

Shadow Government

"THE NEW ORDER OF BARBARIANS"

Tape 2

This is a transcript of the second of three tapes on the "New Order of Barbarians", referred to on the tapes simply as the "new world system." Tapes one and two, done in 1988, are the reminiscences of Dr. Lawrence Dunegan, a pediatrician from Pittsburgh, who sat through a talk in **1969**, while insider, Dr. Richard Day, spoke of the planned future of America and Americans. Day was speaking to a group of Pediatric Physicians who were told, "No note-taking and no tape recorders."

Tape 2 — continued from Tape 1

CHANGE

.... Change, nothing is permanent. Streets would be rerouted, renamed. Areas you had not seen in a while would become unfamiliar. Among other things, this would contribute to older people feeling that it was time to move on, they feel they couldn't even keep up with the changes in areas that were once familiar. Buildings would be allowed to stand empty and deteriorate, and streets would be allowed to deteriorate in certain localities. The purpose of this was to provide the jungle, the depressed atmosphere for the unfit. Somewhere in this same connection he mentioned that buildings and bridges would be made so that they would collapse after a while; there would be more accidents involving airplanes and railroads and automobiles. All of this to contribute to the feeling of insecurity, that nothing was safe.

Not too long after this presentation, and I think one or two even before in the area where I live, we had some newly constructed bridge to break; another newly constructed bridge defect discovered before it broke, and I remember reading just scattered incidents around the country where shopping malls would fall in – right where they were filled with shoppers. And I remember that one of the shopping malls in our area, the first building I'd ever been in where you could feel this vibration throughout the entire building when there were a lot of people in there; and I remember wondering at that time whether this shopping mall was one of the buildings he was talking about. Talking to construction people and architects about it they would say, "Oh no, that's good when the building vibrates like that. That means it's flexible, not rigid." Well... maybe so. We'll wait and see.

Other areas there would be well-maintained. Not every part of the city would be slums. There would be the created slums and other areas well-maintained. Those people able to leave the slums for better areas then would learn to better appreciate the

importance of human accomplishment. This meant that if they left the jungle and came to civilization, so to speak, they could be proud of their own accomplishments that they made it. There was no related sympathy for those who were left behind in the jungle of drugs and deteriorating neighborhoods. Then a statement that was kind of surprising: **"We think we can effectively limit crime to the slum areas, so it won't be spread heavily into better areas."**

CONSOLIDATING POLICY

I should maybe point out here that these are obviously not word for word quotations after 20 years, but where I say that I am quoting, I am giving the general drift of what was said close to word for word; perhaps not precisely so. But anyhow, I remember wondering, "How can he be so confident that the criminal element is going to stay where he wants it to stay?" But he went on to say that increased security would be needed in the better areas.

That would mean more police, better coordinated police efforts. He did not say so, but I wondered at that time about the moves that were afoot to consolidate all the police departments of suburbs around the major cities. I think the John Birch Society was one that was saying, "Support your local police; don't let them be consolidated." And I remember wondering if that was one of the things he had in mind about security.

It was not explicitly stated. But anyhow, he went on to say there would be a whole new industry of residential security systems to develop with alarms and locks and alarms going into the police department so that people could protect their wealth and their well being. Because some of the criminal activity would spill out of the slums into better, more affluent looking areas that looked like they would be worth burglarizing. And again it was stated like it was a redeeming quality. **"See, we're generating all this more crime, but look how good we are – we're also generating the means for you to protect yourself against the crime."** A sort of repeated thing throughout this presentation was the recognized evil and then the self-forgiveness thing... **"Well see, we've given you a way out."**

GLOBAL INTERDEPENDENCE "TO CREATE A NEW STRUCTURE, YOU FIRST HAVE TO TEAR DOWN THE OLD"

American industry came under discussion – it was the first that I'd heard the term GLOBAL INTERDEPENDENCE or that notion. The stated plan was that different parts of the world would be assigned different roles of industry and commerce in a unified global system. The continued pre-eminence of the United States and the relative independence and self-sufficiency of the United States would have to be changed. This was one of the several times that he said in order to create a new structure, you first have to tear down the old, and American industry was one example of that. Our system would have to be curtailed in order to give other countries a chance to build their industries, because otherwise they would not be able to compete against the United

States. And this was especially true of our heavy industries that would be cut back while the same industries were being developed in other countries, notably Japan.

