

News and Current Events :: The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) and The New World Order

The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) and The New World Order - posted by pastorfrin, on: 2008/1/21 18:05

Brothers and Sisters,

May I simply say to those who believe, believe. To those who do not believe, don't.

Having said such, I submit this article for your consideration, realizing there may be some who may refuse to consider what they think impossible, still we should at least look at what some are presenting as evidence.

In His Love

pastorfrin

The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) and The New World Order

- By William Blase

For those who may be confused by the controversies surrounding the "New World Order", a One-World-Government, and American concern over giving the UN more power; those unaware of the issues involved; and those wishing more background, I offer the following.

Originally presented for an Honors Class, "Dilemmas of War and Peace," at New Mexico State University, the paper was ridiculed and characterized by Dr. Yosef Lapid, (an acknowledged and locally quoted "expert" on Terrorism and Middle Eastern affairs) as "paranoid... possibly a symptom of mental illness." You may judge for yourself.

Citing source data is the "scientific method," but does not seem to apply to "Conspiracy Theories." A thousand sources may be quoted, yet will not convince the "skeptics," the "realists." It seems to me the "symptoms of mental illness" are on their side, if they refuse to look at evidence ("There are none so blind as those who WILL not see"); or perhaps something more sinister is at work, such as a knowledge of the truth, that does not want YOU to know.

To be paranoid means to believe in delusions of danger and persecution. If the danger is real, and the evidence credible, then it cannot be delusional. To ignore the evidence, and hope that it CANNOT be true, is more an evidence of mental illness.

The issue involves much more than a difference of philosophy, or political viewpoint. Growing up in the midst of the "Cold War," our generation were taught that those who attempted to abolish our national sovereignty and overthrow our Constitutional government were committing acts of treason. Please judge for yourself if the group discussed is guilty of such.

If one group is effectively in control of national governments and multinational corporations; promotes world government through control of media, foundation grants, and education; and controls and guides the issues of the day; then they control most options available. The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), and the financial powers behind it, have done all these things, and promote the "New World Order", as they have for over seventy years.

The CFR is the promotional arm of the Ruling Elite in the United States of America. Most influential politicians, academics and media personalities are members, and it uses its influence to infiltrate the New World Order into American life. Its "experts" write scholarly pieces to be used in decision making, the academics expound on the wisdom of a united world, and the media members disseminate the message.

To understand how the most influential people in America came to be members of an organization working purposefully for the overthrow of the Constitution and American sovereignty, we have to go back at least to the early 1900's, though the story begins much earlier (depending on your viewpoint and beliefs).

That a ruling power elite does indeed control the U.S. government behind the scenes has been attested to by many Americans in a position to know. Felix Frankfurter, Justice of the Supreme Court (1939-1962), said: "The real rulers in Washington are invisible and exercise power from behind the scenes." In a letter to an associate dated November 21, 1933, President Franklin Roosevelt wrote, "The real truth of the matter is, as you and I know, that a financial element in the large centers has owned the government ever since the days of Andrew Jackson." February 23, 1954,

Senator William Jenner warned in a speech: "Outwardly we have a Constitutional government. We have operating within our government and political system, another body representing another form of government, a bureaucratic elite which believes our Constitution is outmoded."

Baron M.A. Rothschild wrote, "Give me control over a nation's currency and I care not who makes its laws."

All that is needed to effectively control a government is to have control over the nation's money: a central bank with a monopoly over the supply of money and credit. This had been done in Western Europe, with the creation of privately owned central banks such as the Bank of England.

Georgetown professor Dr. Carroll Quigley (Bill Clinton's mentor while at Georgetown) wrote about the goals of the invest

ment bankers who control central banks: "... nothing less than to create a world system of financial control in private hands able to dominate the political system of each country and the economy of the world as a whole... controlled in a feudal fashion by the central banks of the world acting in concert, by secret agreements arrived at in frequent private meetings and conferences."

The Bank of the United States (1816-36), an early attempt at an American central bank, was abolished by President Andrew Jackson, who believed that it threatened the nation. He wrote: "The bold effort the present bank had made to control the government, the distress it had wantonly produced...are but premonitions of the fate that awaits the American people should they be deluded into a perpetuation of this institution or the establishment of another like it."

Thomas Jefferson wrote: "The Central Bank is an institution of the most deadly hostility existing against the principles and form of our Constitution...if the American people allow private banks to control the issuance of their currency, first by inflation and then by deflation, the banks and corporations that will grow up around them will deprive the people of all their property until their children will wake up homeless on the continent their fathers conquered."

Does that not describe the situation in America today?

The U.S. managed to do without a central bank until early in this century, when, according to Congressman Charles Lindbergh, Sr., "The Money Trust caused the 1907 panic, and thereby forced Congress to create a National Monetary Commission." Headed by Senator Nelson Aldrich, father-in-law of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., the Commission recommended creation of a central bank.

Though unconstitutional, as only "The Congress shall have Power...To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof..." (Article I, Section 8, U.S. Constitution) the Federal Reserve Act was passed in December 1913; ostensibly to stabilize the economy and prevent further panics, but as Lindbergh warned Congress: "This act establishes the most gigantic trust on earth...the invisible government by the money power, proven to exist by the Money Trust investigation, will be legalized." The Great Depression and numerous recessions later, it is obvious the Federal Reserve produces inflation and federal debt whenever it desires, but not stability.

Congressman Louis McFadden, House Committee on Banking and Currency Chairman (1920-31), stated: "When the Federal Reserve Act was passed, the people of these United States did not perceive that a world banking system was being set up here. A super-state controlled by international bankers and industrialists...acting together to enslave the world... Every effort has been made by the Fed to conceal its powers but the truth is--the Fed has usurped the government."

Although called "Federal," the Federal Reserve system is privately owned by member banks, makes its own policies, and is not subject to oversight by Congress or the President. As the overseer and supplier of reserves, the Fed gave banks access to public funds, which enhanced their lending capacity.

