

YOUR KINDLE NOTES FOR:

The Genesis of Modern Globalization (1978-1979): The definitive story about how the Trilateral Commission shaped the world

Antony C. Sutton and Patrick Wood

Last accessed on Saturday, May 18, 2024

53 Highlights | 0 Notes

Yellow highlight | Location: 111

> Hoover Institution was overseen by Stanford University, whose President happened to be David Packard (the co-founder of Hewlett-Packard) and a member of the Trilateral Commission. Packard knew that Sutton could not be stopped, so he was subsequently drummed out of Hoover before he got too deep into his exposé.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 9

> The Trilateral Commission was conceived and founded by David Rockefeller with the help of Zbigniew Brzezinski. Rockefeller is a senior member of the Council on Foreign Relations, director of several giant multinational corporations of immense power, and Chairman of Chase Manhattan Bank, one of the most powerful banks in the world. The Rockefeller family has long been associated with conspiratorial activities throughout the world, from the creation of the U.S. Federal Reserve System to profiteering in the Third World countries. There were two types of people whom David Rockefeller set out to involve in the Commission.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 9

> The first group consisted of the “cream” of the other elitist groups in the world — those persons who knew what they were doing and had already been working closely with Rockefeller organizations in the past. They were the "hard core” of the “world control gang,” not those who might have been duped into sitting, for instance, on the C.F.R., unaware of the real intent of the C.F.R. philosophy. To a person, each member of the T.C. carried immense and practical power, from economic and monetary control to intellectual prowess. These were the people who would lay the plans for the future of the T.C. Membership was tightly regulated and exclusive, drawing out equally from Europe, North America, and Japan. The second group solicited by the T.C. consisted of those people who would be more or less willing puppets of the T.C. to do the Commission’s bidding. They were, and still are, totally sympathetic and subservient to T.C. policy. None in this group could claim power based on their own merit, whether it

be business or intellectual power. Their main qualification was “moldability" and a working knowledge of political chicanery.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 9

this second group, the two most notable Trilateral Commission members are now President James Carter and U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young. There are others in other countries. The Commission has many other "operatives” who are not members but play a key role just the same. They are easily identified through simple research into the history of organizations represented by the first group. One might liken this situation to an individual city—The City Council has the supreme authority to set policy in the city. It is not accurate to say the city’s policemen are members of the Council, but they certainly answer to and do the bidding of the Council. So it is…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 10

The projected image of a “country boy” making good in the city is hardly truthful or accurate. Over the years, Carter has been an invaluable figurehead for the same forces that have dominated American politics for decades — the Rockefellers. Carter’s main qualification for that “honor” was a lack of strong moral integrity and a willingness to be molded. The “New South," based in Atlanta, had been forming since the early 1960s and was rapidly becoming this nation's number one drug culture center. Many stories have been written about the so-called “Atlanta Mafia” (which has nothing to do…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 11

Whether or not James Carter was truly "born again” (i.e., accepting Jesus Christ as his personal Savior and Lord) has not particularly changed the course of his political career. Recognizing Carter’s mental instability, the Community (East Coast liberal establishment) "assigned" Dr. Peter Bourne to be responsible for Carter’s “mental health.” Until he resigned in 1978 under fire for illegal prescription writing and drug abuse, Dr. Bourne became Carter’s official psychiatrist in the White House. Who is Bourne? He graduated from Emory College in Atlanta in the early 1960s and was trained in medicine and psychiatry at the Walter Reed Army Medical Research Center, which has only recently been exposed as an important center in the covert drug testing and brain-wash studies that the Army and C.I.A. conducted in the 1960s. Later, Bourne served as a profiler of U.S. Army Special Forces personnel suffering from mental breakdowns in Vietnam. He helped create the somewhat violent Vietnam Veterans Against the War in the U.S. and was an outspoken critic of all drug laws; namely, he thought all drugs should be legalized. As a result of his drug position, he helped create many “free clinics” throughout the country to help drug addicts by supplying them with

methadone. In 1972, he was brought to Washington to serve as a special advisor to the President on drug abuse policy. Bourne's wife, Mary King Bourne, was the beautiful blond radical often…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 12

To say that Carter had no Washington connections is not just bending the truth; it's an outright lie. As early as 1973, Brzezinski knew what would be required to elect a president in 1976 — "The Democratic candidate in 1976 will have to emphasize work, the family, religion and increasingly, patriotism . . . The new conservatism will clearly not go back to laissez-faire. It will be a philosophical conservatism. It will be a kind of conservative statism or managerism. There will be conservative values but a reliance on a great deal of co-determination between state and the corporations." Indeed, we have seen that President Carter has followed this description to the letter.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 13