PATRIOTISM WOULD GO DOWN THE DRAIN

And at this point there was some discussion of steel and particularly automobiles. I remember him saying that automobiles would be imported from Japan on an equal footing with our own domestically produced automobiles, but the Japanese product would be better. Things would be made so they would break and fall apart – that is, in the United States – so that people would tend to prefer the imported variety and this would give a bit of a boost to foreign competitors. One example, was Japanese. In 1969, Japanese automobiles – if they were sold here at all, I don't remember – but they certainly weren't very popular.

But the idea was, you could get a little bit disgusted with your Ford, GM, or Chrysler product – or whatever – because little things like window handles would fall off more, and plastic parts would break which, had they been made of metal, would hold up. Your patriotism about buying American would soon give way to practicality that if you bought Japanese, German, or imported that it would last longer and you would be better off. Patriotism would go down the drain then.

It was mentioned elsewhere, things being made to fall apart too. I don't remember specific items or if they were even stated other than automobiles, but I do recall of having the impression, sort of in my imagination, of a surgeon having something fall apart in his hands in the operating room, at a critical time. Was he including this sort of thing in his discussion? But somewhere in this discussion about things being made deliberately defective and unreliable not only was to tear down patriotism but to be just a little source of irritation to people who would use such things.

LOSS OF JOBS — LOSS OF SECURITY

Again, the idea that you not feel terribly secure, promoting the notion that the world isn't a terribly reliable place. The United States was to be kept strong in information, communications, high technology, education and agriculture. The United States was seen as continuing to be sort of the keystone of this global system. But heavy industry would be transported out. One of the comments made about heavy industry was that we had had enough environmental damage from smokestacks and industrial waste and some of the other people could put up with that for a while. This again, was supposed to be a "redeeming quality" for Americans to accept. You took away our industry but you saved our environment. So we really didn't lose on it.

[ASIDE] POPULATION SHIFTS TO ELIMINATE "TRADITIONS"

And along this line there were talks about people losing their jobs as a result of industry and opportunities for retraining, and particularly population shifts would be brought about. This is sort of an aside. I think I'll explore the aside before I forget it.

Population shifts were to be brought about so that people would be tending to move into the Sun Belt. They would be, sort of, people without roots in their new locations, and traditions are easier to change in a place where there are a lot of transplanted people, as compared to trying to changing traditions in a place where people grew up and had an extended family – where they had roots. Things like new medical care systems. If you pick up from a Northeast industrial city and you transplant yourself to the South Sun Belt or Southwest, you'll be more accepting of whatever kind of, for example, controlled medical care you find there than you would accept a change in the medical care system where you had roots and the support of your family. Also in this vein it was mentioned – he used the plural personal pronoun "we" – we take control first of the port cities... New York, San Francisco, Seattle... the idea being that this is a piece of strategy. The idea being that if you control the port cities with your philosophy and your way of life, the HEARTLAND in between has to yield.

I can't elaborate more on that but it is interesting, if you look around the most liberal areas of the country – and progressively so – are the seacoast cities; the heartland, the Midwest, does seem to have maintained its conservatism. But as you take away industry and jobs and relocate people then this is a strategy to break down conservatism. When you take away industry, and people are unemployed and poor they will accept whatever change seems to offer them survival; and their morals and their commitment to things will all give way to survival. That's not my philosophy. That's the speaker's philosophy.

WORLD CITIZENS — WORLD SPORTS

Anyhow, going back to industry. Some heavy industry would remain. Just enough to maintain a sort of a seedbed of industrial skills which could be expanded if the plan didn't work out as it was intended. So the country would not be devoid of assets and skills. But this was just sort of a contingency plan. It was hoped and expected that the worldwide specialization would be carried on.

But, perhaps repeating myself, one of the upshots of all of this is that with this global interdependence then national identities would tend to be de-emphasized. Each area depended on every other area for one or another elements in its life. We would all become citizens of the world rather than citizens of any one country.

And along these lines then we can talk about sports. Sports in the United States was to be changed, in part as a way of de-emphasizing nationalism. Soccer, a world-wide sport, was to be emphasized and pushed in the United States and this was of interest because in this area the game of soccer was virtually unknown at that time. I had a few friends who attended an elementary school other than the one I attended where they played soccer at their school, and they were a real novelty. This was back in the 50's. So to hear this man speak of soccer in this area was kind of surprising.