Peter Kershaw, in "Economic Solutions" lists the ten major shareholders of the Federal Reserve Bank System as: Rothschild: London and Berlin; Lazard Bros: Paris; Israel Seiff: Italy; Kuhn-Loeb Company: Germany; Warburg: Hamburg and Amsterdam; Lehman Bros: New York; Goldman and Sachs: New York; Rockefeller: New York. (That most, if not all of these families just happen to be Jewish, you may judge the significance of yourself). The balance of stock is owned by major commercial member banks.

According to Devvy Kidd, "Why A Bankrupt America?" The Federal Reserve pays the Bureau of Engraving & Printing approximately \$23 for each 1,000 notes printed. 10,000 \$100 notes (one million dollars) would thus cost the Federal Reserve \$230. They then secure a pledge of collateral equal to the face value from the U.S. government. The collateral is our land, labor, and assets... collected by their agents, the IRS. By authorizing the Fed to regulate and create money (and thus inflation), Congress gave private banks power to create profits at will.

As Lindbergh put it: "The new law will create inflation whenever the trusts want inflation...they can unload the stocks on the people at high prices during the excitement and then bring on a panic and buy them back at low prices...the day of reckoning is only a few years removed." That day came in 1929, with the Stock Market crash and Great Depression.

One of the most important powers given to the Fed was the right to buy and sell government securities, and provide loans to member banks so they might also purchase them. This provided another built-in mechanism for profit to the banks, if government debt was increased. All that was needed was a method to pay off the debt. This was accomplished through the passage of the income tax in 1913.

A national income tax was declared unconstitutional in 1895 by the Supreme Court, so a constitutional amendment was proposed in Congress by none other than ...Senator Nelson Aldrich. As presented to the American people it seemed reasonable enough: income tax on only one percent of income under \$20,000, with the assurance that it would never increase.

Since it was graduated, the tax would "soak the rich", ...but the rich had other plans, already devising a method of protecting wealth. As described by Gary Allen in his 1976 book "The Rockefeller File," "By the time the (16th) Amendment had been approved by the states, the Rockefeller Foundation was in full operation...about the same time that Judge Kenesaw Landis was ordering the breakup of the Standard Oil monopoly...John D...not only avoided taxes by creating four great tax-exempt foundations; he used them as repositories for his 'divested' interests...made his assets non-taxable so that they might be passed down through generations without...estate and gift taxes...Each year the Rockefellers can dump up to half their incomes into their pet foundations and deduct the "donations" from their income tax."

Exchanging ownership for control of wealth, foundations are also a handy means for promoting interests that benefit the wealthy. Millions of foundation dollars have been "donated" to causes such as promoting the use of drugs, while degrading preventive medicine. Since many drugs are made from coal tar derivatives, both oil companies and drug manufacturing concerns (many Rockefeller owned or controlled) are the main beneficiaries.

With the means to loan enormous sums to the government (the Federal Reserve), a method to repay the debt (income tax), and an escape from taxation for the wealthy, (foundations), all that remained was an excuse to borrow money. By some happy "coincidence," in 1914 World War I began, and after American participation national debt rose from \$1 billion to \$25 billion.

Woodrow Wilson was elected President in 1913, beating incumbent William Howard Taft, who had vowed to veto legislation establishing a central bank. To divide the Republican vote and elect the relatively unknown Wilson, J.P. Morgan and Co. poured money into the candidacy of Teddy Roosevelt and his Progressive Party.

According to an eyewitness, Wilson was brought to Democratic Party headquarters in 1912 by Bernard Baruch, a wealthy banker. He received an "indoctrination course" from those he met, and in return agreed, if elected: to support the projected Federal Reserve and the income tax, and "listen" to advice in case of war in Europe and on the composition of his cabinet.

Wilson's top advisor during his two terms was a man named Colonel Edward M. House. House's biographer, Charles Seymour, called him the "unseen guardian angel" of the Federal Reserve Act, helping to guide it through Congress. Another biographer wrote that House believed: "...the Constitution, product of eighteenth-century minds...was thoroughly outdated; that the country would be better off if the Constitution could be scrapped and rewritten..." House wrote a book entitled "Philip Dru: Administrator," published anonymously in 1912. The hero, Philip Dru, rules America and introduces radical changes, such as a graduated income tax, a central bank, and a "league of nations."

World War I produced both a large national debt, and huge profits for those who had backed Wilson. Baruch was appointed head of the War Industries Board, where he exercised dictatorial power over the national economy. He and the Rockefellers were reported to have earned over \$200 million during the war. Wilson backer Cleveland Dodge sold munitions to the allies, while J.P. Morgan loaned them hundreds of millions, with the protection of U.S. entry into the war.

While profit was certainly a motive, the war was also useful to justify the notion of world government. William Hoar reveals in "Architects of Conspiracy" that during the 1950s, government investigators examining the records of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, a long-time promoter of globalism, found that several years before the outbreak of World War I, the Carnegie trustees were planning to involve the U.S. in a general war, to set the stage for world government.

The main obstacle was that Americans did not want any involvement in European wars. Some kind of incident, such as the explosion of the battleship Maine, which provoked the Spanish - American war, would have to be provided as provocation. This occurred when the Lusitania, carrying 128 Americans on board, was sunk by a German submarine, and anti-German sentiment was aroused. When war was declared, U.S. propaganda portrayed all Germans as Huns and fanged serpents, and all Americans opposing the war as traitors.

What was not revealed at the time, however, was that the Lusitania was transporting war munitions to England, making it a legitimate target for the Germans. Even so, they had taken out large ads in the New York papers, asking that Americans not take passage on the ship.

The evidence seems to point to a deliberate plan to have the ship sunk by the Germans. Colin Simpson, author of "The Lusitania," wrote that Winston Churchill, head of the British Admiralty during the war, had ordered a report to predict the political impact if a passenger ship carrying Americans was sunk. German naval codes had been broken by the British, who knew approximately where all U-boats near the British Isles were located.