But, Carter had already filled his cabinet by December 25 and continued to appoint up to 17 Trilateral Commission members to top posts, to wit: Zbigniew Brzezinski — Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs Cyrus Vance — Secretary of State Harold Brown — Secretary of Defense W. Michael Blumenthal — Secretary of the Treasury Andrew Young — Ambassador to the United Nations Warren Christopher — Deputy Secretary of State Lucy Benson Wilson — Undersecretary of State for Security Affairs Richard Cooper — Undersecretary of State for Economic Affairs Richard Holbrooke — Undersecretary of State for Asian and Pacific Aff? W. Anthony Lake — Undersecretary of State for Policy Planning Sol Llnowltz — Co-negotiator on the Panama Canal Treaty Gerald Smith — Ambassador-at-Large for Non-Proliferation Elliot Richardson — Delegate to the Law of the Sea Conference Richard Gardner — Ambassador to Italy Anthony Soloman — Undersecretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs C. Fred Bergston — Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for International Affairs Paul Warnke — Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 14

is also noted that Vice President, Walter Mondale, is also a member of The Trilateral Commission. Virtually every important position in the Carter Administration is filled with “operatives” of the Trilateral Commission, from the Cabinet to various agencies. The following bodies or councils are listed to give the reader an insight into which people to watch for. These are the most important decision-making groups in the country.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 41

> 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 No. 14, Toward a Renovated International System, two additional and interesting caveats relating to international grain reserves appear: That the Soviet Union can benefit from fixed prices and guaranteed sources of supply, and that if the U.S.S.R. doesn't see the wisdom of joining the Trilateral plan, the Trilaterals will go it alone.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 41

> Agriculture Secretary Bergland (a Trilateral nominee) has vowed "to even out the booms and busts" in agriculture. (To this, former Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz responded, "...you'll notice he's going to even out the boom first.") In practice, the Carter grain storage program will produce: a narrow grain price snake - the government will support the floor of the snake, while whipped-up consumer pressure, through a captive media, will create 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.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 42

> NOTE: The CARTER Administration's penchant for stockpiles - $5 billion for oil, $6 billion for wheat, and re-examination of the strategic metals stockpile program - raises a question mark about long-term intentions. Stockpiling of oil, wheat, and metals is a common historical prelude to aggressive warfare. The pragmatic, logical apparatus of the Trilateralist is highlighted: They want an oil stockpile under PROJECT INDEPENDENCE and a wheat storage program under the flag of new world order INTERDEPENDENCE.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 43

> The institutional fundamentals (i.e., transportation, financing, land tenure systems, communications, etc.), all basic to healthy economic expansion, are ignored in this plan. The emphasis is on spending $54 billion on a TECHNOLOGICALLY INTENSIVE form of production not normally used in the labor-intensive Far East. The reason for this is not

complex - Trilateral members heavily reflect the multinational firms that will be supplying the needed technology, equipment, and supplies.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 43

The summer 1972 grain fiasco was the biggest grain sale in American history. The Soviets bought over 700 million bushels of grain, including 440 million bushels of wheat - about 25% of the total American wheat crop. The sale wiped out U.S. reserves, disrupted shipping and grain transportation flows, created farm product shortages - and forced up food prices to American consumers. WHO INITIATED THIS PROGRAM? The original directives came from Henry Kissinger (then National Security Advisor to President Nixon.) On January 31, 1972, KISSINGER directed the Departments of State, Commerce and Agriculture to allow the Department of Agriculture to take the lead in negotiating grain sales to the U.S.S.R. On February 14, 1972, the Department of Agriculture was directed to develop a "negotiating scenario." The subsequent negotiating team from Washington included Commerce Secretary Peter G. Peterson, Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz, Henry Kissinger, and Peter Flanigan.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 44

In general, 1977 was not a good year for agricultural equipment manufacturers. Allis-Chalmers reported a projected cutback of 15% for 1978. Wisconsin-based J.I. Case says equipment conditions "have seriously declined" since early 1977 and predicts either flat or declining sales for 1978. In Des Moines, a Massey-Ferguson, Inc. spokesman stated that the 1978 market is "a matter of great concern." And the agriculture equipment division of Chromalloy is looking for a flat 1978 market. NONE OF THESE FIRMS HAS DIRECT TRILATERAL CONNECTIONS. On the other hand, those companies with direct Trilateral connections are showing an entirely different scenario. Deere & Company, the largest maker of agricultural equipment and the 52nd largest firm in the U.S., is in the midst of the largest capital expansion program in company history. In 1977, Deere negotiated an agreement with Yanmar Diesel Engine Company (Japan) to form "an engineering company that will be jointly owned and will design future tractors in the smaller horsepower sizes." New basic machines will go into production in 1978 - a crawler dozer, a crawler loader, a four-wheel drive loader, and a new hydraulic excavator. Existing Deere plants are to be expanded, and new plants built overseas, with a total expenditure in 1977-78 of $1 billion. The Chairman of the Board of Deere & Company is WILLIAM HEWITT. Another Trilateralist, HENRY B. SCHACHT, is Chairman of the Board of Cummins Engine Company, by far the largest truck engine manufacturer in the U.S., with 49.4% of the heavy-duty truck engine market. Large numbers of Cummins engines are used in farm equipment, and Cummins is now "the power leader in the highest horsepower, four-wheel drive tractor market." J. Irwin

