

Panel V — Change, National Security and Peace, and

Panel VI — Quality of Life of Individuals and Communities in the U.S.A.

In brief, the Commission is a Rockefeller study group, funded in large part by a Rockefeller organization.

The Third Century Corporation, a New York not-for-profit organization, was created to finance the work of the Commission. Since the start of its activities in the fall of 1973, the Corporation has received contributions and pledges from individuals and from foundations well-known for their support of public interest activities.

The Drive for New World Order

While publically portrayed as a high level discussion group, the Trilateral Commission is dedicated to New World Order. The most comprehensive statement of New World Order is to be found in Trilateral co-founder Brzezinski's book, *Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technetronic Era*, published just before the Trilateral Commission was founded.

This book is the blueprint for a "more just and equitable world order." In one sense it is not much different to scores of other plans for political control that go back to Greek times and include More's *Utopia*, Karl Marx, V.I. Lenin, Adolf Hitler, Mao... all are schemas for political control.

The only document in history that has rigidly defined and restrained government control is the Constitution of the United States, unique because it limits government power. Brzezinski's book dismisses the Constitution... for the same reasons that all other political documents have dismissed freedom, i.e. because it is "inadequate." However, Brzezinski's rejection of the Constitution is on unique grounds—"the age cannot bear the problems of assimilating the old into the new"—yet many of the problems are created by the self-same Trilateral members who now propose solutions.

According to Brzezinski mankind has moved through three states of evolution and we are now in the middle of the fourth

and final state. In some ways the secular Brzezinski analysis is parallel to Jose Arguelles' *The Mayan Factor*, a mystical calendar of the world divided into periods. According to *The Mayan Factor*, our world is also presently in the final stages of dissolution, culminating in 2012 when it passes to higher levels of consciousness.

Back to Brzezinski, co-founder of the Trilateral Commission. The first global stage is described as "religious" and combines "a heavenly universalism provided by acceptance of the idea that man's destiny is essentially in God's hands" with an "earthly narrowness derived from massive ignorance, illiteracy and a vision confined to the immediate environment."

The second stage is nationalism, and defined as "another giant step in the progressive redefinition of man's nature and place in our world." In Arguelles this is paralleled as "materialism."

The materialist philosophy of Marxism comprises the third stage. For Brzezinski "this represents a further vital and creative stage in the measuring of man's universal vision." Neither David Rockefeller nor Zbigniew Brzezinski cite the technological and moral weaknesses and excesses of Marxism. They view it as "creative" and a significant factor in man's maturity.

In reality, — and history has now demonstrated what some of us argued for years — Marxism is a hollow sham, a gigantic con job, a device for New York capitalists to control a country through technology and debt while pretending the opposite.

It was American trade unions, especially under Samuel Gompers and George Meany, that recognized the phoniness of Marxism. Wall Street and many academics who should have known better were the promoters, allies and apologizers for Marxism. Capitalists, because a monopoly state offers the opportunity of monopoly markets and monopoly profits without any uncomfortable criticism from the street. Academics, because Wall Street-financed Universities offer opportunities for self-advancement and self-aggrandisement.

After Marxism, according to Brzezinski, comes the fourth and final stage, the Technetronic Era or the idea of rational

humanism on a global scale, the result of American-Communist cooperation. Here is the Brzezinski view of the contemporary structure which is a tortured framework to present a supposed requirement for a New World Order political structure:

Tension is unavoidable as man strives to assimilate the new into the framework of the old. For a time the established framework resiliently integrates the new by adapting it in a more familiar shape. But at some point the old framework becomes overloaded. The new input can no longer be redefined into traditional forms, and eventually it asserts itself with compelling force. Today, though, the old framework of international politics — with their spheres of influence, military alliances between nation-states, the fiction of sovereignty, doctrinal conflicts arising from nineteenth century crises — is clearly no longer compatible with reality.

Interestingly the Brzezinski estimate of change is significantly in error and this error will undoubtedly affect the nature of the world to come. New World Order is not inevitable.

Firstly, the current trend is towards small political units reflecting ethnic and national groups. Within the United States we have proposals for independent States and to divide States into two or three segments as large units become ungovernable and "overloaded." The framework is "overloaded" but the reaction is smaller units, not larger, ungovernable units. This is precisely the opposite reaction proposed by the Trilateral Commission.

Secondly, when it comes to "rational humanism" Brzezinski is again way off contemporary evolvment. Religion is coming back and in a more spiritual form. The older churches, institutionalized churches, are suffering losses, particularly the 2000-year-old Catholic church. However, there is a revival

of religion through modern technology, i.e. radio churches and TV evangelists. Further there is a spiritual evolvment of extraordinary proportions in non-traditional forms such as

meditation and communal groups. Some of these groups, such as the Church Universal and Triumphant in Montana, are now established and accepted by traditional areas.

This is a far cry from "humanism" and non-religion! However, it is in technology that we find departures from the "new world" proposed by Brzezinski and adopted by David Rockefeller and the Trilateral Commission. The technology of the future has an emerging spiritual component. The physics of the future, post-high energy physics and the vacuum energy physics of the 21st century is also a spiritual technology. The Eastern concepts of Buddhism and the material world are to an extent merging with the vacuum physics of the West, Zen and western physics are merging in a manner that confounds the ideas of the Trilateral Commission. Agreed that this new input cannot be defined in traditional terms, in this limited manner Brzezinski is correct but the new framework is not a rigid New World Order. Paradoxically. New World Order turns out to be a reflection of the old traditional framework! Brzezinski and Rockefeller propose to replace the old framework with a new framework. . but one under their control.

CHAPTER TWO: MEMBERSHIP OF THE TRILATERAL COMMISSION

The interesting aspect of Trilateralism is that it brings together the Administrators of power rather than the Holders of power.

David Rockefeller is essentially the only power center in the entire Trilateral catalog. Politicians, lawyers, bureaucrats, media types, trade unionists come and go in the Trilateral halls of power — they are transient administrators. They retain administrative positions only as long as they are successful in using political power to gain political objectives. Operators do not, by and large, create objectives — this is an important point. One should label this group of operators "the hired hands." As Senator Mansfield once said of Congress, "To get along, you must go along." Trilateral operators are at the pinnacle of success in "going along."

In the 1970's, nine of the American Trilateral commissioners were Establishment lawyers, from highly influential major law firms. The "revolving door" area between so-called public service and private gain, where attorneys alternate between private practice and the federal payroll, clouds more precise identification. For some reason, two of the nine lawyers were partners in the Los Angeles law firm O'Melveny & Myers: senior partner, William T. Coleman Jr. (also a director of David Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan Bank and a

former Transportation Secretary): and Warren Christopher, who was a partner from 1958-67 and from 1969 until joining Carter's regime as Deputy Secretary of State, and Clinton's as Secretary of State in 1993.

In 1994 William T. Coleman Jr., now a senior partner in O'Melveny & Myers, had already been Secretary of Transportation, was still a Trilateralist and indeed a member of the exclusive Trilateral Executive Committee.

From the same law firm of O'Melveny & Myers in 1994 Warren Christopher had become Secretary of State after serving as Co-Director of President Clinton's Transition team, amid strong protests that he was not looking for any personal appointment. Christopher did an outstanding job for the Trilaterals, appointing no fewer than 22 fellow members to the Clinton Administration that emphasized the "old way of doing business" could not continue. No doubt Christopher will return to O'Melveny & Myers after his term as Secretary of State, to continue the wheeling and dealing business.

Moreover, this political influence duo is now joined in 1994 by yet another partner in O'Melveny & Myers, Ko-Yung-Tung, Chairman of the firm's New York-based Global Practice Group.

So this almost unknown Los Angeles law firm is in reality an influence-peddling outfit of the first category. This Trilateral trio highlights the cozy revolving door political influence game that makes a mockery of a free society.

O'Melveny & Myers together with Kissinger & Associates and the Carlyle Group have a lock on political influence — and all just happen to be linked to the Trilateral Commission. George Franklin, former Executive Secretary of the Commission, avers, this is a mere statistical accident, all talent just accidentally happens to be within the Trilateral Commission, that we shouldn't be concerned; in fact, according to Franklin, we should be grateful that such eminent ladies and gentlemen are willing to accept the burdens of "public service."

So how does this political influence game work? We'll suppose you're out there in Zaire or the Argentine and you want some U.S. taxpayer dollars — to build a bridge or "fight

drugs," anything in fact that gives you opportunity to skim a little gravy off the top for your own hardworking self — what do you do?

You head for Trilateral Mr. Ko-Yung-Tung, the O'Melveny & Myers man in New York, or Trilateral Henry Kissinger at Kissinger Associates, or former Secretary of Defense Trilateral Frank Carlucci at The Carlyle Group — all with excellent Trilateral connections and — for a substantial, very substantial, fee — they will take your case to Washington.

And do you believe for one minute that some small time Deputy Assistant Secretary of State who makes routine \$100 million aid decisions is going to look the other way when Henry, or Frank, or Yung-Tung telephone about the pitiful needs of Zaire or the Argentine?

After all, a Deputy Assistant Secretary has ambitions one day of becoming a full-fledged Assistant Secretary and will need a few kind words from prominent persons. So the decisions on Zaire or the Argentine are not made with the interests of the United States taxpayer in mind but by what is termed elegantly as "political factors."

Now contrast this con game with the many thousands of American citizens who suffered from U.S. radiation experiments in the 1940's and 1950's. They want compensation but have to go to court to try to get just compensation from the Department of Energy. The American in the street can't call up Henry Kissinger or Frank Carlucci or Ko-Yung-Tung (as can the Zairian Embassy or an Argentinian Senator). Poor Joe Blow has to use his limited funds to challenge a Department of Energy with unlimited taxpayer funds to fight its own citizens.

This is what Trilateralism is all about. It's not about the Technetronic Age which is a long word about nothing and indeed if Brzezinski couldn't see the coming downfall of the Soviet Union, he can't be relied upon to for see the nature of the coming era. Trilateralism may be clothed in fancy language but it boils down to the exercise of political power in the interests of the Trilaterals and their associates. If you swallow the coy phrase "public service" then you shouldn't be reading

this book. It's more like institutionalized ripoff.

So you complain to Congress? Good luck! The Majority Leader, Thomas Foley Jr., is a Trilateral, as are many other Congressmen and Senators. Now you know why laws to restrict lobbying always have gaping loopholes.

Here are the prominent law firms with Trilateral partners, and so linked into the political influence network:

CENTER FOR LAW AND SOCIAL POLICY:

Paul C. Warnke (pre-1994)

Philip H. Trezise (pre-1994);

CLIFFORD, WARNKE, GLASS, MCILWAIN & FINNEY:

Paul C. Warnke (pre-1994);

COUDERT BROTHERS:

Sol M. Linowitz (pre-1994)

Richard N. Gardner (1973-1994);

O'MELVENY & MYERS:

Warren Christopher (1973-1994),

William T. Coleman, Jr. (1973-1994)

Ko-Tung-Yung (1994)

SIMPSON, THACHER & BARTLETT:

Cyrus R. Vance (pre-1994)

WILMER, CUTLER & PICKERING:

Gerard C. Smith (1973-1994)

Lloyd N. Cutler (pre-1994)

AKIN, GUMP, STRAUSS, HAUER & FELD:

Vernon C. Jordan (1994).

Propagandists and Technicians

Quite distinct from the political operators, although their functions often overlap, are the propagandists (the media) and the technicians (academicians and research controllers). These groups provide the intellectual linkage between the power holders and the power administrators (the operators). Technicians design the plans needed to promote and implement objectives. They explain ideas to the public and even conceive ideas — within limits. Technicians and propagandists achieve personal success only insofar as they have ability to conceive and promote plans within the overall

framework welcome to the power holders. A media source distributing unwelcome news or a researcher developing unwelcome conclusions is politely so informed — and usually takes the hint. Trilateralist technicians are experts at "getting the message."

We find the following "think tanks" linked to Trilateralism:
ASPEN INSTITUTE FOR HUMANISTIC STUDIES:

Maurice F. Strong
Robert S. Ingersoll

BROOKINGS INSTITUTION:

William T. Coleman, Jr.
Henry D. Owen
Gerard C. Smith
C. Fred Bergsten
Graham T. Allison, Jr.
Philip H. Trezise
Bruce K. MacLaury

CENTER FOR DEFENSE INFORMATION:

Paul C. Warnke

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Richard N. Gardner

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, CENTER FOR STRATEGIC AND
INTERNATIONAL STUDIES:

David M. Abshire
William E. Brock, III
William V. Roth, Jr.
Gerard C. Smith

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Graham Allison
Robert R. Bowie

HOOVER INSTITUTION ON WAR, REVOLUTION AND PEACE

David Packard
George Schultz

HUDSON INSTITUTE

J. Paul Austin

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY (MIT)

Carroll L. Wilson

MITRE CORPORATION

Lucy Wilson Benson

RAND CORPORATION

J. Paul Austin

Graham Allison

William T. Coleman, Jr.

WORLD WATCH INSTITUTE

C. Fred Bergsten

These "think" tanks are financed by foundations which are also linked to Trilateralism:

ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

Cyrus R. Vance

W. Michael Blumenthal

Robert V. Roosa

Lane Kirkland

John D. Rockefeller IV

TWENTIETH CENTURY FUND RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION

J. Paul Austin

FORD FOUNDATION

Andrew Brimmer

John Loudon

CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE

William A. Hewitt

Hedley Donovan

Thomas L. Hughes

BORDEN FOUNDATION

Zbigniew Brzezinski

ROCKEFELLER BROTHERS FUND

David Rockefeller

ROCKEFELLER FAMILY FUND

David Rockefeller

John D. Rockefeller IV

WOODRUFF FOUNDATION

J. Paul Austin

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

Robert R. Bowie

The Media

Trilateralist media representation, although not large in numbers, is highly influential. In the 1970's, of five media commissioners, three were relatively insignificant: Doris Anderson, editor of *Chatelaine Magazine*; Carl Rowan, columnist, and Arthur R. Taylor, formerly head of the CBS network, dismissed in October 1976.

Two media Trilaterals were highly influential: Emmett Dedmon, editorial director of the *Chicago Sun-Times*, published by Field Enterprises. The chairman of Field Enterprises, Inc., Marshall Field V, also a director of First National Bank of Chicago, operates Field Enterprises under an exhaustive agreement with his half brother, "Ted," Frederick W. Field; and Field ownership is significant because of Trilateral connections with the First National Bank of Chicago. In any event, *Chicago Sun Times* is the sixth largest newspaper in the U.S. (daily circulation 687,000).

Another influential media Trilateralist was Hedley Donovan, editor-in-chief of *Time*, member of the Council on Foreign Relations and director of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. According to the U.S. Labor Party:

Donovan played a central role in the "faking of the President, 1976." Under his Trilateral direction, *Time* functioned as a black propaganda vehicle throughout the campaign and post-election period, painting Carter as an "outsider" with no connections with the corrupt politics of Washington, D.C. and Wall Street. This "image building" provided the crucial cover for the planned vote fraud, and *Time* played a crucial coverup role as widespread evidence of the Nov. 2 fraud surfaced.

Trilateral disdain for the First Amendment is a factor working strongly against generally sympathetic media attention. On the other hand, Trilateralist intervention in day-to-day media operation, by use of the traditional telephone call, is probable, given the numerous Trilateral corporate directors in the media: Henry B. Schacht is a

director of CBS; Sol Linowitz, a director of Time; J. Paul Austin, a director of Dow Jones; Harold Brown, a director of Times-Mirror Corporation; Archibald K. Davis, a director of Media General, Inc.; Peter G. Peterson, a director of Great Book Foundation and National Education TV; William M. Roth, a director of Athenum Publishers; and Cyrus Vance, a director of the New York Times. Their presence is ominous. However, any persistent intervention to kill or re-orient stories will backfire. Most media people are professionals rather than propagandists.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting, supposedly a public institution, has always had a heavy Trilateral bias. This reflects the blurring of public and private which Trilaterals exercise so well for their own advantages.

Sharon Percy Rockefeller, wife of Commissioner John D. Rockefeller IV, former Governor, now Senator from West Virginia, is an example of this link. More emphatic is the funding of the PBS heavyweight programs which mold public opinion by Trilateral-oriented and Trilateral-represented firms.

Robert C. Wenks, a Trilateral in 1994, is also Chairman of Prudential Securities, Inc. and finances "Wall Street Week with Louis Rukeyser," and you will never hear Rukeyser criticize the Federal Reserve private banking monopoly or argue gold as the only stable basis for a monetary system.

"Tony Brown's Journal" on PBS is funded by Pepsi-Cola, a major Trilateral-linked firm with at least one or two directors always on the Trilateral Commission. Pepsi is one of the gung ho New World Order firms and as you will remember, was first into Communist China and only second after Coca Cola into Soviet Russia.

The famous MacNeil-Lehrer Newshour is financed by Archer Daniels Midland, a global corporation with Trilateral Dwayne Andreas as Chairman. Pepsi Cola also finances MacNeil Lehrer.

General Electric is another long-time Trilateral firm; Paolo Fresco is the current Trilateral Chairman, and finances the McLaughlin group.

So — how impartial do you think PBS can be when it comes

to New World Order? And this government-backed organization is supposed to be a "public" institution. Instead it illustrates how Trilaterals have a flair for quietly influencing public institutions.

The following media outlets are also linked to Trilateralism:

NEW YORK TIMES:

Cyrus R. Vance (1978);

Flora Lewis (1994)

CBS:

Arthur R. Taylor (1970s)

Henry B. Schacht (19702)

Los ANGELES TIMES

Harold Brown (1979)

Robert Erburn (1994)

TIME, INC.

Hedley Donovan

FOREIGN POLICY MAGAZINE

Samuel P. Huntington

Thomas L. Hughes

Richard N. Cooper

Elliot L. Richardson

Marina von Neumann Whitman

Richard Holbrooke

Zbigniew Brzezinski

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

William M. Roth

C. Fred Bergsten

CHICAGO SUN-TIMES

Emmett Dedmon

CNN

V. Thomas Johnson (1994)

WASHINGTON POST

Katherine Graham (1994)

Politics and Government

Trilaterals are often politicians. In 1977, 27 out of 77 U.S. Trilateralists were also professional politicians and professional bureaucrats. In 1993 the number had increased to 39 politi-

cians and bureaucrats.

In 1977 President Jimmy Carter and Vice President Walter Mondale were Trilaterals. In 1993 President Bill Clinton and Vice President Albert Gore were Trilaterals. It should be emphasized that selection by the Trilateral Commission was long before they became residents of the White House.

Interestingly, President Jimmy Carter was selected and promoted by none other than Trilateral President David Rockefeller. In 1992 the Trilateral backing was more discreet for Bill Clinton because of previous public criticism of the Trilateral Commission for its dominant influence.

Here's how THE TIMES (London) reported the Rockefeller-Carter linkup:

Governor Jimmy Carter, the 1976 Democratic Presidential candidate, has for reasons known only to himself professed to be an innocent abroad, but the record is somewhat different. As Governor of Georgia, a state aspiring to be the centre of the New South, he led the state trade missions abroad. While in London in the autumn of 1973 he dined with another American visitor, but by no means an innocent, Mr. David Rockefeller of Chase Manhattan Bank.

Mr. Rockefeller was then establishing, with the help of Professor Zbigniew Brzezinski of Columbia University, an international study group now known as the Trilateral Commission. He was looking for American members outside the usual catchment area of universities, corporation law firms and government, was impressed by the Governor, if only because he had ventured abroad, and invited him to join. Governor Carter, perhaps because he was already eyeing the White House from afar, was only too happy to accept.

This enlightening statement in THE TIMES has one significant error. The Trilateral Commission is no "international Study group" — it is clearly a group that generates policies and tries to ensure that its own Trilateral Commissioners have a role in implementing the policies. A study

group would not place one-third of its members in Administration after Administration, both Republican and Democrat. This is, THE TIMES to the contrary, an operating group working towards specific self-centered objectives.

The Congress

Senators and Congressmen are members of the Trilateral Commission, which, given the negative belittling Trilateral view of the Congress, is somewhat surprising. On the other hand, modern politicians in the "Best Congress that money can Buy" have little trouble accommodating inconsistent policies providing the price is right — for them.

Trilateralists also occupy key posts in the House, i.e., chairman of the House Republican Conference, majority whip, chairman of the Democratic Conference, and chairman of the House Democratic Caucus. In sum, Trilaterals have a lock on the legislative process.

The significance of this lock on the legislative process is brought into focus when we examine the political ideology of Trilateralism as expressed by Crozier, Huntington, and Watanuki in THE CRISIS OF DEMOCRACY.

- The democratic political system no longer has any purpose.
- The concepts of equality and individualism give problems to authority.
- The media is not sufficiently subservient to the elite.
- Democracy has to be "balanced" (i.e. restricted).
- The authority and power of the central government must be increased

Weighing these totalitarian ideas which form the political philosophy of the commission against congressional membership in the Trilateral Commission, the reader will be tempted to ask, were these the political policies espoused by these politicians when elected to office?

In any event, five senators also were Trilateral commissioners in 1978:

LAWTON CHILES, Democrat, Florida

ALAN CRANSTON, Democrat, California, Senate majority
whip

JOHN C. CULVER, Democrat, Iowa

JOHN C. DANFORTH, Republican, Missouri

WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR., Republican, Delaware

In 1994, Senators DIANE FEINSTEIN, CHARLES ROBB, JOHN
CHAFEE, and WILLIAM S. COHEN were added.

This neatly reflects the Democratic majority in the Senate,
three Democrats and two Republicans; and it is notable that
the Senate majority whip — a key Senate post — is a
Trilateralist.

The following six Congressmen were Trilateralists in 1978:

JOHN B. ANDERSON, Republican, Illinois, chairman, House
Republican Conference

JOHN BRADEMÁS, Democrat, Indiana; majority whip

WILLIAM S. COHEN, Republican, Maine

BARBER B. CONABLE, JR., Republican, New York

THOMAS S. FOLEY, Democrat, Washington; chairman,
House Democratic Caucus

DONALD M. FRASER, Democrat, Minnesota; chairman,
Democratic Conference and Americans for Democratic
Action.

In brief, top administration jobs — Republican and Demo-
crat — are filled from a talent pool dominated by the Trilateral
Commission. This selective process of filling top Executive
Department slots with Trilateralists has been deliberate and
ruthless. Before President Carter formally took office,
numerous Trilateralists were appointed as follows:
ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI — assistant to the president for

national security affairs

CYRUS VANCE — secretary of state

HAROLD BROWN — secretary of defense

W. MICHAEL BLUMENTAL — secretary of the treasury

ANDREW YOUNG — ambassador to the United Nations

WARREN CHRISTOPHER — deputy secretary of state

LUCY WILSON BENSON — undersecretary of state for
security affairs

RICHARD COOPER — undersecretary of state for economic affairs

RICHARD HOLBROOKE — undersecretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs

W. ANTHONY LAKE — undersecretary of state for policy planning

SOL LINOWITZ — co-negotiator on the Panama Canal Treaty

GERALD SMITH — ambassador-at-large for nuclear power negotiations.

Trilaterals in the Clinton Administration

All Administrations since the Carter Administration have contained an unusually large number of Trilateral members. Nominally they resign on entering government but as most promptly rejoin the Trilateral Commission on leaving government, "resignation" is a farce — part of the government/private revolving door that retains influence in a small, like-thinking elitist group.

President Bill Clinton is a "former member in Public service." When he leaves the White House, Clinton will undoubtedly rejoin the Commission and indeed could not have attained the Presidency without Trilateral approval and support.

On the 1993 (July) membership list of Cabinet positions we find as Trilateral members:

BILL CLINTON, President of the United States

WARREN CHRISTOPHER, co-director of the transition with VERNON C. JORDAN (also a Trilateral). Thus the transition process was entirely controlled by Trilaterals.

BRUCE BABBITT, U.S. Secretary of Labor

DONNA E. SHALALA, U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Services

HENRY CISNEROS, U.S. Secretary of Housing and Urban Development

Cabinet positions in 1994 are:

GRAHAM ALLISON, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Plans & Policy

LYNN E. DAVIS, Under-Secretary of State for International Security Affairs

JOHN M. DEUTCH, Under-Secretary of Defense for Acquisition

DAVID GERGEN, Assistant to the President for Communications

WINSTON LORD, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs

ALICE M. RIVLIN, Deputy Director, Office of Management and Budget

JOAN EDELMAN SPERO, Under-Secretary of State for Economic and Agricultural Affairs

STROBE TALBOTT, Deputy Secretary of State, formerly Ambassador to Russia

PETER TARNOFF, Under-Secretary of State for Political Affairs

CLIFTON R. WHARTON, Deputy Secretary of State 1991-93, followed by Strobe Talbott.

Other Government positions in the Clinton administration

WILLIAM J. CROWE, JR., U.S. Ambassador to Britain

ALAN GREENSPAN, Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System

JAMES R. JONES, U.S. Ambassador to Mexico

JOSEPH S. NYE, JR., Chairman, National Intelligence Council, Central Intelligence Agency.

As Executive Director George Franklin Jr. stated back in 1978, the Trilateral Commission invites only members with New World Order viewpoints and goals.

President Bill Clinton then is an ideal member, unusually so because his entire career has been formed under tutelage and guidance of New World Order advocates. (See JBS Bulletin, October 1992).


Clinton has a B.S. in International Affairs from Georgetown University in 1968, where he studied under Carroll Quigley, whose famous *Tragedy and Hope* had been published in 1966. Quigley broke the story of an elitist British group financed by the Rothschilds and Cecil Rhodes, whose ambition was to run the world. Rhodes founded the Rhodes

scholarships at Oxford University — and Clinton, a devout disciple of the New World Order message, was given a Rhodes scholarship to Oxford University.

There is another side to the Quigley story which is little known, and we are aware of it because this author had some correspondence with Quigley about *Tragedy and Hope*. Quigley sincerely believed in New World Order but was not aware of the darker side of the globalist types until they refused to reprint his book and destroyed the plates; Quigley was alerting too many honest academics and citizens to the dark side of New World Order. The difference between Quigley and Clinton is morality. We know that Quigley was an honest academician, a little naive, genuinely puzzled why the Establishment wanted the secrets in *Tragedy and Hope* kept secret. Clinton, on the other hand, quickly learned the political power profit lessons of the New World Order, in the tradition of Rothschild and Rhodes. Consequently, while Quigley died a puzzled man, Bill Clinton has been supported at every turn of the road (until early 1994) by the Trilaterals and their fellows to gain a reputation of deceit and deviousness unequalled by any past President of the United States.

As we write this (January 1994) Clinton is in trouble. We even hear rumors that he is targeted for political destruction and will be succeeded by another Trilateralist, former Mayor of San Francisco, now Senator Dianne Feinstein. But make no mistake, the Trilaterals have a firm hold on the Presidency and will continue to bring their influence to bear on its occupant.

Primary Occupation of Trilateral Commission Members (Past & Present)



CHAPTER THREE: NEW WORLD ORDER AS THE OBJECTIVE

Run your eye down the list of executive committee members:* who is the most powerful individual among them?

There is no doubt that David Rockefeller dominates the executive committee, and thus the commission itself. Even if we are generous (or naive) and see the executive members as equals, then David would surely be *primus inter pares*. It is, however, naive to see David Rockefeller as an omnipotent dictator or the Rockefeller family as an all-powerful monarchy. This is a trap for the unwary. Our world is much more complex. We are looking at a family of families, a collective of power holders with at least several hundred, perhaps several thousand, members, who collectively aim to divert the world, not just the United States, to their own collective objectives.

Let's start at the beginning. The Trilateral Commission was David Rockefeller's idea and promoted with David's funds. (Leave aside for the time being the U.S. Labor party theory that Trilateralism uses the Rockefellers as a "cover" for a "British conspiracy.")

An interview with George S. Franklin, former commission coordinator, by Michael Lloyd Chadwick, editor of *The Freeman Digest*, published in Provo, Utah, is the most authentic version of the founding process which has yet

* See Appendix A, p. 142

surfaced. This portion of the interview follows:

MR. CHADWICK: Mr. Franklin, you were a participant with Mr. David Rockefeller, Robert Bowie, Zbigniew Brzezinski and Henry Owen in forming the Trilateral Commission. Would you provide us with a brief history of how it came into existence?

MR. FRANKLIN: David Rockefeller, in the winter and spring of 1972, gave several speeches to the Chase Bank forums in London, Brussels, Montreal and Paris. He recommended the establishment of an international commission on peace and prosperity which in fact is now the Trilateral Commission. He didn't receive an enthusiastic response in these meetings and he dropped the idea. He thought, "If the Chase Bank Forums don't respond favorably to my suggestion then it's probably a lousy idea."