According to Simpson, Commander Joseph Kenworthy, of British Naval Intelligence, stated: "The Lusitania was deliberately sent at considerably reduced speed into an area where a U-boat was known to be waiting...escorts withdrawn." Thus, even though Wilson had been reelected in 1916 with the slogan "He kept us out of war," America soon found itself fighting a European war. Actually, Colonel House had already negotiated a secret agreement with England, committing the U.S. to the conflict. It seems the American public had little say in the matter.

With the end of the war and the Versailles Treaty, which required severe war reparations from Germany, the way was paved for a leader in Germany such as Hitler. Wilson brought to the Paris Peace Conference his famous "fourteen points," with point fourteen being a proposal for a "general association of nations," which was to be the first step towards the goal of One World Government-the League of Nations.

Wilson's official biographer, Ray Stannard Baker, revealed that the League was not Wilson's idea. "...not a single idea--in the Covenant of the League was original with the President." Colonel House was the author of the Covenant, and Wilson had merely rewritten it to conform to his own phraseology.

The League of Nations was established, but it, and the plan for world government eventually failed because the U.S. Senate would not ratify the Versailles Treaty.

Pat Robertson, in "The New World Order," states that Colonel House, along with other internationalists, realized that America would not join any scheme for world government without a change in public opinion.

After a series of meetings, it was decided that an "Institute of International Affairs", with two branches, in the United States and England, would be formed.

The British branch became known as the Royal Institute of International Affairs, with leadership provided by members of the Round Table. Begun in the late 1800's by Cecil Rhodes, the Round Table aimed to federate the English speaking peoples of the world, and bring it under their rule.

The Council on Foreign Relations was incorporated as the American branch in New York on July 29, 1921. Founding members included Colonel House, and "...such potentates of international banking as J.P. Morgan, John D. Rockefeller, Paul Warburg, Otto Kahn, and Jacob Schiff...the same clique which had engineered the establishment of the Federal Reserve System," according to Gary Allen in the October 1972 issue of "AMERICAN OPINION."

The founding president of the CFR was John W. Davis, J.P. Morgan's personal attorney, while the vice-president was Paul Cravath, also representing the Morgan interests. Professor Carroll Quigley characterized the CFR as "...a front group for J.P. Morgan and Company in association with the very small American Round Table Group." Over time Morgan influence was lost to the Rockefellers, who found that one world government fit their philosophy of business well. As John D. Rockefeller, Sr. had said: "Competition is a sin," and global monopoly fit their needs as they grew internationally.

Antony Sutton, a research fellow for the Hoover Institution for War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University, wrote of this philosophy: "While monopoly control of industries was once the objective of J.P. Morgan and J.D. Rockefeller, by the late nineteenth century the inner sanctums of Wall Street understood the most efficient way to gain an unchallenged monopoly was to 'go political' and make society go to work for the monopolists-- under the name of the public good and the public interest."

Frederick C. Howe revealed the strategy of using government in a 1906 book, "Confessions of a Monopolist": "These are the rules of big business...Get a monopoly; let society work for you; and remember that the best of all business is politics..."

As corporations went international, national monopolies could no longer protect their interests. What was needed was a one world system of government controlled from behind the scenes. This had been the plan since the time of Colonel House, and to implement it, it was necessary to weaken the U.S. politically and economically.

During the 1920's, America enjoyed a decade of prosperity, fueled by the easy availability of credit. Between 1923 and 1929 the Federal Reserve expanded the money supply by sixty-two percent. When the stock market crashed, many small investors were ruined, but not "insiders." In March of 1929 Paul Warburg issued a tip the Crash was coming, and the largest investors got out of the market, according to Allen and Abraham in "None Dare Call it Conspiracy."

With their fortunes intact, they were able to buy companies for a fraction of their worth. Shares that had sold for a dollar might now cost a nickel, and the buying power, and wealth, of the rich increased enormously.

Louis McFadden, Chairman of the House Banking Committee declared: "It was not accidental. It was a carefully contrived occurrence...The international bankers sought to bring about a condition of despair here so that they might emerge as rulers of us all."

Curtis Dall, son-in-law of FDR and a syndicate manager for Lehman Brothers, an investment firm, was on the N.Y. Stock Exchange floor the day of the crash. In "FDR: My Exploited Father-In-Law," he states: "...it was the calculated 'shearing' of the public by the World-Money powers triggered by the planned sudden shortage of call money in the New York Market."

The Crash paved the way for the man Wall Street had groomed for the presidency, FDR. Portrayed as a "man of the little people", the reality was that Roosevelt's family had been involved in New York banking since the eighteenth century. Frederic Delano, FDR's uncle, served on the original Federal Reserve Board. FDR attended Groton and Harvard, and in the 1920's worked on Wall Street, sitting on the board of directors of eleven different corporations.

Dall wrote of his father-in-law: "...Most of his thoughts, his political 'ammunition,'...were carefully manufactured for him in advance by the CFR-One World Money group. Brilliantly... he exploded that prepared 'ammunition' in the middle of an unsuspecting target, the American people--and thus paid off and retained his internationalist political support."

Taking America off the gold standard in 1934, FDR opened the way to unrestrained money supply expansion, decades of inflation--and credit revenues for banks. Raising gold prices from \$20 an ounce to \$35, FDR and Treasury Secretary Henry Morgenthau, Jr. (son of a founding CFR member), gave international bankers huge profits.

FDR's most remembered program, the New Deal, could only be financed through heavy borrowing. In effect, those who had caused the Depression loaned America the money to recover from it. Then, through the National Recovery Administration, proposed by Bernard Baruch in 1930, they were put in charge of regulating the economy. FDR appointed Baruch disciple Hugh Johnson to run the NRA, assisted by CFR member Gerard Swope. With broad powers to regulate wages, prices, and working conditions, it was, as Herbert Hoover wrote in his memoirs: "...pure fascism;...merely a remaking of Mussolini's 'corporate state'..." The Supreme Court eventually ruled the NRA unconstitutional.