Miller, long-time internationalist and member of the Council on Foreign Relations, personally owns 19.4% (1,339,620) of the common stock of Cummins - and participates in other large blocks of stock. In addition, Cummins' former vice-president of Corporate Action was recently appointed by President CARTER to be Under Secretary of the Interior. JOHN PERKINS is president, and WILLIAM A. HEWITT and ARTHUR M. WOOD are directors of Continental Illinois National Bank and Trust Company of Chicago. Continental Illinois and its subsidiaries are operators in the agricultural industry worldwide. For example, the 1976 Annual Report has a half-page photograph of "a central-pivot irrigation system" financed by a subsidiary of Continental Illinois Leasing Corp. The firm provides agricultural management services through Continental Agricultural Properties Management Division, maintaining a global banking network for agricultural operations. JOHN HAROLD PERKINS is also director of the Pillsbury Company, which in 1976 agreed with Cargill Inc. of Minneapolis to use Cargill port facilities to put Pillsbury into the grain export field, (WILLIAM R. PEARCE is vice-president of Cargill.) In early 1978, the Memphis, Tennessee firm of Cook Industries, Inc. ($500…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 46

Coming issues of THE TRILATERAL OBSERVER will build on this base to document the insidious overall Trilateral objective - TO DOMINATE THE WORLD ECONOMICALLY AND POLITICALLY. Issues discussed will include: the international monetary system and the battle for GOLD, weather modification on a worldwide scale, energy limitation, control of the seas, re-defining of national objectives, and more.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 61

Triangle Paper No. 14, “Towards a Renovated International System,” concludes that the 1944 Bretton Woods system has "come under increasing strain," and events forced changes, i.e., the assault on the dollar and floating exchange rates. The current Trilateral objective is to build another international system based on "cooperation" and focussing on two aspects which require "cooperation." (We will examine these concepts of "cooperation" and "interdependence" at a later date: basically, these are mechanical devices to centralize political power.) The two monetary aspects central to the new system are: international lending, creation of international reserves. The Trilateral proposal is to have only five to ten leading "core" countries establish the new system. The rest of the world will have to go alone as best it can. These ideas have already been emphasized: A new man-made artificial international money, the SDR, has been created for central banks. As the SDR is introduced, gold will be phased out of the international reserve system. flexible exchange rates among major currencies: either linked to a major currency or to the 16-currency composite SDR. The task ahead for the

TC world managers is to integrate these ideas into the world monetary system. 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 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." Trilaterals recognize that so long as countries build reserves with national currencies and gold, then the SDR will take second place. The IMF is the vehicle to achieve the twin objectives, and the IMF will evolve into a "central bank for national central banks." At the moment, the IMF does not have the resources for this: the Trilaterals propose to artificially create the necessary reserves. The IMF is also the forum for "coordination of macroeconomic- policies." How are our Trilateral friends faring with their plans? To answer this, we have to go back to Bretton Woods and the Keynes/White schemes for Bancor and Unitas. After we identify the differences in these schemes and why Bretton Woods failed, we can assess the road ahead for the Trilaterals.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 63

Keynes was not the originator of the 1944 Bancor scheme, nor are the Trilaterals the originators of the 1978 Bancor scheme. In 1892 a German economist, Julius Wolf, came up with the idea of an international gold reserve deposited in a neutral country with international banknotes issued on the basis of this gold reserve - very much the Keynesian concept reflected in Bretton Woods and the IMF. The major differences between Trilateral plans in 1978 and the Anglo-American Keynes-White proposals of 1944 are: Keynes wanted a "consciousness of consent" from the general public; Keynes argued the arrangements would not succeed if hatched in secret, The system was to be linked to gold. Trilaterals have NO "consciousness of consent" and have abandoned gold. The principle objective in 1944 was much narrower than current proposals: It was to be a system 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 one.”

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 64

> Actually, the two proposals (Bancor, British, and Unitas, United States) had different features. The adopted American plan, Unitas, deposited part of national 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…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 64

> Bancor was not adopted in 1944. It's now a matter of history that the related Harry Dexter White "Unitas" plan which was adopted and led the U.S, into bankruptcy: the dollar weaknesses of today are directly traceable to the Bretton Woods 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. The question is not to design a workable system to facilitate trade and improve human welfare but to design a system that will further establish and preserve power for the Trilaterals. The answer adopted is to…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 65

> early February 1978, core country finance ministers vital to the success of the revived and modified BANCOR met in Europe -- a supposedly secret meeting that became public knowledge. There is no concealing the cold reception for the Trilateral scheme from Europeans. U.S. Treasury Secretary BLUMENTHAL tried to arm-twist Germany into a "locomotive" role: i.e., that Germany should reflate, spur its economy in good Keynesian fashion and hopefully pull lagging economies onto a higher plane of economic activity. This is the "coordination of macroeconomic policies" planned by the T.C. The Germans welcomed the Keynesian locomotive no more in February 1978 than in previous years. German Economics Minister Count Otto Lambsdorff commented: “I am surprised by American stubbornness.” Chancellor Helmut Schmidt indicated zero chance of a stimulative, i.e., inflationary, German policy. This European episode exemplifies the Trilateral weakness in historical precedent. Why do the Germans refuse to go along with Keynesian demand stimulation? Two factors are locked into the German psyche, 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 had two recent devastating price inflations (1923 and 1946): both times, the Mark went to zero. Germans know the consequences of inflation. W. MICHAEL BLUMENTHAL was born in Germany and lived there until 1947. He must have some remembrance…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 66

The central unstated propellant is that the international monetary system is on a precarious merry-go-round of borrow - generate a deficit - 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 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 any one of a dozen other LDCs default, the whole pack of monetary cards will come tumbling down. Trilaterals push for an international monetary system based on "Bancor" created money simply because: Their banker necks are already in the wringer, the gold solution is no longer available, because the U.S. long ago shipped out its good delivery gold (as we noted last month in Issue #2). At this…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 67