He then went to a Bilderberger meeting. Mike Blumenthal was there (now Treasury Secretary), and he said, "You know, I'm very disturbed. . . Cooperation between these three areas — Japan, the United States and Western Europe — is really falling apart, and I foresee all sorts of disaster for the world if this continues. Isn't there anything to be done about it?" David then thought, "I'll present the idea once more," which he did, and he aroused great enthusiasm. The next eight speakers said that this was a marvelous idea; by all means, somebody get it launched

David wasn't quite sure whether these were all his friends. He wasn't quite sure if they were being polite or if they really thought it was a good idea. So he took Zbig Brzezinski back on the plane with him. Zbig thought it was a very good idea and had done some writing on it. Bob Bowie had done some writing on it too. When he got back, David asked me if I would go back to Europe and talk to some people more at leisure and see if they really thought this was a good idea They truly did

David and I went to Japan in June of 1972 and he talked to a lot of people there. They thought it was a good

idea, so we had a meeting of 13-15 people at his place in Tarrytown (ed: New York).

It was decided to go ahead and try to organize and form it

There is no reason to doubt that formation came about in any other way — at least we have no evidence that Franklin is hiding anything. But note that the way the Trilateral Commission was founded suggests a loose power coalition, sometimes in competition, sometimes in cooperation, rather than a small, tight, iron-fisted conspiracy run by the Rockefellers.

But even the establishment Washington Post has found unsettling features about the Trilateral Commission in its current seemingly non-interested packaging.

Consequently it is not surprising that Trilateral objectives are not shouted from the rooftops but inferred from policy statements, papers and positions as well as the personal philosophies of those chosen as members of the Commission.

Here's the Washington Post observation:

Trilateralists are not three-sided people. They are members of a private, though not secret, international organization put together by the wealthy banker, David Rockefeller, to stimulate the establishment dialogue between Western Europe, Japan and the United States.

But here is the unsettling thing about the Trilateral Commission. The President-elect is a member. So is Vice-President-elect Walter F. Mondale. So are the new Secretaries of State, Defense and Treasury, Cyrus R. Vance, Harold Brown and W. Michael Blumenthal. So is Zbigniew Brzezinski, who is a former Trilateral director and, Carter's national security adviser, also a bunch of others who will make foreign policy for America in the next four years.

No doubt this Washington Post observation was brought to the attention of David Rockefeller because by the 1990s the publisher of the Washington Post, Katherine Graham (Chairman of the Board of Washington Post Companies) had been appointed to the Trilateral Commission!

Even though Trilateral control has continued, the Washington Post has made no more remarks about "unsettling things."

This was the White House composition in the early 70s. It remains the same today, in 1994, a heavily Trilateral membership.

President Bill Clinton is a Trilateral as was President Jimmy Carter. Secretary of State Warren Christopher is an original member of the Trilateral Commission. So are 22 other members of the Clinton Cabinet and sub-cabinet Administration.

The personal philosophies of Carter appointees are similar to that of Clinton. . . they all adhere more or less to a global New World Order. Where, for example, President Truman was non-imperialist, these are imperialist Presidents. From speeches and letters written by Trilateralists we know their New World Order position.

When the Trilateral Commission met in Tokyo, Japan, in January 1977. Carter and Brzezinski obviously could not attend as they were still in the process of reorganizing the White House. They did, however, address personal letters to the meeting, which were reprinted in *Dialogue*:

It gives me special pleasure to send greetings to all of you gathering for the Trilateral Commission meeting in Tokyo. I have warm memories of our meeting in Tokyo some eighteen months ago, and am sorry I cannot be with you now.

My active service on the Commission since its inception in 1973 has been a splendid experience for me, and it provided me with excellent opportunities to come to know leaders in our three regions.

As I emphasized in my campaign, a strong partnership among us is of the greatest importance. We share economic, political and security concerns that make it logical we should seek ever-increasing cooperation and understanding. And this cooperation is essential not only for our three regions, but in the global search for a more just and equitable world order (emphasis added). I hope to see you on the occasion of your next meeting in

Washington, and I look forward to receiving reports on your work in Tokyo."

Jimmy Carter

Brzezinski's letter, written in a similar vein, follows:

The Trilateral Commission has meant a great deal to me over the last few years. It has been the stimulus for intellectual creativity and a source of personal satisfaction. I have formed close ties with new friends and colleagues in all three regions, ties which I value highly and which I am sure will continue.

I remain convinced that, on the larger architectural issues of today, collaboration among our regions is of the utmost necessity. This collaboration must be dedicated to the fashioning of a more just and equitable world order (emphasis added). This will require a prolonged process, but I think we can look forward with confidence and take some pride in the contribution which the Commission is making.

Zbigniew Brzezinski

The key phrase in both letters is "a more just and equitable world order."

Does this emphasis indicate that something is wrong with our present world order, that is, with national structures? Yes, according to Brzezinski; and since the present "framework" is inadequate to handle world problems, it must be done away with and supplanted with a world government.

In Brzezinski's Technetronic Era, the "nation state as a fundamental unit of man's organized life has ceased to be the principal creative force: International banks and multinational corporations are acting and planning in terms that are far in advance of the political concepts of the nation-state."

Understanding the philosophy of and monitoring the Trilateral commission is the only way we can reconcile the myriad of apparent contradictions in the information filtered through to us in the national press. For instance, how is it

that the Marxist regime in Angola derived the great bulk of its foreign exchange from the offshore oil operations of Gulf Oil Corporation? Why did Andrew Young insist that "Communism has never been a threat to Blacks in Africa"? Why did the U.S. funnel billions in technological aid to the Soviet Union and Communist China? Why does the U.S. apparently help its enemies while chastising its friends?

These questions, and hundreds of others like them, cannot be explained in any other way: the U.S. Executive Branch (and related agencies) is not anti-Marxist or anti-Communist — it is, in fact, pro-Marxist. Those ideals which led to the abuses of Hitler, Lenin, Stalin, and Mussolini are now being accepted as necessary inevitabilities by our elected and appointed leaders.

This hardly suggests the Great American Dream. It is very doubtful that Americans would agree with Brzezinski or the Trilateral Commission. It is the American public who is paying the price, suffering the consequences, but not understanding the true nature of the situation.

One of the most important "frameworks" in the world, and especially to Americans, is the United States Constitution. It is this document that outlined the most prosperous nation in the history of the world. Is our sovereignty really "fiction"? Is the U.S. vision no longer compatible with reality? Brzezinski further states:

The approaching two-hundredth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence could justify the call for a national constitutional convention to re-examine the nation's formal institutional framework. Either 1976 or 1989 — the two-hundredth anniversary of the Constitution — could serve as a suitable target date culminating a national dialogue on the relevance of existing arrangements. . . . Realism, however, forces us to recognize that the necessary political innovation will not come from direct constitutional reform, desirable as that would be. The needed change is more likely to develop incrementally and less overtly. . . . in keeping with the American tradition of blurring distinctions between public and

private institution.

Obviously Brzezinski, and global capitalists have no use for national sovereignty or the Constitution. Their interests are global — and much as they may protest we see no difference between Trilateral globalism and, for example, British and French imperialism of the 19th Century. Or the Holy Roman Empire for that matter.

But this New World Order objective would not pass an electorate. Outside the globalists, the New World Order fanatics, we doubt that many in the United States are interested in a planned world economy under the dominance of Wall Street.

In conclusion, the Trilateral Commission when pressed makes no secret of its unrepresentative nature nor its New World Order objectives.

Back in 1978 in the previously cited radio interview with George Franklin Jr., then Executive Director of the Trilateral Commission, these objectives emerged under questioning from the author:

SUTTON: Mr. Donovan, of Time-Life, has just been appointed Special Assistant to President Carter. Mr. Donovan is a member of your Commission.

FRANKLIN: That is correct.

SUTTON: Does this not emphasize the fact that the Carter Administration is choosing its administration from an extremely narrow range. In other words, the Trilateral Commission?

FRANKLIN: I do not think that that needs any confirmation. That is a matter of fact that he has chosen most of his main foreign policy people, I would have to say, from the people he got to know while he was on the Trilateral Commission.

SUTTON: Well, I can only make the statement that this leaves any reasonable man with the impression that the Carter Administration is dominated by the Trilateral Commission with your specific ideas which many people do not agree with.

FRANKLIN: Well, I would certainly agree that people who were members of the Commission have predominant

places in the foreign policy aspects of the Carter Administration. They are not, because they are members of the Commission, controlled in any sense by us. I do think that they do share a common belief that is very important that we work particularly with Europe and Japan or we are all going to be in trouble.

SUTTON: But this common belief may not reflect the beliefs of the American people. How do you know that it does?

FRANKLIN: I do not know that it does. I am no man to interpret what the people think about.

SUTTON: In other words, you are quite willing to go ahead (and) establish a Commission which you say does not necessarily reflect the views of the people in the United States? It appears to me that you have taken over political power.

FRANKLIN: I do not think this is true at all. Anybody who forms a group for certain purposes obviously tries to achieve these purposes. We do believe that it is important that Europe, Japan, and the United States get along together. That much we do believe. We also chose the best people we could get as members of the Commission. Fortunately, nearly all accepted. The President was one of them and he happened to have thought that these were very able people indeed, and he asked them to be in his government, it is as simple as that. If you are going to ask me if I am very unhappy about that, the answer is no. I think that these are good people.

The reader can make his or her own interpretation. We hold the view today in 1994 that we held in 1973 and 1978 (the date of the radio program) — that the Trilateral Commission is not representative of the United States, has clearly by its actions demonstrated that it is a group intent on manipulating power for personal advantage and that these actions or objectives are not those of American citizens — and the Trilateral Commission has no intention of putting the matter to a vote. *Quod etat demonstrandum.*

CHAPTER FOUR: POLICIES FOR MONOPOLY CONTROL

The unstated concealed Trilateral policy is global power and influence, a policy best achieved by financial control. The dedicated interest of the Rockefeller family and international bankers in world order, world planning, global problems is the sure indicator that they understand how political control can be translated into dollars and cents.

Trilaterals, one of several elitist organizations for global control, have organized influence peddling companies headed by their own Trilateral buddies. These grease the way more or less legally between government contracts and corporate contracts.

Anti-lobbying laws are so deviously written and so easy to circumnavigate that in practice they do no more than convince the public that government contracts are intended to be influence free.

The reality is that the revolving door is significantly controlled by Trilaterals and completely controlled by elitists, if we include the influence of such organizations as Council on Foreign Relations (long-time Chairman was David Rockefeller) and Yale Skull and Bones (with members such as George Bush, Averell Harriman and other government movers and shakers).

One well-known conduit for government business using insider influence is Kissinger Associates. Trilateral Henry

Kissinger, founder and Chairman of Kissinger Associates, is former Assistant for National Security Affairs and a former U.S. Secretary of State. As such, Kissinger was able to acquire and use worldwide contacts and a thorough knowledge of the contact-contract world.

Kissinger & Associates charges global corporations substantial fees to act on their behalf within and without the United States. Kissinger uses his influence, earned and gained at US. taxpayer expense, to push the cause of his clients. This is, of course, influence peddling, but apparently legal because the loopholes written into the laws are big enough to drive a truck through and will remain that way until the voting public demands that politics be separated from personal finance.

A more recent influence peddling outfit is the Carlyle Group, subject of a scathing and well-written article in the New Republic (October 18, 1993). According to this article, the Carlyle Group was founded by David Rubenstein, a minor league former merchant banker, and named after the New York Hotel Carlyle.

The Hotel Carlyle is a long-time corporate hangout. (We once visited one of the suites and found it to be a dismal, solidly-furnished building used by global wheeler dealers for private business.)

The Carlyle Group according to New Republic holds a majority stake in firms that do business with the United States Government. Day-to-day operations are conducted by former Secretary of Defense Frank Carlucci, a Trilateralist whose entire stock of expertise consists of whom he knows in Government and how Government wheels mesh together.

Among members of the Carlyle Group are former Secretary of State James Baker, a close friend of former President George Bush, former Budget Director Richard Darman, Treasury Secretary Donald Regan, Bush Campaign Chairman Fred Malek, George Bush Jr., former CIA Director Robert Gates, the current SEC Chairman Arthur Levitt, Clinton transition team co-director Vernon Jordan, and politician Bob Strauss.

These are former Cabinet-level politicians who have noth-

ing to sell but their access in Government, i.e. their personal telephone books. All are directly or indirectly Trilateral connected.

Frank Carlucci openly lists himself in the Trilateral biographies as "Vice Chairman, the Carlyle Group, former US Secretary of State." Vernon Jordan is listed as Partner Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld."

As New Republic author Michael Lewis describes the scene:

The Carlyle Group in short has become a kind of salon des refusees for the influence peddling class. It offers a neat solution for people who don't have a whole lot to sell besides their access, but who don't want to appear to be selling their access.

So the "access capitalist" joins the perennial "Washington lobbyist" — roads to instant wealth for the not-so-fussy lawyer. One of the first successful Carlyle operations is known as "The Great Eskimo Tax Scam of 1987." This well-organized and well-thought out loophole enabled Alaskan companies to sell their losses for hard cash to other companies. These losses were used to reduce the tax load of the companies and so everyone gained — except the U.S. taxpayer. Carlyle, of course, was in the business of matching Alaskan losses to corporate tax avoidance. Eskimos were flown to Washington, D.C. and shown how to organize some dubious losses — for which the high-toned Carlyle Group took a fancy fee of one percent.

According to New Republic, Carlyle has excellent expertise to enable firms to buy Government property cheap — as Carlucci had spent billions of tax dollars in contracts to large military industrial firms, these same firms were no doubt willing to look kindly on his efforts to organize a private auction of assets.

According to Carlucci, "everyone in our business is trying to figure out ways to avoid getting into an auction. Get into auctions, that's a way to lose a lot of money." The idea was "private auctions" for a few invited buyers. We call it a

conspiracy to defraud taxpayers — but Department of Justice hasn't yet lifted a finger to go into court.

Trilateral Frank Carlucci, whose efforts are described by Jack Anderson as "the bureaucratic havoc wrought by Frank Carlucci, a human windstorm out of Washington" is a perfect example of the market value of political contact. . . Carlucci has worked in every administration from Kennedy to Bush, in numerous departments without any momentous contribution to public welfare.

According to Carlyle Chairman Rubenstein, "I get resumes from some of the biggest names in town, lawyers who are making \$800,000 a year. They call and say they'll come and work for free. It's almost embarrassing." Now why would any Washington lawyer want to work for free, in New York too? Obviously because Carlyle has a reputation for making money, lots of money, at public expense and is apparently untouchable. Yet one senses a certain uncertainty because the last words to the New Republic writer were "How do I keep it from being a cover story?"

Global Money Monopoly

Trilaterals want monopoly, world monopoly. Therefore, you must hold a key fundamental proposition in mind: Trilaterals are not interested in what monetary system works best, or most equitably, or whether gold is a more effective monetary device than paper, or what monetary system will support a higher standard of living for the world's poor.

The overriding drive for Trilaterals is to manage the world economy, "manage" being a euphemism for control. This control is exercised through so-called coordination of macroeconomic policy, in spite of the dismal results from attempted macroeconomic direction. It is argued that the prime desideratum for this control device is to keep world peace. Nowhere is there any recognition of the historical fact that such control has always led to conflict: that denying national and ethnic independence is a sure road to strife and bloodshed.

Trilaterals by their own words are interested in political power: all objectives are subordinate to the political power

needed to order the world as the Trilateralists see fit. So you will not find rational consideration of alternatives, or the weighing of options in Trilateral dogma. You can, however, expect an irrational drive, come what may, to control the world in the name of globalism and New World Order.

Triangle Paper 14, "Towards a Renovated International System," concludes that the 1944 Bretton Woods system has already "come under increasing strain," and events have forced traumatic changes, that is, the periodic assault on the dollar and floating exchange rates. The current Trilateral objective is to build an international system, a world order based on cooperation and focusing on two aspects which require such cooperation:

- International lending, and
- The creation of international reserves.

The Trilateral proposal is to involve five to ten leading core countries in establishing the new system. The rest of the world will have to go along as best it can. Some ideas to this end have already been implemented: for example, a new man-made artificial international money, the Special Drawing Rights (SDRs) has been created for central banks. As the SDR is introduced, gold will (supposedly) be phased out of the international reserve system.

International Bankers and Bancor (Paper Money)

The benefits of Bancor will accrue to international bankers more than to anyone else. The interlock between New York international bankers, the Trilateral Commission, and thus, Trilateral proposals in Bancor can be traced precisely.

The earnings that major banks receive from overseas is a matter of public record and is a measure of the division between their domestic interests in the United States and a global economy. The degree of domestic control over the economy by international banks has been identified in a report published by the late Senator Lee Metcalf, "Voting Rights in Major Corporations." Also a matter of public record are the names of international bankers who are Trilateral

Commissioners. When we integrate these three statistics, (a) source of bank earnings, (b) control of domestic companies, and (c) Trilateral membership, we identify a highly significant interlock between international banks and the Trilateral push for a global economy.

Table 4-1 ranks 12 international banks in order of their 1976 earnings from overseas; that is, the bank with the highest percentage of its earnings from overseas is ranked Number 1, and the bank with the least percentage from overseas is ranked Number 12 (columns 1 and 2). This percentage is compared with the equivalent 1970 figures to demonstrate that foreign earnings have ballooned since 1970 (columns 3 and 4). Column 5 is the Metcalf Index of domestic control by these same bankers, defined as the number of the 122 companies examined by a congressional committee in which the bank is among the top five shareholders. Column 6 lists Trilateral commissioners who are also directors of these banks.

Chase Manhattan is the bank with the highest percentage of earnings from abroad: a remarkable 78 percent, compared to 22 percent in 1970. In brief, David Rockefeller's international merchandising has made Chase a global bank, not an American bank, and we might call David a de facto world citizen, not an American citizen. At the same time, Chase has a very low rating on the Metcalf Index. The bank is among the largest five stockholders in only eight of the 122 companies studied by the subcommittee (compared to Citibank's 25 and J.P. Morgan's 56).

No fewer than six Chase Manhattan directors (Kissinger is on the Chase International Advisory Board) were represented in 1976 on the Trilateral Commission. In sum, Chase is heavily, almost totally, oriented outside the United States. Its pecuniary interest in promoting a New World Order is slightly more than obvious.

Contrast Chase to J.P. Morgan where 53 percent of income is from overseas (up from 25 percent in 1970) with only one Trilateral representative. Banks like Charter New York (formerly Irving Trust) and Chemical Bank do not appear on the Metcalf Index at all and have no Trilateral representation,

that is, they are not apparently involved in creating a New World Order.

This pattern is dramatized if we rearrange the data in Table 4-1 with the highest Trilateral representation first.

In a few words: the Trilateral Commission is dominated by a very few international banks, essentially Chase Manhattan, and is an institution focused outside the United States. At the same time, the Trilateral Commission has taken over the United States executive branch. We have not been taken over by communists or Russians or Martians but by a group which wants to "revise" the Constitution (to organize more political power) but is without majority financial and economic ties to the United States.

Table 4-1
International Banks and the Trilateral Commission (1976)

1976 Rank in Foreign Earnings	International Banks	% of Earnings International Operations		Metcalf Index	No. of Trilateral Commissioners as Directors (1976)
		1970	1976		
1	Chase Manhattan	22	78	8	6 Rockefeller, Coleman, Hewitt, Haggarty, Jamieson, Kissinger
2	Citicorp	40	72	25	0
3	First Nat'l Bank of Boston	8	65	10	0
4	Banker's Trust	14	64	11	0
5	Charter New York	12	58	—	0
6	Manufacturers Hanover	13	56	12	1 Whitman
7	J.P. Morgan	25	53	56	1 Austin
8	Chemical Bank	10	44	—	0
9	Bank of America	15	40	15	2 Clausen, Wood
10	Continental Illinois	0	23	8	3 Hewitt, Perkins, Wood
11	First Chicago	2	17	11	3 Ingersoll, Morgan, Peterson
12	Wells Fargo	9	12	—	1 Arbuckle

Table 4-2
Banks with Trilateral Representation (1976)

Name of Bank	Percent of Earnings From International Operations, 1976	Metcalf Index	Number of Trilateral Commissioners as Directors
Chase Manhattan	78	8	6
Continental Illinois	23	8	3
First Chicago	17	11	3
Bank of America	40	15	2
Manufacturers Hanover	56	12	1
J.P. Morgan	53	56	1
Wells Fargo	12	0	1

Banks with No Trilateral Representation

Citicorp	72	25	0
First National of Boston	65	10	0
Bankers Trust	64	11	0
Charter New York	58	0	0
Chemical Bank	44	0	0

Table 4-3
International Banks and the Trilateral Commission (1993)

Chase Manhattan	David Rockefeller Thomas G. Labreque, CEO Wm. T. Coleman Henry Kissinger
World Bank	Jessica P. Einhorn, Vice President Robert McNamara, former Chairman
Salomon, Inc.	John H. Gutfreund, former Chairman
Goldman Sachs Int'l.	Robert D. Hormats, Vice Chairman
Federal Reserve Bank	Paul A. Volcker, former Chairman, Board of Governors E. Gerald Corrigan, President, Federal Reserve Bank of New York Alan Greenspan, Chairman, FRS.

* See Appendix A; Executive Committee members are marked with an asterisk.

However, SDRs have proven no match for gold. Attempts to hold the price of gold at an artificially low "official price" proved elusive and ultimately demonstrated that even Trilateral power is subject to world market forces — and market forces are the sum of individual marketing decisions.

The task ahead for the Trilateral Commission world managers is to integrate these monopoly ideas into the world monetary system and make them work. The immediate and most compelling task is to operate the floating rate system to dampen erratic movements in exchange rates, which are, of course, damaging to international trade. Such erratic movements do not occur in fixed rates tied to gold. However, gold moves the world away from the "cooperative" international arrangements needed by Trilaterals, and gold, therefore, is a bigger problem than floating rate disorder. Following this is the task of world reserve management. The Trilaterals want "wider cooperation since the key to world reserve management is restraint in the additions to central bank holdings of gold and of course currencies such as the U.S. Dollar, the German Mark, the British Pound and the French Franc."¹

The sinking dollar is also a problem, and an unforeseen one, particularly as it inevitably leads to lesser use of dollars as a world reserve unit. Trilaterals with their vague views on gold were not able to foresee that the 1971 suspension of gold convertibility would be a millstone around the neck of dollar and "international cooperation."

The out-of-date views on gold held by the U.S. Treasury, under Trilateral control, are well exemplified by a letter from Gene E. Godley, assistant secretary for legislative affairs at the treasury to Congressman J. Kenneth Robinson — a letter which incidentally illustrates clearly why the treasury has been able to lose billions of dollars for the U.S. taxpayer.

There is, moreover, a high degree of uncertainty about the usefulness of gold as money. Its monetary role has greatly diminished in recent years, and its market price has varied widely. Thus, our gold stocks no longer represent an assured source of financing for our imports.

The principal objective in 1944, when Keynes proposed a universal money, was much narrower than current proposals: the system was to be one of multilateral clearing, a universal currency valid for trade transactions throughout the world. According to Keynes:

It is not necessary in order to attain these ends that we should dispossess gold from its traditional use. It is enough to supplement and regulate the total supply of gold and of the new money taken together. The new money must not be freely convertible into gold, for that would require that gold reserves should be held against it, and we should be back where we were, but there is no reason why the new money should not be purchasable for gold."

When it came to christening this new money, Keynes said, "What shall we call the new money? Bancor? Unitas? Both of them in my opinion are bad names, but we racked our brains without success to find a better." Even "Bezant" was proposed, interestingly the name of the last international coin (a gold coin) that circulated throughout the then known world for 800 years because it was a gold coin and never debased.

Actually the two proposals, Bancor (British) and Unitas (United States), had different features. The adopted American plan, Unitas, deposited part of the U.S. gold reserves with the IMF together with a specific amount of domestic currency but created no international currency. By contrast, the Keynesian plan, Bancor, provided an international currency with overdraft facilities at the clearing union. In other words, today the Trilaterals have taken us back to the Keynesian Bancor plan rejected in 1944.

A comparison of the two monetary schemes clarifies their major differences:

Keynes Bancor Scheme (not adopted in 1944)	Trilateral-modified Bancor Scheme of 1978 (used today)
Universal money - Bancor	Universal money — SDRs (Special Drawing Rights)
Gold accepted as a reserve	Gold not accepted as reserve
No gold convertibility	No gold convertibility

National currencies not held
as reserves
Public approval necessary

National currencies not held
as reserves
Public approval not necessary

Bancor was not adopted in 1944. It's now a matter of history that the related Harry Dexter White Unitas plan which was adopted led the U.S. into bankruptcy: the dollar weaknesses of today are directly traceable to the Bretton Woods Unitas plan.

Today's Trilaterals are political animals, with New World Order objectives, not interested in orderly world trade but in a specific future world structure under their control. The question is not to design a workable system to facilitate trade and improve human welfare, but to design a system that will enhance and preserve power for the Trilaterals. The Trilateral answer is to reinvent the system not used in 1944, the Keynesian Bancor, but modified this time as a universal currency divorced completely from gold and national currencies.

The extent of insider willingness to disregard, and even distort, widely held progold views of others is exemplified by an extraordinary statement in Robert Solomon's book, which is aptly subtitled *An Insider's View*. This is Solomon's interpretation of the motivation of gold-oriented economists:

Those who are worshipful of gold (gold bugs or, more politely, chrysophilites) are usually motivated by one or more of these concerns: particular economic theories now held by a small minority of economists, distrust of government, (and) international political objectives.

The rationale for paper money, to quote Robert Solomon again:

Just as there is a need in each country for economic policies aimed at high employment and price stability, there is a need, at the international level, for a similar effort to make the policies of individual countries compatible with the well-being of the world economy. Since there exists no international authority that can directly

perform this function, it can be done only by means of consultation and cooperation among representatives of independent nations meeting together in established international form.

This European episode and the later creation of the European Currency Unit (ECU) exemplifies the Trilateral weakness in historical precedent. Why did the Germans refuse to go along with Keynesian demand stimulation? Because two factors are locked into the German psyche and ignored by American planners. First, the unparalleled rise of the German economy from the ashes of 1946 was due to plain old laissez faire free enterprise, not artificial Keynesian locomotives. Second, Germany has had two recent devastating price inflations (1923 and 1946), and both times the Mark went to zero. Germans know the consequences of inflation and Keynesian-type stimulation.

In sum, a combination of factors — German refusal to adopt Keynesian stimulation, the French political scene, and the collapse in the leading indicators (signaling a depression in 1979) — has reduced international cooperation and coordination.

One can perceive in the background a central reason why the Trilaterals, essentially the big New York banking powers, must move ahead with Bancor. . . why they must develop the so-called Witteveen facility. . . why they must create elastic international reserves, to be expanded at the push of a computer key.

The central unstated propellant for global fiat money is that the international monetary system is on a precarious merry-go-round: borrow — generate a deficit — be unable to repay — reschedule — borrow some more. The world debt balloon must be kept inflated. If the balloon goes bust, so do the New York banks (remember Chase receives 78 percent of its earnings from abroad). If one of the world players decides he's had enough, if a New York bank says no to Zaire, if Turkey or anyone of a dozen other LDCs default, the whole pack of monetary cards will come tumbling down.

Monopolists Plot Their Course

The 1993 Annual Meeting of the Trilateral Commission held very appropriately in Washington, D.C. on March 27-29 focused on the new Clinton Administration.

Trilateral Secretary of State Warren Christopher spoke to the group and read a letter from fellow Trilateral, President Bill Clinton.

However, the most enlightening feature came from the Chairman's Report (page 75 in the Report) entitled "An Agenda for Trilateral Leadership." The title itself negates the propaganda that the Trilateral Commission is a "study group." This title claims "leadership" and an "agenda," i.e. a plan. And indeed the speech, presumably expected to be kept semi-secret, did spell out an agenda for a New World Order and the need for definite action and planning to bring this about:

A future order based on sustained cooperation will not happen without the conscious planning and steering of political leadership and without a fuller sense among our citizens of the needs of this new era. ...

Trilaterals are right in believing that citizens are unenthusiastic about "the needs of the new era."

The "needs" are largely chosen and exploited by the Trilaterals themselves for self interested reasons. Furthermore Trilaterals have no legal validity. They are not elected. They are not subject to any citizen review. They apparently can do what they want without consulting any citizen. No wonder citizens are uninterested. And if enough read this book (a most unlikely event) citizens might even start to think that their sovereignty has been usurped — and start to look for the rope to hang the perceived creators of contemporary misery. When GATT and NAFTA reduce even further American standards of living, citizens will be looking for a scapegoat. When crime and phony "wars" on drugs, crime, poverty and everything else evolve into street bloodshed — this author would not want to be in a Trilateralist's shoes. Nor in those of an international banker sitting in New York.

FRONT PAGE OF 1979
 TRILATERAL COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP LIST
 Note David Rockefeller, Chairman of Chase Manhattan
 Bank is the
 founder and North American Chairman as well as
 Chairman of the
 Executive Committee that selects Trilateral members.