During the FDR years, the Council on Foreign Relations captured the political life of the U.S. Besides Treasury Secretary Morgenthau, other CFR members included Secretary of State Edward Stettinus, War Secretary Henry Stimson, and Assistant Secretary of State Sumner Welles.

Since 1934 almost every United States Secretary of State has been a CFR member; and ALL Secretaries of War or Def

ence, from Henry L. Stimson through Richard Cheney.

The CIA has been under CFR control almost continuously since its creation, starting with Allen Dulles, founding member of the CFR and brother of Secretary of State under President Eisenhower, John Foster Dulles. Allen Dulles had been at the Paris Peace Conference, joined the CFR in 1926, and later became its president.

John Foster Dulles had been one of Woodrow Wilson's young proteges at the Paris Peace Conference. A founding member of the CFR...he was an in-law of the Rockefellers, Chairman of the Board of the Rockefeller Foundation, and Board Chairman of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

In 1940 FDR defeated internationalist Wendell Willkie, who wrote a book entitled "One World," and later became a CFR member. Congressman Usher Burdick protested at the time on the floor of the House that Willkie was being financed by J.P. Morgan and the New York utility bankers. Polls showed few Republicans favored him, yet the media portrayed him as THE Republican candidate.

Since that time nearly ALL presidential candidates have been CFR members. President Truman, who was not a member, was advised by a group of "wise men," all six of whom were CFR members, according to Gary Allen. In 1952 and 1956, CFR Adlai Stevenson challenged CFR Eisenhower.

In 1960, CFR Kennedy (who was probably killed because he had the courage NOT to go along with all their plans) CFR Nixon. In 1964 the GOP stunned the Establishment by nominating its candidate over Nelson Rockefeller.

Rockefeller and the CFR wing proceeded to picture Barry Goldwater as a dangerous radical. In 1968 CFR Nixon ran against CFR Humphrey. The 1972 "contest" featured CFR Nixon vs. CFR McGovern.

CFR candidates for president include George McGovern, Walter Mondale, Edmund Muskie, John Anderson, and Lloyd Bentsen. In 1976 we had Jimmy Carter, who is a member of the Trilateral Commission, created by David Rockefeller and CFR member Zbigniew Brzezinski with the goal of economic linkage between Japan, Europe, and the United States, and: "...managing the world economy...a smooth and peaceful evolution of the global system." We have also had (though his name strangely disappears from the membership list in 1979) CFR director (1977-79) George Bush, and last but not least, CFR member Bill Clinton.

They have all promoted the "New World Order," controlled by the United Nations. The problem is that "...the present United Nations organization is actually the creation of the CFR and is housed on land in Manhattan donated to it by the family of current CFR chairman David Rockefeller," as Pat Robertson describes it.

The original concept for the UN was the outcome of the Informal Agenda Group, formed in 1943 by Secretary of State Cordell Hull. All except Hull were CFR members, and Isaiah Bowman, a founding member of the CFR, originated the idea.

The American delegation to the San Francisco meeting that drafted the charter of the United Nations in 1949 included CFR members Nelson Rockefeller, John Foster Dulles, John McCloy, and CFR members who were communist agents--Harry Dexter White, Owen Lattimore, and the Secretary-General of the conference, Alger Hiss. In all, the Council sent forty-seven of its members in the United States delegation, effectively controlling the outcome.

Since that time the CFR and its friends in the mass media (largely controlled by CFR members such as Katherine Graham of the "Washington Post" and Henry Luce of "Time, Life"), foundations, and political groups have lobbied consistently to grant the United Nations more authority and power. Bush and the Gulf War were but one of the latest calls for a "New World Order."

Admiral Chester Ward, a member of the CFR for over a decade, became one of its harshest critics, revealing its inner workings in a 1975 book, "Kissinger ON THE COUCH." In it he states "The most powerful cliques in these elitist groups have one objective in common: they want to bring about the surrender of the sovereignty and national independence of the United States."

Most members are one-world-government ideologists whose long-term goals were officially summed up in September 1961 State Department Document 7277, adopted by the Nixon Administration: "...elimination of all armed forces and armaments except those needed to maintain internal order within states and to furnish the United Nations with peace forces... by the time it (UN global government) would be so strong no nation could challenge it."

Within the CFR there exists a "much smaller group but more powerful...made up of Wall Street international bankers and their key agents. Primarily, they want the world banking monopoly from whatever power ends up in control of the global government ...This CFR faction is headed by the Rockefeller brothers," according to Ward.

What must be remembered is that this is not some lunatic-fringe group...these are members of one of the most powerful private organizations in the world: the people who determine and control American economic, social, political, and military policy. Members' influence and control extends to "leaders in academia, public service, business, and the media," according to the CFR 1993 "Annual Report."

Their founding they describe as: "American Participants in the Paris Peace Conference decided that it was time for more private Americans to become familiar with the increasing responsibilities and obligations of the United States...there was a need for an organization able to provide for the continuous study of U.S. foreign policy for the BENEFIT OF ITS MEMBERS (emphasis mine) and a wider audience of interested Americans."

They sponsor hundreds of programs, where members "exchange views with American and foreign officials and policy ex

perts... discuss foreign policy issues...consider international issues of concern to the business community" (Corporate business), and "...affiliated groups of community leaders throughout the United States...meet with decision makers."

The CFR states that it is "host to many views, advocate of none," and it "has no affiliation with the U.S. government." No, no affiliation at all, if you don't count: "A Council member was elected president of the United States...Dozens of other Council colleagues were called to serve in cabinet and sub-cabinet positions," as they describe it in "Foreign Affairs," along with many members of Congress, the Supreme Court, the Joint Chiefs, the Federal Reserve, and many other Federal bureaucrats.

They are not AFFILIATED with government, they ARE the government, in effect.