Anyhow, soccer is seen as an international sport and would be promoted and the traditional sport of American baseball would be de-emphasized and possibly eliminated

because it might be seen as too American. And he discussed eliminating this. One's first reaction would be *well, they pay the players poorly and they don't want to play for poor pay so they give up baseball and either go into some other sport or some other activity.* But, he said that's really not how it works. Actually, the way to break down baseball would be to make the salaries go very high.

The idea behind this was that as the salaries got ridiculously high there would be a certain amount of discontent and antagonism as people resented the athletes being paid so much, and the athletes would begin more and more to resent among themselves what other players were paid and would tend to abandon the sport. And these high salaries then also could break the owners and alienate the fans. And then the fans would support soccer and the baseball fields could be used as soccer fields. It wasn't said definitely this would have to happen, but if the international flavor didn't come around rapidly enough this could be done.

There was some comment along the same lines about football, although I seem to recall he said football would be harder to dismantle because it was so widely played in colleges as well as in the professional leagues and would be harder to tear down. There was something else also about the violence in football that met a psychological need that was perceived, and people have a need for this vicarious violence. So football, for that reason, might be left around to meet that vicarious need.

The same thing is true of hockey. Hockey had more of an international flavor and would be emphasized. There was some foreseeable international competition about hockey and particularly soccer. At that time hockey was international between the United States and Canada. I was kind of surprised because I thought the speaker just never impressed me as being at all a hockey fan, and I am. And it turns out, he was not. He just knew about the game and what it would do to this changing sports program.

But in any event soccer was to be the keystone of athletics because it is already a world-wide sport in South America, in Europe, in parts of Asia and the United States should get on the bandwagon. All this would foster international competition so that we would all become citizens of the world to a greater extent than citizens of our narrow nations.

HUNTING

There was some discussion about hunting, not surprisingly. Hunting requires guns and gun control is a big element in these plans. I don't remember the details much, but the idea is that gun ownership is a privilege and not everybody should have guns. Hunting was an inadequate excuse for owning guns and everybody should be restricted in gun ownership. The few privileged people who should be allowed to hunt could maybe rent or borrow a gun from official quarters rather than own their own. After all, everybody doesn't have a need for a gun, is the way it was put.

SPORTS FOR GIRLS — TO DE-EMPHASIZE FEMININITY

Very important in sports was sports for girls. Athletics would be pushed for girls. This was intended to replace dolls. Baby dolls would still be around, a few of them, but you would not see the number and variety of dolls. Dolls would not be pushed because girls should not be thinking about babies and reproduction. Girls should be out on the athletic field just as the boys are. Girls and boys really need not to be all that different. Tea sets were to go the way of dolls, and all these things that traditionally were thought of as feminine would be de-emphasized as girls got into more masculine pursuits.

Just one other thing I recall was that the sports pages would be full of the scores of girls teams just right along there with the boys teams. And that's recently begun to appear after 20 years in our local papers. The girls sports scores are right along with the boys sports scores. So all of this to change the role model of what young girls should look to be. While she's growing up she should look to be an athlete rather to look forward to being a mother.

ENTERTAINMENT: VIOLENCE, SEX AND MORE SEX DESENSITIZATION — PREPARING THE PEOPLE FOR "HUMAN CASUALTIES"

Movies would gradually be made more explicit as regards sex and language. After all, sex and rough language are real and why pretend that they are not? There would be pornographic movies in the theaters, on television. And VCR's were not around at that time, but he had indicated that these cassettes would be available, and video cassette players would be available for use in the home and pornographic movies would be available for use on these VCRs as well as in the neighborhood theater and on your television. He said something like, **"You'll see people in the movies doing everything you can think of."**

He went on to say that... and all of this is intended to bring sex out in the open. That was another comment that was made several times – the term "sex out in the open." Violence would be made more graphic. This was intended to desensitize people to violence. There might need to be a time when people would witness real violence and be a part of it. Later on it will become clear where this is headed. So there would be more realistic violence in entertainment which would make it easier for people to adjust.

People's attitudes towards death would change and they would not be so fearful of it but more accepting of it, and not be so aghast at the sight of dead people or injured people. We don't need to have a genteel population paralyzed by what they might see. People would just learn to say, "well, I don't want that to happen to me."