The Trilateral Commission

GEORGES BERTHOIN	TAKESHI WATANABE	DAVID ROCKEFELLER
European Chairman	Japanese Chairman	North American Chairman
EGIDIO ORTONA	NOBUHIKO USHIBA	MITCHELL SHARP
European Deputy Chairman	Japanese Deputy Chairman	North American Deputy Chairman
MARTINE TRINK	GEORGE S. FRANKLIN	CHARLES B. HECK
European Secretary	Coordinator Japanese Secretary	North American Secretary

North American Members

David M. Abshire, Chairman, Georgetown University Center for Strategic and International Studies

Gardner Ackley, Henry Carter Adams University Professor of Political Economy, University of Michigan

Graham Allison, Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University

Doris Anderson, President, The Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women; former Editor, Chatelaine Magazine

John B. Anderson, U.S. House of Representatives

J. Paul Austin, Chairman, The Coca-Cola Company

George W. Ball, Senior Partner, Lehman Brothers

Michel Belanger, President, Provincial Bank of Canada

Robert W. Bonner, Q.C., Chairman, British Columbia Hydro

Robert R. Bowie, Harvard Center for International Affairs

John Brademas, U.S. House of Representatives

Andrew Brimmer, President, Brimmer & Company, Inc.

Arthur F. Burns, Distinguished Scholar in Residence, The American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research; former Chairman of Board of Governors, U.S. Federal Reserve Board

Philip Caldwell, Vice Chairman and President, Ford Motor Company

Hugh Calkins, Partner, Jones, Day, Reavi's & Pogue

Claude Castonguay, President, Fonds Laurentien; Chairman of the Board, Imperial Life Assurance Company; former Minister in the Quebec Government

Sol Chaikin, President, International Ladies Garment Workers Union

William S. Cohen, United States Senate

*William T. Coleman, Jr., Senior Partner, O'Melveny & Myers; former U.S. Secretary of Transportation

Barber B. Conable, Jr., U.S. House of Representatives

John Cowles, Jr., Chairman, Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co.

John C. Culver, United States Senate

CHAPTER FIVE: TWO DECADES OF TRILATERAL SCHEMING IN AGRICULTURE

In a previous volume, *TRILATERALS OVER WASHINGTON*, we pointed out that a Trilateral objective is to exaggerate and exacerbate world problems so that Trilateral power to control and order a new world may be magnified.

We pointed out that such magnified problems appear to be selected according to the following criteria:

- The problem must be important from a global viewpoint;
- The problem must be one that can be solved by some degree of Trilateral-Communist cooperation following a presumed unstated objective to merge the U.S. with a socialist structure.
- The venture must be one that can be pursued without undue intrusion into the internal affairs of the participating states.

An important problem area that fits the criteria for selective manipulation is that of world food. Food supplies are inadequate, people need food to live, and the technological and financial abilities for food production are heavily within Trilateral countries. As Triangle Paper No. 13 puts it:

Prospects are somewhat more substantial for cooperation in the realm of increasing food production. Production increases require both more effective domestic

agricultural policies on the part of developing countries and enlarged provision of outside capital and technology to them for agricultural development.

In particular, Triangle Paper 13 claims:

The prospects for cooperation are more promising with regard to the third objective: the development of adequate food (particularly grain) reserves. A reserve stock policy that could keep cereal price changes within a less disruptive range than in the recent past could make a considerable contribution not only to restraining inflation in the developed and developing worlds, but also to ensuring that adequate food supplies are available to developing nations at prices that will not impose an undue drain on foreign exchange...

In considering Trilateral targets for international food reserves and world agriculture, we need to consider what the Trilaterals say they want and compare it to what they really want. Fascinated by the idea of "food power" and "contrived shortages," the Trilaterals intend to use food as a weapon to bring about the New World Order. One stated objective is to create an "international system of national food reserves" by massive manipulation of recently acquired political power against private markets and initiatives. It is proposed, for example:

- To keep grain prices in a "less disruptive range,"
- Restrain inflation,
- Ensure adequate food reserves for lesser developed countries (LDCs) and
- Overcome periodic food imbalances.

Trilateral intentions for a world grain storage program are published by the Trilateral Commission and the Brookings Institution, headed by Trilateral Commissioner Bruce K. MacLaury. Other Trilateralists on the Brookings Board of Trustees include Robert V. Roosa (partner in Brown Brothers, Harriman), Lucy Wilson Benson, and Gerard C. Smith (ambassador at large for non-proliferation matters.) In 1976

Brookings Institution Senior Fellow Philip H. Trezise, with the assistance of former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Carroll Brunthaver, published *Re Building Grain Reserves: Toward An International System*. Brunthaver had previously been involved in a conflict of sworn testimony, investigated by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. (See Report, *Russian Grain Transactions*, 93rd Congress, 2nd Session, p. 33). In the Trezise book, the problems for multi-lateral agreement on grain reserves are considered to be "formidable." Going ahead is "compelling" because of the following: upward moves in grain prices have a "pervasive influence" on all food prices; they mean more worldwide hunger; and grain stocks can be used in periods of famine.

More specifically, Trezise proposed:

- An initial reserve of sixty million tons of grain, rising to between seventy-five and eighty million tons by 1981,
- Contributions from all industrial countries, including Argentina and South Africa,
- A program cost of \$6 billion plus \$640 million in annual storage costs,
- That stocks should be "national," bought at 10 percent above floor prices and sold at 10 percent below ceiling prices,
- That twenty million tons be set aside for famine reserve.

As in most Trilateral writings, Trezise includes only evidence in favor of proposed Trilateral policy. Trilaterals typically use an ideological procedure of gathering facts and opinion supporting their argument, never allowing a hint of serious counterargument. Two glaring unstated consequences in Trezise's book are:

1. Any such massive stockpiling will raise the long-term price of grain, negating the objective of "restraining inflation";
2. The only way to stop the resulting inflation is through rigid government price controls and regimented farming.

The choice of food products as a means of reducing national sovereignty is emphasized in the following paragraph:

There are several reasons why commodities are treated differently than other products that enter into trade. Probably the most basic reason is that commodity supplies are linked to land, tying them to the concept of territory, over which nation-states exercise sovereignty. As a general proposition, the demand for, and the supply of, most commodities are rather unresponsive to changes in price over short periods of time, so that quite sharp fluctuations in price can be generated by fairly modest changes in overall market conditions. Moreover, the time required to expand supplies is often lengthy, although this property varies widely among individual commodities. Although the value of all commodity consumption represents no more than about ten percent of annual economic activity in industrialized nations, and even though substitutes exist for any particular commodity, commodities are sometimes distinguished as "core products."

The Trilateral elite, through control of the U.S. executive branch, will be calling the shots on a world basis to reduce producer control and indirectly national sovereignty. The amount of political power possessed by world grain producers can be measured by comparing the area devoted to 1976 wheat production in Trilateral regions:

	Thousand Hectares
European Economic Community	11,232
Japan	89
United States	28,700
U.S.S.R. (for comparison)	59,462

This U.S./Trilateral dominance is further reflected in world export figures of wheat plus flour for 1975-76:

	Metric Tons
United States	31,522,000
Canada	12,136,000
Australia	8,072,000
EEC	7,729,000
Argentina	3,111,000
Japan	38,000

If it were possible for other countries to substantially increase their wheat production, the quickest way to do so would be to raise government price support levels. However, except for Argentina, the U.S. already has the lowest support levels among the 30 or so wheat-producing countries in the world. Thus, one can see how the U.S. has acreage, yield, and production efficiency all working for it at the bargaining table.

This discussion of "food power" is not academic — it has major significance for any grain trader, farmer, firm, or individual in any way connected with grain products.

The Trilaterals propose international sanctions against any government, private firm, or producer (in or out of an association) that interferes with Trilateral objectives. These sanctions will not be applied in any principled way, but will be used pragmatically to achieve Trilateral goals. The key to this plan and associated sanctions is in Triangle Paper 10, "Seeking a New Accommodation in World Commodity Markets." Therein, the concept of "contrived shortages" is floated. A contrived shortage is any non-Trilateralist action in the market place that interferes with Trilateral objectives. For example, a farmer withholding grain from the market and waiting for a higher price, is guilty of contrived shortage. The paper further states that these contrived shortages can be informal, rather than brought about by a formal association of producers.

While all offenders are to be subject to effective international investigation and action, the penalties are not to be applied equally. A non-Trilateral developed country such as Argentina or South Africa will be dealt harsher penalties (i.e. sanctions) than underdeveloped Zaire or Zambia (phrased subtly as ". . . in the case of non-industrialized countries, however, it is necessary to consider this issue from a broader political perspective").

Consequently, any informal or formal farmers group in the U.S. protesting price levels — and such protest will be inevitable when Trilateral objectives surface — will be subject to penalties. When can these individual firms and nonfavored

governments anticipate Trilateral hostility? Probably under the following conditions:

- If they attempt to stabilize or move market prices to non-Trilateral levels,
- If they respond to market imperfections or undertake any systematic withholding of supplies from the market,
- If they make any information exchange for these purposes.

Trilaterals are well aware that market fluctuations in agriculture are highly sensitive to supply changes, and that whoever controls the supply controls the market.

In Triangle Paper 14, "Toward a Renovated International System," two additional and interesting caveats relating to international grain reserves appear:

1. That the Soviet Union can benefit from fixed prices and guaranteed sources of supply, and
2. That if the U.S.S.R. doesn't see the wisdom of joining the Trilateral plan, the Trilaterals will go it alone.

On the other hand, the paper comments: We have not sought ventures that would exacerbate Sino-Soviet rivalry. We have thus focussed, for the most part, on projects that would involve either the USSR or China, but not both. This does not mean that cooperation with the Soviet Union and China cannot be pursued simultaneously — only that it should not focus on the same projects.

The chances of Soviet or Chinese agreement are, of course, uncertain; our assessments are tentative, based on such limited evidence as exists. Only by seeking cooperation can its feasibility be ascertained. Looking at the period since 1976 when these ideas were floated, agriculture has been used to promote New World Order, in some ways not too obvious.

The Soviet Union dictatorship was kept alive for decades by American wheat sold at below market rates—and butter and cheese subsidized by the American taxpayer. Furthermore Trilateral writer Philip Trezise was one of the most vocal Washington policy makers, promoting the downright false

view that the Soviet Union was technically viable — all the while American grain companies and multinationals were preparing to exploit the Russian market.

When it came to Somalia however, a minor pawn on the New World Order scene, some two million Somalis were allowed to starve before U.S. came to offer help — then the help was a comic opera military excursion (network TV cameras were on Somali beaches filming U.S. Marines wading ashore — presumably the network crews got there first with dry feet). The Somali fiasco demonstrated that Trilateral objectives are political, not humanitarian. The humanitarian is merely an excuse for the military.

And while Trilaterals say they will not "exacerbate Sino-Soviet rivalry" they most certainly condone Chinese persecution of dissidents. Every time the Chinese demonstrate brutality towards their own people and the Western world calls for sanctions, the Trilateral forces urge restraint and caution. For what reason? Obviously, to protect investments in China.

Crisis Politics in Agriculture

As Trilateral policies are implemented, unrest among farmers surfaces — mostly in Europe, especially among French and Belgian farmers but also from time to time in the United States.

A nationwide farm strike was well underway in mid-1978, with participating farmers from all areas of agriculture. Demonstrations like "tractorcades" were common events covered on national T.V. While some farmers in winter areas were not sure if they would be planting spring crops, others were already pressed to the wall with bankruptcy: they had no choice but to refrain from planting as long as prices remained relatively low. Once again the banks were in danger of becoming owners of real estate — farms. Since banks do not want that responsibility, every effort was made to support shaky farms and ranches. Recently, the Federal Land Bank (where most farmers have found an easy and inexpensive source of credit for decades) announced it would not foreclose on farmers in default. The implications of this are

far-reaching, especially since no one knows just how many farmers are in serious trouble.

Big changes cannot be implemented only during periods of crisis. It appears the Trilateralists are pushing for a major farming crisis in the U.S. within the next year or so, one that can be manipulated for Trilateral ends. If the farming industry becomes bankrupt, the government's only choice will be to "institutionalize" the nation's food production in the same manner that Amtrak was "nationalized." On the other hand, if the government chooses to let prices rise to the point where farmers can realize a profit, it will be only with additional and far-reaching controls over the farmer. Government-induced prosperity has always resulted in a trade-off: Profits for Controls.

The current situation in the U.S. plays directly into Trilateral hands. The grain or "cereal snake" will be a foregone conclusion when the Trilaterals find themselves caught in the vise between farmers crying for higher prices and consumers demanding lower food prices. But, of course, it will have been a "contrived" crisis in the first place.

How then will a national grain reserve — keyed to the international grain plan of the Trilateral Commission — affect the American farmer?

The carrot offered by the Carter administration, under Trilateral control, was stable and "high" prices. Farmers, suffering from four years of low prices, were eager listeners. Secretary of Agriculture Bergland (a Trilateral nominee) vowed "to even out the booms and busts" in agriculture. (To this, former Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz responded, ". . . you'll notice he's going to even out the boom first.") In practice, the Carter grain storage program produced the following:

- A narrow grain price snake. The government supported the floor of the snake, while whipped-up consumer pressure, through a captive media, created a lid on the ceiling of the snake, making an ultimate government price ceiling inevitable.
- More — and more — government control.

If the government determines quantities produced and

market prices, then ultimately, it will decree who plants what, and where. Farmers have yet to learn they cannot have traditional freedoms and security at the same time.

The summer of 1977 was favorable for grain farmers, due to increased yields and stocks; and then, worried over production and low prices, farmers asked for acreage cutbacks. By August 1977, Secretary of Treasury Blumenthal and Secretary of State Vance wanted no cutbacks: they argued increased production was needed for the storage program. It is not clear if this was a dispute between Trilateralists and non-Trilateralists in the cabinet, but it is not likely. Former Minnesota Congressman Bergland is not a Trilateral member, but he was sponsored by Vice President Walter Mondale — and Bergland has a longtime image to maintain of being "the farmer's friend."

President Carter made a contradictory decision by calling for Congress to legislate a 20 percent acreage cutback plus adding 30 to 35 million tons of grain for the national stockpile.

By 1994 the grassroots reaction by farmers could be identified but had not reached crisis proportions.

Finally American trade unions at the local level sensed they were being betrayed at the national level. In the days of Samuel Gompers and George Meany, American workers were represented with honesty in their struggle with management. The coming of Trilateralism changed that and it took many years for the unions to recognize they had been sold out. Lane Kirkland, boss of the AFL-CIO, was a long time Trilateral member (not in 1993). His place was taken on the Commission by Glen E. Watts, former President of the Communications Workers of America, and Albert Shanker, President of the American Federation of Teachers.

A remarkable article, "DDT in the Baby Food — and other threats posed by GATT" appeared in the San Francisco Examiner (February 2, 1994) by Jay Hopkins, a writer on labor affairs. Remarkable, because the article not only reflected labor's sense of betrayal, but that it appeared in a major city newspaper.

Here's a couple of quotes from Hopkins: "U.S. workers are

being told by their own governing elite that they must compete in the world market against the poor masses in the Third World."

The article points out that recent GATT sessions received delegations from "major corporations like DuPont, Monsanto, and Cargill, alongside U.S. government officials. There were virtually no representatives from small businesses, farms, churches, unions, environmental groups. Obviously the economic interests of multinational corporations including those based in the United States are frequently at odds with the welfare of average Americans."

Hopkins stated bluntly, "should the US Government defend American sovereignty, jobs and economic independence?" or "throw American workers and consumers into a downward spiraling global competition with nations that have nowhere near our quality of life?"

What is happening in many industries and certainly in agriculture and food processing, is that the American standard of living is being pulled down deliberately by the Trilateral process.

Whether enough American workers, who are notoriously sparse readers, will read these words and spread the message is unlikely. In all probability, we shall see the old time high standard of living of the American worker go by the wayside. The unions should be watching out for their members, but union leaders are too interested in the trappings of power. Why American Federation of Teachers, Communications Workers of America, and International Ladies Garment Workers Union would want to be represented on the Trilateral Commission can only be explained in terms of the limited vision and self-advancing greed of union leaders. We cannot imagine that Samuel Gompers or George Meany would give the Trilateral Commission even the time of day.

Trilateral Agriculture Under Clinton

By the early 1990s Trilateral policies had further reduced the small family farmer and magnified the global power of large

multi-national agricultural corporations.

We find these global food firms heavily represented on the Trilateral Commission:

DWAYNE O. ANDREAS, Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of Archer-Daniels-Midland Company, a global agricultural giant, which has featured a joint merged U.S.A.-Soviet Union in its Russian advertising.

The formerly cited ROBERT MCNAMARA and JESSICA EINHORN of the World Bank, heavily involved in development of global agriculture.

WHITNEY MACMILLAN, Chairman of the Board and CEO of Cargill Inc., the largest grain operators in the world.

With the passage of NAFTA, where Clinton placed his total effort and prestige on the line, the doors were opened for U.S. global control of agriculture. The American consumer will not find lower prices but will see lower quality products in many cases (for example, in imported meat) and a loss of jobs in labor-intensive agricultural and food processing operations. Canning and meat processing plants are closing by the score in the United States and their operations moved overseas to lower wage costs.

The original objective of world "cooperation" in agriculture stated in Triangle Paper No. 13 had been heavily implemented by 1994. However, the impact on American jobs can only be generally estimated because so much low-paying labor in the U.S. has come from illegal immigrants.

Within another 20 years we project that all global agriculture and food processing will be under control of the international giants. This will give Trilaterals the power to create abundance or famine at will.

INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION CHALLENGES IN A NEW ERA

DORIS M. MEISSNER
ROBERT D. HOBMATS
ANTONIO GARRIGUES WALKER
SHIHO OGATA

⊗ A REPORT TO THE TRILATERAL COMMISSION: 14

CHAPTER SIX:
TRILATERALS DON'T LIKE
TAXATION.. FOR THEMSELVES

Oddly, while there are Trilateralist papers on almost every major policy issue, there are none at all on taxation. After some research, we discovered a possible reason for the silence. Taxation is not a pressing problem for Trilateralists; it is only a pressing problem for you and me. Research unearthed an interesting paradox: Trilaterals emphatically favor more taxes for the common man, but do very well avoiding taxation for themselves and their corporate vehicles.

When we were able to identify Trilateral public statements on Proposition 13, for example, they were not unexpectedly strongly against reducing California property taxes. For example,

- Bank of America (Trilaterals Clawson and Wood were directors) contributed \$25,000 to defeat Jarvis-Gann (Proposition 13).
- Governor Thompson of Illinois, who is making appropriate presidential noises, rejected a similar tax reduction program in Illinois.
- Carter said Proposition 13 is an "aberration" that will not sweep the country.
- The Los Angeles Times (a director is Commissioner Harold Brown) was described by Jarvis himself as "the vindictive paranoiac, schizophrenic Los Angeles Times" for the vitriolic nature of its opposition to 13.

In sum, Trilateral put their weight against Jarvis-Gann and tax reduction.

Trilateral opposition to tax reduction most emphatically did not apply to their own taxes nor to those of their corporate affiliations. Trilateral multinationals have successfully avoided paying taxes in the United States and have made some headway in tax avoidance in England and possibly elsewhere.

The United States picture was publicized by Congressman Charles A. Vanik (on 26 January 1978) after a congressional study of the taxes paid by major multinational corporations. Reported Congressman Vanik:

This study, covering tax year 1976, examines 168 companies. These include 108 industrial, 7 mining, 8 airline, 9 railroad, 5 trucking, 13 utility, 8 retailing, and 10 commercial bank companies. Because a few did not furnish data adequate for computation, some categories of taxes or rates could not be computed

Where sufficient data made computations possible, the average effective U.S. tax rate on worldwide income of the corporations was approximately 13.04 percent, down significantly from the 21.3 percent rate in tax year 1975. In order to qualify for a tax rate this low, an average family of four could only have earned \$20,000. The companies listed in this study had a pretax income of more than \$38.7 billion.

The figures show that 17 companies paid nothing in effective Federal income taxes in tax year 1976 — 6 more than tax year 1975 — despite combined total worldwide net incomes of more than \$2,594,060,000 — table 1. The 17 companies accumulated tax credits of more than \$375 million. In some cases, however, companies paid no taxes because they sustained net losses. In other cases, some companies will claim to have "paid" Federal taxes, but their credits exceed taxes, resulting in no effective payment and an effective tax rate of zero.—

Included in this tax avoidance group of multinationals we

find numerous corporations with Trilateral connections.

Having assumed the burden of deciding the future for American society and the New World Order, one would at least expect that Trilaterals pay their full share of the costs. We therefore examined the Vanik study from the viewpoint of identifying the taxes paid by multinationals represented in the Trilateral Commission by company directors.

The lowest income tax bracket for an individual U.S. taxpayer is 14 percent. On the other hand, Chase Manhattan, Continental Illinois, and First Chicago, the power houses behind Trilateralism, all pay far lower rates. In fact, Chase Manhattan Bank paid no U.S. taxes at all in 1976.

On the one hand, David Rockefeller (chairman of Chase and the largest individual shareholder in Chase,) wants to decide the future of American society and the world; on the other hand, his bank is totally unwilling to make a contribution to the new American society and a New World Order.

Given these facts, we have every right to be skeptical about announced Trilateral intentions and objectives. We have every right to assume that the Trilateral Commission may be a gigantic rip-off on American society.

Unfortunately no study of multinational taxation rates has been made by Congress since 1978, the Vanik study was the last comprehensive study which revealed the low rates paid by multinationals. However, we believe that the rates paid in the late 1970s and included here have not changed dramatically in the last decade.

As we all know, personal income tax rates are much higher than the rates paid by the tax-avoiding multinationals. In the U.S. the starting individual tax rate is 14 percent and the highest rate is 70 percent. In Canada, the rate starts at 17 percent and ranges to 43 percent. Other European countries have even higher rates up to a confiscatory 98 percent in Britain. If you are a Trilaterally-connected international bank, your effective rate in 1976 was much lower than the lowest individual bracket. In order of their success in avoiding taxes, Trilateralist banks rank as follows:

Bank	U.S. Taxes in 1976
Chase Manhattan	0.0%
Manufacturers Hanover	3.8%
First Chicago	6.3%
Continental Illinois	10.5%
Bank of America	14.9%

This success in avoiding U.S. taxation is carried abroad by these same multinationals. Take, for example, a report in the London Economist (14 January 1978) from the British viewpoint, under the scathing headline:

"No Tax Please, We're Banks"

American and other foreign banks in London could end up paying little or no British tax if their huge claims for relief which are now being examined by the Inland Revenue are accepted. Even the British clearing banks could have their tax bills dramatically reduced

... the MNC is also a source of concern to some governments, since from its wide base it is often able to circumvent national monetary, fiscal, and exchange policies. The possibility of distortions arising from intracorporate pricing practices to take advantage of national variations in tax laws has also been cited with concern.

A check of multinational corporations and their 1976 U.S. tax rates on world income turns up some multinationals that did pay significantly high U.S. tax rates.

Company	U.S. Taxes in 1976
Getty Oil	21.14%
R. J. Reynolds Ind.	41.0 %
Greyhound	46.8 %
Textron	40.1 %

Generally, however, those MNCs with Trilateral connections appear to pay significantly lower rates. This is only an approximation. It could be a spurious correlation, but there is sufficient evidence to warrant a closer look.

Company	1976 tax Paid
EXXON (controlled by Rockefeller interests)	8.0%
STANDARD OIL OF CALIFORNIA (Rockefeller and Packard)	17.1%
EASTERN AIRLINES (controlled by Rockefeller interests) (now defunct)	0.0%
ARCO (Ingersoll)	11.4%
OCCIDENTAL PETROLEUM (Armand Hammer, one-time friend of Lenin, was chairman of the board of Occidental In 1919 Julius Hammer, father of Armand, was secretary of the Communist Party U.S.A. Hammer has been probably the most active western capitalist in building the military power of the Soviet Union.)	4.2%
GULF OIL (Gulf provides almost \$1 billion a year in oil concession revenues to the Marxist Neto regime. Gulf's Cabinda oil wells were protected by Cuban troops, thus releasing Angolans to support the SWAPO forces invading South-West Africa.	7.0%

We can push this argument a little further. Trilateralists in government are protecting fellow capitalists from taxation.

A recent report by the House Government Operations Committee disclosed the following:

- IRS decisions on some multinational oil firms have cost the U.S. Treasury over \$7 billion since 1974. "By the early 1970s, multinational petroleum companies were operating abroad under a set of factual and legal circumstances completely at variance with those upon which the previous foreign tax credit rulings were based."
- IRS failed to audit oil company returns or require them to provide supporting information for their expense claims (Presumably audits are only for individual taxpayers.)
- These favorable actions stemmed from "interference" by then Secretary of State Henry Kissinger (Trilateral).

- More recent "improper interference" for the same purpose came from Secretary of Treasury Blumenthal (Trilateral).

The committee did not cite the U.S. oil companies involved, except to note that they operate in Saudi Arabia, Libya, and Indonesia. Aramco alone was named in one place: this company is linked with Exxon and Chase Manhattan interests.

In brief, a House committee has charged Trilateralists Henry Kissinger and Michael Blumenthal with "improper interference" with IRS to obtain benefits for certain companies. Even further,

In September 1977, at the very time that the subcommittee discovered and criticized a suggestion made by a Treasury official a year earlier to have IRS and Treasury officials "cooperate" in secret dealings with Indonesia and oil companies therein regarding foreign tax credits (a suggestion which was also admonished as being improper by other Treasury officials), the new International Affairs officials were recommending similar actions.

Another example follows for those readers who have read my Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution and who may remember that in 1918, the leading Wall Street law firm supporting the infant Bolshevik regime in Russia was Simpson, Thacher and Bartlett of New York. As one indication of then-support, partner Thomas D. Thacher wrote a report which became decisive in gaining British cabinet support for the Bolsheviks. Also Thomas Lamont, Dwight Morrow, and H. P. Davison were closely involved in developing policy towards the Bolsheviks: all were partners in the J. P. Morgan firm.

While in London on 13 April 1918, Thomas D. Thacher, a member of the American Red Cross Mission to Russia, wrote to the American ambassador in London that he had received a request from H. P. Davison, a Morgan partner, "to confer with Lord Northcliffe" concerning the situation in Russia and then to go on to Paris "for other conferences." Lord Northcliffe was ill, and Thacher left a memorandum to be submitted to Northcliffe on his return to London with yet another Morgan partner, Dwight W. Morrow. This memorandum not

only made explicit suggestions about Russian policy that supported the pro-Bolshevik position of William Boyce Thompson (director of Chase, now Chase Manhattan, Bank), but even stated that "the fullest assistance should be given to the Soviet government in its efforts to organize a volunteer revolutionary army."

The first three proposals in Thacher's report follow:

First of all... the Allies should discourage Japanese intervention in Siberia.

In the second place, the fullest assistance should be given to the Soviet Government in its efforts to organize a volunteer revolutionary army.

Thirdly, the Allied Governments should give their moral support to the Russian people in their efforts to work out their own political system free from the domination of any foreign power. . .

Was Wall Street attorney Thacher a capitalist enemy of the Bolsheviks? Of course not. Thacher was right in there, helping the revolution, as part of the "breakaway ruling class," along with capitalists from J. P. Morgan and Chase Bank.

Similar aid for Marxist revolution came in South Africa and Red China. And who was U.S. Secretary of State in charge of facilitating this aid? Cyrus D. Vance, who before his appointment as Secretary of State was also a partner in Simpson, Thacher and Bartlett.

Senator Clifford P. Case was a member of the firm of Simpson, Thacher and Bartlett from 1928 to 1953, when he became president of the Fund for the Republic, the foundation that funded the study for a "new constitution" so desired by the elite.

Yet another memorandum from William Boyce Thompson (director of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and Chase Bank) to Lloyd George (prime minister of Great Britain) in December 1917, supported the Bolsheviks and admitted in part:

About the overthrow of the last Kerensky government we materially aided the dissemination of the Bolshevik

literature, distributing it through agents and by aeroplanes to the German army. If the suggestion is permissible, it might be well to consider whether it would not be desirable to have this same Bolshevik literature sent into Germany and Austria across the West and Italian fronts.

Does this sound as if Wall Street and the Bolsheviks were enemies? Or allies?

Another excellent example of the capitalist-communist alliance is Gulf Oil in Angola, the financial backer of the Neto government, while Cuban troops protect Gulf's Cabinda production facilities.

And how about Armand Hammer, chairman of Occidental Petroleum? In the Russian edition of Lenin's Collected Works, you will find several letters from Lenin to Hammer addressed affectionately as "Dear Comrade." Capitalists, the big enemy of communists? Nonsense. They work hand-in-glove to rule the world.

And in 1994 inside history is not too much different to 1919.

It has not gone unnoticed that politicians make election promises that are abandoned when they enter office.

President Bill Clinton, a Trilateralist, is a prime example. Election promises to reduce bureaucracy, to protect individual privacy, to reduce the power of the elite and lobbyists and similar populist scenarios have all been abandoned.

And a series of declassified FBI documents illustrates the behind-the-scenes origins of many Clinton appointments. They are evenly divided between associates and supporters of the Institute for Policy Studies, a pro-Marxist think tank, and multinational professional lobbyists. The co-directors of the transition team were both Trilaterals: Warren Christopher and Vernon Jordan; and both were big time lobbyists. Then came a series of appointments reflecting Marxist-leaning Washington think tank persons (mostly from the Institute for Policy Studies, i.e. Anthony Lake, Leon Panetta, Morton Halperin) and/or big time lobbyists (Ron Brown, Warren Christopher), and revolving door insiders (Winston Lord, David Gergen, Bruce Babbitt).