One re-occurring view was stated in the 50th anniversary issue of "Foreign Affairs," the official publication of the CFR. In an article by Kingman Brewster, Jr. entitled "Reflections on Our National Purpose." Our purpose should be, according to him, to do away with our nationality, to "take some risks in order to invite others to pool their sovereignty with ours..."

These "risks" include disarming to the point where we would be helpless against the "peace-keeping" forces of a global UN government. We should happily surrender our sovereignty to the world government in the interests of the "world community."

Today we have the spectacle of Spc. 4 Michael New, a U.S. soldier in Germany who refuses to wear the uniform of the UN, facing an "administrative discharge." He states rightly that he swore an oath to defend the U.S. Constitution, not the United Nations. Many other Americans have taken that same oath, such as myself, and believe it is our sworn duty still to defend the Constitution, since an oath sworn before God must be fulfilled. (Why else do we swear to tell the truth in our courts, or when taking public office?) Is it a crime these days to actually BELIEVE in God and the oath that was taken? Meanwhile, others who attempt to destroy the Constitution and our sovereignty are given honors and position...At least they are not hypocrites...only supremely arrogant.

"In short, the 'house of world order' will have to be built from the bottom up rather than from the top down...An end run around national sovereignty, eroding it piece by piece, will accomplish much more than the old fashioned assault..." in the opinion of Richard N. Gardner, former deputy assistant Secretary of State in "Foreign Affairs," April 1974.

James Warburg, son of CFR founder Paul Warburg, and a member of FDR's "brain trust," testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 17, 1950, "We shall have world government whether or not you like it--by conquest or consent."

Is this an AMERICAN speaking, or a dangerous lunatic? Who is this "We" who threatens to CONQUER us?

They are a group that actually has the power to do it, and is doing it every day, bit by bit.

CFR Members in the mass media, education, and entertainment push their propaganda of "humanism" and world brotherhood. We should all live in peace under a world government, and forget about such selfish things as nationalities and patriotism. We can solve our own problems. We don't need God, or morals, or values: it's all relative, anyway, right?...Because if we actually had some moral character and values, we might be able to discern that these people are actually EVIL.

The Bible says that the LOVE of money is the root of all evil (1 Tim. 6:10). These people are evil because they love money and power, and greed drives them to do anything to achieve their goals. They have lost all morality and conscience, and believe such concepts, as well as our Constitution, "outdated".

THAT is insanity--to have more wealth than can be spent, and still it is never enough. They have to control governments, start wars, conspire to rule the world; least the "common people" wake up to how they have gained their wealth, take it away from them, and demand that they pay the price for their crimes.

That is why they constantly pit us one against the other, with "Diversity," Affirmative Action, and other programs,...black against white, men against women, rural against urban, ranchers against environmentalists, and on and on...least we look in their direction.

We The People are held to a much higher standard. If we threaten the President or a public official, we are charged with a crime...yet the One-World-Gang can threaten the Constitution and the liberties of We The People, the sovereign rulers of this nation, and nothing is said or done.

Perhaps they do not fear what Man can do to them... they believe they have arranged everything, and their power and wealth will prevail in this world. However, those among them who have sworn an oath before God to uphold and defend the Constitution: the President, members of Congress, and the military; may find one day that they do indeed have something to fear.

List of CFR Members

Colonel House, the fallen angel, still has relatives controlling the CFR. Karen Elliot House is Chairman of the Membership Committee, and a member of the Nominating Committee, along with Jeane Kirkpatrick. David Rockefeller is now "Honorary Chairman of the Board", after serving as Chairman 1970-1985; and "Director Emeritus," after serving as a Director 1949-1985. Peter G. Peterson is Chairman, Admiral B. R. Inman is Vice Chairman, while Thomas Foley and Jeane Kirkpatrick are Directors serving on the Executive Committee.

These "private citizens" have access to government officials and policy makers as often as they wish, yet the results of their meetings can only be given to other government officials, corporate officers, or law partners. Participants are forbidden

en to transmit an attributed statement to any public medium, such as newspapers or TV, where there is "risk that it will promptly be widely circulated or published," as the "Annual Report" puts it.

Should not OUR public officials be forbidden to meet in secret with private groups? Public officials should only be allowed to discuss public business and policy in a public forum. The Public...remember US?

There is much more to say about this group and their plans for America. Gary Allen, in "The Rockefeller File," states that they are behind the many regional government plans, which would abolish city, county, and state lines, leaving us at the mercy of federal bureaucrats; and behind the push for "land use" controls. They want "federal control of everything. Since they intend to control the federal government..."

There are also the many allegations of involvement in gun running, drug smuggling, prostitution and sex slaves; and the many mysterious assassinations and "suicides" of witnesses and others who get too close to the truth...but that is another story.

REFERENCES

• Bo Adelman, 1986. "The Federal Reserve System." The New American, October 17.

• Gary Allen, 1976. The Rockefeller File. Seal Beach, CA: '76 Press.

• Gary Allen with Larry Abraham, 1972. None Dare Call it Conspiracy. Rossmore, CA: Concord Press.

• "Congressional Record," December 22, 1913, Vol. 51.

• Phoebe and Kent Courtney, 1962. America's Unelected Rulers, The Council on Foreign Relations. New Orleans: Conservative Society of America.

• Curtis B. Dall, 1970. FDR My Exploited Father-In-Law. Washington D.C.: Action Associates.

• A. Ralph Epperson, 1985. The Unseen Hand. Tucson, AZ: Publius Press.

• F.D.R.: His Personal Letters, 1950. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce.

• William P. Hoar, 1984. Architects of Conspiracy. Belmont MA: Western Islands.

• Herbert Hoover, 1952. The Memoirs of Herbert Hoover, The Great Depression 1929-1941. New York: Macmillan.

• Frederick C. Howe, 1906. Confessions of a Monopolist. Chicago: Public Publishing Co.

• Robert C. Johansen, 1980. Models of World Order, in "Dilemmas of War and Peace."

• Peter Kershaw, 1994. "Economic Solutions."