This was the first statement suggesting that the plan includes numerous human casualties which the survivors would see. This particular aspect of the presentation came back in my memory very sharply a few years later when a movie about the Lone Ranger came out and I took my very young son to see it and early in the movie were some very violent scenes. One of the victims was shot in the forehead and there was sort of a splat where the bullet entered his forehead and blood and I remember regretting that I took my son, and remember feeling anger toward the doctor who spoke.

Not that he made the movie, but he agreed to be part of this movement, and I was repelled by the movie and it brought back this aspect of his presentation very sharply in my memory.

"MUSIC WILL GET WORSE"

As regards music, he made a rather straightforward statement like, "Music will get worse." In 1969, Rock music was getting more and more unpleasant. It was interesting just his words the way he expressed it. It would "get worse"... acknowledging that it was already bad. Lyrics would become more openly sexual. No new sugary romantic music would be publicized like that which had been written before that time.

All of the old music would be brought back on certain radio stations and records for older people to hear. And all the folks would have sort of their own radio stations to hear. Younger people, as it got worse and worse, he seemed to indicate that one group would not hear the other group's music. Older folks would just refuse to hear the junk that was offered to young people, and the young people would accept the junk because it identified them as their generation and helped them feel distinct from the older generation.

I remember at the time thinking that would not last very long because even young kids wouldn't like the junk when they got a chance to hear the older music that was prettier they would gravitate toward it. Unfortunately, I was wrong about that, when the kids get through their teens and into their 20's some of them improve their taste in music, but unfortunately he was right. They get used to this junk and that's all they want. A lot of them can't stand really pretty music. He went on to say that the music would carry a message to the young and nobody would even know the message was there. They would just think it was loud music. At the time, I didn't understand quite what he meant by that, but in retrospect, I think we know now what the messages are in the music for the young.

GIVE US THE YOUNG

And again, he was right. This aspect was sort of summarized with the notion that entertainment would be a tool to influence young people. It won't change the older people, they are already set in their ways, but the changes would be all aimed at the young, who are in their formative years, and the older generation would be passing. Not only could you not change them, but they are relatively unimportant, anyhow. Once they live out their lives and are gone, the younger generation being formed, are the ones that would be important for the future in the 21st century.

He also indicated all the old movies would be brought back again, and I remember on hearing that through my mind ran quickly the memories of a number of old movies. I wondered if they would be included, the ones that I thought I would like to see again.

Along with bringing back old music and old movies for older people there were other privileges that would also be accorded older folks: free transportation, breaks on purchases, discounts, tax discounts – a number of privileges just because they were older. This was stated to be sort of a reward for the generation which had grown up through the depression and had survived the rigors of World War II. They had deserved it, and they were going to be rewarded with all these goodies, and the bringing back of the good old music and the good old movies was going to help ease them through their final years in comfort.

'80s AND '90s — THE GRIM REAPER. TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS — NATIONAL ID — THE CHIP, ETC.

Then, the presentation began to get rather grim, because once that generation passed, and that would be in the late 80's and early 90's where we are now, most of that [age] group would be gone and then, gradually, things would tighten up and the tightening up would be accelerated. The old movies and old songs would be withdrawn; the gentler entertainment would be withdrawn. Travel, instead of being easy for old folks... travel then would become very restricted. People would need permission to travel and they would need a good reason to travel. If you didn't have a good reason for your travel you would not be allowed to travel, and everyone would need ID.

This would at first be an ID card you would carry on your person and you must show when you are asked for it. It was already planned that later on some sort of device would be developed to be implanted under the skin that would be coded specifically to identify the individual. This would eliminate the possibility of false ID and also eliminate the possibility of people saying, "Well, I lost my ID."

The difficulty about these skin-implanted ID was stated to be getting material that would stay in or under the skin without causing foreign body reaction whereby the body would reject it or cause infection, and that this would have to be material on which information could be recorded and retrieved by some sort of scanner while it was not rejected by the body.

Silicon was mentioned. Silicon at that time was thought to be well tolerated. It was used to augment breasts. Women who felt their breasts were too small would get silicon implants, and I guess that still goes on. At any rate silicon was seen at that time as the promising material to do both... to be retained in the body without rejection and to be able to retain information retrievable by electronic means.

FOOD CONTROL

Food supplies would come under tight control. If population growth didn't slow down, food shortages could be created in a hurry and people would realize the dangers of overpopulation. Ultimately, whether the population slows down or not the food supply is to be brought under centralized control so that people would have enough to be well-nourished but they would not have enough to support any fugitive from the new system.