The degree of domestic control over the economy by international banks is identified in a report published by the late Senator Lee Metcalf, "Voting Rights in Major Corporations" (referred to as the Metcalf Index.) Also a matter of public record are the international bankers who are also Trilateral Commissioners. When we integrate these three statistics, [(a) source of banker 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. This table ranks twelve international banks in order of earnings from overseas, i.e., the bank with the highest percentage of its earnings from overseas is ranked No. 1, and the bank with the least percentage from overseas is ranked No. 12 (Column 1). This percentage is compared with the equivalent 1970 figures to demonstrate that foreign earnings have ballooned over the past five years or so (Column 2). Column 3 is the Metcalf Index of domestic control by these same bankers, defined as the number of the 122 companies in which the bank is among the top five shareholders. Column 4 lists Trilateral Commissioners who are also directors of these banks. Chase Manhattan is the bank with the highest percentage of its 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 David is 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…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 69

In a few words: the Trilateral Commission 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 without allegiance to the Constitution (more on this in a later issue) and without majority financial and economic ties to the United States.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 75

The basic Trilateral structure is a power pyramid. At the tip of the pyramid we can identify a "financial mafia," comprising several old-line American families, the American aristocracy. Below this highest level is the Executive Committee for the United States, linked to Executive Committees in Europe and Japan. Next comes the Trilateral Commission itself: 109 members from North America, 106 from Europe, and 74 from Japan. Trilaterals control the Executive Branch of the U.S. government and so, control policy.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 75

An ongoing project is to dominate nine "core countries" in Europe (and Japan) which, by virtue of their productive ability, account for 80 percent of world output. The "core" group can then dominate the remaining 20 percent of the world. The American multinationals (MNCs) provide country-by-country liaison, intelligence, and conduits, the sinews to bind a global New World Order to the directions of the "financial mafia."

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 86

From the viewpoint of Canadian independence, its Trilateral membership is disturbing, including two Canadian Members of Parliament: GORDON FAIRWEATHER and MITCHELL SHARP (former Canadian Minister of Foreign Affairs), along with the directors of three quasi-official research institutions, PETER DOBELL, MICHAEL KIRBY, and LOUIS A. DESROCHERS, founding director of the Institute for Research on Public Policy. CLAUDE MASSON, head of Division of Planning and Research at Department of Trade and Commerce, Ottawa, is also a Trilateralist. In brief, there is a heavy Canadian representation from the equivalents of Brookings Institution. Corporate representation includes ROBERT W. BONNER (British Columbia Hydro), MAURICE F. STRONG (Petro Canada), and JEAN LUC PEPIN. director of American multinationals in Canada (i.e. Westinghouse Canada Ltd., Collins Radio Co. of Canada Ltd., Celanese Canada Ltd. and others). Finally, Canadian banking Trilateralists are MICHEL BELANGER, President of Provincial Bank of Canada and ALAN HOCKIN, formerly with Morgan Stanley and now Executive Vice President of Toronto Dominion Bank.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 95

Identification of the Trilateral power base varies according to the observer. Most American observers zero in on the international bank affiliation. While constitutional conservatives focus on the Rockefeller family and Chase Manhattan as the culprit, liberal-leftists focus on bankers in general. A radically different interpretation comes from the U.S. Labor Party - it considers the Rockefeller label a "cover," that Trilateralism is a "British conspiracy" operation to infiltrate the U.S. using HENRY KISSINGER as a conduit. This issue will not fully resolve the conflict of identification of the power base; it is more complex than meets the eye. Our initial aim is to present some fundamental information. In later issues, we shall refine the analysis. The North American Executive Committee consists of: I.W. ABEL, Former President, United Steel Workers of America; ROBERT W. BONNER, (Canadian), Chairman, British Columbia Hydro; WILLIAM T. COLEMAN JR., a director of Chase Manhattan Bank and former Secretary of Transportation; ROBERT S. INGERSOLL, Director of First Chicago Corp and former Deputy Secretary of State; HENRY KISSINGER, Former Secretary of State, now on the International Advisory Committee of Chase Manhattan; BRUCE K. MACLAURY and HENRY OWEN, Brookings Institution; CHARLES W. ROBINSON, Senior Managing Director of Kuhn, Loeb and former Deputy Secretary of State; DAVID ROCKEFELLER, Chairman: Chase Manhattan Bank; WILLIAM M. ROTH, Roth Properties; WILLIAM W. SCRANTON, Former Ambassador to the United Nations; MITCHELL SHARP, (Canadian), Former Minister for External Affairs. The most obvious observation is that three members of the Executive Committee are CHASE MANHATTAN people (ROCKEFELLER and COLEMAN are directors, KISSINGER is on the International Advisory Committee). Later, we shall explore the Rockefeller-Chase Manhattan connection in detail. Suffice it to note that G. William Miller (Chairman Federal Reserve Board) was on the Chase International Advisory Committee just before their appointment to the Fed. These 12 Executive Committee members can be grouped as follows:

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 97

Many other Commissioners moved into the Carter Administration (including, of course, JAMES EARL CARTER and WALTER MONDALE) but it is significant that no fewer than one-third of the Executive Committee moved into the top security slots in the new Administration. In brief, we note two outstanding characteristics: (a) the CHASE MANHATTAN BANK dominates the Trilateral Commission, and (b) the TRILATERAL COMMISSION dominates the U.S. Executive branch.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 98

It is, however, naive to see DAVID ROCKEFELLER as an omnipotent dictator or the Rockefeller family as an all-powerful, all-highest monarchy. This is a trap for the unwary. Our world is much more complex. What we are looking at is a family of families, a "mafia," a collective of power maniacs 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.")