• Devvy Kidd, 1995. "Why A Bankrupt America?" Colorado: Project Liberty.

• Ferdinand Lundberg, 1938. America's 60 Families. New York: Vanguard.

• Louis T. McFadden, 1934. "The Federal Reserve Corporation, remarks in Congress." Boston: Forum Publication Co.

• James Perloff, 1988. The Shadows of Power. Appleton, WI: Western Islands.

• Carroll Quigley, 1966. Tragedy and Hope. New York: Macmillan.

• Pat Robertson, 1991. The New World Order. Dallas: Word Publishing.

• Charles Seymour, ed., 1926. The Intimate Paper of Colonel House. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

• Colin Simpson, 1972. The Lusitania. Boston: Little, Brown.

• Arthur D. Howde Smith, 1940. "Mr House ob5 Texas." New York: Funk and Wagnalls.

• Antony C. Sutton, 1975. Wall Street and FDR. New Rochelle, New York: Arlington House.

• George Sylvester Viereck, 1932. The Strangest Friendship in History. New York: Liveright.

This document may be freely distributed or quoted in any medium, provided credit is given to the author and The Courier . Copyright 1995

Re: The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) and The New World Order, on: 2008/1/21 18:25

Well, how this topic came up recently on the net within Christians circles, was because of Rick Warren.

Not having the time to look up the links, just type "Rick Warren CFR" into google, I suppose, if interested in why it got included in the 'merger' thread, for one.

Shalom!

Re: The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) and The New World Order - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2008/1/21 20:17

Hi pastorfrin, how are you?

I did not read the entire article, the spacing makes it all seem to run together?

I did see something here and wondered if you could comment on it. In the article it says

"Because if we actually had some moral character and values, we might be able to discern that these people are actually EVIL.

The Bible says that the LOVE of money is the root of all evil (1 Tim. 6:10). These people are evil because they love money and power, and greed drives them to do anything to achieve their goals."

Now, I was wondering if you think this comment is similar to what Jude wrote about, saying

"Likewise also these *filthy* dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities. Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee. But these speak evil of those things which they know not: but what they know naturally, as brute beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves."

- Jude 1:8-10(KJV)

He says they:

despise dominion

speak evil of dignities

bring railing accusations(is implied)

and speak evil of what they know naturally.

Do you think this applies here?

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Chris

Re: The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) and The New World Order - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/1/21 20:3

Hi pastorfrin...

Quote:

-----May I simply say to those who believe, believe. To those who do not believe, don't.

Is it me, or is this a proper thing to say? Either this article is TRUTH or it is a LIE.

It is my very sincere belief that the vast bulk of information included in this conspiracy theory is nonsense. I would spend hours refuting it (again), but I don't think that this is the purpose of SermonIndex. There are MANY conspiracy theory websites on the internet. Can't we keep this ministry's website focused according to its purpose?

:-)

EDIT:

Please don't take this wrong. I hope that this doesn't come across as arrogant or mean-spirited. I just really don't think that it is wise to engage in any sort of pointless discussion of this conspiracy theory. But don't the guidelines of the website contain statements regarding the discussion of "conspiracy theories?"

Re:, on: 2008/1/22 17:09

Quote:

-----I did not read the entire article, the spacing makes it all seem to run together

I didn't either, because I am just not into this sort of stuff. However, it is interesting, and I am glad that there are minds out here that can handle information like this.

God Bless

Re: - posted by pastorfrin, on: 2008/1/22 17:50

Quote:

ChrisJD wrote:

Hi pastorfrin, how are you?

I did not read the entire article, the spacing makes it all seem to run together?

I did see something here and wondered if you could comment on it. In the article it says

"Because if we actually had some moral character and values, we might be able to discern that these people are actually EVIL.

The Bible says that the LOVE of money is the root of all evil (1 Tim. 6:10). These people are evil because they love money and power, and greed drives them to do anything to achieve their goals."

Now, I was wondering if you think this comment is similar to what Jude wrote about, saying

"Likewise also these *filthy* dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities. Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee. But these speak evil of those things which they know not: but what they know naturally, as brute beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves."

- Jude 1:8-10(KJV)

He says they:

despise dominion

speak evil of dignities

bring railing accusations(is implied)

and speak evil of what they know naturally.

Do you think this applies here?

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Chris

Hi ChrisJD,
I'm fine thank you, and yourself?

The answer to your question is NO!

In His Love
pastorfrin

Re: - posted by pastorfrin, on: 2008/1/22 17:56

Hi Chris,

There was never any request made for a discussion about this article. I very plainly stated what it was for:
"I submit this article for your consideration, realizing there may be some who may refuse to consider what they think impossible, still we should at least look at what some are presenting as evidence."

Consideration: Continuous and careful thought.

Chris said:

Quote:

"Is it me, or is this a proper thing to say? Either this article is TRUTH or it is a LIE."

You see Chris, this is where you do error. You can give your reasons why you may think parts of this article are not true, but that would only be your opinion based on your own biases.

There is no difference in the author of this article saying this is true and you saying it is false, though I would tend to lean toward some of these authors with their years of research than your simple "I interviewed some of these people and had lunch with them...ect."

At any rate you are right, it is pointless to go round and round and accomplish no good and possibly ill feelings, which this is not worth.

Thus, I simply submitted the article for consideration, "careful thought." Which could be a benefit to some, as we see the day approaching.

In His Love

pastorfrin

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2008/1/22 18:02

Hi Pastorfrin and thank you for your response. I'm doing alright.

Pastorfrin, you said you didn't think these comments from the article were similar to what Jude wrote about. Could you tell me why?

Are they not speaking about dignitaries? And accusing them of being evil? Based upon what they know naturally?

Is this a godly thing to do?

Thanks again,

Chris

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2008/1/22 18:51

Hi again all,

Pastorfrin, also I was reading this in your response to Chris

'Thus, I simply submitted the article for consideration, "careful thought."

Pastorfrin, is this a safe way to approach publishing accusations against the leaders of our country before the children of God?