In other words, if you had a friend or relative who didn't sign on [side one ends abruptly continue on side two]

And growing ones own food would be outlawed. This would be done under some sort of pretext. In the beginning, I mentioned there were two purposes for everything – one the ostensible purpose and one the real purpose – and the ostensible purpose here would be that growing your own vegetables was unsafe, it would spread disease or something like that. So the acceptable idea was to protect the consumer but the real idea was to limit the food supply and growing your own food would be illegal.

And if you persist in illegal activities like growing your own food, then you're a criminal.

WEATHER CONTROL

There was a mention then of weather. This was another really striking statement. He said, **"We can or soon will be able to control the weather."**

He said, **"I'm not merely referring to dropping iodide crystals into the clouds to precipitate rain that's already there, but REAL control."** And weather was seen as a weapon of war, a weapon of influencing public policy. It could make rain or withhold rain in order to influence certain areas and bring them under your control. There were two sides to this that were rather striking.

He said, **"On the one hand you can make drought during the growing season so that nothing will grow, and on the other hand you can make for very heavy rains during harvest season so the fields are too muddy to bring in the harvest, and indeed one might be able to do both."**

There was no statement how this would be done. It was stated that either it was already possible or very very close to being possible.

POLITICS

Politics. He said that very few people really know how government works. Something to the effect that elected officials are influenced in ways that they don't even realize, and they carry out plans that have been made for them, and they think that they are authors of the plans. But actually they are manipulated in ways they don't understand.

KNOW HOW PEOPLE RESPOND — MAKING THEM DO WHAT YOU WANT

Somewhere in the presentation he made two statements that I want to insert at this time. I don't remember just where they were made, but they're valid in terms of the general overall view. One statement: **"People can carry in their minds and act upon two contradictory ideas at one time, provided that these two contradictory ideas are kept far enough apart."**

And the other statement is, **"You can know pretty well how rational people are going to respond to certain circumstances or to certain information that they encounter. So, to determine the response you want, you need only control the kind of data or information that they're presented or the kinds of circumstance that they're in; and being rational people they'll do what you want them to do. They may not fully understand what they're doing or why."**

FALSIFIED SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Somewhere in this connection, then, was the statement admitting that some scientific research data could be – and indeed HAS been – falsified in order to bring about desired results. And here was said, **"People don't ask the right questions. Some people are too trusting."**

Now this was an interesting statement because the speaker and the audience all being doctors of medicine and supposedly very objectively, dispassionately scientific and science being the be all and end-all... well to falsify scientific research data in that setting is like blasphemy in the church... you just don't do that. Anyhow, out of all of this was to come the New International Governing Body, probably to come through the UN and with a World Court, but not necessarily through those structures. It could be brought about in other ways.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE U.N. — THE END JUSTIFIES THE MEANS

Acceptance of the U.N. at that time was seen as not being as wide as was hoped. Efforts would continue to give the United Nations increasing importance. People would be more and more used to the idea of relinquishing some national sovereignty. Economic interdependence would foster this goal from a peaceful standpoint.

Avoidance of war would foster it from the standpoint of worrying about hostilities. It was recognized that doing it peaceably was better than doing it by war. It was stated at this point that war was "obsolete." I thought that was an interesting phrase because obsolete means something that once was seen as useful is no longer useful. But war is obsolete... this being because of the nuclear bombs war is no longer controllable.

Formerly, wars could be controlled, but if nuclear weapons would fall into the wrong hands there could be an unintended nuclear disaster. It was not stated who the "wrong hands" are. We were free to infer that maybe this meant terrorists, but in more recent years I'm wondering whether the wrong hands might also include people that we've assumed that they've had nuclear weapons all along... maybe they don't have them.

Just as it was stated that industry would be preserved in the United States – a little bit, just in case the world wide plans didn't work out; just in case some country or some other powerful person decided to bolt from the pack and go his own way – one wonders whether this might also be true with nuclear weapons. When you hear that... he said they might fall into the wrong hands, there was some statement that the possession of

nuclear weapons had been tightly controlled, sort of implying that anybody who had nuclear weapons was intended to have them. That would necessarily have included the Soviet Union, if indeed they have them.