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 100

The Trilateral Commission, we can conclude: (1) originated with DAVID ROCKEFELLER (2) was chosen by DAVID ROCKEFELLER and a small group of four assistants and (3) was financed in great part by DAVID ROCKEFELLER and the Kettering Foundation. Without being accused of hastiness or bias, one could reasonably conclude that DAVID ROCKEFELLER is a power behind THE TRILATERAL COMMISSION and presumably stands to gain the most from its activities. THE KETTERING FOUNDATION There are 3 "Kettering Foundations." This citation almost certainly refers to the Charles F. Kettering Foundation, Dayton, Ohio. Donor: Charles F. Kettering -- who was 27 years with General Motors and, among other positions, a Director of Ethyl Corp (transfer of technology to Hitler pre World War II) and Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research (in mounting trouble over the credibility of its research programs). Assets of the Foundation early 1970s, about $93 million. No grants to individuals only to "high-risk programs" to "support the forces for world order and peace." TRUSTEES: Harrison Scott Brown, Norman Cousins, John Sloan Dickey, George H. Gallup, Samuel B. Gould, Carroll A. Hochwalt, Frederick J. Hoover, Robert A. Kerr, Charles F. Kettering II, Richard D. Lombard, Walter Orr Roberts, Howard E. Skipper, and James M. Stewart.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 102

Don't be concerned about the complexity of this diagram: focus attention on the top one-third. The two large triangles represent two potential power bases: the "Rockefeller Family Group" on the left and the "Kirby-Allegheny Group" on the right. Any reader of this newsletter has probably read enough "conspiratorial literature" to know that the "Kirby-Allegheny Group" is never cited as part of a "conspiracy." Why is the Kirby-Allegheny Group important? Simply because in terms of power as measured by stock voting it is right up there with the Rockefellers.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 102

Note the following (reading from the diagram): Rockefellers are the No. 1 stockholder in Chase Manhattan Corporation with 591,533 votes, while Kirby Allegheny Corporation (No. 3) has 300,000 votes, (the No. 2 stockholder is California Employees Retirement System) Rockefeller Family Group has NO direct holdings in Citicorp (although Chase Manhattan Corp is No. 11 holder with 1,001,000 votes) but Kirby Allegheny Group is No. 6 holder in Citicorp with 1,661,000 votes. The Kirby Family Group controls Investors Diversified Services with interests in numerous multinationals -- Northwest Airlines, PepsiCo Inc., Atlantic Richfield Inc., and so on. What is the difference between the Rockefeller Family Group and the Kirby Family Group? There is one all-important distinction. Rockefellers are politicized. Kirbys are not. Rockefellers apparently subvert the political process to gain their objectives. Kirbys apparently do not. Look at the diagram again, at the smaller black triangles which represent Trilateral members. The Rockefeller dominated bank influence in the Commission can now be followed precisely: TWO Trilaterals are in the Rockefeller Family Group (DAVID and JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV, Governor of West Virginia), Ignore temporarily numerous Rockefeller associates and flunkies who are Commissioners, Rockefeller Family Group is No. 1 shareholder in Chase Manhattan Corp: SIX Trilaterals are on the board of Chase Manhattan Corp. In turn Chase Manhattan Corp is No. 1 stockholder in First Chicago Corp. THREE Trilaterals are on the board of First Chicago Corp. (The reader can trace the other influences from the diagram) Kirby-Allegheny Group has NO TRILATERALS at all. Nor are there any Trilaterals on the board of Citicorp, where the Rockefeller Family has no direct stockholding interest.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 104

An interesting historical note is that (today) no families directly control J.P. Morgan and its subsidiary Morgan Guaranty. The onetime fiefdom of J.P. Morgan and the Morgan family was the power behind the creation of the Federal Reserve System in 1913 and the power behind the throne of Woodrow Wilson. Today No. 1 stockholder in J.P. Morgan is Citibank and No. 2 stockholder is Chase Manhattan Corp. Moreover J.P. Morgan controls Morgan Guaranty which in turn is No. 1 stockholder in Citicorp. What does this picture add up to? It is like a snake swallowing its own tail or a gaggle of snakes swallowing each other’s tails.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 106

straightforward conclusion is that there has apparently been a covert fascist (national socialist) takeover of the United States Government. By "fascist,” we mean a corporate socialist state of the type established by socialist Mussolini in Italy in the 1920s. Mussolini was editor of a Marxist socialist newspaper before developing his own brand of corporate socialism. All forms of socialism derive from the same philosophical bases.

Corporate socialism was later promoted in the United States by General Electric Chairman Swope and became Roosevelt's New Deal (i.e., "Swope's Plan") . It is a socialist revolution by stealth rather than by blood in the streets, but revolution is just the same. Trilateralism is the current operational vehicle for this takeover. The bitter joke is that Roosevelt and CARTER have been mainly supported by "liberals" and "do-gooders" supposedly horrified at fascism and corporate socialism!