If Michael dared not bring an accusation against Satan, is it safe for us to bring accusations made against earthly princes before God's people in this way? Even repeating them in the public?

According to Strong's, the two words which are translated **railing accusation** in Jude 1:9 are

G988

βλασφημία

blasphem̄mia

blas-fay-me'-ah

From G989; vilification (especially against God): - blasphemy, evil speaking, railing.

and

G2920

κρίσις

krisis

kree'-sis

(Subjectively or objectively, for or against); by extension a tribunal; by implication justice (specifically divine law): - accusation, condemnation, damnation, judgment.

Thank you very much for your time here,

Chris

Re: The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) and The New World Order - posted by MaryJane, on: 2008/1/22 18:52

Greetings brother

I did read the article all the way through, and I found it to be very interesting. Some interesting things to open our eyes to for sure. Thank you very much for sharing it.

God Bless

MJ

Re: - posted by SimpleLiving (), on: 2008/1/22 19:20

If the article is true, it's true. If it's a lie, then it's a lie. Either way, what do you want to do about it? All you can do is pray. If it's true, the Bible says these things are to be expected in the last days. Nothing will stop it. If it's a lie, then nothing will come of it.

It seems wasteful to put time or energy into it, especially if you aren't in prayer about it to begin with. If it's just, "Ooh! Look what's in the news!" then it's not productive and our time is better spent on more meaningful things.

Re: - posted by Tears_of_joy, on: 2008/1/22 20:03

Dear brother Chris, as I was meditating on what you said, I was reminded of the (https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id16110&forum40) Testimony Of Richard Wurmbrand (Interview), and particularly these words:

Reverend Wurmbrand: Just I didn't finish this question. Â...

Our Government doesn't mind old women coming to church, but our childhood, our youth is poisoned with atheism. We are not allowed to counteract, and what bitter fruits will come out of this seed nobody can know.

Now you have asked another question, do we have open churches in Rumania? If somebody comes to Rumania - it is another situation in Russia - if somebody comes to Rumania, he is really impressed.

The Orthodox liturgy is something very beautiful. It is grand. And if you come in Rumania you see thousands of churches open, liturgies, sermons, many people in the church. And I have spoken with Americans who have been there and have told me, "I was very impressed." **And now there is really a certain religious liberty. In Rumania you are allowed to say as much as you like that God is good. You are not allowed to say that the Devil is bad. St. John the Baptist could have saved his life if he had said: "Repent because the kingdom of heaven is near." Nobody would have touched him. He was touched when he said, "You, Herod, are bad."**

If Christ would have delivered a thousand "Sermons on the Mount" they would not have crucified Him. They crucified Him when He said, "You vipers," then He was crucified.

In Rumania you can say God is good but you can't say "communism is cruel, they commit atrocities, it is a crime

e to poison children with atheism." If you do this you go to prison. There are many priests, rabbis, and pastors who compromise and don't put the dot on the "i." There exists the real church and the real religion and that which compromise S.

Brother, do you feel in your spirit that these things in one or another form are coming or already here, in America, Macedonia, Sweden, Europe?

I feel it strongly, and can see them already fulfilling in some of our brothers around the world. And this feeling has been shared by many godly brothers and sisters that I have been talked, beginning from my own church and pastor and continuing with brothers and sisters from all over the world.

I am not interested what this or that organization will do to the sovereignty of this or that nation. I am not interested in politics (I was once before 8-9 years). I don't believe that this our job as Christians.

But my spirit cannot ignore watching the preparation of 'the kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the LORD, and against his anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us.' and (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/%C3%85ke_Green) the preparation of the 'great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be.'

And certainly I don't believe that we should be indifferent of what is going on around us. We must not. We have commandments to be not. 'And when you will see...'

Brother, how your spirit is reacting and feeling on these matters?

Is the testimony of the spirit in my heart and the heart of many brothers and sisters false and superficial, or maybe is it something that the Spirit is trying to move and say to us? Where ever in the world we are.

Your brother,
Kire

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2008/1/22 20:10

Dear brother Kire, thank you for writing to me.

Brother I believe there is a great difference between God speaking through men and **men making accusations on their own.**

My concern, for us here, is what guilt we may bring upon ourselves and others by doing so.

Take a pillow, cut it open.

Scatter the feathers throughout the city that you live in.

Try to collect those feathers one year later.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiss () , on: 2008/1/23 11:14

Hello pastorfrin...

I debated even replying to this thread again. The "Community Rules" for this forum are abundantly clear: Such discussions are not allowed. I will cut and paste the rules along with a link, and include this at the bottom of this post. Please understand that this is not meant as an attack on any person, but a refutation of the underlying notions presented in this post and conspiracy theory.

Quote:
----- You see Chris, this is where you do error. You can give your reasons why you may think parts of this article are not true, but that would only be your opinion based on your own biases.

Do you see the problem with this statement? This is where you THINK that I "do error." It would be very helpful if we could add such a word from time to time. In addition, I could give my reasons as to why I believe that many parts of this article are not true (especially the underlying accusation of this conspiracy theory), and instead of accusing me of basing an opinion upon my "own biases," such reasons could and should be based upon "fact." Let me make this clear: I hold no "bias" in regard to this organization. In fact, I really don't think or care much for this organization at all. However, I do hold a very certain bias for the truth.

I could care less about the accusation that Rick Warren is a member (as has been alleged). Who cares? I can't stand that man's doctrinal views, but that doesn't necessarily make this organization *sinister* or guilty of trying to bring about a one world government for the Antichrist. Leonard Ravenhill might actually have had a membership with the National Geographic Magazine (well, at least he had several copies in his house). Does that make such an organization "holy?!!?" I wouldn't think so. So why are we spreading allegations about this organization based upon the membership or particular claims of single individuals?