The only truly non-Washington appointment is Attorney General Reno, who has proven herself adept at squashing investigations and actions that might embarrass the Administration — BCCI, Brown bribe investigation, Whitewater affair, Waco. . .

The key to understanding world events is to look at the world in terms of a Marxist Ruling-Class Alliance. Then, seemingly inconsistent actions and events make sense:

- The elite subsidizes Marxist regimes: they are not enemies.
- The elite abandons free enterprise allies: it wants socialism.
- The elite presses for more individual taxation, that is, the Marxist "graduated income tax."
- The elite reduces its own taxation in the same way that the Moscow elite lived it up in Soviet Russia at the expense of the Russian working class.

The textbook modern history is illusory because it is based on a mythical capitalist-versus-communist struggle.

Thus, when we are asked to believe that Trilateral ambitions are morally justified to build a New World Order devoted to the peace and welfare of mankind, two points strike us: (a) this end does not coincide with other interpretations of Trilateral motivations and actions, and (b) the means adopted appear authoritarian and suggest that the ends may also be authoritarian.

What are some of the practical lessons we can learn from this alliance?

- If you, an average American-in-the-street voter, recall the history of both Democrats and Republicans, can you think of one instance where either party kept a promise? "Very few!"
- Our argument is that if you are a small- or medium-sized businessman or independent professional, then you are targeted for elimination. Does this coincide with your personal experience over your own working lifetime?
- If you are a socialist, then stop deluding yourself. You are

working hand-in-hand with the elitists you proclaim to despise.

- If you are interested in tax reform, then consider that the only acceptable tax reform is complete repeal of the Sixteenth Amendment.

To emphasize the discriminatory approach of the Carter administration on tax matters, we can do no better than quote the congressional testimony of Philip E. Vision, supervisory revenue officer in the Chicago District Office of IRS, who in 1976 blew a small whistle on IRS procedures before the Subcommittee on Oversight of the Committee on Ways and Means. Congressman Jones asked Vision about differing treatment of rich and poor taxpayers:

Is there pressure to seize a small business or a poor taxpayer's property in order to close the case, and pressure to perhaps settle quickly with a rich taxpayer who has plenty of accounting and legal ability to drag things out?

To which IRS official Vision replied:

In all candor, Congressman, I must say this: You will find those branches or groups that are involved in the inner city of Chicago, the low income, the closures are highest because there is really no problem. It requires no technical skills or knowledge to prepare a levy upon the employer of an employee who is getting take-home pay of about \$80. We can go in, serve the levy, and take the entire \$80.

Certainly a taxpayer who is earning \$80 could hardly be expected to employ an expensive attorney or CPA. Usually when he comes in, in response to the levy, it is with tears in his eyes because he allocated that \$80 to the gas or electric company and because IRS took that money, his electric and gas will be shut off and also part of that money was intended to feed his family. This is a common practice.

I am sorry to report that, but if you would look at the closures in the poor areas of Chicago, the depressed areas, you would find that the closures of the small dollar

TDA's are overwhelmingly larger than they are in the affluent suburbs of Deerfield where I live.

To fully understand the implications of a viciously graduated income tax system aimed at the small/medium American businessman and the broad middle class and to understand as well the role of the multinationals and the international bankers who make up the power elite behind the Trilateral Commission, we need to go back to 1847 and the Communist Manifesto of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Of the Communist revolution, Marx and Engels wrote: In the first instance, this can only be affected by despotic inroads upon the rights of property and by despotic interference with bourgeois methods of production; that is to say by measures which seem economically inadequate and untenable, but have far-reaching effects, and are necessary as means for revolutionizing the whole system of production.

In brief, elimination of property owners and small- and medium-sized businessmen ("Bourgeois methods of production") outside the orbit of the multinationals and international banks is an essential prerequisite to socialism.

Then Marx and Engels outline the famous ten "measures" for achieving revolution in the advanced countries to bring about socialism.

These measures are described by Marx and Engels as follows:

In the most advanced countries they willy generally speaking, take the following forms:

1. Expropriation of landed property, and the use of landrents to defray State expenditure.
2. A vigorously graduated income tax.
3. Abolition of the right of inheritance.
4. Confiscation of the property of all emigres and rebels.
5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.

6. Centralization of the means of transport in the hands of the State.

7. Increase of national factories and means of production, cultivation of uncultivated land, and improvement of cultivated land in accordance with a general plan.

8. Universal and equal obligation to work; organization of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.

9. Agriculture and urban industry to work hand-in-hand, in such a way as, by degrees, to obliterate the distinction between town and country.

10. Public and free education of all children. Abolition of factory work for children in its present form. Education and material production to be combined

Notably, there is a parallel between Marx and Trilateral propositions: centralization of credit in IMF and the Federal Reserve System parallels Marx's measure 5. AMTRAK, federal funding of rapid transit, and persistent efforts to cut down on use of individual automobiles parallels Marx's measure 6. Finally, our Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution, the "income tax amendment," is none other than the "vigorously graduated income tax" proposed by Marx in the Manifesto. What has this to do with Trilateral multinational avoidance of taxation? Plenty, as it turns out.

It is interesting to reread Karl Marx's Manifesto in the light of the alliance between Wall Street multinationals and the Communist imperialists. Marxists, especially, should reread Marx. The enemy of Marxist totalitarianism is not the capitalist but rather the "Bourgeoisie," the middle class. Marx sees the bourgeoisie as the source of all that is evil, yet he does not include all the ruling establishment in those designated for elimination. To the contrary, when the class war is about to be fought to a finish, Karl Marx envisaged a curious event: "a small part of the ruling class breaks away to make common cause with the revolutionary class, the class which holds the future in its hands."

In sum, Marx envisaged a coalition of ruling interests of the

revolutionary Marxists and a segment of the ruling class. This is precisely what history has recorded in the hundred or so years since the Manifesto was published. One of the most significant forces in modern world development has been the assistance from a relatively small yet powerful part of the ruling Western establishment to the Soviet Union channeled through such influential organizations as the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) and today the Trilateral Commission. In Marx's terms, are not Cyrus Eaton, Armand Hammer, David Rockefeller, and the Trilateral Commission ruling class breakaways? Have not Marxists and the "break-away ruling class capitalists" joined hands to eliminate the American middle class? Unfortunately, academic analysts are blind to the implications of the alliance: they read Marx with preconceptions. So let's present some evidence.

In 1976, the Marxist government of Angola reorganized Diamang, its diamond-producing monopoly. The Neto Marxist government will own 60.8 percent, and the balance will be owned by the former foreign corporate owners. It will be a mixed company. But which former owners will be expropriated to make way for the new Marxist shareholders? Not the big greedy capitalists we hear so much about in socialist literature, but, in the words of the Neto government, "a large number of small shareholders." The major "foreign companies," the large multinationals, that is, the ruling capitalists, will not be affected by the takeover. In other words, the ruling class joins hands with Marxist revolutionaries against the small bourgeois owners.

KEEPING THE PEACE IN THE POST-COLD WAR ERA:

Strengthening Multilateral Peacekeeping

JOHN ROPER
MASASHI NISHIHARA
OLARA A. OTUNNU
ENID C.B. SCHOETTLE

Ⓢ A REPORT TO THE TRILATERAL COMMISSION: 43

CHAPTER SEVEN PERPETUAL WAR FOR PERPETUAL PEACE

Trilaterals have a fondness for declaring "war" on world problems. We have a "war on cancer," a "war on crime," a "war on drugs," a "war on AIDS" and so on.

What we find within these "wars" are policies designed to advance Trilateral world objectives. Peace and individual freedom are certainly not the objectives, nor in many cases do we identify any contribution to human welfare.

In this chapter we consider (a) the "war on AIDS" and (b) the "war on drugs." In each case we unearth a story very different from the establishment media official line intended for public consumption.

THE WAR ON AIDS

According to Dr. Robert Gallo and other establishment AIDS researchers, this deadly disease with the capability to wipe out the world originated with a little green monkey in Africa who bit a native with disastrous results. Believe it or not, establishment scientists either push this absurd, unproven argument or dismiss origins as irrelevant.

There is another argument, backed by hard evidence and reflected in five books by respected medical doctors. Briefly, this argument is that AIDS is a man-made disease developed by the U.S. Army as part of a biological warfare program,

funded by Congress and released by elitist fanatics to eliminate specific segments of the world's population.

Horrific as genocide by global fanatics may appear, there is more evidence for this interpretation than for the little green monkey theory.

Even more horrendous, this argument takes us right to Tri-lateralist Robert S. McNamara, former Secretary of State and Chairman of the World Bank. It was McNamara who approved funding for development of an artificial AIDS virus later funded by Congress.

Here's the story based on the research of these five doctors which we supplemented with our own research for documentary evidence.

We previously published our assessment in THE PHOENIX LETTER edited by this author in November 1992 and December 1993.¹ We reprint the following from the December 1993 issue. Further documentation may be found in the November 1992 issue.

Fort Detrich Biological Programs In The '60s

Fort Detrich in Maryland is the U.S. biological warfare base. Originally called U.S. Army Biological Laboratories it is now labeled U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases (USAMRIID).

The Army maintains a Special Operations Division (SOD) on the Fort Detrich base with a formal operating agreement with CIA (memorandum signed in May 1952). Both CIA and Army have covered their tracks well but some original documents survive to outline a horrific story.

In the early '60s U.S. Army SOD personnel used specially designed suitcases to spray unsuspecting American civilians with bacillus subtilis at the Greyhound Bus Terminals in Washington, Chicago and San Francisco.

¹ Available from THE PHOENIX LETTER, Suite 216C, 1517 14th Street West, Billings, MT 59102; \$87 for one year. THE PHOENIX LETTER, now in its 12th year, is a report on abuse of power.

Similar operations were conducted at airports in Washington D.C., New York, Boston and Los Angeles. The number of one way tickets sold at time of release was used to estimate distribution of the bacterial agents. (*Bacillus subtilis* can be bought at biological supply houses. It is not listed as a pathogen, but can cause respiratory infections, blood poisoning and food poisoning.)

According to declassified Army documents the Greyhound terminals in San Francisco and Chicago were the location for "six operatives to launch covert attacks" spread over 7 days. Specially designed suitcases sprayed bacteria into crowded terminals for maximum exposure. Photographs were taken and other Army personnel "covertly collected air samples in close proximity to the passengers" to determine if the civilians had been infected (See photographs.)

Later tests were repeated with smallpox agents, grown in large quantities and converted to a lethal powder for spraying. Senate investigation in 1975 revealed close cooperation between SOD and CIA:

"CIA associaiton with Fort Detrich involved the Special Operations Division (SOD) of that facility. This division was responsible for developing special applications for biological warfare agents and toxins. Its principal customer was the U.S. Army. Its concern was with the development of both suitable agents and delivery mechanisms for use in paramilitary situations. Both standard biological warfare agents and biologically derived toxins were investigated by the division."

The Senate Committee found the CIA had covered its tracks to conceal this unconstitutional activity from the American public. The Senate Committee stated, "Although some CIA originated documents have been found in the project files it is clear that only a very limited documentation of activities took place."

An extract from a U.S. Army report details why smallpox was selected as the "agent of choice." Its "attractive" features are listed as:

1. Smallpox is highly infectious with close contact. It spreads readily from an infected person to susceptible individuals.

2. A long incubation period of relatively constant duration permits the operatives responsible to leave the country before the first case is diagnosed.

3. The duration of illness for those who recover is relatively long.

Although the Federal Government claims that the 1972 treaty banning biological weapons stopped further use of Fort Detrich we know that the U.S. Army applied for \$1.4 million appropriation to EXPAND germ warfare testing ability in the early 1980s. Senator James Sasser objected and it is unlikely that the appropriation went through. It could have been handled on the "black budget."

The Originator of AIDS

In July 1969 Dr. MacArthur, Director of the U.S. Army Advanced Research Project Agency (ARPA) appeared before Congress (the Appropriations Committee of the House) and stated: "within a period of 5-10 years it would be possible to produce a synthetic biological agent, an agent that does not naturally exist and for which no natural immunity could have been acquired.

This synthetic agent is AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency syndrome virus or HIV-1). ARPA requested \$10 million to develop AIDS, 10 years before the virus was identified in the field.

Dr. MacArthur added, "It is a highly controversial issue and there are many who believe such research should not be undertaken lest it lead to another method of massive killing of large populations."

From 1961 to 1968 while this artificial biological agent was under discussion in the Pentagon, Trilateral Robert McNamara was Secretary of Defense. Clark Clifford (of BCCI notoriety) took over as Secretary in 1969. (Emphasis added.)

On October 2, 1970, just 15 months after Dr. MacArthur requested an appropriation for AIDS development, Robert McNamara, now World Bank President, made a speech to international bankers in which he identified population growth as "the gravest issue that the world faces over the years ahead."

In his speech to the bankers, McNamara argued that population growth was leading to instability, that a 10 billion world population would not be "controllable."

Said McNamara, "It is not a world that any of us would want to live in. Is such a world inevitable? It is not sure but there are two possible ways by which a world of 10 billion people can be averted Either the current birth rates must come down more quickly or the current death rates must go up. There is no other way."

In brief, Robert McNamara was in the final decision-making role for development of AIDS at the very time he was contemplating the idea that "world death rates must go up." This is more than coincidence.

Our conclusion is that Trilateralist Robert McNamara knowingly encouraged development of AIDS as a means to reduce the world's population. It is difficult to arrive at any other conclusion,

Soviet Union Charges Pentagon With AIDS Development

This information became known to the Soviets and in October 1985 the Soviet Union mounted a worldwide propaganda campaign, AIDS had been manufactured at Fort Detrich, Maryland by the Pentagon, The initial information was planted in a Soviet-backed newspaper in India and then surfaced in more than 30 media sources worldwide. The report was backed by an East German report by Professor Jacob Segal of Humbolt University, East Berlin. Segal argued that the AIDS virus is "the product of an abortive experiment carried out at a laboratory to develop biological warfare means." This Soviet propaganda campaign was discounted in

the West (this editor included). It was beyond the realm of rationality that the U.S. would develop a killer agent such as AIDS. Professor Segal appears to hold the view that it was "accidental," i.e. an "abortive experiment." This position we also held for a while, until the McNamara speech of October 1970 surfaced.

In any event, in the late 80's the U.S. State Department ran a rebuttal campaign to the Soviet charges. However, State was unaware that the Congress had published Dr. MacArthur's requests and statements so the rebuttal fell flat on its face. The State Department, for example, claims the U.S. Army had never used Fort Detrich as a biological warfare base. This is just not true. Further, State apparently had no knowledge of the McNamara contemplation of raising death rates by design.

Conclusions

1. CIA-U.S. Army undertook field tests with bacillus subtilis and smallpox against American civilians.

2. There is no question that the Army received funds from Congress for AIDS development and this was probably undertaken at Fort Detrich.

The AIDS release could have been accidental but we discount this for several reasons. Initial cases came from Africa and Haiti, not the United States. Second, Robert McNamara had simultaneously called for increase in world death rates. This suggests a deliberate policy of controlled release of the AIDS virus.

3. The Soviets obtained the information and used it for a propaganda campaign. The State Department rebuttal was ineffective because State had no idea how much information had already been made public.

129 - Tuesday, July 1, 1969

SYNTHETIC BIOLOGICAL AGENTS

There are two things about the biological agent field I would like to mention. One is the possibility of technological surprise. Molecular biology is a field that is advancing very rapidly and eminent biologists believe that within a period of 5 to 10 years it would be possible to produce a synthetic biological agent, an agent that does not naturally exist and for which no natural immunity could have been acquired.

MR. SIKES. Are we doing any work in that field?

DR. MACARTHUR. We are not.

MR. SIKES. Why not? Lack of money or lack of interest?

DR. MACARTHUR. Certainly not lack of interest.

MR. SIKES. Would you provide for our records information on what would be required, what the advantages of such a program would be, the time and the cost involved?

DR. MACARTHUR. We will be very happy to.

(The information follows:)

The dramatic progress being made in the field of molecular biology led us to investigate the relevance of this field of science to biological warfare. A small group of experts considered this matter and provided the following observations:

1. All biological agents up to the present time are representatives of naturally occurring disease, and are thus known by scientists throughout the world. They are easily available to qualified scientists for research, either for offensive or defensive purposes.


2. Within the next 5 to 10 years, it would probably be possible to make a new infective microorganism which could differ in certain important aspects from any known disease-causing organisms. Most important of these is that it might be refractory to the immunological and therapeutic processes upon which we depend to maintain our relative freedom from infectious disease.

3. A research program to explore the feasibility of this could be completed in approximately 6 years at a total cost of \$10 million.

4. It would be very difficult to establish such a program. Molecular biology is a relatively new science. There are not many highly competent scientists in the field. Almost all are in university laboratories, and they are generally adequately supported from sources other than DOD. However, it was considered possible to initiate an adequate program through the National Academy of Sciences - National Research Council (NAS-NRC).

The matter was discussed with the NAS-NRC, and tentative plans were made to initiate the program. However, decreasing funds in CB, growing criticism of the CB program, and our reluctance to involve the NAS-NRC in such a controversial endeavor have led us to postpone it for the past 2 years.

It is a highly controversial issue and there are many who believe such research should not be undertaken lest it lead to yet another method of massive killing of large populations. On the other hand, without the sure scientific knowledge that such a weapon is possible, and an understanding of the ways it could be done, there is little that can be done to devise defensive measures. Should an enemy develop it there is little doubt that this is an important area of potential military technological inferiority in which there is no adequate research program.



Reprinted from a cartoon by Steve Benson in the Thursday, January 6, 1994 edition of the Arizona Republic.

Pravda: October 31, 1986

"The AIDS virus, a terrible disease with no cure was, according to western researchers, created in Pentagon laboratories."
(SPID = AIDS)



(At Bottom) "Pentagon SPIDtsialist" (In Russian, a play on the words "SPID" and "specialist.")

For more information see:

(1) Lorraine Day, M.D., *AIDS: What the Government Isn't Telling You*, Rockford Press, P.O. Box 952, Rancho Mirage, CA 92270; \$26.

(2) Alan Cantwell, M.D., *Queer Blood: The Secret AIDS Genocide Plot*, Aries Rising Press, P.O. Box 29532, Los Angeles, CA 90029; \$15.50. Dr. Cantwell is a gay dermatologist and can hardly be accused of anti-gay writing.

(3) Stanley Monteith, M.D., *AIDS: The Unnecessary Epidemic*, \$18 from AIDS Book, 618 Frederick Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95062.

THE WAR ON DRUGS

The war on drugs is a farce. The "war" has had no effect on the supply of drugs, has not reduced demand for drugs, but has definitely been used to fund covert programs not authorized by Congress and to line individual official pockets.

Under the Bush and Clinton administrations, the national "war on drugs" is a shoot-from-the-hip stumbling failure and a waste of taxpayer funds. This is not only a personal conclusion, it is a conclusion reached by police chiefs, medical researchers, sociologists, psychologists, syndicated columnists and even by politicians. One can be excused if the conclusion is reached that the "war" is designed to fail

What went wrong?

- No one in any administration bothered to identify the problem in a realistic manner. . . each administration reacted in panic from a public outcry, unthinking and too late.

- The drug abuse problem involves perhaps 20 million Americans. Tsar Bennett wanted to build prisons to accommodate these 20 million errant citizens. . .but without facilities for cures. Additionally Bennett proposed gun control, curtailing civil rights and foster homes for children of abusers.

- Two-thirds of the drug fighting budget is spent on military excursions... in Latin America and Colombia. . . also in

Humboldt County, California, where for the first time possibly since the Civil War American troops have been used against Americans.

- Of every ten aircraft intercepted, only one is a drug runner. . . the other nine are innocents.

- A war of words is fought with incomplete, sometimes false, research information.

- The end result of the Bush-Clinton war has been more violence, more homicides, an increase in drug use. . . and of course an increase in headline-catching drug busts.

Some capsule comments:

Washington D.C. Police Chief Isaac Fulwood: "Bennett spends his time talking, not doing anything. Bennett's approach is absolutely wrong. I don't even know if he has an approach."

Washington D.C. Police Executive Research Forum (a think tank reflecting major city police chiefs): "A clear need exists to expand and intensify the inquiry into both the medical aspects of drug abuse and the efficacy of our current policy."

If we had space we could print scores of critical comments from the medical side. Here's a couple of typical comments:

Medical drug specialists are caustic in their criticism of on-going programs. Says Dr. Lester Grinspoon of Harvard Medical School: "These ads (anti-drug ads) are totally irresponsible and they're scaring kids. When kids realize they've been had and not been told the truth, they'll backfire."

The general assessment is that the program is a failure: Statistician Susan Nissenbaum (California Department of Drug and Alcohol Programs), "The general consensus is that we're beginning to see an increase in the heroin problem."

The latest medical research suggests that certain brain irregularities make some people much quicker to become addicted than others. . . and much harder to cure. Extensive well-controlled research suggests that some addicts take drugs to repair a defective brain chemistry, that persons subject to depression, anger, restlessness find the first dose of the drug immensely reinforcing, i.e. they are biologically pre-

disposed to a specific drug. Reports Ralph Tarter, a psychologist at the Western Psychiatric Institute in Pittsburgh, many recovering drug abusers "tell me the moment I took my first drug I felt normal for the first time."

The New York Times (June 26, 1990) had an extensive article on biological predisposition. More generally, Newsweek (January 29, 1990) commented: "After nine months the model for national action has turned out to be only a nasty battle of words."

A predictable by-product of the Bennett war has been a distinct increase in violence and a dramatic increase in drug-related homicides. The undeniable increase in drug-related homicides is reported from New York, Miami, Houston, Phoenix, Los Angeles and San Francisco. Oakland, California, for example, tabulated 88 homicides by July 1990 (as opposed to 148 for all 1989) and 37 percent were drug related

Another neglected aspect is that valium and codeine, legally prescribed, are among the most addictive drugs and cause as many medical problems as illegally acquired drugs.

An increasing reaction has been a demand for legalization ... to place cocaine and heroin on a par with cigarettes and alcohol, freely available with tax revenues going to the government instead of the dope dealers.

This would certainly put the dealers out of business, and there would be no supply side left for the military excursion tactic. However, it would not solve the medical problem: if certain people are biologically disposed to drugs, then given the existing totally inadequate cure facilities we would end up with a medical overload instead of a legal enforcement overload

Here the information is inadequate... we just don't know too much about how business losses are generated in relation to drugs. Is it the pressure to obtain money for drugs that leads to theft, embezzlement and inefficiency or do the drugs themselves make for the inefficiency? This is a significant point: in one case legalization would lead to fewer business losses, in the other it would lead to even more inefficiency.

In brief: the shoot-from-the-hip Bush-Clinton approach wholly underestimates the complexity of the drug abuse

problem.

However, the program does achieve what has long been feared. . . curtailment of human rights and constitutional rights, military action against Americans by Americans, prison camps for large numbers of Americans, domestic street violence... all under the name of fighting drug abuse.

What's Happening at the Street Level

IF the Bush-Clinton anti-drug crusade had been successful, supply would have dried up at the street level and prices skyrocketed. This has not come about.

COCAINE is in plentiful supply. Police Departments around the country confirm this finding. Price dropped right after Bennett was appointed (as suppliers emptied their pipelines). Prices have now stabilized.

Police Chief Fulwood (Washington, D.C.) states: "We haven't seen any decrease in availability of drugs." A continent away from Washington D.C, this author was walking along Market Street, San Francisco, and saw a stocky white male at the corner of Powell and Market, where the tourists congregate for cable cars. . . who was shouting, "Powder, Rocks" (i.e., cocaine "powder" and crack "rocks"). This in broad daylight!


HEROIN supply has increased and price has dropped substantially. Here's a chart from Drug Enforcement Agency:

MARIJUANA can be bought openly on the street in any large U.S. city.

AMPHETAMINES of domestic manufacture have increased in supply.

PRICE OF COCAINE (per kilogram inside United States)

SOURCE: Drug Enforcement Agency, Field Intelligence Reports



The war on drugs has squeezed a balloon at a billion dollar cost. The effect has been to partly shift the drug of choice among users, away from cocaine to heroin.

Street violence has increased. We have overwhelmed police departments, the court system and our prisons. . . for what? For every dealer jailed another opens up shop... 70 percent of our prison population is drug related. Supply curtailment is a failure.

In November 1993 the CBS-TV program 60 Minutes produced dramatic evidence that our analysis is right on. DEA officials, including former DEA Chief Judge Bonner charged the CIA with importing one ton of pure cocaine in a single transaction from Venezuela. This was sold on American streets.

This same CIA operation created the drug trafficking network in Haiti with "intelligence network" used as a cover and operating under General Cedras.

One thousand pounds of the 1990 Venezuelan shipment was seized at the Miami Airport. DEA and Customs investigators were ordered to back off because the cocaine was imported with the approval of the United States Government.

Moreover, Department of Justice knew about the shipment and did nothing. Senator Boren (Skull & Bones) knew about the shipment and did nothing. A Senator who represents the people of the United States closed his eyes.

Only a few officials at DEA did their job! Culminating in the 1993 CBS program.

(No U.S. newspaper printed this information until New York Times 11/20/93. Phoenix Letter picked up some facts years ago, including information not on the CBS program, through the Caracas, Venezuela newspaper El Universal)

The point is this, if one has knowledge of a drug shipment going to the United States, then legally one is required to report the facts. That means every one of these knowledgeable officials in CIA, Justice and State, plus Senator Boren, are guilty of trafficking.

The street dealers who sold this one ton of pure cocaine were no doubt routinely picked up and sentenced. The offi-

rials should also go to jail. After all, if a \$20 street sale earns a prison sentence then so should importing one ton of pure cocaine.

What has happened? You guessed it! Nothing.

The White House is protecting everyone, which, given Trilateralist Clinton's involvement in Mena, Arkansas cocaine trafficking, should not surprise us. Senator Boren is protected by fellow Senators. We don't hear any calls for investigation of the Boren role.

The ranking CIA official, Mark McFarlin, resigned. No charges filed.

The assistant CIA official in charge of the shipment was "disciplined," no charges filed. All State and Justice officials have been protected.

What's the law? Here it is, as outlined by a Senior DEA official: "If you are part of a drug shipment, and you have knowledge that it is going to the United States, you are culpable."

"Culpable?" Yes, culpable of drug trafficking.

So where is Attorney Janet Reno? Do we have a Constitution or have we become just another Banana State petty dictatorship? One rule for the peasants and another for the privileged?

Phoenix Letter has reported scores of government criminal activities over its 14 year history. Omaha child abuse, suppressed technology, taxpayer rip-offs, BCCI murder and corruption, prominent officials involved in corruption and bribery, unsafe aircraft design, weather control, government lies, treason, unconstitutional political policies and so on.

We do not recall any instance where government has acted honestly and brought right and honesty into the equation. The reaction has always been more cover up until the victim becomes the culprit.

Today the United States is governed by a bunch of amoral whining money grubbers whose only concern is to keep intact their position at the public trough.

The key point for Trilaterals Over America is that almost one-third of the American members of the Trilateral Commis-

sion have been appointed by Presidents from Carter to Clinton.

The dominant policy influence since the 1970s has been a Trilateral influence. These people have a written policy for guidance. The credit for all U.S. policies in the past several decades, including these absurd "wars" on problems, is definitely with the Trilateral Commission.

There is significant evidence published over the last two decades that the U.S. Government is involved in drug trafficking and that this trafficking is more than an accident.

The largest cocaine laboratory in Bolivia was built and operated by CIA. Lt. Colonel "Bo" Gritz has charged and produced evidence that the Golden Triangle, largest producer of heroin, has ties to Washington, D.C.¹ We know that CIA financed the Afghan rebels and the Nicaraguan "contras" through drug sales. There are in fact scores of such instances in brief, a large portion of trafficking is operated under official Washington approval.

And we have demonstrated that Washington, D.C. since the 1970s, has been under the control of Trilateralists. . . and not coincidentally the "drug problem," the so-called "war on drugs," has been with us since the late 1970s.

It was Trilateralist Henry Kissinger who developed "crisis management" — that crises can be used to move the world to New World Order. The multibillion dollar "war on drugs" is a brilliant example of "crisis management" — and will continue until the voting public insists that the "war" be closed down and the multibillions wasted are returned to the taxpayers.

¹ See Appendix below.

CHAPTER EIGHT
POLITICS OF NEW WORLD ORDER
FORMATION OF TRILATERAL ADMINISTRATIONS

Examinations of appointments to both the Carter and Clinton Administrations show that Trilaterals do the choosing and essentially run administrations.

Remarkably both Carter and Clinton ran on a platform emphasizing anti-Establishment policies while immediately and without hesitation appointing establishment representatives and then conducting long time establishment policies.