But I recall wondering at the time, "Are you telling us, or are you implying that this country willingly gave weapons to the Soviets?". At that time that seemed like a terribly unthinkable thing to do, much less to admit. The leaders of the Soviet Union seem to be so dependent on the West though, one wonders whether there may have been some fear that they would try to assert independence if they indeed had these weapons. So, I don't know. It's something to speculate about perhaps... Who did he mean when he said, "If these weapons fall into the wrong hands"? Maybe just terrorists.

Anyhow, the new system would be brought in, if not by peaceful cooperation – everybody willingly yielding national sovereignty – then by bringing the nation to the brink of nuclear war. And everybody would be so fearful as hysteria is created by the possibility of nuclear war that there would be a strong public outcry to negotiate a public peace and people would willingly give up national sovereignty in order to achieve peace, and thereby this would bring in the New International Political System.

This was stated and very impressive thing to hear then... "If there were too many people in the right places who resisted this, there might be a need to use one or two – possibly more – nuclear weapons. As it was put this would be possibly needed to convince people that **"We mean business"**.

That was followed by the statement that, **"By the time one or two of those went off then everybody – even the most reluctant – would yield."**

He said something about "this negotiated peace would be very convincing," as kind of in a framework or in a context that the whole thing was rehearsed but nobody would know it. People hearing about it would be convinced that it was a genuine negotiation between hostile enemies who finally had come to the realization that peace was better than war.

WAR IS GOOD — YOU GET TO BE CANNON-FODDER, KEEP THE POPULATION DOWN, AND DIE A HERO

In this context discussing war, and war is obsolete, a statement was made that there were some good things about war... one, you're going to die anyway, and people sometimes in war get a chance to display great courage and heroism and if they die they've died well and if they survive they get recognition. So that in any case, the hardships of war on soldiers are worth it because that's the reward they get out of their warring.

Another justification expressed for war was, if you think of the many millions of casualties in WWI and WWII, well... suppose all those people had not died but had continued to live, then continued to have babies. There would be millions upon millions

and we would already be overpopulated, so those two great wars served a benign purpose in delaying over-population. But now there are technological means for the individual and governments to control over-population so in this regard war is obsolete. It's no longer needed. And then again, it's obsolete because nuclear weapons could destroy the whole universe. War, which once was controllable, could get out of control and so for these two reasons it's now obsolete.

TERRORISM — THE GREAT TOOL FOR 'CONTROL'

There was a discussion of terrorism. Terrorism would be used widely in Europe and in other parts of the world. Terrorism at that time was thought would not be necessary in the United States. It could become necessary in the United States if the United States did not move rapidly enough into accepting the system. But at least in the foreseeable future it was not planned. And very benignly on their part. Maybe terrorism would not be required here, but the implication being that it would be indeed used if it was necessary.

Along with this came a bit of a scolding that Americans had had it too good anyway and just a little bit of terrorism would help convince Americans that the world is indeed a dangerous place... or can be if we don't relinquish control to the proper authorities.

MONEY AND BANKING

There was discussion of money and banking. One statement was, **"Inflation is infinite. You can put an infinite number of zeros after any number and put the decimals points wherever you want"**, as an indication that inflation is a TOOL of the controllers.

Money would become predominately credit. It was already... money is primarily a credit thing, but exchange of money would be not cash or palpable things but electronic credit signal. People would carry money only in very small amounts for things like chewing gum and candy bars. Just pocket sorts of things. Any purchase of any significant amount would be done electronically. Earnings would be electronically entered into your account.

It would be a single banking system. [It] may have the appearance of being more than one but ultimately and basically it would be one single banking system, so that when you got paid your pay would be entered for you into your account balance and then when you purchased anything at the point of purchase it would be deducted from your account balance and you would actually carry nothing with you.

Also computer records can be kept on whatever it was you purchased so that if you were purchasing too much of any particular item and some official wanted to know what you were doing with your money they could go back and review your purchases and determine what you were buying.

There was a statement that any purchase of significant size like an automobile, bicycle, a refrigerator, a radio or television or whatever might have some sort of identification on it so it could be traced, so that very quickly anything which was either given away or stolen – whatever – authorities would be able to establish who purchased it and when.