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 109

The Agnelli family in Italy has always been in the forefront of globalism. The FIAT firm dominated by Trilateral UMBERTO AGNELLI has been prominent in technological transfers to the Soviet Union since the early 1920s and designed the giant KAMA truck plant for the Soviets. In 1975 AGNELLI merged the European Fiat interests - Fiat, OM and Lancia in Italy, Unic in France, KHD in West Germany. A headquarters company IVECO (Industrial Vehicles Corporation) was established in Amsterdam, and 1000 management employees transferred from Italy, West Germany and France to Holland. Not only has IVECO been ordered by Trilateralist AGNELLI to work completely in English but any employee unable to speak, read and write English fluently by the end of 1978 will be fired -- This on the personal order of UMBERTO AGNELLI. Cultural genocide would be a fair description of the FIAT policy. TRILATERALISM

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 114

Before probing the Tether case, let's look at the Trilateral view of the press and its freedoms. Trilateraists, by their own statements, see freedom of the press as a threat to achieving their objectives, the First Amendment of the Constitution notwithstanding. While the First Amendment obviously does not apply in England, there is in the British press, and society at large, a long and proud tradition of freedom of speech - albeit broken from time to time by recalcitrant monarchs. In CRISIS OF DEMOCRACY, Trilateral author MICHEL J. CROZIER describes our society as drifting with a "dangerously progressed alienation." The media has, it is argued by CROZIER, played a role in this alienation, and; "the media have thus become an autonomous power . . . we now are witnessing a crucial change when the profession (the media) tends to regulate itself in such a way as to resist pressure from financial or governmental interests." (page 35) NOTE: the key phrase "resist pressure from financial or governmental interests;" we shall see later that the Tether case fits this mold. Trilateralists don't like resistance to special interest pressure because:

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 115

"the media deprive governments and to some extent also other responsible authorities of the time tag, tolerance and thrust that make it possible to innovate and to experiment responsibly." NOTE: the self-appointed Trilateralist role as "responsible authorities" and the threads of authoritarianism woven into this passage. What do the Trilaterals propose to do about this "threat" of free expression? On page 181 of CRISIS OF DEMOCRACY, the counter-action is spelled out: . . significant measures are required to restore an appropriate balance between the press, the government and other institutions in society." Specifically, Trilaterals call for an Interstate Commerce Act for the media, i.e., a regulatory agency for the media, "to assure to the government the right and the ability to withhold information at the source."

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 115

So here we have it. Trilaterals want a "responsible," i.e., a captive censored press and propose legislation to achieve this end. Presumably, while waiting for appropriate legislation, Trilaterals are applying an informal censorship. Shades of Josef Stalin and Adolf Hitler! In the meantime, there are those annoying journalists - like Gordon Tether of London - who feel a higher call than crass Trilateralism.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 139

The revolution, wrote Marx and Engels, "can only be effected by despotic inroads upon the rights of production..." (Tyazanoff, page 52) In brief: elimination of property owners and small and medium-sized businessmen, those outside the orbit of the multinationals and international banks. Then Marx and Engels outlined the famous ten "measures" for achieving revolution in advanced countries. The second "measure" is "(2) a vigorously graduated income tax." (Ryazanoff, page 52) Our 16th Amendment to the Constitution 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.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 139

It pays to re-read Karl Marx's MANIFESTO in the light of the alliance between Wall Street multinationals and the communist imperialists. Marxists, especially, should re-read Marx. The enemy of Marxism is not the capitalist. It is the middle class, the bourgeoisie. The central enemy of Marxism is the "bourgeoisie," the middle class, because the middle class is the enemy of totalitarianism. Marx sees the bourgeoisie as the source of all that is evil. Yet Marx does not include 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, i.e., "that 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." (Ryazanoff, page 38) Are not Cyrus Eaton, Armand Hammer, DAVID ROCKEFELLER, and the Trilateral Commission examples of the ruling-class breakaway? Marxists and the "breakaway ruling class capitalists" have joined hands to eliminate the middle class. Unfortunately, academic analysts are blind to the implications of the alliance: they read Marx with preconceptions. So, let's present some evidence. Earlier this year, the Marxist government of Angola reorganized DI AMANG, its diamond-producing monopoly. Now, 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. Who 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 "foreign companies," i.e., the ruling capitalists, will not be affected by the takeover; the ruling class joins hands with Marxist revolutionaries. Another example 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. To quote one instance of their support, partner Thomas D. Thacher wrote a report which became decisive to gain British Cabinet support for the Bolsheviks. The second paragraph of this Thacher report (April 18, 1918) reads, "the fullest assistance should be given to the Soviet government in its efforts to organize a volunteer revolutionary army." (reprinted in full on page 95 of WALL STREET AND THE BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION) 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." The same aid for the Marxist revolution is taking place today in Southern Africa and Red China. And who is the U.S. Secretary of State today? CYRUS D. VANCE. And with which Wall Street law firm was VANCE before appointment as Secretary of State? None other than Simpson, Thacher, and Bartlett. As a final…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 151