The duplicitous procedures of both administrations is remarkable for its parallels rather than differences: both Carter and Clinton lied during the election process and told the electorate only what the electorate wanted to hear. When gaining office both Presidents proceeded to do the opposite in many cases to the policy promised during the election.

Reagan and to a lesser extent Bush were more consistent in that policy tended to follow promises. However, both these Presidents also lied before and after taking office.

If politicians in the United States complain they are held in low regard they have only themselves to blame. What we find extraordinary is that common sense suggests voters would turn to third parties. So far the electorate has been convinced that a third party could not win, without even considering the probability that a strong third party vote would at least bring some honesty to the morally bankrupt Democrats and Republicans.

A very large proportion of the electorate is now sitting on its hands, not voting. If this silent and considerable segment ever acts in unity, there will be a political revolution in the United States, and New World Order will take a massive tumble.

The creation of a Carter administration image of anti-Establishmentarianism while simultaneously creating a Trilateral administration is typically the deceptive operational approach taken by this self-appointed elite. Take the first half dozen appointments and look at their associations and allegiances. The administration was at some pains to show a competition for posts and promoted the idea that anti-Establishment and non-Establishment persons would be appointed. See, for example, the Wall Street Journal on 2 December 1976 concerning the meeting of 16 candidates in Plains, Georgia. The initial sequence of appointments went like this:

Appointment Number 1 - Bertram Lance: president of National Bank of Georgia (Atlanta) to be director of Office of Management and Budget (OMB). This is a vital, central post for plans to centralize the U.S. economy.

Appointment Number 2 - Cyrus Vance. Secretary of State, Trilateralist. At the time of taking office, Vance was a partner in Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett; a director of IBM, Pan American World Airways and Aetna Life Insurance; a member of the Democratic party, Foreign Policy Task Force, Council on Foreign Relations (vice-chairman of the board), and the Trilateral Commission; and also a former deputy director of defense.

Appointment Number 3 - W. Michael Blumenthal: Secretary of Treasury. Also a Trilateralist. Who is Blumenthal? Like Henry Kissinger, he was born in Germany and came to the U.S. at the age of 21. At the time of taking office, he was chairman of Bendix Corporation and formerly in the Kennedy administration as deputy for the secretary for economic affairs, member of the Trilateral Commission, and the Council on Foreign Affairs, and the Initiative Committee for National Economic Planning (with Irwin Miller and Robert McNamara.)

After this third appointment, there was definite feedback in newspapers and radio that the "liberals" felt they had been

betrayed because appointments and rumors of appointments did not include them. The result? Jane Cahill Pfeiffer, vice president of IBM, strongly pushed for commerce secretary as Appointment Number 4, dropped out, and the next two appointments went to big government liberals:

Appointment Number 4 - Brock Adams: transportation secretary. Also a Trilateralist.

Appointment Number 5 - Congressman Andrew Young as Ambassador to the United Nations. Trilateral

Appointment Number 6 - Zbigniew Brzezinski: executive director of Trilateral Commission, was appointed national security adviser. Who is Brzezinski? By explicit statement, Trilateralists reject the Constitution and the democratic political process; in *Between Two Ages*, Brzezinski (Carter's sixth appointment) wrote as follows:

The approaching two-hundredth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence could justify the call for a national constitutional convention to reexamine the nation's formal institutional framework. Either 1976 or 1989 — the two hundredth anniversary of the Constitution — could serve as a suitable target date culminating a national dialogue on the relevance of existing arrangements. . . Realism, however, forces us to recognize that the necessary political innovation will not come from direct constitutional reform, desirable as that would be. The needed change is more likely to develop incrementally and less overtly. . . in keeping with the American tradition of blurring distinctions between public and private institutions.

According to Huntington of *Foreign Policy* magazine, an "election coalition" may be abandoned after political office has been achieved; a politician does not have to keep his word to the electorate. Jimmy Carter is a supreme example of Trilateralism in practice. When Brzezinski refers to "develop(ing) incrementally and less overtly" he is specifically recommending a deceptive "salami-type" approach to abandonment of the Constitution. Perhaps some readers may consider this to be the essence of subversion. If so, they had better do some-

thing about it, because no one in Congress has yet plucked up enough courage to even call for an investigation of Trilateralism.

Clinton Abandons "Election Coalition"

Trilateral Huntington's dictum that a politician may abandon the "election coalition" after election to office, i.e., a politician may break his promises, has bypassed our journalist investigators.

Jimmy Carter broke promises right and left without much of a squeak from anyone. There appears to be a joint Democrat-Republican compact to ignore the "election coalition" and keep out third parties, which is about as close as you can get to dictatorship without abandoning the Constitution.

In January 1993, the same month Clinton took office, our newsletter, *The Phoenix Letter*, (a Report on the Abuse of Power) carried the following front page article:

Clinton Reeks of Conflict of Interest

The American public has been suckered. . . again!

Among the lavish Clinton promises to fix everything from health care to the deficit was above all a commitment to run the thieves and crooks out of Washington.

Well, we have news for Clinton voters. Clinton was backed by the thieves and crooks and has appointed the self-same lobbyists he swore to run out of town to run the transition team. The political con game has become so blatant that Presidents don't even wait until the ink is dry on the ballot to break their promises.

Before the election, we identified the background of Clinton's key financial backer, none other than Jackson Stephens, a founder of the Bank for Crooks and Criminals (BCCI), and the man who actually introduced Democratic elder statesman, Clark Clifford, to the BCCI crowd.

We figure that one way or another, Stephens contributed \$2 million to the Clinton campaign. And we are supposed to

believe that the BCCI whitewash won't continue!

Then we looked at Clinton's transition team and found it headed and staffed by Washington lawyers and lobbyists, the very people that Clinton said he would remove, those whose client lists and board directorships covered just about every major corporation and many foreign countries.

Who is represented in Washington? You and I? Not likely.

Many of the transition team clients have matters pending before regulatory bodies and the Congress itself. Then to emphasize the hypocrisy, the transition team introduced new ethics "rules" to supposedly limit "the influence of lobbyists" and to be rigidly enforced. All well and good, except that at time of writing, it has been impossible to obtain a set of these rules. (Released December 10, see below.)

During the election, Clinton repeatedly called for limits on lobbyists. "We've got to clean it up. We're all going to have to change," said candidate Clinton.

"Business as usual," says elected Clinton.

A Huge Scaly Serpent Crawling Through the Corridors of Congress

Politicians, lobbyists, college professors of political science and their textbooks all tell us that lobbying is essential, a necessary function of society to make democracy work.

The conventional view is that lobbying is harmless and useful in that it makes all viewpoints heard.

Hogwash! Individual voting citizens are those represented in Congress by their elected representatives. Congressmen and women are not elected by corporations or foreign interests, they are elected by individual American voters. It is American citizens that are elected, not the dairy interests or the water interests or the welfare interests of some way off foreign country. Certainly Joe Dairy Farmer has representation as an individual, but the collected interests have no collective vote and should have no representation in Congress.

In practice, lobbying has become the conduit for pressure groups. And every so-called reform has left gigantic loopholes

to continue the process of lobbying. Lobbyists now place money on both sides (Democrat and Republican) and fight smaller parties because they would then have to lay out money on more parties to guarantee representation.

The political process has become an outright fraud. The individual American has become disenfranchised. The power groups and foreign interests have become power holders working through a compliant Congress.

And from what we can see, the "new" Congress will be little different from the old.

Reportedly, Clinton was shocked at the public reaction to the appointed transition team, and instructed staff to draft lobbying rules. These rules were drafted and succeeded only in rejecting one transition aide from one meeting for conflict of interest. Even then the Clinton White House refused to release copy of the new "rules" until December 10.

The transition director, Trilateralist Warren M. Christopher, is senior partner in O'Melveny and Myers, with a heavy Far East client list including Mitsui, Sumitomo Trust, Japan Airlines and Hyundai. Christopher has more interest in representing Japanese interests than the American down home. In fact, just to illustrate the hypocrisy, during the campaign, Clinton pointedly criticized American law firms who work for foreign interests.

Once elected, Clinton picked on this foremost representative of foreign interests to act as director of the transition.

Warren Christopher is on the board of Lockheed Aircraft but is not (under the Clinton rules) in conflict of interest on military matters in the Clinton Administration. The Clinton rules do not bar Christopher from discussing Asian matters on behalf of his clients.

What is the Clinton defense to such charges? Simply that there is no conflict of interest because the connection between these officials' advice and their ability to profit is "too diffuse" and that Mr. Clinton, not his transition advisors, will make the final decisions.

Lobbyists themselves are under no illusion that the "rules" have not changed. The firm of Patton, Boggs and Blow pub-

lishes a newsletter in which it openly boasts of its contacts within the Democratic Party and Washington power circles, and indeed has two partners close to the Democratic Party: Democratic Party Chief Ron Brown and Thomas Boggs.

Then we find Lefitia Chambers, who is transition overseer on budget issues, who in real life is lobbyist for AFL-CIO, home builders and senior citizens.

The results of this system can be seen in billion dollar wasteful expenditures:

- The State of Virginia, as reported in November Phoenix Letter, has a disproportionate share of Federal funds guided to Virginia by the "King of Pork."

- Extraordinary waste of money in technical expenditures: for example, the billion dollar "Hot fusion" program.

- Neglect of programs that have no powerful voice in Congress. Most of the "future technology" reported in FTIR (Future Technology Intelligence Report, P.O. Box 423652, San Francisco, CA 94142-3652) is ignored by financiers.

The rules announced on December 10 and hailed by observers as pathbreaking are no more than a further whitewash. Officials may be personally banned from lobbying for five years, but what about their partners? These are exempt. The lifetime ban on foreign company lobbying has no meaning in practice. The only sure fire solution is complete and final ban on all lobbying, except that of individual private citizens or their own elected representative. Corporations and law firms do not vote. Individuals do. When Mr. Clinton adopts this standard, we shall see the scaly serpent crawl back out of Washington, D.C.

NAFTA — Step to New World Order

Multinationals well represented on the Trilateral Commission aim to dominate world production and trade.

The enormous pressure behind the NAFTA agreement, to bring the U.S., Mexico and Canada into a tariff-free community, was motivated by New World Order. Little question that the U.S. citizen will be adversely impacted, but gains will be

made by international firms and banks that drive NWO.

Initial reaction was from Chiapas, Mexico, the revolt of Indians against Mexican authority. The Indians, already hard-pressed, unable to sell their coffee on the world market, now find that the Mexican Government support structure was dismantled, and their domestic corn crop could not compete against imported U.S. corn. NAFTA was the last straw.

Another result still to emerge will be Mexican meat exports. U.S. giant meat firms will go to Mexico to take advantage of low wages, poor safety standards and lax sanitation regulation. We will see a flood of imported Mexican beef, with the identity of U.S. firms hidden behind a Mexican import label. NAFTA exempts Mexico from the U.S. Import Act to benefit GIANT U.S. firms. NAFTA was an end-run by U.S. multinationals around U.S. regulation. Clinton promised to appoint more meat inspectors as a cover to disguise the reality. The end result will be to hurt smaller U.S. ranchers and to expose U.S. citizens to uninspected beef.

Mexico is now highly advantageous for Trilateral firms like General Electric (Vice Chairman Paolo Fresco is a Trilateral), Motorola (Chairman George M. C. Fisher is a Trilateral), Levi Strauss (Robert D. Haas is a Trilateral and close to David Rockefeller), Mobil Corporation (Allen Murray, Chairman, is Trilateral), and several major pharmaceutical companies (Johnson and Johnson, Smith Kline Beecham).

NAFTA will spur U.S. firms into Mexico to take advantage of lower regulatory standards and low wage rates.

NAFTA is an essential part of the Trilateral plan to reduce U.S. living standards and transfer benefits overseas to less developed countries. Trilateral Clinton was able to do this because the media have their Trilateral members who act as guides for smaller circulation newspapers and stations (CNN Chairman W. Thomas Johnson is a Trilateral, so is Katharine Graham, Chairman of the Washington Post, among others).

The U.S. citizen doesn't stand a chance, faced with this array of like-minded conspirators. The only way out is to vote for a third party candidate, read books published by small publishers along with newsletters, and above all, be critical

and question statements out of Washington and your State capitol.

If you feel up to tackling your Congressman, there are some do's and don'ts.

- Don't write long complaining letters; keep to a single issue, short and definite. Don't insult or threaten. State the problem, how it affects you, and what you see as the solution. Briefly.

- Often a Congressional aide is a more effective target. Especially if you can get a personal visit. Be persistent and definite. You have a vote, the lobbyist has money. Your representative needs both.

- Probably an effective route is to get a group of like-minded citizens to invite a representative to discuss a problem — if 20 aircraft mechanics are threatened by overseas low cost maintenance contracts and can get together with a Congressman, this will get some action. But remember, you're fighting the Trilateral Commission — and if your representative is a member (see Appendix), you might want to question the company he/she keeps.

- Above all, talk to your friends, buy extra copies of this book (see copyright page) and similar books, pass them around. It's slow, but over the long haul, it works. This author remembers when there was no discussion at all of Trilaterals and establishment elitism, when to talk about a political conspiracy was to be dismissed as a kook. No longer. The bulk of citizens these days are onto the con game. Awareness now needs to be translated into action.

TRILATERAL GLOBAL POLITICS AIMS TO REMOVE ALL NON-CONFORMING GROUPS... THE WACO MASSACRE IS A PRIME EXAMPLE.



VICTORY! ATF flag flies over ashes of Waco compound.

BY REUTERS



COST TO SERVE A SEARCH WARRANT:
83 Civilians + 4 ATF agents dead
\$10 million (?) in taxpayers' funds.

CHAPTER NINE: FRIENDS OF NEW WORLD ORDER

The Trilateral Commission is not the only organization working for New World Order in the United States.

Much of the thinking behind Trilateralism comes from early concepts put forward by Cecil Rhodes and Lord Milner with funds from South African gold and diamond mines. Rhodes founded the Rhodes Scholarships to bring Americans with specific personality traits to Oxford University for one year. Bill Clinton became a Rhodes scholar after studying under Carroll Quigley at Georgetown University.

Carroll Quigley wrote a massive volume, *Tragedy and Hope*, which described New World Order plans. Quigley was not a defector; he agreed with the objectives of an Anglo-American New World Order. Where he parted company was that he believed this should be an open objective, not a closed secretive conspiracy.

So the Rhodes organization and the Royal Institute for International Affairs in London are essential parts of the New World Order. The RIIA spawned the Council on Foreign Relations in the United States, a broader-based but still limited organization with the same objectives. Our observation is that CFR has a wider range of views among its members, some even against New World Order, than does the Trilateral Commission or the RIIA.

The interesting aspect of CFR is that David Rockefeller, founder of the Trilateral Commission, was long time Chairman of CFR and is today Chairman Emeritus. (Appendix C lists the officers and directors of CFR. There is an obvious interlock with the Trilateral Commission.)

Another more restricted segment of New World Order is the truly secret Skull & Bones Senior Society at Yale. Fifteen years ago this author obtained a copy of the secret membership list (a two-volume black leather-bound affair) and was able to analyze in depth the influence and extent of Skull & Bones in the U.S. government. This was published as America's Secret Establishment¹ and is still in print today.

Loose Backgrounds of New World Order Types

Almost every proponent of New World Order from its very earliest days has some kind of shady past certainly not in keeping with the high ideals professed.

Cecil Rhodes himself was accused of deception and crookery in gaining control of the gold and diamond mines of South Africa. His partner, Lord Milner, was the author of the infamous "Milner Telegram" which brought about the Anglo-Boer War in 1899.

The Rhodes diamond mines became the core of the DeBeers monopoly and still today maintains monopoly control of world diamonds — a model for New World Order.

Cecil Rhodes' own image of a New World Order was hardly inspiring to any but Anglo Americans. The second largest language group in the world is Spanish speaking — and you won't find a single Latin in any New World Order organization. In fact, so far as the Trilateral Commission is concerned, Latins don't exist who warrant membership in the Commission. You won't find Arabs, either, or Chinese resident in the Far East.

Now this might be comforting to the English-speaking world but disparities of this kind are guaranteed to lead to

¹ Obtainable from Liberty House Books, P.O. Box 80650, Billings, MT 54108-0650, for \$22 postpaid.

conflict. If Latins, Arabs, Chinese, Russians and others are delegated to subordinate positions in New World Order, the outcome will be conflict, not peace.

Then the individual and corporate histories of Trilateral members and firms are hardly reassuring. We couldn't find a single individual or firm where some investigation had not been started for illegal conduct.

Take as a random example a firm mentioned only once above — Prudential Securities Company. Robert C. Winters, Chairman of the Board of Prudential, is a Trilateral. As we go to press, Prudential is under investigation on several charges. Apparently Prudential brokers had orders to deceive customers (New York Times, 2/28/94) and some brokers even quit rather than go along. Prudential is the focus of a widening criminal inquiry relating to the way customers were treated when the firm was suffering enormous losses.

A few years ago Wall Street brokerage firms could maintain zero balance accounts, funds were deposited only when the bank called. This is also known as check kiting. If you and I did it we would end up in jail. The brokerage firms got off scot-free and made millions a year from the practice. E. F. Hutton was the major player in this con game.

Kissinger Associates, an influence-peddling outfit founded by Henry Kissinger to capitalize on his "public service" has more than once come into unfavorable criticism but his membership of the Trilateral Commission is carefully screened out of reports.

The firm had a field day, for example, in the bankruptcy of LTV Corporation where \$144 million went to consultants for professional services related to the bankruptcy, and Kissinger Associates got the lion's share. The gross overcharging was never investigated.

Similarly, the BCCI affair, a worldwide scandal to which Kissinger Associates was linked, managed to evade investigation in the United States. In England where many thousands lost deposits, only a lower level manager went to jail.

Friends of Hillary

The Clintons have proved themselves remarkably adept at promoting their own private interests at public expense — and especially in acquiring "friends" in need of Government favors who can show a little appreciation.

The fascinating difference between the Clintons and almost any other political family we can think of is the vehement, almost breast-beating denunciation of influence peddlers and lobbyists. Yet these are the "friends" that come to show their appreciation.

The New York Times (March 31,1994) commented caustically on "Arkansas, where a thousand or so insiders run things in a loosey-goosey way that may look unethical or even illegal to outsiders." Apparently, Arkansas morality is, for the Clintons, distinct from Washington morality and they cannot be accused of irregular conduct because that would discriminate against Arkansas.

The really breathtaking "loosey-goosey" event that benefited the Clintons was Hillary's ability to take \$1,000 as a complete novice without collateral and with naked market exposure, and convert it into \$100,000 in cattle futures — a notoriously unstable market.

Hillary did this in ten months with only \$1,000 in a margin account (this would normally require at least \$10,000) and faced disastrous losses any day or hour if the market turned sour on her investment.

Moreover, Hillary went through specific market moves with results which are impossible unless her broker was making illegal actions on her behalf.

Hillary's broker was Robert L. (Red) Bone of the Ray E. Friedman & Company brokerage firm of Chicago. In October 1978 she opened a trading account with \$1,000. The very first day this investment went to \$6,300. There is no documentation for the trades, and there is no way that \$1,000 would cover the amount of cattle futures trades needed to make that amount of profit.

House Speaker Thomas Foley (Trilateral)

House Speaker Thomas Foley is a disgrace. Ever ready to serve fellow Trilaterals, Foley should be investigated for obstruction of justice.

Fellow Trilateral Bill Clinton was in trouble in March 1994, so Congressman Thomas Foley called a secret 8:00 a.m. meeting of Democratic congressmen and staff members. It was agreed — no meetings or hearings on Whitewater under any circumstances.

That put non-Trilateral Congressman John La Falce, Chairman of the Small Business Committee, on the spot. La Falce had already started an investigation and requested documents from the Small Business Administration. These documents had already been sent to the General Accounting Office for analysis and Congressman La Falce had to install his own minor coverup at the insistence of Speaker Foley to block GAO from issuing a report.

And these are your elected representatives!

"Poor, Poor Motorola"

Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of Motorola is George M. N. Fisher, a member of the Trilateral Commission.

Motorola under Chairman Trilateralist Fisher is notorious for using politics to advance its competitive position against both foreign countries and non-Trilateral American companies.

Under fellow Trilateral Bill Clinton, the former Public Relations Director for Motorola is the Number Three man in the office of the U.S. Trade Representative. And the former head of the U.S. Trade Offices Telecommunications Trade Policy Division is another Motorola type, today a lobbyist for Motorola. There's more. Lionel Olmer, undersecretary of Commerce, was four years with Motorola and helped negotiate the 1986 agreement that led to Motorola's system being approved in Japan.

In 1994 Motorola was dissatisfied with its sales position in Japan and used the U.S. Government as a blunt weapon to demand more trade. This even infuriated the Wall Street Journal, which ran a satirical article, "Poor, poor Motorola." Says Wall Street Journal (March 3, 1994):

The U.S. has publicly accused the Japanese of reneging on their promises and throwing up barrier after barrier to block Motorola's market access. Nothing could be further from the truth. The history of Motorola in Japan reveals a company that has repeatedly used the U.S. Government as a battering ram to knock aside Japanese regulations and win special favors to accelerate market entry.

What Wall Street Journal omitted in this lengthy critique of Motorola is that both Chairman Fisher of Motorola and President Bill Clinton are members of the Trilateral Commission, which is devoted to such special interest strategies.

When you talk to these businessmen and suggest that their favored treatment is unfair, they respond with a smug, "That's how business is done."

CHAPTER TEN

TRANSCENDING MARXISM: OLD AND NEW MARXISTS

The world has been portrayed by historians as a political arena where capitalists and Marxists are rigidly opposed to one another and always act in opposition to each other.

Nothing could be further from the truth. This view is another Karl Marx fundamental misinterpretation of the 19th century world. Lenin, who followed Marx as tactician of the world revolutionary battle, was more perceptive and saw capitalists as shortsighted, with many willing to supply the rope to hang themselves.

The Rockefeller group of Wall Street financiers and their associated banks, Chase, Manhattan and then Chase Manhattan Bank, have always been in the forefront of capitalists willing to aid and succor Marxism. This suicidal policy continued under various Presidents who owe election to the Rockefeller family, i.e. Carter and Clinton, and the Trilateral Commission. A fundamental Trilateral policy is one world interdependence, a merging of Marxism and capitalism under Trilateral leadership.

The Rockefeller family has shown notable ability to first conceal its support of Marxism before and after World War II and then conceal its promotion of Trilateralism in recent decades. Historians have been unwitting supporters of the Rockefeller family objectives by continuing to advance the

theoretical dialectic view of an historical antagonism of communism vs. capitalism as the actual nature of events. The true history is a history of cooperation between elite political leaders of the West and various Marxist regimes. The West has used debt and technology to more or less control these ineffective Marxist societies.

Trilateralism is merely continuation of this global deception, and fools historians as well as voters. We are in a period where Marxist regimes are allowed to find their own level of instability, i.e. effectively to collapse, while new forms of world control are substituted. New World Order via Trilateralism is 21st Century Marxism.

Let's briefly review the history of elitist support of Marxism and Trilateralism to achieve New World Order. This began, by the way, with Cecil Rhodes and Lord Milner in England, founders of the Rhodes scholarships at Oxford. President Clinton is a Rhodes scholar and understands at least part of the picture. (A fascinating research topic, never undertaken, would be to explore the contacts between Rhodes, Milner and the Fabians in London with Karl Marx, who worked most of his life in London in the same period. The start point for any interested researcher would be the Scotland Yard files on Karl Marx.)

Back in the 1920s the Chase National Bank (Chase National merged with the Bank of Manhattan to become Chase Manhattan) was deeply involved in building the Soviets — and some of this activity was probably illegal and certainly against U.S. official policy.

Both Chase National and Equitable Trust were the leaders in the Soviet credit business at a time in the 1920s when the State Department had banned credits to Soviet Russia. Chase evaded the ban by accepting platinum from Soviet mines and advancing credit on the basis of these shipments. This was strictly against U.S. policy in the 1920s.

The president of the American-Russian Chamber of Commerce in the 1920s was Reeve Schley, also a vice-president of Chase National. The Chamber was a pressure group which sought to change U.S. policy into recognition of the USSR, to

open up the Russian market for some major American firms and banks. To this end, the Chamber used avowed communists as agents; for example, a Chamber delegation to Russia in 1936 was led by Charles Haddell Smith, previously described by the State Department as "in the employ of the Soviets and a member of the Soviet Peasant International." Members of the Chamber included many of the firms opening up the China trade today, including Deere & Co., Westinghouse and Chase National.

In the early 1920s the Soviet Union was on the verge of collapse. The only industrial structure was that of the Tsars. Industry was dormant, not destroyed as Soviet propagandists would have us believe. Foreign firms, mainly American and German, came in to start up a dormant Tsarist industry and remained to build the Five Year Plans. Why? Because the Soviets had destroyed the skilled engineers and managers needed to run industry. As Soviet Commissar Krassin phrased the problem: "Anyone can help pull down a house; there are but a few who can rebuild. In Russia there happened to be far fewer than anywhere else."

Take the example of Boeing Aircraft (Trilateral T.W. Wilson is chairman of the board). In the 1930s Boeing supplied technical assistance to the growing Soviets. The Soviet I-16 fighter was patterned on the Boeing P-26. The Soviet TU-4 four-engine bomber was a copy of the Boeing B-29 and could only have been reproduced with U.S. assistance. Today Boeing is a one-time supplier of aircraft technology to the Soviet Union and to Communist China, and remains represented on the Trilateral Commission.

Another example is UOP (Universal Oil Products), now a subsidiary of Signal Oil Company. In 1932 UOP had contracts in the USSR for construction of hydrogenation plants, which were of vital importance for military purposes. Up to 1938 the Soviets were unable to produce 87-94 octane gasoline for aviation use. Hydrogenation plants built by UOP converted 85 octane gasoline from Saratov and Grozny into 95 octane avgas. Today, UOP is one of the first American firms into China to build the Chinese petrochemical industry — also

vital for war purposes.

Yet another example is Ingersoll-Rand, which was represented in the Soviet Union by Armand Hammer (former chairman of Occidental Petroleum Corporation) as early as 1918. At that time Armand Hammer's father, Julius Hammer, was secretary of the Communist Party U.S.A. Ingersoll-Rand became a prime seller of technology to the U.S.S.R. In 1979, Ingersoll-Rand is following the same road with Communist China.

We can cite dozens of firms with similar stories. U.S. multinationals built Soviet power. This has cost the United States hundreds of thousands of lives in Korea and Vietnam. Now these same multinationals have begun to build Communist China under the initial push from Trilateral President Jimmy Carter.

The most important and largest China contracts link to Trilateralists and their corporate affiliates: The key financial backer of Jimmy Carter was Coca-Cola chairman and Trilateral Commissioner J. Paul Austin.

Coca-Cola will have a soft drink monopoly in China. Maybe the Chinese don't yet know what a soft drink tastes like, but 800 million Chinese is a prime market for the 21st century.

NOTE: Coca-Cola had been negotiating for ten years before 1979 with the Chinese, i.e., long before any public surfacing of a "new" China policy and presumably while the Chinese aided the killing of Americans in Vietnam.

- A consortium of U.S. oil companies has negotiated development of Chinese petroleum resources. These include Exxon (David Rockefeller has dominant interests), Pennzoil, Phillips and Union Oil.

- Former Time Magazine Man-of-the-Year was the Chinese Communist leader, Teng Hsiao-Ping. Trilateralist Hedley Donovan was editor-in-chief of Time.

- The first American banks into Communist China were Chase Manhattan and the First National Bank of Chicago.

- Japanese Trilaterals are heavily involved in construction of Communist China.

The Carter Administration agreement with Communist

China, the so-called "normalization" of relations, was an extraordinary treaty. All the Chinese terms, including those rejected by Presidents Nixon and Ford, were totally accepted by the Trilateral negotiations. The negotiators were Trilaterals. On the spot in Peking was Leonard Woodcock. In Washington was Cyrus Vance and Warren Christopher (under-Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, now Secretary of State).

There was no pressure to make an agreement at this time from the strategic or political viewpoint — so we must look to the multinationals for an answer. What do they gain? Was the China treaty a duplicate of the early 1920-30 Soviet agreement? A device to fill multinational order books and expand the loan base of international banks?

The United States was in an extremely strong bargaining position. The Chinese needed U.S. technology to survive. They needed U.S. credits to buy technology. They needed the U.S. as an ally against Russian intrusions over the Chinese border; and recognition by the U.S. gave the Chinese Communists a status they could achieve in no other way. Yet the United States capitulated without a whimper, very much like the Vietnamese situation when the U.S. got sucked into a major war without plan or purpose. Some 50,000 Americans were killed. Then we abandoned the battlefield at a time when we still had the absolute capability to finish the military job. In other words, we did not apparently know why we were in Vietnam in the first place. When we were involved, we spent billions on war materials and even then lacked the will to use those weapons.

In these instances and others we can find a common thread, a common explanation. In science, the answer that most likely is true, is that answer which fits the largest number of cases or events. Is there profit for Wall Street in recognizing Communist China? Was there also profit in \$300 billion of Vietnamese military contracts? In the same way there was profit in saving the Soviets and building the Soviet Five Year Plan?

This is the simplest, most plausible answer. It fits most

cases — and this is where Trilateralism comes in. Trilateralism is the vehicle by which some banking interests and multinationals carry out their policy objectives.

The Trilateral opening to Communist China also reveals a total failure to recognize the human cost of Chinese Communism. Conservatively, China has murdered 50 million Chinese in the 30 years of the Revolution. During one particular campaign, "Let a Million Flowers Bloom," Chinese Communists lifted their restrictions on freedom of speech and action. Many Chinese then took the bait to criticize the regime. After a few months of freedom of speech the Chinese government promptly arrested the dissidents and used their own words as evidence to send them to labor camps, prisons, or to their death.

These big businessmen have a habit of telling each other how non-political and smart they are to ignore civil and social conditions while concentrating on the business at hand. The profit statement is the guide: In brief, an utter, complete amorality.

The dangerous illusions Trilaterals hold about Russia and China do not therefore stem from ignorance of the facts — their actions stem from extreme short-sightedness and amorality. The next contract for a multinational has total precedence over any nonsense about human rights. While, for example, Trilateral J. Paul Austin may want to sell Coca-Cola to 800 million Chinese, Austin has no interest in what happened to tens of millions of the less fortunate Chinese.

The outright betrayal of Taiwan in the clear, stark words in the official agreement reads as follows: "The government of the United States of America acknowledges the Chinese position that there is but one China, and Taiwan is part of China."

It is difficult to find any historical parallel where a country has acknowledged the slaughter of 50 million people by creating an alliance with that country. Possibly the closest parallel is Hitler's alliance with Stalin in 1939 after Stalin had murdered millions of peasants and Hitler had begun to move against his enemies much as the Trilaterals are moving today against their own particular enemies.

At this point we should note the official Trilateral double standard on human rights. In brief, for Trilaterals' human rights are subordinate to their overall objective of world control. Witness the following statement:

... the support for human rights will have to be balanced against other important goals of world order. Some Trilateral conceptions of detente with the Soviet Union and other communist states tend to conflict with a policy of promoting human rights. (Richard N. Cooper, et al; Toward a Renovated International System; Trilateral Commission, 1977, p. 30)

Clintons Follow Rockefeller Pro-Marxist Policies

The Rockefeller founded and directed Trilateral Commission is a major force behind the Clinton Administration. . . and Clinton follows Carter's pro-Marxist policies long after the moral and practical usefulness of Marxism has been discredited.

Interestingly, the Clintons fit the description of "break-away capitalists" formulated by Lenin. . . i.e., a group of capitalists who see pecuniary advantage in Marxism and so support the Marxist cause. Obviously the Clintons have no aversion to moneymaking using the political process; Hillary's cattle futures trading and Arkansas activities are excellent examples. Yet while making capitalistic profit we also find Hillary supporting Marxist causes... in exactly the same manner as the Rockefeller Chase Bank in the 1920s.

In the case of the Clintons, the evidence is somewhat more serious because, according to recently released FBI documents (reprinted below) a Clinton-supported pro-Marxist organization, IPS (Institute for Policy Studies) is suspected of bank robbery and murder.

The Clintons have a long standing and close connection with IPS in Washington, D.C. This link is well described in SECRET (FBI Documents Link Bill and Hillary Clinton to Marxist Terrorist Network), Sunset Research Group, 608 North West Street, No. 236, Wichita, KS 67203; \$10.

Here are some quotes from SECRET (pages 35-40) which

illustrate the close Clinton-IPS link. Our interpretation is somewhat different to the general conservative interpretation. We do not see the Clintons as "Marxists." We see them as opportunists, amoral and apolitical opportunists, much as Lenin viewed the Rockefellers as "breakaway capitalists" who support Marxism for personal financial gain.

We see the Clintons as cultivating and financing IPS for future personal gain, not because they had Marxist leanings.

These revelations of a communist-oriented IPS veteran (Derek Shearer) directly influencing Clinton, and Clinton entrusting the country's future to numerous other IPS supporters, is grim indeed and does not bode well for the Nation. But there are many more such disturbing revelations yet to be fathomed. These additional evidences — which even more firmly cement Bill Clinton into the camp of IPS subversives — come through Hillary Clinton.

If the only links Hillary had to IPS were her close friendship with Derek Shearer's sister and her furrow-browed fling at Yale, such could appear quite incidental. But unfortunately, there are additional reams of hard evidence which indict Hillary as a motivated IPS champion. For example, while serving as Director and Chair of the Board of Directors of the New World Foundation in 1987-88, Hillary Clinton praised and gave away significant sums of money to several far left organizations — including IPS.

An especially interesting footnote is:

Statement by Isabel Letelier read at Rockefeller's New York City "Riverside Church" (next to NCC headquarters), February 2, 1985; per Powell, op. cit., p. 244. See section of SECRET on Johnetta Cole for more on the Clintons' links to Sandy Pollack.

Riverside Church is of course linked to Skull & Bones.

In addition to IPS, Hillary sent money to other pro-communist groups which themselves have strong ties to

IPS — indicating a collaborative attempt for donations to serve similar purposes. These included the Committee in Support of the People of El Salvador (CISPES — a supporter of the Marxist Salvadoran guerrillas), the National Lawyers Guild (an officially cited adjunct of the Communist Party USA), militant William Kunstler's Center for Constitutional Studies, and the terroristic Christic Institute. Information on some of the anti-American and pro-communist activities of these other groups Hillary supported, and some of their relationships to IPS, are explained below.

CISPES, Hillary and IPS. The Committee in Support of the People of El Salvador (CISPES), which Hillary dished out \$5,000.00 to, has been properly classified as a communist front organization. Formed in 1980 as the US branch of a worldwide apparatus supporting Marxist FMLN guerrillas in El Salvador, insight into CISPES's function with Latin American communist rebels and the international communist movement was gained in 1981 when the personal papers of guerrilla leader Farid Handal were captured in El Salvador, (p. 35)

The National Lawyers Guild, Hillary and IPS. U.S. Government investigators have repeatedly condemned the NLG (which Hillary lavished \$15,000.00 on) as being a "Communist front" group. One such official denunciation charged that the NLG: "Is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party [and]its front organizations. . . [which] since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents." (page 36)

At an NLG convention in Austin, Texas the delegates sang the Communist "Internationale" anthem, whose lyrics include the verse, "Tis the final conflict, let each stand his place. The International Soviet shall be the Human Race!"

Hillary gave money to a man who makes speeches be-

neath the Soviet flag, who cheered the murder of 5 policemen and who applauds the assassination of President Kennedy. (page 37)

IPS Suspected of Bombings and Murder

The IPS has long been suspected of revolutionary activities and this must have been known to the Clintons—and especially to Hillary Clinton, who financed IPS in part. Foundation fund disbursers make themselves aware of recipients' backgrounds.

In 1971 the IPS was under investigation by the FBI "for possible involvement of IPS associates in bombing matters" (see documents reproduced below) and "a connection has been shown between the subjects of a bank robbery-murder and some IPS associates." (This related to the murder of a police officer on September 23, 1970 during robbery of the State Street Bank and Trust Company in Boston.)

At precisely this time in 1970, Hillary Clinton was associated with Robert Borosage, Director of the IPS. . . and ten years later we find Hillary still associated with and financing IPS Marxist causes.

If writers on the outside of IPS can determine IPS' revolutionary violent nature, then so can a Yale lawyer with inside contacts at IPS. We have to assume that either Hillary Clinton is remarkably naive or was aware of the violent nature of the IPS when she directed funds into the IPS and related organizations.

When we consider the FBI documents reproduced below with the additional materials in SECRET, this writer has serious reservations about Hillary Clinton. Anyone who would finance or aid violent activities is unstable and certainly not fit to influence public policy in a free country.

SECRET comments on public reaction to some of these revelations as follows:

On CNN's Capital Gang columnist Mona Charen cited Hillary's radicalism but was interrupted by Al Hunt, Chief of the Washington Bureau of the Wall Street Journal, "It's utter, complete nonsense. You don't have

anything factual" blurted Hunt Charen replied, "No, it's based on her foundation grants to CISPES and William Kunstler." Hunt stormed, "No, that is the far-right American Spectator kind of neo-fascist hit nonsense."

After Rush Limbaugh raked Hunt over the coals over 500 radio stations for that sophomoric name-calling spree, a humbled and much smarter Al Hunt scraped out an apology, offering that, "It would be outrageous for me or anyone else to smear [The American Spectator] with that pejorative label."

Regardless how uneasy the truth makes persons such as Al Hunt, Hillary Clinton's political activities are as relevant as the political activities of any first lady. If Eleanor Roosevelt had (before, after or during WWII) channeled money to Japan's military supporters, that would have been relevant. If Bess Truman had directed monies to North Korea's advocates, that would have been relevant. If Jackie Kennedy had aided Castro or if "'Lady Bird' Johnson had supported the Viet Cong, those actions would have been relevant; as would news of Barbara Bush funding Sadam Hussein's forces.

Likewise, Hillary's support for pro-Marxists in America and for communist insurgents in Nicaragua and El Salvador is just as relevant! Especially in light of the Clinton campaign rhetoric that he and Hillary would be somewhat of a husband-and-wife Presidential team. As Hillary declared at the New York Convention, "With me you are getting two for the price of one.... Vote for him and you will have me also.

The Trilateral Commission then is a prime Rockefeller front to control policy to bring about New World Order. Through the Clintons the decades-old policy of aid to Marxist regimes and revolutionaries continues.

This is a long way from the "study group" label claimed by the Trilateral Commission. The Commission is a revolutionary organization in opposition to the U.S. Constitution (in its own reports) and through its members uses deceit, violence and criminal activity to advance its own global political and

financial interests.

The delicacy of language and presumed elevated status of its members should not disguise either their tenacity or their immorality. The soft word, the empty promise and the subtle threat have replaced the Marxist red banner and screaming hordes.

CHAPTER ELEVEN WHERE THE TRILATERAL COMMISSION WENT WRONG

When we published the original TRILATERALS OVER WASHINGTON, the Trilateral Commission had no track history. Although we wrote the book from the viewpoint that Trilateral Commissioners and especially Chairman David Rockefeller were not telling the entire truth about their objectives, there was no way to prove self interested objectives.

Today, in 1994, we can look at two decades of Trilateral actions and determine just how disinterested Trilateral proposals and policies have been in the light of the extraordinary ability to place their members in every Administration.

First, we now know they have a common philosophy, this by their own statements. The radio interview of Trilateral Coordinator George Franklin Jr., in July 1979 (Radio station KLNG, Council Bluffs, Iowa, July 27,1979) highlighted specific sensitive areas of discussion that the Commission wants to avoid.

Without doubt the Trilaterals had not considered the possibility of opposition to their plans and have no damage control mechanism in place. They also demonstrate an easy ability to avoid, evade, deny and even outright lie when these sensitive areas are made public.

The central role of David Rockefeller is always disguised and his influence diluted:

COMMENTATOR: Mr. Sutton?

SUTTON: Can we go off energy for a while?

COMMENTATOR: Yes.

SUTTON: I have a question for Mr. Franklin. Who chooses the members of the Trilateral Commission?

FRANKLIN: The Trilateral Commission's Executive Committee.

SUTTON: Who comprises that committee?

FRANKLIN: Who is on that committee?

SUTTON: Yes.

FRANKLIN: Okay. William Coleman, former Secretary of Transportation, who is a lawyer; Lane Kirkland, who is Secretary-General of the American Federation of Labor; Henry Kissinger, who does not need too much identification; Bruce McLaury, who is president of the Brookings Institution; David Rockefeller; Robert Ingersoll, who was formerly Deputy Secretary of State and Ambassador to Japan; I. W. Able, who was formerly head of United Steelworkers; and William Roth, who is a San Francisco businessman and was chief trade negotiator in the previous trade Kennedy round.

SUTTON: May I ask a question? How many of these have a rather intimate business relationship with Mr. Rockefeller?

FRANKLIN: Henry Kissinger is chairman of Mr. Rockefeller's Chase Advisory Committee.

SUTTON: Coleman?

FRANKLIN: Coleman, I don't think has any business relationship with him, he is a lawyer. [In fact, William Coleman is a Director of Chase Manhattan Bank, which Franklin has already admitted to be controlled by David Rockefeller.]

SUTTON: Mr. Ingersoll?

FRANKLIN: Mr. Ingersoll, I don't think has any business relationship.

SUTTON: Isn't he connected with First Chicago?

FRANKLIN: He is vice chairman of the University of Chicago.

SUTTON: NO, what about the First Bank of Chicago? (First

Chicago Corp.)

FRANKLIN: I don't believe that Ingersoll has any relationship with banks in Chicago, but I don't know for certain on that. [Robert Stephen Ingersoll, before joining the Washington "revolving door," was a director of the First National Bank of Chicago, a subsidiary of First Chicago Corp. The largest single shareholder in First Chicago is David Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan Bank. Ingersoll has also been a director of Atlantic Richfield and Burlington Northern. Chase Manhattan is also the largest single stockholder in these two companies. Thus, Ingersoll has a longstanding relationship with Rockefeller interests.]

Freedom of the press is distasteful to Trilaterals, and they have good reason to find it distasteful. Here's another segment of the same radio interview of Mr. Franklin, in which he disclaims knowledge of a Trilateral book recommending abridgement of press freedoms, a violation of the First Amendment of the Constitution.

SUTTON: Mr. Franklin, do you believe in freedom of the press in the United States?

FRANKLIN: Definitely, of course.

SUTTON: Let me quote you from a book, *Crisis In Democracy*, written by Michel Crozier, who is a Trilateral member.

FRANKLIN: Correct.

SUTTON: I am quoting from page 35 of his book: "The media has thus become an autonomous power. We are now witnessing a crucial change with the profession. That is, media tends to regulate itself in such a way as to resist the pressure from financial or government interests." Does that not mean that you want to restrict the press in some way?

FRANKLIN: I can't quite hear you.

SUTTON: Let me paraphrase this for you. I think I will be clear in my paraphrasing. The Trilateral Commission is unhappy with the press because it resists the pressure from financial or government interests. That is one of your statements.

FRANKLIN: NOW, let me say something about our book. [NOTE: "our"] The book that we put out, the report, is the responsibility of the authors and not of the Commission itself. You will find that in the back of a number of them, and that book is one of them, that other members of the Commission will hear dissenting views, and you will find dissenting views in the back of that book on the press question.

SUTTON: I would like to quote a further statement from the same book and leave the question at that point: "The media deprives government and to some extent other responsible authorities of the time lag and tolerance that make it possible to innovate and to experiment responsibly." What the book recommends is something like the Interstate Commerce Commission to control the press. This seems to me to be a violation of the Constitution.

FRANKLIN: I would agree with you that we do not want something like the Interstate Commerce Commission to control the press.

[Michel Crozer, et al, in Crisis In Democracy, make the following statements with reference to the "Interstate Commerce Act and the Sherman Anti-trust Act":

"Something comparable appears to be now needed with respect to the media. .. there is also the need to assure to the government the right and the ability to withhold information at the source" (page 82).

The authors go on to argue that if journalists do not conform to these new restrictive standards, then "The alternative could well be regulation by the government. "]

SUTTON: I fail to understand why the Trilateral Commission would associate itself with such a viewpoint.

FRANKLIN: As I just mentioned to you, we hired three authors for each report. The authors are allowed to say what they think is correct. What the Trilateral Commission does is this: It says we think this report is worthwhile for the public to see. This does not mean that all the members of the Commission agree with all the statements in the report and, in fact, a majority of them might disagree with certain things. Now,

where a statement is one that many Commissioners seem to disagree with, we then do put in the back a summary of the discussion. That book does have a summary of the discussion of our meeting which questions various things in the book, in the back of it.

While Mr. Franklin tries to put distance between the Trilateral Commission and individual members, he then admitted to a "common philosophy" which appears to suggest they have common views on at least fundamental issues.

SUTTON: Would you say Mr. Franklin that the members of the Commission do have a common philosophy?

FRANKLIN: Yes, I think a common philosophy. I think that all of them believe that this world will work better if the principal industrial powers consult each other on their policies and try to work them out together. This does not mean that they will agree on everything. Of course, they won't. But, at least they will know what the other countries feel, and why they feel it.

SUTTON: The Financial Times in London—the editor is Ferdie Fisher, a Trilateralist. He fired a long time editorial writer, Gordon Tether, because Tether wanted to write articles criticizing the Trilateral Commission. Do you have any comments?

FRANKLIN: I didn't know that at all. It sounds terribly unlikely, but if you say that it is so, probably it is. [See Chapter Seven, "Trilateral Censorship: the case of C. Gordon Tether" in *Trilaterals Over Washington*. Trilaterals see the media as the "gatekeeper" and comment as follows: "Their main impact is visibility. The only real event is the event that is reported as seen. Thus, journalists possess a crucial role as gatekeepers of one of the central dimensions of public life. "]

George Franklin got into further deep water about control of the press when asked how it chose writers and whether it approved of the chosen writers.

REES: Yes, Mr. Franklin, I noticed that you were saying that the Trilateral Commission takes no responsibility for the use

of the publisher's imprimatur, but I would be interested to know about how you go about selecting your writers to put out the various positions.

FRANKLIN: Well that is a very interesting question. We have a meeting with the chairmen. The way the situation is organized is this. There are three chairmen, one from each of the three areas. Three secretaries, one from each of the three areas, and I, have got an intermediate staff job called "coordinator." Now, the chairmen and secretaries meet with what they have jointly, will discuss not only topics they think will be useful to have, but also authors for these topics. The topics are then discussed by the whole Commission and approved or changed slightly. The authors are chosen by members of the staff and consultation with the chairmen.

REES: SO, although you do not take responsibility for the finished product you are responsible for the selection of the writers.

FRANKLIN: Very much. No question about that.

REES: SO it does have your imprimatur stamp of approval each time?

FRANKLIN: In that sense. We certainly choose the writers, and we choose them because we think they are very good, obviously. So far, every single report that has been written by the authors has, in fact, been accepted for publication by the Commission.

REES: Then the report on the news media was accepted?

FRANKLIN: It was accepted, but there was a lot of disagreement with that. It was felt that it was an important statement, with quite a lot of interesting new ideas in it. It was also a very strong opposition which was reflected in the back of the report in a section, I think it is entitled, "Summary of Discussion."

Whatever Mr. Franklin's evasive statements, common sense suggests that Trilateral reports do in fact reflect a common philosophy, else the Commission would hardly pay out funds for their production. The "do not necessarily agree with

the authors" is a mere ploy to evade responsibility for unwelcome views.

In one sensitive area, the abnormally low tax rates paid by Trilateral banks and firms, George Franklin Jr. was highly evasive — and for good reason. Trilaterals have been getting away with murder, taxwise.

Here's the Council Bluffs segment on taxation:

COMMENTATOR: Mr. Sutton, do you have any other questions?

SUTTON: I have one more question, that goes to a new field entirely: taxation. We have established that David Rockefeller is chairman and single most powerful influence in Chase Manhattan Bank. Now, do you happen to know the tax rate that Chase Manhattan pays in the United States?

FRANKLIN: I don't know. . . happen to know — it is about 50% (fifty percent),

SUTTON: I will give you some figures. In 1976, Chase Manhattan Bank's tax rate was precisely zero. I am wondering why, if you are so influential politically, why at least you cannot pay a tax rate more equivalent to that of the average American taxpayer, which is 15%, or 20% or 30%.

FRANKLIN: I have nothing to do with Chase Manhattan Bank. But if the tax rate was zero, it must have been because it had very large real estate losses in that year, I think.

SUTTON: In 1975, it was 3.4%. It is always way under 10%.

FRANKLIN: Well, that is extremely interesting. It is a new fact for me.

SUTTON: Well, my point is this, that you are willing to guide the United States into the future, but apparently you are not willing to pay your fair share of the costs.

COMMENTATOR: YOU are talking about the Commission members as a whole?

SUTTON: Yes.

FRANKLIN: I think you will find that the Commission members pay whatever the laws say they are supposed to pay under the circumstances. I do not know what the particular

reason was on Chase. They did have heavy losses; I am not familiar enough with their situation to be able to tell to you.

In brief, our Trilateral friends have been dealing themselves favors when it comes to taxation. Trilateral firms are notorious for the ridiculous low tax rates they appear to pay, zero being quite common. And it's all legal because Trilateral policies are put into law by Trilateral politicians — so George Franklin can truly say that "the Commission members pay whatever the laws say they are supposed to pay under the circumstances."

CHAPTER TWELVE: CONCLUSIONS

Twenty years after founding of the Trilateral Commission we can now assess its objectives and intentions. Originally presented as a "study group" by interested citizens concerned about world problems, we find that the Trilateral Commission is anything but this description.

The first finding is that from the start the Commission has reflected extremely narrow segments of the citizenry in each constituent country. The Commission is as representative of world requirements and world needs as the fox is representative of chickens in the hen coop.

The dominant influence has always been David Rockefeller and comparable bankers overseas. The dominant influence is that of the international bankers, those who already heavily control world directions through control of finance. Furthermore, David Rockefeller was long time Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, the most important regional bank in this private system. The Federal Reserve System is not a public institution, it is a private institution, a fact which has to be borne in mind. Federal Reserve distance from the prevailing government of the time is deliberate, so that the financial system can be controlled in the interests of those who own the Federal Reserve.

Rockefeller has a small executive Committee that invites

prominent citizens to join the Commission. This perpetuates the Rockefeller influence so that new members are at least sympathetic to Rockefeller objectives in their private views. This in itself would not be objectionable if:

- (1) The Commission was indeed a "study group" and,
- (2) If the Commission exercised the same interest in separation from the Federal Government in appointments as it does in operation of the Federal Reserve.

The Trilateral Commission is not a study group. Its studies are farmed out to academics who can reflect the Commission views. These studies are then the basis for Trilateral discussion and agreed policies become the policy viewpoints of individual members.

When these members are appointed to the Federal Government, and generally about one-third of the members at any time are in the current Administration, then they transmit these policies into practice. The conclusion is that the Trilateral Commission is a policy-oriented group with the power to translate policies into action whatever the general citizenry may wish.

Nowhere do we find any policy determinations in favor of individual free enterprise and individual freedom. We find many claims that the world is "ungovernable" and that State action is needed to bring citizen objectives into line with Trilateral ambitions.

Our chapters and examples of attempts to solve social problems through "wars" demonstrates policies that must have a hidden objective. The so-called "war on drugs" has not succeeded and never could succeed. We find that the Clinton "war on drugs" is not far removed from the Reagan-Bush "war on drugs" although Clinton promised a new approach. It is still a multi-billion military approach to intercept supply, a remarkably inefficient procedure. The demand side has never been realistically tackled. And as Lt. Colonel "Bo" Gritz has pointed out, along with others, the CIA is deeply involved in trafficking. So we are left with the thought — is the war on supply designed to allow other channels like CIA to control supply? This is the only rational conclusion one can make.

Whatever the Trilateral Commission members may claim, our finding is that the objective is a New World Order with Trilateralists in control. This would be a planned New World Order with no individual freedom and no constitutional protections. These so-called "wars" on problems are designed to mold the outcome of the problem towards New World Order objectives, not to solve the problem.

INSTITUTE FOR POLICY STUDIES, Washington, D.C., is the "think tank" heavily used by the Clinton Administration to implement Trilateral policies. Here is the FBI summary on IPS.

FROM THE FBI FILES:

Memorandum for Mr. C. D. Brennan
Re: Institute for Policy Studies
1520 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C.

~~SECRET~~

172

NO FORN DISSEMINATION

ineffective efforts by such groups as Weatherman and the Communist Party. *SU*

SU

[REDACTED]

b7C

OBSERVATIONS:

As indicated above, it appears that IPS is not primarily an institution of learning nor is it an ordinary political organization; rather, it is an action-oriented organization of subversive aspect and should be investigated by the FBI as a New Left subversive organization, without limiting the investigation to contact with established sources.

U

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

b7C

~~SECRET~~
NO FORN DISSEMINATION

APPENDIX A: TRILATERAL COMMISSION MEMBERS

as of October 15, 1978. See page 142 for 1993.

North American Members

- Abel, I.W., Former President, United Steelworkers of America
Abshire, David M., Chairman, Georgetown University Center for
Strategic and International Studies
Ackley, Gardner, Henry Carter Adams University Professor of Political
Economy, University of Michigan
Allison, Graham, Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government,
University of Michigan
Anderson, Doris, Former Editor, Chatelaine Magazine
Anderson, John B., House of Representatives
Armstrong, Anne, Former U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain
Austin, J. Paul, Chairman, The Coca-Cola Company
Ball, George W., Senior Partner, Lehman Brothers
Belanger, Michel, President, Provincial Bank of Canada
Bonner, Robert W., Q.C., Chairman, British Columbia Hydro
Brademas, John, House of Representatives
Brimmer, Andrew, President, Brimmer & Company, Inc.
Brock, III, William E., Chairman, Republican National Committee
Burns, Arthur F., Senior Adviser, Lazard Freres & Co.; former Chairman
of Board of Governors, U.S. Federal Reserve Board.
Calkins, Hugh, Partner, Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue
Castonguay, Claude, President, Fonds Laurentien; Chairman of the
Board, Imperial Life Assurance Company; former Minister in the
Quebec Government
Chaikin, SoL President, International Ladies Garment Workers Union
Cohen, William S., House of Representatives
Coleman, William T., Senior Partner, O'Melveny & Meyers; former
Secretary of Transportation
Conable, Jr., Barber B., House of Representatives
Cowles, Jr., John, Chairman, Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co.
Cranston, Alan, United States Senate
Colver, John C, United States Senate
Curtis, Gerald L., Director, East Asian Institute, Columbia University

Cutler, Lloyd N., Partner, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering
Desrochers, Louis A., Partner, McCuaig and Desrochers, Edmonton
Dobell, Peter, Parliamentary Centre for Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade, Ottawa
Donovan, Hedley, Editor-in-Chief, Time, Inc.
Edwards, Claude A., Member, Public Service Staff Relations Board; former President, Public Service Alliance of Canada
Evans, Daniel J., President, The Evergreen State College; former Governor of Washington
Fairweather, Gordon, Chief Commissioner, Canadian Human Rights Commission
Foley, Thomas S., House of Representatives
Franklin, George S., Coordinator, The Trilateral Commission, former Executive Director, Council on Foreign Relations
Fraser, Donald M., House of Representatives
Fraser, John Allen, Member of Parliament, Ottawa
Glenn, Jr., John H., United States Senate
Harvie, Donald Southam, Deputy Chairman, Petro Canada
Hawley, Philip M., President, Carter Hawley Hale Stores, Inc.
Heller, Walter W., Regents' Professor of Economics, University of Minnesota
Hewitt, William A., Chairman, Deere & Company
Hills, Carla A., Senior Resident Partner, Latham, Watkins & Hills; former U.S. Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.
Hockin, Alan, Executive Vice President, Toronto-Dominion Bank
Hoge, Jr., James F., Chief Editor, Chicago Sun Times
Houthakker, Hendrik S., Henry Lee Professor of Economics, Harvard University
Hughes, Thomas L., President, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
Ingersoll, Robert S., Deputy Chairman of the Board of Trustees, The University of Chicago; former Deputy Secretary of State
Johnson, D. Gale, Provost, The University of Chicago
Train, Russell E., Former Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Trezise, Philip H., Former Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs
Volcker, Paul A., President, Federal Reserve Bank of New York
Wallace, Martha R., Executive Director, The Henry Luce Foundation, Inc.
Ward, Martin J., President, United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada
Watts, Glenn E., President, Communications Workers of America
Weinberger, Caspar W., Vice President and General Counsel, Bechtel Corporation

Weyerhaeuser, George, President and Chief Executive Officer,
Weyerhaeuser Corporation
Whitman, Marina V. N., Distinguished Public Service Professor of
Economics, University of Pittsburgh
Wilson, Carroll L., Mitsui Professor in Problems of Contemporary
Technology, Alfred P. Sloan School of Management; Director,
Workshop on Alternative Energy Strategies, MIT
Wilson, T. A., Chairman of the Board, The Boeing Company

Former Members in Public Service

Benson, Lucy Wilson, U.S. Under-Secretary of State for Security
Assistance
Blumenthal, W. Michael, U.S. Secretary of the Treasury
Bowie, Robert R., U.S. Deputy to the Director of Central Intelligence for
National Intelligence
Brown, Harold, U.S. Secretary of Defense
Brzezinski, Zbigniew, U.S. Assistant to the President for National
Security Affairs
Carter, Jimmy, President of the United States
Christopher, Warren, U.S. Deputy Secretary of State
Cooper, Richard N., U.S. Under-Secretary of State for Economic Affairs
Gardner, Richard N., U.S. Ambassador to Italy
Holbrooke, Richard, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian
and Pacific Affairs
Mondale, Walter F., Vice President of the United States
Owen, Henry, Special Representative of the President for Economic
Summits; U.S. Ambassador at Large
Pepin, Jean-Luc, Cochairman, Task Force on Canadian Unity
Richardson, Elliot L., U.S. Ambassador at Large with Responsibility for
U.N. Law of the Sea Conference
Kaiser, Jr., Edgar F., President and Chief Executive Officer, Kaiser
Resources Ltd.
Kirby, Michael, President, Institute for Research on Public Policy,
Montreal
Kirkland, Lane, Secretary-Treasurer, AFL-CIO
Kissinger, Henry A., Former Secretary of State
Linowitz, Sol M., Senior Partner, Coudert Brothers; former Ambassador
to the Organization of American States
Lord, Winston, President, Council on Foreign Relations
Macdonald, Donald S., Former Canadian Minister of Finance
MacLaury, Bruce K., President, The Brookings Institution

McCracken, Paul W., Edmund Ezra Day Professor of Business Administration, University of Michigan

Miller, Arjay, Dean, Graduate School of Business, Stanford University

Morgan, Lee L, President, Caterpillar Tractor Company

Naden, Kenneth D., President, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives

Packard, David, Chairman, Hewlett-Packard Company

Parsky, Gerald L., Partner, Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher; former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for International Affairs

Pearce, William R., Vice President, Cargill Incorporated

Peterson, Peter G., Chairman, Lehman Brothers

Reischauer, Edwin O., University Professor and Director of Japan Institute, Harvard University; former U.S. Ambassador to Japan

Robinson, Charles W., Vice Chairman, Blyth Eastman Dillon & Co.; former Deputy Secretary of State

Rockefeller, David, Chairman, The Chase Manhattan Bank, N.A.

Rockefeller, John D., IV, Governor of West Virginia

Roosa, Robert V., Partner, Brown Bros., Harriman & Company

Roth, William M., Roth Properties

Roth, Jr., William V., United States Senate

Sawhill, John C, President, New York University; former Administrator, Federal Energy Administration

Schacht, Henry B., Chairman, Cummins Engine Inc.

Scranton, William W., Former Governor of Pennsylvania; former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations

Sharp, Mitchell, Member of Parliament; former Minister of External Affairs

Shepherd, Jr., Mark, Chairman, Texas Instruments Inc.

Spencer, Edson W., President and Chief Executive Officer, Honeywell Inc.

Taft, Jr., Robert, Partner, Taft, Stettinius & Hollister

Taylor, Arthur R.

Thompson, James R., Governor of Illinois

Smith, Gerard C, U.S. Ambassador at Large for Non-Proliferation Matters

Solomon, Anthony M., U.S. Under-Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs

Vance, Cyrus R., U.S. Secretary of State

Warnke, Paul C, Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; Chief Disarmament Negotiator

Young, Andrew, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations

European Members

- Agnelli, Giovanni, President, FIAT
- Anderson, P. Nyboe, Chief General Manager, Andelsbanken A/S; former Danish Minister for Economic Affairs and Trade
- Bassetti, Piero, Chamber of Deputies, Rome
- Berthoin, George, President, European Movement
- Biedenkopf, Kurt H., Deputy Chairman, Christian Democratic Union
Federal Republic of Germany
- Birrenbach, Kurt, President, German Foreign Policy Association;
President, Thyssen Stiftung
- Boon, Henrik N., Former Dutch Ambassador to NATO and Italy
- Carli, Guido, President, Confindustria; former Governor, Bank of Italy
- Carrington, Lord, House of Lords, London
- Casanova, Jean-Claude, Professor of Political Science, Institute of
Political Studies, Paris
- Clercq, Willy de, Chairman, Party for Freedom and Progress, Belgium
- Colombo, Umberto, Director-General, Research & Development Division,
Montedison
- Compagna, Francesco, Chamber of Deputies, Rome
- Cromer, The Earl of, Advisor to Baring Bros. & Co., Ltd., former British
Ambassador to the United States
- Danis-Spaak, Antoinette, Member of Chamber of Representatives,
Brussels
- Debatisse, Michel, Chairman of the French National Farmers Union
- Delouvrier, Paul, Chairman, French Electricity Board
- Desmond, Barry, Member of Irish Parliament and Labour Party Whip
- Dromer, Jean, President Directeur General, Banque Internationale pour
l'Afrique Occidentale
- Duchene, Francois, Director, Sussex European Research Centre,
University of Sussex
- Eastwood, G., General Secretary, Association of Patternmakers & Allied
Craftsmen, London
- Ehmke, Horst, Deputy Chairman, Parliamentary Fraction of Social
Democratic Party, Federal Republic of Germany; former Minister of
Justice
- Esteva, Pierre, Administrateur Directeur General, Union des Assurances
de Paris
- Fibbe, K, Chairman of the Board, Overseas Gas and Electricity
Company, Rotterdam
- Fisher, M. H., Editor, Financial Times
- Fitzgerald, Garret, Member of Irish Parliament and Leader of Fine Gael
Party; former Foreign Minister of Ireland
- Foch, Rene. Deleque National aux Questions Internationales du Parti
des Republicains Independants

Forte, Francesco, President, Tescon, S.p.A., Rome
 Gaudet, Michel, President, Federation Francaise des Societes
 d' Assurances
 Geddes, Sir Reay, Chairman, Dunlop Holdings, Ltd.
 Glisenti, Giuseppe, President, La Rinascente
 Grierson, Ronald, Director, General Electric Co., Ltd.
 Harlech, Lord, Chairman, Harlech Television; former British
 Ambassador to the United States
 Hartwig, Hans, Chairman, German Association for Wholesale and
 Foreign Trade
 Hayhoe, Bernard, Member of British Parliament
 Houthuys, Jozef P., Chairman, Belgian Confederation of Christian
 Trade Unions
 Huber, Ludwig, President, Bayerische Landesbank
 Jannott, Horst K., Chairman, Board of Directors, Munich Reinsurance
 Society
 Janssen, Daniel E., Administrateur Delegeue et Directeur General,
 Belgian Chemical Union
 Junghans, Hans-Jurgen, Member of the Bundestag
 Kaiser, Karl, Director, Research Institute of the German Society for
 Foreign Policy
 Keith, Sir Kenneth, Chairman, Rolls Royce Ltd.
 Keswick, Henry, Chairman, Matheson & Company, Ltd.
 Killeen, Michael, Managing Director, Industrial Development Authority
 of the Irish Republic
 Knight, Sir Arthur, Chairman, Courtaulds, Ltd.
 Kohnstamm, Max, Principal, European University Institute, Florence
 Kristoffersen, Erwin, Director, International Division, German
 Federation of Trade Unions
 Lambert, Baron Leon, President du Groupe Bruxelles Lambert, S.A.
 Levi, Arrigo, La Stampa, Turin
 Littman, Mark, Deputy Chairman, British Steel Corporation
 Lowenthal, Richard, Professor Emeritus, Free University of Berlin
 MacFarquhar, Roderick, Member of British Parliament
 Malfa, Giorgio La, Chamber of Deputies, Rome
 Marjolin, Robert, Former Vice President of the Commission of the
 European Communities
 Martin, Roger, President, Compagnie Saint-Gobain Pont-a-Mousson
 Maudling, Reginald, Member of British Parliament; former Cabinet
 Minister
 Merlini, Cesare, Director, Institute for International Affairs, Rome
 Montbrial Thierry de, Professor of Economics, Ecole Polytechnique,
 Paris

Munchmeyer, Alwin, Chairman of the Board, Bank Schroder,
Munchmeyer, Hengst & Co.

Munthe, Preben, Professor of Economics, Oslo University; Official Chief
Negotiator in Negotiations between Labor Unions and Industry

Murphy, Dan, Secretary-General of the Civil Service Executive Union,
Dublin

Narjes, Karl-Heinz, Member of the Bundestag

Neuman, Friedrich A., Chairman, State Association, Industrial
Employers Societies, North-Rhine Westphalia

Ortona, Egidio, President, Honeywell Information Systems, Italia;
former Italian Ambassador to the United States

Pagezy, Bernard, President Directeur General, Societes d' Assurances
du Groupe de Paris

Pilcher, Sir John, Former British Ambassador to Japan

Rey, Jean, Ministre de 'Etat; former President of the Commission of the
European Communities

Ridsdale, Julian, Member of British Parliament; Chairman, Anglo-
Japanese Parliamentary Group

Roberts, Sir Frank, Advisory Director, Unilever Ltd.; former British
Ambassador to Germany and the Soviet Union

Robinson, Mary T. W., Member of Senate, Irish Republic

Roll, Lord, Chairman, S. G. Warburg and Co., Ltd.

Roper, John, Member of British Parliament

Rose, Francois de, Ambassadeur de France; President Directeur General,
Societe Nouvelle Pathe Cinema

Rothschild, Baron Edmond de, President, Compagnie Financiere
Holding, Paris

Samkalden, Ivo, Former Mayor of Amsterdam

Sanness, John C, Director, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs

Scherpenhuijsen Rom, W. E., Chairman, Board of Directors,
Nederlandsche Middenstandsbank, N.V.

Schmidt, Erik Ib, Permanent Undersecretary of State, Chairman, Riso
National Laboratory

Scholten, Th. M., Chairman of the Board, Robeco Investment Group,
Rotterdam

Schroder, Gerhard, Member of the Bundestag; former Foreign Minister
of the Federal Republic of Germany

Seidenfaden, Erik, Directeur de la Fondation Danoise, Institut
Universitaire International de Paris

Sensi, Federico, Ambassador of Italy; former Italian Ambassador to
the Soviet Union

Seydoux, Roger, Ambassadeur de France; President, Banque de
Madagascar et des Comores; President, Fondation de France

Shackleton, Lord, Deputy Chairman, Rio Tinto-Zinc Corporation
Ltd., London

Shonfield, Sir Andrew, Professor of Economics, European University Institute, Florence; former Director, Royal Institute of International Affairs

Smith, J. H., Deputy Chairman, British Gas Corporation

Sohl, Hans-Gunther, Chairman of the Board, August Thyssen Hutte A.G.

Sommer, Theo, Editor-in-Chief, Die Zeit

Staunton, Myles, Member of Senate, Irish Republic

Story, G. R., St. Antony's College, Oxford (Far East Centre)

Swire, John A., Chairman, John Swire and Sons, Ltd.

Tidemand, Otto Grieg, Shipowner; former Norwegian Minister of Defense and Minister of Economic Affairs

Tuke, A. F., Chairman, Barclays Bank International Ltd.

Vetter, Heinz-Oskar, Chairman, German Federation of Trade Unions

Vittorelli, Paolo, Member of Italian Parliament

Warner, Sir Frederick, Director, Guinness Peat Group Ltd.; former British Ambassador to Japan

Wauters, Luc, Chairman, Kredietbank, Brussels

Wellenstein, Edmund, Former Director General for External Affairs, Commission of the European Communities

Whitaker, Kenneth, Member of Senate, Irish Republic; former Governor of the Central Bank of Ireland

Williams, Alan Lee, Member of British Parliament

Wolf von Amerongen, Otto, President, Otto Wolff A.G.; President, German Federation of Trade and Industry

Woods, Michael, Member of Irish Parliament

Zulueta, Sir Philip de, Chairman, Antony Gibbs Holdings Ltd.

Former Members in Public Service

Auken, Svend, Minister of Labor, Denmark

Barre, Raymond, Prime Minister and Finance Minister, French Republic

Ehrenberg, Herbert, Minister of Labor and Social Affairs, Federal Republic of Germany

Eyskens, Marc, Belgian State Secretary for Budget and Flemish Regional Economy

Lambsdorff, Otto Graf, Minister of Economics, Federal Republic of Germany

Lecat, Jean-Philippe, Minister of Culture and Communications, French Republic

Luard, Evan, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for the British Foreign Office

Norgaard, Ivar, Danish Minister of Commerce

O'Kennedy, Michael, Minister for Foreign Affairs, Irish Republic

Simonet, Henri, Foreign Minister of Belgium

Stoltenberg, Thorvald, Secretary of State, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Sund, Olaf, Senator for Labor and Social Affairs, Land Government of Berlin

Japanese Members

Amagi, Isao, President, Japan Society for the Promotion of Science; former Vice Minister of Education
Ariyoshi, Yoshiya, Counsellor, Nippon Yusen, K.K.
Asada, Shizuo, President, Japan Air Lines Company, Ltd.
Ashihara, Yoshishige, Chairman, Kansai Electric Power Company, In-<
Doko, Toshiwo, President, Japan Federation of Economic Organizatio:
(Keidanren)
Eto, Jun, Professor, Tokyo Institute of Technology
Eto, Shinkichi, Professor of International Relations, Tokyo University
Fujino, Chujiro, Chairman, Mitsubishi Corporation
Fukushima, Shintaro, President, Kyodo News Service
Gotoh, Noboru, President, TOKYU Corporation
Hagiwara, Toru, Advisor to the Minister of Foreign Affairs; former Ambassador to France
Hanamura, Nihachiro, Vice President, Japan Federation of Economic Organizations (Keidanren)
Hara, Sumio, Executive Advisor, Bank of Tokyo, Ltd.
Haraguchi, Yukitaka, Chairman, Central Executive Committee, All Japan Federation of Metal Mine Labor Unions
Hasegawa, Norishige, Chairman, Sumitomo Chemical Company, Ltd.
Hidaka, Teru, Chairman, Yamaichi Securities Company, Ltd.
Hirose, Gen, President, Nihon Insurance Co, Ltd.
Hori, Hideo, President, The Association for Employment Promotion of the Handicapped
Hosomi, Takashi, Advisor, Industrial Bank of Japan, Ltd.
Hotta, Shozo, Honorary Chairman, Sumitomo Bank, Ltd.
Hyuga, Hosai, Chairman, Sumitomo Bank, Ltd.
Ichimura, Shinichi, Professor of Economics, Kyoto University
Ikeda, Yoshizo, President, Mitsui & Co., Ltd.
Inayama, Yoshihiro, Chairman, Nippon Steel Corporation
Inouye, Kaoru, Honorary Chairman, Dai-Ichi Kangyo Bank, Ltd.
Ishikawa, Rokuro, President, Kajima Corporation
Ishikawa, Tadao, President, Keio University
Itakura, Joji, President, The Mitsui Bank, Ltd.
Iwasa, Yoshizane, Chairman, Japan-U.S. Economic Council

Kaji, Motoo, Professor of Economics, Tokyo University
Kamiya, Fuji, Professor of International Relations, Keio University
Kashiwagi, Yusuke, President, Bank of Tokyo, Ltd.; former Special
Advisor to the Minister of Finance
Kato, Koichi, Member of the Diet
Kawai, Ryoichi, President, Komatsu, Ltd.
Kawamura, Katsuji, Chairman, Nissan Motor Company, Ltd.
Kitaura, Kiichiro, President, Nomura Securities Company, Ltd.
Kobayashi, Koji, Chairman, Nippon Electric Company, Ltd.
Komai, Kenichiro, Chairman, Hitachi, Ltd.
Kondo, Shinichi, Advisor, Mitsubishi Corporation; former Ambassador
to Canada
Kono, Fumihiko, Counsellor, Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd.
Kosaka, Masataka, Professor, Faculty of Law, Kyoto University
Maki, Fumihiko, Principal Partner, Maki and Associates, Design,
Planning and Development
Matsumoto, Shigeharu, Chairman, International House of Japan, Inc.
Miyado, Daigo, Chairman, The Sanwa Bank, Ltd.
Morita, Akio, Chairman, SONY Corporation
Mukaibo, Takashi, President, Tokyo University
Nagai, Norihiko, President, Mitsui O.S.K. Lines
Nagai, Yonosuke, Professor of Political Science, Tokyo Institute of
Technology
Nagano, Shigeo, President, Japan Chamber of Commerce and Industry
Nagasue, Eiichi, Member of the Diet
Nakahara, Nobuyuki, Managing Director, Toa Nenryo Kogyo, K.K.
Nakamura, Toshio, Chairman, Mitsubishi Bank, Ltd.
Nakayama, Ichiro, President, Japan Institute of Labor
Nakayama, Sohei, Counsellor, Industrial Bank of Japan, Ltd.
Ogata, Okira, Chief News Commentator, Japan Broadcasting
Corporation (NHK)
Ohjimi, Yoshihisa, President, Arabian Oil Company, Ltd.; former Vice
Minister of International Trade and Industry
Okita, Saburo, Chairman, Japan Economic Research Center
Saeki, Kiichi, President, Nomura Research Institute
Sasaki, Kunihiko, Chairman, Fuji Bank, Ltd.
Shibayama, Yukio, Chairman, Sumitomo Shoji Kaisha, K.K.
Shibusawa, Masahide, Director, East-West Seminar
Shimada, Yoshihito, President, Takahashi Foundation; former
President, Japan Petroleum Development Corporation
Shoda, Tatsuo, Chairman, The Nippon Credit Bank Ltd.
Sugiura, Binsuke, Chairman, The Long Term Credit Bank of Japan, Ltd.

Takeuchi, Ryuji, Advisor to the Minister for Foreign Affairs;
former Ambassador to the United States
Toyoda, Eiji, President, Toyota Motor Company, Ltd.
Tozaki, Seild, President, C. Itoh & Co., Ltd.
Tsutsumi, Seiji, Chairman, Seibu Department Store, Inc.
Umesao, Tadao, Director, National Museum of Ethnology
Watanabe, Takesi, Former President, Asian Development Bank
Yasui, Kizo, Chairman, Toray Industries, Inc.

Former Members in Public Service

Miyazawa, Kiichi, Minister of Economic Planning
Ushiba, Nobuhiko, Minister of External Economic Affairs

APPENDIX B:

TRILATERAL COMMISSION MEMBERS

as of July 1, 1993.

OTTO GRAF LAMBSDORFF European Chairman	PAUL A. VOLCKER North American Chairman	AKIO MORITA Japanese Chairman
---	--	----------------------------------

GARRET FITZGERALD European Deputy Chairman	ALLAN E. GOTLIEB North American Deputy Chairman	YOSHIO OKAWARA Japanese Deputy Chairman
--	---	---

DAVID ROCKEFELLER
Founder and Honorary Chairman

PAUL REVAY European Director	CHARLES B. HECK North American Director	TADASHI YAMAMOTO Japanese Director
---------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------

North American Members

Allaire, Paul A., Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Xerox Corporation
Andreas, Dwayne O., Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer,
Archer Daniels Midland Company

Araskog, Rand V., Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer,
ITT Corporation

*Bergsten, C. Fred, Director, Institute for International Economics; former
U.S. Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for International Affairs

Black, Conrad M., Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Hollinger Inc.,
Toronto

Bosley, John, Member, Canadian House of Commons and Chairman of
the Standing Committee on External Affairs and International Trade;
former Speaker of the House of Commons

Bouey, Gerald K., Former Governor of the Bank of Canada

Brademas, John, President Emeritus, New York University;
former Member, U.S. House of Representatives

Brown, Harold, Counselor, Center for Strategic and International Studies;
former Chairman, Johns Hopkins Foreign Policy Institute,
Washington, D.C.; former U.S. Secretary of Defense

*Brzezinski, Zbigniew, Counselor, Center for Strategic and International
Studies; Robert Osgood Professor of American Foreign Affairs, Paul
Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins
University; former U.S. Assistant to the President for National
Security Affairs

Burke, James E., Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer Emeritus, Johnson & Johnson

Calloway, D. Wayne, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, PepsiCo

Carlucci, Frank C., Vice Chairman, The Carlyle Group, former U.S. Secretary of Defense

Chafee, John H., Member, United States Senate

*Coleman, William T. Jr., Senior Partner, O'Melveny & Myers; former U.S. Secretary of Transportation

Corrigan, E. Gerald, President, Federal Reserve Bank of New York

Curtis, Gerald L., Professor of Political Science, East Asian Institute, Columbia University

Deans, Ian; Chairperson, Public Service Staff Relations Board of Canada, Ottawa; former Member, Canadian House of Commons

Dobell, Peter C., Director, Parliamentary Centre for Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade, Ottawa; Vice-President, Institute for Research on Public Policy

Drouin, Marie-Josée, Executive Director, Hudson Institute of Canada, Montreal

Einhorn, Jessica P., Vice President and Treasurer, World Bank

Erburu, Robert F., Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Times Mirror Company

Eyton, Trevor, Member, Canadian Senate; President and Chief Executive Officer, Brascan Limited, Toronto

Feinstein, Dianne, Member, United States Senate; former Mayor of San Francisco

Feldstein, Martin S., President, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.; George F. Baker Professor of Economics, Harvard University; former Chairman, President's Council of Economic Advisors

Fisher, George M. C., Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, Motorola, Inc.

Foley, Thomas S., Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives

*Fortier, L. Yves, Senior Partner, Ogilvy Renault, Barristers and Solicitors, Montreal; former Canadian Ambassador and Permanent Representative to the United Nations

Fresco, Paolo, Vice Chairman of the Board and Executive Officer, The General Electric Company, (U.S.A.)

Friedman, Stephen, Senior Partner & Co-chairman, Goldman, Sachs & Co.

Gardner, Richard N., Henry L. Moses Professor of Law and International Organization, Columbia University; Of Counsel, Coudert Brothers; former U.S. Ambassador to Italy

Gerstner, Louis V. Jr., Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, International Business Machines

Goldschmidt, Neil, former Governor of Oregon; former U.S. Secretary of Transportation

Gorman, Joseph T., Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, TRW Inc.

- *Gotlieb, Allan E., Chairman, Canada Council; Chairman, Burson-Marsteller, Toronto; former Canadian Ambassador to the U.S.
- Graham, Katharine, Chairman of the Board, The Washington Post Co.
- Greenberg, Maurice R., Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, American International Group, Inc.
- Gutfreund, John H., former Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, Salomon Inc.
- *Haas, Robert D., Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Levi Strauss & Company
- Hamilton, Lee H., Member, U.S. House of Representatives
- Hennigar, David J., Chairman, Crownx Inc.; Vice-Chairman, Crown Life Insurance Co.; Atlantic Regional Director, Burns Fry Limited, Halifax, Nova Scotia
- Hormats, Robert D, Vice Chairman, Goldman Sachs International; former U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Economic and Business Affairs
- Houghton, James R., Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, Corning Incorporated
- Johnson, Samuel C, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc.
- Johnson, W. Thomas, President, CNN
- Jordan, Vernon C, Partner, Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld
- Keohane, Nannerl O., President, Duke University, Durham, No. Carolina
- Keough, Donald R., Chairman of the Board, Allen & Co., Inc.
- *Kissinger, Henry A., Chairman, Kissinger Associates, Inc.; former U.S. Secretary of State; former U.S. Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs
- Labrecque, Thomas G., Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, The Chase Manhattan Bank, N.A.
- Leach, Jim, Member, U.S. House of Representatives
- Lewis, Flora, Senior Columnist, The New York Times, Paris
- MacLaren, Roy, Member, Canadian House of Commons; former Minister of State [Finance]; former Minister of National Revenue
- MacMillan, Whitney, Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, Cargill, Inc.
- Mazur, Jay, President, International Ladies' Garment Workers Union
- McColl, Jr., Hugh L., President and Chief Executive Officer, Nations-Bank Corporation
- *McNamara, Robert S., former President, The World Bank; former U.S. Secretary of Defense
- Murray, Allen E., Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, Mobil Corporation
- Oksenberg, Michel, President, East-West Center, Hawaii

Owen, Henry, Senior Fellow on leave, Brookings Institution; Member, Consultants International Group; former U.S. Ambassador-at-Large and Special Representative of the President for Economic Summits

Putnam, Robert D., Director, Center for International Affairs and Clarence Dillon Professor of International Affairs, Harvard University

Rangel, Charles B., Member, U.S. House of Representatives

Raymond, Lee R., Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Exxon Corp.

Ridgway, Rozanne, Co-chair, Atlantic Council; former U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs; former U.S. Ambassador to the German Democratic Republic

Robb, Charles S., Member, United States Senate; former Governor of Virginia

*Rockefeller, David

Rockefeller, John D. IV, Member, United States Senate; former Governor of West Virginia

*Rosovsky, Henry, Lewis P. & Linda L. Geyser University Professor, Harvard University

Roth, Jr., William V., Member, United States Senate

Ruckelshaus, William D., Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Browning-Ferris Industries; former Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; former U.S. Deputy Attorney General

Shanker, Albert, President, American Federation of Teachers

Shultz, George P., Honorary Fellow, Hoover Institution, Stanford University; former U.S. Secretary of State; former U.S. Secretary of the Treasury; former U.S. Secretary of Labor; former Director, U.S. Office of Management and Budget

Smith, Gerard C, former Head, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and Chief Negotiator of SALT 1; former Ambassador-at-Large for Non-Proliferation Matters

Southern, Ronald D., Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer, ATCO Ltd., Calgary; Chairman, Canadian Utilities Ltd., Edmonton

Stern, Paula, President, The Stern Group, Washington, D.C.; former Chairwoman, U.S. International Trade Commission

Thurow, Lester C, Professor of Economics and Dean, Alfred P. Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Tung, Ko-Yung, Chairman, Global Practice Group, O'Melveny & Myers, New York

Turner, William I.M. Jr., Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Exsultate, Inc., Montreal

*Volcker, Paul A., Chairman, James D. Wolfensohn Inc., New York; Frederick H. Schultz Professor of International Economic Policy, Princeton University; former Chairman, Board of Governors, U.S. Federal Reserve System

Watts, Glenn E., President Emeritus, Communications Workers of America

Wendt, Henry, Chairman, Smith Kline Beecham

Whitman, Marina v.N., Distinguished Visiting Professor of Business Administration and Public Policy, The University of Michigan
Williams, Karen Hastie, Partner, Crowell & Moring
Winters, Robert C, Chairman of the Board, The Prudential Insurance Co. of America

Former Members in Public Service

Allison, Graham, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Plans and Policy
Babbitt, Bruce, U.S. Secretary of the Interior
Christopher, Warren; U.S. Secretary of State
Cisneros, Henry, U.S. Secretary of Housing and Urban Development
Clinton, Bill, President of the United States
Crowe, William E. Jr., U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain
Davis, Lynn E., U.S. Undersecretary of State for International Security Affairs
Deutch, John M., Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition
Gergen, David, U.S. Assistant to the President for Communications
Greenspan, Alan, Chairman, Board of Governors, U.S. Federal Reserve System
Jones, James R., U.S. Ambassador to Mexico
Lord, Winston, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs
Murray, Lowell, Government Leader in the Senate
Nye, Joseph S. Jr., Chairman, National Intelligence Council, Central Intelligence Agency
Rivlin, Alice M., Deputy Director, Office of Management and Budget
Shalala, Donna E., U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Services
Spero, Joan Edelman, U.S. Undersecretary of State for Economic and Agricultural Affairs
Talbot, Strobe, Ambassador-at-Large and Special Adviser to the Secretary of State for the New Independent States and Russia
Tarnoff, Peter, U.S. Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs
Wharton, Clifton R., Jr. U.S. Deputy Secretary of State

European Members

Agnelli, Umberto, Vice Chairman, Fiat, Turin
*Albert, Michel, Assurances Generales de France; former High Commissioner of the French Planning Agency
Armstrong, Lord of Ilminster, Director, The R.T.Z. Corporation, London; former Chief Cabinet Secretary to the Prime Minister
Armenise, Giovanni Auetta, Chairman, Banca Nazionale dell'Agricoltura, Rome

- Barre, Raymond, Member of National Assembly; former Prime Minister of France
- Bartelds, Hans, Chairman of the Board of Managing Directors, Amev, Utrecht; Chairman of the Executive Board of Fortis
- Bassetti, Piero, Chairman, Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Milan; former Member of Chamber of Deputies
- Bergougnot, Jean, Director General, French Electricity Board (EDF), Paris
- Berthoin, Georges, International Honorary Chairman, European Movement; Honorary European Chairman, The Trilateral Commission, Paris
- Biedenkopf, Kurt, Minister President of the Free State of Saxony; former Member of the German Bundestag
- Bjerregaard, Ritt, Member of Danish Parliament; Chairman, Social Democratic Parliamentary Group; former Minister of Education and Minister for Social Affairs
- Boada Vilallonga, Claudio, Honorary Chairman, Banco Hispano-Americano, Madrid
- Boiteux, Marcel, Honorary Chairman, French Electricity Board, Paris
- Callebaut, Pierre, Chairman, Amylum, Brussels; former Chairman, Belgian Federation of Agricultural and Food Industries
- Cappuzzo, Umberto, Defense Advisor to the Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs; Member of the Defense Committee, Italian Senate; Former Chief of Staff of the Army, Rome
- *Carmoy, Herve de, Chairman, Banque Industrielle Mobiliere et Privee (B.I.M.P.); Advisor to the Chairman, HR Finances, Paris; former Chief Executive, Societe Generale de Belgique, Brussels
- Carvajal Urquijo, Jaime, Chairman Iberfomento; Chairman, Ford Espana, Madrid
- Casanova, Jean-Claude, Professor of Economics, Institute of Political Studies, Paris; Editor, Commentaire
- Cereti, Fausto, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Alenia, Rome
- Ceron Ayuso, Jose Luis, Former Spanish Minister of Trade; Chairman of ASETA, Madrid
- Clercq, Willy de, Member of the European Parliament; Chairman, Commission on Foreign Economic Relations; former Vice President, Commission of European Communities, Brussels
- Conroy, Richard, Chairman, Conroy Petroleum; Member of Senate, Irish Republic
- Cotta, Alain, Professor of Economics and Management, University of Paris
- David-Weill, Michel, Senior Partner, Lazard Freres, Paris & New York
- Davignon, Viscount Etienne, Chairman, Societe Generale de Belgique; former Vice President, Commission of the European Communities
- Declercq, Baron Guido, Chairman, FIDISCO, INVESTVO and BENEVENT, Brussels; Honorary General Administrator, Kath University, Leuven