Computers would allow this to happen. The ability to save would be greatly curtailed. People would just not be able to save any considerable degree of wealth. There was some statement of recognition that wealth represents power, and wealth in the hands of a lot of people is not good for the people in charge, so if you save too much you might be taxed. The more you save the higher rate of tax on your savings so your savings really could never get very far. And also if you began to show a pattern of saving too much, you might have your pay cut. We would say, **"Well, you're saving instead of spending. You really don't need all that money."**

That basically the idea being to prevent people from accumulating any wealth which might have long range disruptive influence on the system. People would be encouraged to use credit to borrow, and then also be encouraged to renege on their debt, so they would destroy their own credit. The idea here is that, again, if you're too stupid to handle credit wisely, this gives the authorities the opportunity to come down hard on you once you've shot your credit.

Electronic payments initially would all be based on different kinds of credit cards... these were already in use in 1969 to some extent. Not as much as now. But people would have credit cards with the electronic strip on it and once they got used to that then it would be pointed out the advantage of having all of that combined into a single credit card, serving a single monetary system and then they won't have to carry around all that plastic.

So the next step would be the single card and then the next step would be to replace the single card with a skin implant. The single card could be lost or stole, give rise to problems; could be exchanged with somebody else to confuse identify. The skin implant on the other hand would be not loseable or counterfeitable or transferrable to another person so you and your accounts would be identified without any possibility of error. And the skin implants would have to be put some place that would be convenient to the skin; for example your right hand or your forehead.

At that time when I heard this I was unfamiliar with the statements in the Book of Revelation. The speaker went on to say, "Now some of you people who read the Bible will attach significance to this to the Bible," but he went on to disclaim any Biblical significance at all. This is just common sense of how the system could work and should work and there's no need to read any superstitious Biblical principals into it. As I say, at the time I was not very familiar with the words of Revelations. Shortly after, I became familiar with it and the significance of what he said really was striking. I'll never forget it.

BIG BROTHER IS WATCHING YOU, WHILE YOU'RE WATCHING TV

There was some mention, also, of implants that would lend themselves to surveillance by providing radio signals. This could be under the skin or a dental implant... put in like a filling so that either fugitives or possibly other citizens could be identified by a certain frequency from his personal transmitter and could be located at any time or any place by any authority who wanted to find him. This would be particularly useful for somebody who broke out of prison.

There was more discussion of personal surveillance. One more thing was said, **"You'll be watching television and somebody will be watching you at the same time at a central monitoring station."**

Television sets would have a device to enable this. The TV set would not have to be on in order for this to be operative. Also, the television set can be used to monitor what you are watching. People can tell what you're watching on TV and how you're reacting to what you're watching. And you would not know that you were being watched while you were watching your television.

How would we get people to accept these things into their homes? Well, people would buy them when they buy their own television. They won't know that they're on there at first. This was described by being what we now know as Cable TV to replace the antenna TV. When you buy a TV set this monitor would just be part of the set and most people would not have enough knowledge to know it was there in the beginning. And then the cable would be the means of carrying the surveillance message to the monitor. By the time people found out that this monitoring was going on, they would also be very dependent upon television for a number of things. Just the way people are dependent upon the telephone today.

One thing the television would be used for would be purchases. You wouldn't have to leave your home to purchase. You just turn on your TV and there would be a way of interacting with your television channel to the store that you wanted to purchase. And you could flip the switch from place to place to choose a refrigerator or clothing. This would be both convenient, but it would also make you dependent on your television so the built-in monitor would be something you could not do without. There was some discussion of audio monitors, too, just in case the authorities wanted to hear what was going on in rooms other than where the television monitor was, and in regard to this the statement was made, **"Any wire that went into your house, for example your telephone wire, could be used this way."**

I remember this in particular because it was fairly near the end of the presentation and as we were leaving the meeting place, I said something to one of my colleagues about going home and pulling all of the wires out of my house... except I knew I couldn't get by without the telephone. And the colleague I spoke to just seemed numb. To this day, I don't think he even remembers what we talked about or what we heard that time, cause I've asked him. But at that time he seemed stunned.

Before all these changes would take place with electronic monitoring, it was mentioned that there would be service trucks all over the place, working on the wires and putting in new cables. This is how people who were on the inside would know how things were progressing.

PRIVATELY OWNED HOMES — "A THING OF THE PAST"

Privately owned housing would become a thing of the past. The cost of housing and financing housing would gradually be made so high that most people couldn't afford it. People who already owned their houses would be allowed to keep them but as years go by it would be more and more difficult for young people to buy a house. Young people would more and more become renters, particularly in apartments or condominiums. More and more unsold houses would stand vacant. People just couldn't buy them. But the cost of housing would not come down.