Neither Giscard nor Schmidt, the joint architects of ECU, are Trilaterals; note that both Schmidt and Giscard are former Finance Ministers for their respective countries. Further, there is a report that European bankers had muffled but audible reservations about the Giscard-Schmidt plan. European Trilaterals include powerful European bankers: BARON LEON LAMBERT, ALWIN MUNCHMEYER (German Banking Federation), BARON EDMOND DE ROTHSCHILD, ANTHONY TUKE (Barclays International) and LUC WAUTERS (Kredietbank, Brussels). Also note that such prominent European Trilaterals as RAYMOND BARRE (Prime Minister of France) and COUNT OTTO LAMBSDORFF ((Minister of Economics, Germany) are not prominent in the ECU Plan: the ECU Plan is a non-Trilateralist Schmidt-Giscard creation. The ECU system scheduled for operation by January

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 173

> The elitist energy reports and proposals for energy control are: FORD FOUNDATION: A TIME TO CHOOSE, COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: ACHIEVING ENERGY INDEPENDENCE, and COMMISSION FOR CRITICAL CHOICES FOR AMERICA: ENERGY: A PLAN FOR ACTION, 1975. The FORD FOUNDATION financed the Trilateral Commission, and the Ford contribution to energy crisis manipulation is a plan entitled A TIME TO CHOOSE. This plan demands: a massive socialist bureaucracy to plan and control all energy use, ultimately a massive reduction in energy use + income redistribution, price controls + fuel allocations + tax increases. The CARTER energy crisis is guided from the White House by the same S. David Freeman who wrote sections of this FORD FOUNDATION report. A TIME TO CHOOSE unleashed a flood of criticism, even from a member of the FORD FOUNDATION advisory board, President of ALCOA, John Harper, who described the Ford energy plan as one ". .. abhorrent to me and I am sure, to most of the people in this nation." In turn, the Commission for Critical Choices for America was financed by the ROCKEFELLER Foundation and is a variation of the FORD FOUNDATION plan. The reader will find interlocks with the Committee for Economic Development. In Brief, three supposedly impartial objective plans are little more than coordinated blueprints for planned energy under elitist control.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 176

> In brief, six of the "seven sisters" have Trilateral representation. The above records only Trilaterally connected bank holdings in the major oil companies where this holding places the bank among the top FIVE shareholders, i.e., the Trilateralist bank has a controlling influence. To this picture, we can add the personal holdings of the ROCKEFELLER family in these same major oil companies, in addition to their indirect interest via the above-named banks:

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 195

> Ian Smith of Rhodesia, now in the United States, accuses the Trilateralist Carter Administration of: breaking the Kissinger agreement. Rhodesia has done everything required under agreement; the United States has overtly and covertly aided the Marxist side. Smith blames U.S. and British support for Marxist guerrillas as the cause of the Rhodesian crisis. In brief, the United States is continuing a 60-year tradition of aiding Marxists. This tradition began with the Thacher Memorandum pressing military aid for the infant Soviet government in 1918. Thacher was a member of the elitist law firm Simpson, Thacher, and Bartlett. By sheer coincidence, CYRUS VANCE was a partner in

Simson, Thacher, and Bartlett before joining the Carter Administration. The more it changes the more it is the same.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 209

We can therefore legitimately arrive at the following conclusions: the power base in Europe is closely connected with a branch of the ROTHSCHILD family, rather than ROCKEFELLERS'. there is an ominous concentration of Trilaterals in influential positions. For example: the directors of the following institutes of international affairs: ANDREW SHONFIELD, Director, Royal Institute of International Affairs in London, KURT BIRRENBACH, President of Germany Foreign Policy Association, CESARE MERLINI, Director, Institute for International Affairs in Rome, JOHN C. SANNESS, Director, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, KARL KAISER, Research Institute the German Society for Foreign Policy. add to this the "public service" positions previously listed, including the Prime Minister of France and three foreign ministers, consequently, if anything, European Trilateralism has as tight a grip on political activities in Europe as U.S. Trilateralism does in the United States.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 211

The Trilateralists, representing the Rockefeller and Rothschild financial power, have mounted an all-out attack on South Africa headed by Trilateralist ANDREW YOUNG. It reminds us of the history of South Africa in 1898-9. The attack at that time was by the Rothschild financial interests spearheaded by Alfred Milner and aimed at the Boer independent states. It was British imperialism in 1890's and American-European imperialism today. The last conference between Alfred Milner at Bloemfontain in May 1899 concluded when President Kruger, with tears in his eyes said; "You want our country."

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 211

What the history books have not recorded is that Alfred (later Lord) Milner then proceeded to send a telegram to London, which completely distorted Paul Kruger's position. Milner removed the peaceful statements made by Kruger and mutilated the telegram to make it appear that Kruger wanted war. The Anglo-Boer War broke out shortly thereafter. TRILATERALISTS ARE THE BITTER ENEMIES OF SOUTH AFRICA - BOTH BLACK AND WHITE - THIS TIME, HOWEVER, SOUTH AFRICA KNOWS OF WESTERN DECEPTION AND IS FOREWARNED.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 215