Bias? The only reason I ever approached these accusations is that I actually know individuals within the organization, and they have NEVER desired a one world government. As a graduate student, I attended CFR meetings (which were highly educational into what the organization is really all about). I also interviewed some of the more sinister members of this organization. Recently, I actually spoke to two members of the CFR about the accusations made by this conspiracy (both who are very close friends of mine). Both of them were surprisingly aware of the various conspiracy theories. You know what they said? They said that these notions are simply the "notions of some ignorant gossips" that are "searching under every pencil sharpener to find evidence of a menacing conspiracy." One of these men told me that no matter how many statements are made to refute those allegations, there will always be people around who "willingly believe a lie." Ouch! This didn't come from a "believer." This came from a college professor who is a member of the organizational think tank. Pastorfrin, the underlying accusation that this article is trying to extend is either truth or it is a lie. The article does not make such a distinction. It is presented as truth.

Quote:
----- There is no difference in the author of this article saying this is true and you saying it is false, though I would tend to lean toward so me of these authors with their years of research than your simple "I interviewed some of these people and had lunch with them...ect."

Do you honestly think that is what I was doing? Did you truly read any of my posts, or do you really believe such a remark? In the last thread about the CFR, I did my best to question whether there is any credible basis upon which to base this CONSPIRACY THEORY (for this is exactly what it is). This theory alleges that the CFR is a sinister organization trying to secretly exert control upon the world and subjugate the United States to a one world government. It also alleges that the CFR is "effectively in control of national governments and multinational corporations." This is evidenced in the article as:

Quote:
----- If one group is effectively in control of national governments and multinational corporations; promotes world government through control of media, foundation grants, and education; and controls and guides the issues of the day; then they control most options available. The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), and the financial powers behind it, have done all these things, and promote the "New World Order", as they have for over seventy years.

Evidence? What evidence? No one has presented any plausible evidence that states such a notion! While I believe that a one world government (or something that resembles such a thing) is likely to come about eventually, it is disingenuous to point the finger of conspiracy at a loose organization like this. The CFR is simply a "think tank" whose only goal (according to its website, its mission statement, individuals involved, etc...) is to gather various opinions about international relations (particularly how such policy deals with the United States) and present these various, independent ideas i

in a forum and peer-reviewed journal. No one member controls the organization. Yet the conspiracy theories abound!

The CFR consists of liberals, conservatives, and independents. There are Democrats, Republicans, Greens, and independents. It consists of politicians, business leaders and famous people. There are bound to be a few weirdoes who are a part of this organizational "think tank." I've thought about how such conspiracies are alleged because of the opinions or thoughts of a single member (or even a small group of members). It would be like judging SermonIndex because of a few weird ideas expressed in the forums. But no one would argue that SI is sinister, because we fully understand the purpose of this ministry. Why do we neglect to consider the (<http://www.cfr.org/about/mission.html>) Mission Statement of the Council on Foreign Relations? This statement reflects what they are in their meetings – a group of individuals from various backgrounds and with diverse opinions who meet to discuss the state of world affairs and debate possible solutions. In other words, they are what they say they are (and not what the conspiracy theorists allege). They are simply a "think tank."

Quote:
----- At any rate you are right, it is pointless to go round and round and accomplish no good and possibly ill feelings, which this is not worth.

Then why did you post the article? Don't you see how the opinions of the individual who wrote this article (who failed to cite sources, other than a general bibliography of works that he may or may not have referenced within this article) was interlaced with supposed fact? Could this somehow be interpreted as another person spreading this conspiracy theory? If you really want to research this organization – they why have you not communicated with anyone from the organization itself? Why do people rely primarily on articles that have already concluded an opinion about a conspiracy theory? Why was there no disclaimer (except to keep on believing the way you believe) if the article was simply meant for discussion rather than influence?

Quote:
----- Thus, I simply submitted the article for consideration, "careful thought." Which could be a benefit to some, as we see the day approaching.

Is that what you have done? Or have you actually helped to spread a rumor and conspiracy theory on a website that discourages this? I'm certainly not going to accuse you or question your own motives, but do you see how this could be interpreted by others who just happen upon this thread? What does this say about these forums or the focus of this ministry? Yes, the day of Christ is approaching. Why should we fear? If we know and walk with the Lord, then what is there to fear? We can look with excitement for our approaching King! We can even point to signs of the end (including the possibility of a one world government – or confederation of governments). But should we spread rumors about organizations? Is that what the Lord told us to do when he said that we should "watch?" All that I am saying is that if we are going to spread a rumor or conspiracy theory, let us at least make certain that our facts are straight. In this instance, what evidence has ever been presented that would lead us to believe that this organization is at work to create a one world government for the Antichrist (or "in control of governments and multinational corporations")? What if, by concentrating on a single organization or two, we are actually diverting attention from what we should be looking at? What if we are polluting the pure focus of this website by introducing the fogs of rumor?

Conspiracy and Conspiracy Theory*

We believe there is certainly a conspiracy afoot, that which is present since the fall of mankind in their enmity with God. What other websites or ministries may have of a variety of present theory as it relates to what the governments of the world are doing is too much in dispute to be presented here. The New World Order and One Government system is understood in a variety of fashion. What we will not allow is unscrupulous and un-scriptural notions and ideals to foster fear and paranoia to the saints. Our trust and yours should be placed firmly in God, not in the conspiracy of the world, the flesh or the devil. We will monitor these things in our best discretion but do not bring in ministries or other agendas devoted to these mandates.

*Taken from the "SermonIndex Forum Disclaimer / Community Rules"

: -)

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2008/1/23 11:21

Quote:
-----I debated even replying to this thread again. The "Community Rules" for this forum are abundantly clear: Such discussions are not allowed. I will cut and paste the rules along with a link, and include this at the bottom of this post.

Thank you brother Chris,

I think there is some true in these things but to protect people from useless aimless imaging of what is possible and happening is not worthwhile. It is much better to rest and put our minds on what is true and absolute ie the Scriptures.

We all agree this whole world is under the sway of the wicked one! So why try to figure out how it is, lets just believe it is.

I am **locking** this thread.