You'd right away think, well the vacant house, the price would come down, the people would buy it. But there was some statement to the effect that the price would be held high even though there were many available so that free market places would not operate. People would not be able to buy these and gradually more and more of the population would be forced into small apartments... small apartments which would not accommodate very many children. Then as the number of real home-owners diminished they would become a minority.

There would be no sympathy for them from the majority who dwelled in the apartments and then these homes could be taken by increased taxes or other regulations that would be detrimental to home ownership and would be acceptable to the majority. Ultimately, people would be assigned where they would live and it would be common to have non-family members living with you. This by way of your not knowing just how far you could trust anybody. This would all be under the control of a central housing authority. Have this in mind in 1990 when they ask, **"How many bedrooms in your house? How many bathrooms in your house? Do you have a finished game room?"**.

This information is personal and is of no national interest to government under our existing Constitution. But you'll be asked those questions and decide how you want to respond to them.

When the new system takes over people will be expected to sign allegiance to it, indicating that they don't have any reservations or holding back to the old system. **"There just won't be any room", he said, "for people who won't go along. We can't have such people cluttering up the place so such people would be taken to special places,"**

And here I don't remember the exact words, but the inference I drew was that at these special places where they were taken, then they would not live very long. He may have said something like, "disposed of humanely", but I don't remember very precisely...

just the impression the system was not going to support them when they would not go along with the system. That would leave death as the only alternative.

Somewhere in this vein he said there would not be any martyrs. When I first heard this I thought it meant the people would not be killed, but as the presentation developed what he meant was they would not be killed in such a way or disposed of in such a way that they could serve as inspiration to other people the way martyrs do. Rather he said something like this. **"People will just disappear."**

A FEW FINAL ITEMS...

Just a few additional items sort of thrown in here in the end which I failed to include where they belong more perfectly.

One: The bringing in of the new system he said probably would occur on a weekend in the winter. Everything would shut down on Friday evening and Monday morning, when everybody wakened, there would be an announcement that the New System was in place. During the process in getting the United States ready for these changes everybody would be busier with less leisure time and less opportunity to really look about and see what was going on around them.

Also, there would be more changes and more difficulty in keeping up as far as one's investments. Investment instruments would be changing. Interest rates would be changing so that it would be a difficult job with keeping up with what you had already earned.

Interesting about automobiles; it would look as though there were many varieties of automobiles, but when you look very closely there would be great duplication. They would be made to look different with chrome and wheel covers and this sort of thing, but looking closely one would see that the same automobile was made by more than one manufacturer.

This recently was brought down to me when I was in a parking lot and saw a small Ford – I forget the model – and a small Japanese automobile which were identical except for a number of things like the number of holes in the wheel cover and the chrome around the plate and the shape of the grill. But if you looked at the basic parts of the automobile, they were identical. They just happened to be parked side-by-side, where I was struck with this, and I was again reminded of what had been said many years ago.

I'm hurrying here because I'm just about to the end of the tape. Let me just summarize here by saying, all of these things said by one individual at one time in one place relating to so many different human endeavors and then to look and see how many of these actually came about... that is, changes accomplished between then and now [1969 - 1988] and the things which are planned for the future, I think there is no denying that this is controlled and there is indeed a conspiracy.

The question then becomes what to do. I think first off, WE MUST PUT OUR FAITH IN GOD and PRAY and ASK FOR HIS GUIDANCE. And secondly, do what we can to inform other individuals as much as possible, as much as they may be interested.

SOME PEOPLE JUST DON'T CARE, because they're preoccupied with getting along in their own personal endeavors. But, as much as possible, I think we should try to inform other people who may be interested, and again...

PUT OUR FAITH AND TRUST IN GOD AND PRAY CONSTANTLY FOR HIS GUIDANCE AND FOR THE COURAGE TO ACCEPT WHAT WE MAY BE FACING IN THE NEAR FUTURE. Rather than accept PEACE and JUSTICE which we hear so much now... it's a cliché. LET'S INSIST ON LIBERTY AND JUSTICE FOR ALL. [End of tape two]

[Continue with Tape Three](#)

[Back to **Shadow Government**](#)

[**Council on Domestic Relations Home**](#)

[Home](#) | [Issues](#) | [Perspective](#) | [Audio](#) | [Guests](#) | [Images](#) | [Live Chat](#) | [Links](#) | [Search](#) | [About](#) | [Contact](#)