Deflassieux, Jean, Chairman, Banque des Echanges Internationaux;
Honorary Chairman, Credit Lyonnais, Paris

Del Turco, Ottaviano, Secretary General, Italian General Confederation
of Labour (C.G.I.L.), Rome

Dromer, Jean, Chairman, Financiere Agache, Paris; Chairman, Louis
Vuitton, Paris; former Chairman, Union des Assurances de Paris (UAP)

Evans, Robert, Chief Executive and Member of the Board, British Gas
Corporation, London

*Fanjul, Oscar, Chairman, Repsol; Chairman, Institute National de
Hidrocarburos, Madrid

Feo, Julio, Chairman, Consultores de Communication y Direction,
Madrid; Chairman, Holmes & Marchant

Ferrer, Carlos, Chairman, Ferrer International; Chairman, Bank of
Europe, Barcelona; President, UNICE, Brussels; former Chairman,
Spanish Employers Confederation

*FitzGerald, Garret, Former Prime Minister of Ireland

Fuchs, Michael, President, National Federation of German Wholesale &
Export Traders, Bonn

*Garrigues Walker, Antonio, Senior Partner, J & A Garrigues, Madrid

Gazzoni Frascara, Giuseppe, Chairman and Managing Director, Gazzoni;
President, Federation of Italian Food Industries, Bologna

Gilbert, John, Member of British Parliament, London; Former Treasury,
Transport and Defense Minister; Chairman, John Gilbert & Associates

*Groothaert, Baron Jacques, Honorary Chairman of the Board, Generale
de Banque, Brussels; Honorary Ambassador of Belgium

Hahn, Curt, Member of the Supervisory Board, Volkswagen, Wolfsburg

Harding, Sir William, Director, Lloyds Bank, London; former British
Ambassador

Harrowby, Earl of, Chairman, The Private Bank, London

Herrero de Minon, Miguel, Member, Spanish Parliament

Hinneken, Jan, Chairman, Belgian Boerenbond; Member, Board of
Directors, National Bank of Belgium

Holm, Niels W., Chairman, Ramboll & Hannemann, Virum; Vice
Chairman, L. Lauritzen Holding; Director, Teledanmark, Copenhagen

Hornhues, Karl-Heinz, Member, German Bundestag; Deputy Chairman,
CDU/CSU Parliamentary Group

Howell, David, Member, British Parliament and Chairman of the
Foreign Affairs Committee; former Cabinet Minister

Imbert, Claude, Editor-in-Chief and Managing Director, Le Point, Paris

Jagland, Thorbjorn, Secretary General, Norwegian Labour Party

Janssen, Baron Daniel, Chairman, Executive Committee, Solvay & Co.,
Brussels

Janssen, Baron Paul-Emmanuel, Chairman of the Board of Directors,
Generale de Banque, Brussels

Jochimsen, Reimut, President, Central Bank of the Northrhine-Westphalia, Dusseldorf; Member, Central Bank Council of the Deutsche Bundesbank

Joly, Alain, Member of the Board and Managing Director, L'Air Liquide, Paris

Julliard, Jacques, Associate Director, Le Nouvel Observateur, Paris

Keating, Justin, Former Irish Minister of Industry and Commerce; former Leader of the Labour Party in the Senate; former Dean, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University College, Dublin

Kiep, Walther Leisler, Treasurer of the Christian Democratic Party and Chairman of the "Atlantik Brücke"; Senior Partner, Gradmann & Holler, Frankfurt

Kohnstamm, Max, Former President, European University Institute, Florence

*Lambsdorff, Count Otto, Chairman, Free Democratic Party; Member, German Bundestag; President, Liberal International; former Federal Minister of Economics

Liam Lawlor, Member of Irish Dail

Lede, Cees van, Member of the Board, Akzo; former President, Federation of Netherlands Industry

Lee Williams, Alan, Director, The British Atlantic Committee; former Member, British Parliament

Leister, Klaus Dieter, Member of the Board, Westdeutsche Landesbank Girozentrale, Dusseldorf; former State Secretary, Minister of Defense; former Head of the Chancellery of Northrhine Westphalia

Levi, Arrigo, Political Columnist, Corriere della Sera, Rome

Levy-Lang, Andre, Chairman of the Board of Management, Compagnie Financiere Paribas, Paris

Leysen, Andre, Chairman, Agfa Gevaert, Antwerp; Chairman, Supervisory Board, Hapag Lloyd, Hamburg

Maas, Cees, Member of the Executive Board of the Internationale Nederlanden Group, Amsterdam; former Treasurer, Dutch Government

MacFarquhar, Roderick, Professor of Government, Harvard University; Director, Fairbank Center for East Asian Research; former Member, British Parliament

March Delgado, Carlos, Chairman, Banca March; Vice Chairman, Juan March Foundation, Madrid

Martinet, Gilles, Ambassadeur de France; President, Association for the European Cultural Community, Paris

Martini, Eberhard, President, Association of German Banks; Chairman, Bayerische Hypotheken-und Wechsel Bank, Munich

Mateus, Rui, Chairman, Emaudio International; President, The Foundation for International Relations, Lisbon

Matuschka, Count Albrecht, Chairman, Matuschka Group, Munich

Mauil, Hanns W., Co-Director, German Institute for Foreign Affairs (DGAP), Bonn; Professor of International Relations, University of Trier;

European Representative, Japan Center for International Exchange
Merlini, Cesare, Chairman, Institute for International Affairs, Rome
Montbrial, Thierry de, Member de l'Institut; Professor, Ecole
Polytechnique; Director, French Institute for International Relations,
Paris

*Monti, Mario, Rector, Bocconi University, Milan

Munthe, Preben, Professor of Economics, University of Oslo; Counselor,
Norwegian Nobel Institute

Murmann, Klaus, Chairman, Federation of German Employers'
Association (BDA), Cologne

Narjes, Karl-Heinz, Former Vice President, Commission of the European
Communities

Neisser, Heinrich, Member, Austrian Parliament; Chairman, People's
Party Parliamentary Group (OeVP), Vienna

Nixon, Sir Edwin, Deputy Chairman, National Westminster Bank, London

Norrington, Humphrey, Vice Chairman, Barclays Bank, London

*Ortona, Egidio, Chairman, ISPI, Milan; Honorary Chairman, Bull Italia,
Rome; former Italian Ambassador to the United States

Owen, Lord, Co-Chairman (EC) of the Steering Committee of the Inter-
national Conference on former Yugoslavia; former Member, British
Parliament; former Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary

* Palliser, Sir Michael, Chairman, Sameul Montagu & Co.; former Permanent
Undersecretary of State, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, London

Perry, Michael, Chairman, Unilever, London

Pierer, Heinrich von, Chairman, Siemens, Munich

Pinho, Ilidio de, Chairman, COLEP, Lisbon

Pinto Balsemao, Francisco, Member, Portuguese Parliament; former
Prime Minister

Ratti, Giuseppe, Member of the Board, Coe-Clerici, Genoa

Rippon of Hexham, Lord, President, INVESCO MIM.; Chairman, Unichem,
London; Former Chancellor Duchy of Lancaster

Rocca, Gianfelice, Chairman of Techint, Milano

Roll of Ipsden, Lord, President, S.G. Warburg Group, London

Romano, Sergio, Editorialist, La Stampa; former Italian Ambassador to
USSR, Milan

Roper, John, Director, Institute for Security Studies, Western European
Union; former Member of British Parliament

Rose, Francois de, Ambassadeur de France; former Permanent
Representative to NATO

Ruding, H. Onno, Vice Chairman Citicorp/Citibank, New York;
former Dutch Minister of Finance

Ruggiero, Renato, Member of the Board of Directors in charge of
International Relations, Fiat, Turin; former Italian Minister of
Foreign Trade

- Sarasqueta, Antxon, President, Multimedia Capital; Editor, Echos, Madrid
- * Scherpenhuijsen Rom, Willem, Former Chairman, Internationale Nederlanden Group, Amsterdam
- Schlehnann, Jorgen, Columnist, Morgenavisen Jyllands-Posten, Denmark
- * Schmidt-Chiari, Guido, Chairman, Creditanstalt Bankverein, Vienna
- Schmitz, Ronaldo, Member of the Board of Managing Directors, Deutsche Bank, Frankfurt
- Schwartz, Pedro, Executive Vice President, National Economic Research Associates, Madrid; Member of the Board of Directors, Iberagentes Brokers; Professor of Economics, Madrid University
- Segurado, Jose, Chairman, Jasinas, Madrid; Special Advisor to the Chairman, Banesto; former Member, Spanish Parliament
- * Shore, Peter, Member of British Parliament
- Siglianti, Sergio, Chairman, Banca Commerciale Italiana, Milan
- Silvestri, Umberto, Managing Director and Chief Executive Officer, STET, Rome
- Simonet, Henri, Member, Belgian Senate; former Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs and Vice President of the Commission of the European Communities, Brussels
- * Staunton, Myles, Member of Senate, Irish Republic
- Sutherland, Peter, Chairman, Allied Irish Bank Group, Dublin; former Member of the European Commission; former Attorney General of Ireland
- Svanholm, Poul Johan, President and Group Chief Executive Officer, Carlsberg, Copenhagen
- Tameron, Marques de, Director, Institute de Cuestiones Internacionales y Politica Exterior (INCIPE), Madrid
- Tapsell, Sir Peter, Member of British Parliament
- Taylor, Geoffrey W., Chairman, Daiwa Europe Bank; former Group Chief Executive, Midland Bank, London
- Thierry, Jacques, Chairman of the Board, Banque Bruxelles Lambert; Chairman of the Board, Artois Piedboeuf Interbrew, Brussels
- Thorn, Gaston, Chairman, Banque Internationale a Luxembourg; former President, Commission of the European Communities
- * Thygesen, Niels, Professor of Economics, Economics Institute, Copenhagen University
- Tidbury, Sir Charles, Member, Board of Directors, Whitbread & Co.
- * Tidemand, Otto Gried, Shipowner, Oslo; former Norwegian Minister of Defense and Minister of Economic Affairs
- Van Traa, Maarten, Member of Dutch Parliament; Foreign Affairs Spokesman, Labour Party, Amsterdam
- * Vasco de Mello, Antonio, Chairman, Sociedade de Reparacao e Montagem de Equipamentos Industriais, Lisbon; former Member, Portuguese Parliament

- Verzetnitsch, Friedrich, Member, Austrian Parliament (SPOe); President, Austrian Federation of Trade Unions, Vienna
- Vila Marsans, Jose, Chairman, Rhone Poulenc Fibras, Barcelona; Director, Banco Central, Madrid
- Vittorelli, Paolo B., Chairman, Istituto Studi Ricerche Defesa (ISTRID), Rome; former Member of Italian Parliament
- Voigt, Karsten D., Member of the German Bundestag; Spokesman on Foreign Affairs of the SPD Parliamentary Group
- Voorhoeve, Joris, Director, Netherlands Institute for International Relations, The Hague
- Vuursteen, Karel, Chairman, Executive Board, Heineken, Amsterdam
- *Wallenberg, Peter, First Vice Chairman, Skandinaviska Ensilka Banken, Stockholm
- Weinberg, Serge, Chairman, Comagnie de Distribution de Materiel Electrique; Member of the Board and Director General, Pinault Group, Paris
- *Wieczorek, Norbert, Member, German Bundestag; Spokesperson on International Economic and Monetary Affairs, SPD Parliamentary Group
- *Wolff von Amerongen, Otto, Chairman, East-West Trade Committee; Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Otto Wolff Industrieberatung und Beteiligung
- Ybarra, Emilio, Chairman of the Board of Directors, Banco Bilbao-Vizcaya, Madrid
- Zwan, Arie van der, Chairman, World Software Group, The Hague

Former Members in Public Service

- Boniver, Margherita, Minister of Tourism, Italy
- Braga de Macedo, Jorge, Minister of Finance, Portugal
- Colombo, Umberto, Minister of Universities and Scientific Research, Italy
- Hoist, Johan Jorgen, Minister of Defense, Norway
- Savona, Paolo, Minister of Industry, Italy
- Stoltenberg, Thorvald, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Norway
- Veil, Simone, Minister of State for Social, Health and Urban Affairs, France

Japanese Members

- Amaya, Naohiro, Executive Director, Dentsu Institute for Human Studies
- Chino, Yoshitoki, Honorary Chairman, Daiwa Securities, Co. Ltd.
- *Ejiri, Koichiro, Chairman of the Board of Directors and Executive Director, Mitsui & Co., Ltd.
- Fukukawa, Shinji, Executive Vice President, Kobe Steel Co., Ltd.
- Funabashi, Yoichi, Columnist, The Asahi Shimbun

- *Gyohten, Toyoo, Chairman, The Bank of Tokyo; former Vice Minister of Finance for International Affairs
 Hasegawa, Norishige, Director and Counsellor, Sumitomo Chemical Company Ltd.
 Hashida, Taizo, Counsellor, Fuji Bank, Ltd.
 Hata, Tsutomu, Member of the Diet; former Minister of Finance
 Hirose, Gen, Honorary Chairman, Nippon Life Insurance Company, Ltd.
 Horie, Tetsuya, President, The Long-Term Credit Bank of Japan, Ltd.
- *Hosomi, Takashi, Chairman, NLI Research Institute; former Chairman, The Overseas Economic Cooperation Fund
 Ichimura, Shin'ichi, Vice-Chancellor and Director, Institute of International Relations, Osaka International University
 Inouye, Kaoru, Honorary Chairman, Dai-Ichi Kangyo Bank, Ltd.
 Ishikawa, Rokuro, Chairman, Kajima Corporation
 Kishikawa, Takeru, Chairman, Mitsui Marine & Fire Insurance Co., Ltd.
 Ito, Tadashi, Chairman, Sumitomo Corporation
 Kaji, Motoo, Vice President, The University of the Air; Professor Emeritus, University of Tokyo
 Kakizawa, Koji, Member of the Diet; Parliamentary Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs
 Kamiya, Fuji, Professor, Toyo-Eiwa Women's University; Visiting Professor, Keio University
 Kamiya, Ken'ichi, Director and Counsellor, The Sakura Bank, Ltd.
 Kato, Koichi, Member of the Diet; former Chief Cabinet Secretary
 Kawakatsu, Kenji, Chairman, Sanwa Bank, Ltd.
 Kitamura, Toshi, Executive Vice-President and Director, Hitachi, Ltd.
 Kobayashi, Shoichiro, Chairman of the Board of Directors, Kansai Electric Power Company, Ltd.
- *Kobayashi, Yotaro, Chairman, Fuji Xerox Co., Ltd.
 Kojima, Akira, Senior Editor and International Editor, The Nihon Keizai Shimbun
 Kosai, Yutaka, President, Japan Center for Economic Research
 Kume, Yutaka, Chairman, Nissan Motor Company, Ltd.
 Shonosuke, Maeda, President, Toray Industries, Inc.
- *Makihara, Minoru, President, Mitsubishi Corporation
 Matsukawa, Michiya, Senior Advisor to the President, Nikko Securities Co. Ltd.
 Matsuoka, Seiji, President, The Nippon Credit Bank, Ltd.
 Miyazaki, Isamu, Chairman, Daiwa Institute of Research, Ltd.
 Miyoshi, Masaya, President and Director General, Keidanren (Japan Federation of Economic Organizations)
 Mogi, Yuzaburo, Executive Managing Director, Kikkoman Corporation
- *Morita, Akio, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Sony Corporation

Motono, Moriyuki, Advisor to the Board, Nomura Securities Co., Ltd.
Mukaibo, Takashi, Chairman, Japan Atomic Industrial Forum; former
President, University of Tokyo

Murase, Jiro, Managing Partner, Marks & Murase
*Murofushi, Minora, President, Itochu Corporation

Nagai, Yonosuke, Professor, Aoyama Gakuin University
Nagasue, Eiichi, Member of the Diet

Nakahara, Nobuyuki, President, Tonen Corporation

Nakamura, Kaneo, Counsellor, The Industrial Bank of Japan, Ltd.
Nakamura, Toshio, Counsellor, Mitsubishi Bank, Ltd.
Nishihara, Masashi, Professor of International Relations, National
Defense Academy

Noguchi, Teruo, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Koa Oil Co., Ltd.
Ogasawara, Toshiaki, Publisher-Chairman, The Japan Times, Ltd.;
President, Nifeo Inc.

Ogata, Shijuro, Senior Advisor, Yamaichi Securities Co., Ltd., Tokyo
Okano, Mitsuyoshi, President, The Suruga Bank, Ltd.

*Okawara, Yoshio, Executive Advisor, Keidanren (Japan Federation of
Economic Organizations); former Ambassador to the United States
Okumura, Ariyoshi, President and Chief Executive, IBJW Asset
Management Co., Ltd.

Saba, Shoichi, Advisor to the Board, Toshiba Corporation Ltd.

*Saeki, Kiichi, Deputy Chairman, International Institute for Global Peace

Saito, Yutaka, President, Nippon Steel Corporation

Sato, Seizaburo, Professor, Keio University; Acting Director,
International Institute for Global Peace

Shibusawa, Masahide, Director, East-West Seminar

Shiina, Motoo, Member of the Diet; President, The Policy Study Group
Shiina, Takeo, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, IBM Japan, Ltd.

Shimokobe, Atsushi, Chairman, The Tokio Marine Research Institute

Suzuki, Tetsuo, President, HOYA Corporation

Takagi, Tsuyoshi, General Secretary; ZENSEN (The Japanese Textile,
Garment, Chemical, Mercantile and Allied Industry Workers' Unions)

Tanaka, Akihiko, Associate Professor, Institute of Oriental Culture,
University of Tokyo

Tatsumi, Sotou, President, Sumitomo Bank, Ltd.

Tomabechi, Toshihiro, Auditor, Toppan Moore Co., Ltd.

Toyoda, Eiji, Honorary Chairman, Toyota Motor Corporation

Toyonaga, Keiya, Senior Managing Director, Matsushita Electric
Industrial Co., Ltd.

Tsutsumi, Seiji, Chairman, Saison Corporation

Uetani, Hisamitsu, Chairman Emeritus, Yamaichi Securities Co., Ltd.
Umemura, Shoji, Chairman of the Board, Nikko Securities Co., Ltd.

Washio, Etsuya, President, Japan Federation of Steel Workers' Union
Watanabe, Fumio, Counsellor, Tokio Marine & Fire Insurance Co., Ltd.
Watanabe, Takeshi, Chairman, The Non-Life Insurance Institute of
Japan; former President, Asian Development Bank
Yamamoto, Tadashi, President, Japan Center for International Exchange
Yamashita, Isamu, Former Japanese Chairman, The Trilateral Commission
Chairman, East Japan Railway Company; Senior Advisor, Mitsui
Engineering and Shipbuilding Co., Ltd.
Yashiro, Masamoto, Country Corporate Officer, Citibank NA
Yoshino, Bunroku, Chairman, Institute for International Economic
Studies; former Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany

Former Members in Public Service

Miyazawa, Kiichi, Prime Minister
Ogata, Sadako, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

*Executive Committee

APPENDIX C:

STATEMENT

by

Lt. Col. James "Bo" Gritz, U.S.A. (Ret)

for

U.S. Congress, House Foreign Affairs Committee

International Narcotics Control Task Force

Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, 30 June 1987

NINE HUNDRED TONS OF HEROIN & OPIUM WILL ENTER THE FREE WORLD FROM SOUTHEAST ASIA'S "GOLDEN TRIANGLE" THIS YEAR. The reason is because U.S. taxpayer dollars and American equipment have been used to construct a new road that will allow narcotics to pour out of General Khun Sa's Shan Territories rather than trickle out by horse and mule as has been the case until the beginning of this year.

Last year 600 tons of Opiates trafficked from this area. Press reports included as part of this statement argue that it is logistically impossible to increase the output to 900 tons. The new road capable of easily handling 10-ton truck convoys signal not only the capability, but the reality. The disappointing fact is that this new artery was constructed by the Thai Government using money, manpower, time and materials furnished by our drug suppression funds.

Moreover, there are serious implications that elements within the U.S. Government are Khun Sa's biggest customers. The facts are that for 15 years U.S. taxpayers through legislative bodies like this committee and executive agencies such as have testified here today, have dumped hundreds of millions of dollars into drug suppression programs within Thailand and Burma which have done nothing but nourish the flow of narcotics from Asia into the United States. The proof is statistically clear. Fifteen years ago the flow of Opiates was 60 tons; this year it will approach or exceed 900 tons. The reasons, while multi-faceted, boil down to one word, "money."

Certain high level Thai and Burmese officials are packing their pockets with U.S.-supplied drug suppression funds, political payoffs, and other spinoff profits like the thousands of Teak trees felled during the Khun Sa road effort. Khun Sa has no outlet for teak, but it is a protected and highly valued commodity in Thailand. More shameful are the serious allegations raised by General Khun Sa and his staff that corrupt U.S. officials allow this travesty and in certain cases are directly involved.

After a meeting with General Khun Sa and others, I am convinced that a secret combination exists today within the U.S. Government that was officially germinated during the Nixon-Vietnam years and has, through illicit drug profits, propagated itself today into a self-serving righteous monster of global proportions. I believe Ed Wilson was a member of this combination and that his activities represent only one of many tentacles. I believe the Contra-Iran situation is merely another visible lesion that has emerged from this extra-governmental organism.

I say "would be righteous" because those within this secret combination I believe honestly think they are serving America by offering an established model of sabotage, subversion, and assassination to areas threatened by communism. They are in existence because normal government process is too cumbersome, time-consuming and oftentimes impotent. These persons who are intelligent and well seeded in our governmental structure think they are smarter than our elected officials and can expedite accomplishment of national objectives. They have funded their efforts through drug trafficking because of a 1960s mindset that anyone who would use opiates is animalistic and the U.S.A. doesn't really care about them. They began their drug dealing in Southeast Asia as a means to fund the secret war in Laos and Cambodia that Congress was officially unaware of. Besides my personal experiences, all of these conclusions are spelled out in the book, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*.

I have good reason to believe that after President Nixon got the U.S. out of Vietnam "with honor," while bringing home "all the POWs" in 1973 that either with his concurrence, or on the initiative of those "Best and Brightest" included within the "President's 40," the war continued to be fought through Project Phoenix. The insiders knew the North Vietnamese would not abide by the tri-accord and continue to consolidate their position in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Since the war was over there was no Congressional funding and homegrown trafficking offered the most expedient solution.

Ideally the communist takeover in 1975 would fall like a house of cards since the infrastructure would be eliminated by extreme prejudice through the Phoenix operation. Even so, an estimated 150,000 nonmilitary persons were terminated; the program failed to meet the expectations of those in charge.

Next, I believe the Phoenix model was moved to help stabilize a toppling Shah who happened to be close to the Administration — and to people in the secret combination society, many of whom held high positions within the Executive Branch. The Shah fell. By this time the model was self-perpetuating.

Rather than shut down after failing in Iran, there was a refocus on the building communist threat in Central America. The Contra-Iran-Oliver North-White House disclosures are only protrusions that have become visible because of the extent and intensity of this para-government organization. Even as these hearings are underway, representatives of this secret combination are at work in the Philippines, offering "anti-communist solutions" to that struggling democracy. I believe that.

As years and changing administrations have gradually thinned the society's active duty status within the U.S. Government, I believe those who still steer the society have become more self-serving, making huge personal profits under the guise of fighting worldwide communism. Further, I believe they are maximizing their influence to protect those of the brotherhood who still hold active office in the government.

I have been told for years that U.S. POWs would never be allowed to return because they were directly related to illegal drug trafficking by U.S. officials. Until May of 1987, I thought this absurd. Now, after eight years in the POW-Southeast Asian arena, I clearly can see what was hidden except to those more sensitive to power politics than myself. The reason we have met the enemy and he is U.S. in our efforts to return POWs while they are still alive is simple. When POWs are returned the first demand by the American people will be to examine those within the government responsible for their return. America will want to know why these individuals failed in their official capacities; why the burden fell on the private sector, and what took so long if the POW issue is truly "Top National Priority" as designated by President Reagan. Upon investigation it will be revealed that responsible officials were more interested in interested in actuating

their secret society than accounting for our POW and MIA.

The fact is that all of the Heroin and Opiates could be shut off at

the Golden Triangle if America's responsible elected and appointed officials would do their job. General Khun Sa is recognized as the drug kingpin and controls the Golden Triangle with a well-disciplined army of 40,000 Shan soldiers. He has stated to me before three other American witnesses on videotape that he greatly desires to stop the drug trafficking, but we won't let him. He has promised that if we will give him any economic alternative, he will not just stem, but stop the flow of narcotics through his areas of control. He has said for example that for one-tenth the money we now give the Burmese for drug suppression turned into economic aid and crop substitution, he will use his force to enforce what we cannot and have not. In addition, Khun Sa has stipulated that the Burmese must be stopped from using the 12 Bell Helicopters and fixed wing aircraft given them by the U.S. to spray the Shan State people, animals, food and water with Agent Orange and herbicides. All that I have presented thus far is backed up by written and recorded documents made available to the Committee.

It has been reported to me by committee personnel that Khun Sa has made these offers before. They say the CIA has expressed doubt and mistrust that Khun Sa will carry out his part of the bargain. I and three other Americans have met with Khun Sa. We believe him to be sincere. Certainly in view of the dismal failure of the CIA and DEA to slow, stop or even deter the flood of drugs from the Golden Triangle, it seems that a change in dynamics is in order. Especially since Khun Sa has directly implicated persons within the CIA as some of his best customers. The videotapes show testimony of a frustrated medical doctor who, under orders from Khun Sa, did everything from offer radio links to Khun Sa's headquarters to present a horse that might be used to alert DEA of drug movements. The low level agents supported these initiatives, but in every case they were rejected at DEA headquarter levels.

I have strived at the invitation of the Executive Branch for eight years to convince political skeptics that American POWs are alive in the hands of Communist forces in Laos and Vietnam. I abhor drugs and dopes that are users, yet in the past two weeks I've been told by committee staff and others that "federal sources" and a Los Angeles State Department employee have said that I am "a drug trafficker," and I will be in prison before July 4th. I know this level of federal employee would never make such slanderous statements unless encouraged by higher-ups. While following the

classic model of "deny-defame-divert," it is disappointing that law enforcement agencies would reveal such lowlife practices as directly as they have, and then avoid comment when confronted.

I have tried in every way to cooperate with the committee and its membership. I've furnished videotapes, only to be informed that the chairman has blocked their distribution. I've supplied the Sucheski letter to Vice President Bush, and requested a written transcript of the file from which Khun Sa's secretary read from. I received a letter in the mail last week. It was from Khun Sa. The stapled and sealed envelope had been opened. Inside, the pamphlet, which had also been stapled shut, had been opened and the contents removed. I had asked Khun Sa to translate his record; sign it himself with two additional witnesses. I was assured this document was part of the opened package. I have requested my contacts furnish me with a FAX of their copy. It serves to supplement in writing the verbal and video accounts.

I'm disillusioned that this committee, which represents the interest of 240 million Americans in controlling illegal drug trafficking, would take such a negative and skeptical position on such a critical issue as Khun Sa's proposal and my deliverance of the information he gave us. I've been told that I must "sell my case" to you. Facts are, I am a citizen who has been twice to see a warlord who is recognized as the world's most powerful Heroin kingpin. This person has shown statistically that our 15-year old drug suppression program is, at best, "dumb" by anyone's standards. At best we have millions of U.S. tax dollars being mishandled; one recipient has made use of U.S. assets to build a major road, and secures that road from outside infiltration; 900 tons of opiates entering the free world; rampant corruption of allied officials. At worst, in addition to the best case, we have officials within the USG who won't, as Khun Sa says, let him get out of the drug business, because they are his biggest buyers.

Your business is representing American interest in drug control. You greatly influence how our tax dollars are used and how well the enforcement agencies do their job. My business is bringing home POWs while they are still alive. Neither one of us has been able to make much headway because I'm convinced there are persons within the government that are opposing us both. If POWs came home, the resulting investigation will expose their drug involvement; if the drugs are stopped, their source of income dries up. I agree that communism threatens the liberty of free people

everywhere, but in my opinion drugs are even a bigger and more immediate threat. To fuel these self-righteous freedom fighters with drug money is to steal, cheat, and mislead every American taxpayer, and circumnavigate the greatest governmental system in the world. While it may appear slow, and at times fickle and indecisive, still ours is the greatest government in the world. There aren't boatloads of Americans headed for the Soviet Union. I believe our system was divinely inspired. I believe it will work despite any shortcomings.