January 1979 is an appropriate time to record that 1979 has been designated THE INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF THE CHILD. The United States participates in this program through the U.S. National Commission for the International Year of the Child established April 14, 1978 by JIMMY CARTER under Executive Order Number 12053. This order was issued at the request of fellow Trilateralist and Secretary of State, CYRUS VANCE, and HEW Secretary Joseph Califano. What is the Year of the Child? The stated intention of the United Nations and the U.S. National Commission is to not spend money on more programs relating to children (and for that, we may be grateful.) However, there is a specific intent to take action on certain programs through 200 cooperating U.S. non-governmental organizations. The literature issued by the U.S. Commission includes the following statement of purpose: “The Commission will encourage families and local communities to assert and assume responsibilities for the growth and well-being of their children." This has a significant aspect: the STATE IS TO PLAY A ROLE IN THE RAISING OF CHILDREN. The State role will, of course, reduce the importance of the family, the local group and the tribal or national unit. Experts will replace the parents as determinators of upbringing: to be done through “child development centers” from the age of 2 onwards. Another basic objective of the U.S. Commission is to "examine existing Federal and private projects that affect children to ensure that they provide current and effective resolution to children’s problems and needs." This objective makes the assumption that "children’s problems and needs” are the function of the State to decide. In child abuse the law and the courts must play a role; however to include all "childrens problems and needs” without limitation is to remove the child as the ward of the family unit to become a ward of the State. In other words, education, environment, and morals will be decided, not by the parents but by the State. Even assuming a bureaucrat can make a more effective decision than a parent, which few would believe, there is a strong philosophical and moral argument concerning the right of the State to intervene at all. The Commission is chaired by Mrs. Andrew Young, wife of Trilateralist ANDREW YOUNG. Other members of the Commission include professional bureaucrats in the field of child education but conspicously absent is representation from the 100 million parents of the United States. In brief:

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 216

“experts" are to replace parents to decide the rights of the child, children's rights will be defined to reflect the philosophical orientation of the Commission, the project is a vital part of internationalization because education will reduce any nationalist-ethnic content.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 225

The forthcoming European Parliament is to be chosen by direct election in July 1979. However, there is heavy behind-the-scenes pressure to promote the interests of GIOVANNI AGNELLI, head of FIAT. The Domenica del Corriere, a Milan newspaper now reports that the first "President of Europe" (i.e., President of the European Parliament) will be GIOVANNI AGNELLI. AGNELLI is a Trilateral intimately connected with Chase Manhattan affairs.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 251

The Rockefeller family is represented directly on all four organizations, and also indirectly, as will be discussed later. DAVID ROCKEFELLER is Chairman of both the Trilateral Commission and the Council on Foreign Relations. The late Nelson Rockefeller was an Honorary Director of The Atlantic Council and created The Commission on Critical Choices for Americans. In addition, Laurence Rockefeller served on The Commission on Critical Choices. In brief, there is direct, at-the-top Rockefeller family participation in all four organizations. Logically these organizations do not reflect American society as a whole, but presumably, those interests represented by the Rockefeller family — whatever those interests might be. This extraordinary influence cannot be denied except by some intellectually dishonest mind "blank." Those researchers and journalists who choose to ignore this unparalleled influence over domestic and foreign policy-making need to reconsider their basic moral position. WITHOUT DOUBT, THE INFLUENCE OF THE ROCKEFELLER FAMILY IN U.S. POLICYMAKING IS NOW AND HAS BEEN FOR MANY DECADES A TOPIC DEMANDING URGENT AND THOROUGH INVESTIGATION. TRILATERAL OBSERVER WILL MAKE A FURTHER INVESTIGATION OF THIS TOPIC IN A LATER ISSUE. Apart from the Rockefeller family, the most notable “quadruple hat” is that of HENRY KISSINGER. Let’s briefly look as some KISSINGER-ROCKEFELLER ties: In 1955, KISSINGER, then an obscure Harvard Professor, was chosen as head of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. Objective? To develop studies to formulate American foreign policy for the 1960’s. An ambitious and far-sighted project, except that T.O. is unable to determine what constitutional or moral sanction gave the Rockefeller family the right to determine U.S. policy. Nelson Rockefeller has described KISSINGER as a “close personal friend and associate for more than eighteen years” (1974). In January 1969, KISSINGER resigned as a personal foreign policy consultant to Nelson Rockefeller and became Assistant to President Nixon for National Security Affairs. Nelson Rockefeller presented KISSINGER with a gift of $50,000 at that time. The gift was made in Rockefeller’s own words as a token of “my affection and appreciation.” The amount paid by Nelson Rockefeller to KISSINGER over the period 1958 to 1968 is a matter of public record. These amounts are not unsubstantial:

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 252

(The last gift was on joining President Nixon') The official report notes that these payments were for work "done for the family rather than on a consulting basis through any governmental agency." In sum, quadruple hat KISSINGER can, without prejudice, be described as a hired intellectual servant of the Rockefeller family. The remaining triple hat is a completely unknown academic, MARINA v. NEUMANN WHITMAN, Professor of Economics at the University of Pittsburgh. How Professor WHITMAN finds herself in such exalted company is beyond the knowledge of T.O. (perhaps some T.O. reader can fill the gap). Apart from virtually unknown WHITMAN, the ROCKEFELLER interests are the ONLY individual interests represented on all four policy-making bodies. We might ask how the impressive investigative powers of The Washington Post and the New York Times managed to miss such an obvious conflict of interest; or, for that matter, we might ask the same question about the Conservative Digest.

Note: