BIG BROTHER

A Piker By Modern Standards

Gary Allen, *a graduate of Stanford University, is author of* Communist Revolution In The Streets; Richard Nixon: The Man Behind The Mask; Nixon's Palace Guard; *and,* None Dare Call It Conspiracy – *a sensational new best-seller with 2 million copies already in print. Mr. Allen, a former instructor of both history and English, is active in anti-Communist and other humanitarian causes. Now a film writer, author, and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to* AMERICAN OPINION. *Gary Allen is also nationally celebrated as a lecturer.*

■ FUTURE gazing has occupied the mind of man from the earliest days. Prophets, Delphic oracles, Arab stargazers, Tibetan lamas, medieval astrologists, wandering gypsies, saints, poets, and charlatans – all have, with varying degrees of success, probed the future.

In the last century our imagination was captured by Jules Verne and, more importantly, Edward Bellamy, whose *Looking Backward* forecast a communal Utopia. In recent years the language of George Orwell's nightmarish *1984* has almost become cliché. What is worse is that Orwell's predictions, like those of the prophet Jeremiah, seem to be coming true.

Great changes that only a few years ago seemed like nonsense from a Buck Rogers scenario have already become reality, giving rise to a whole new field of social alchemy.

According to a survey conducted by sociologist John McHale under a contract with the U.S. National Institute of Mental Health, there are at present nearly 3,000 Americans directly employed in the field of futurist study and research. These include engineers, physicists, political scientists, chemists, psychologists, urban planners, and computer experts. Those indirectly employed in this field run into the tens of thousands. And what many of them have in mind for us would draw gasps from even George Orwell.

Since at least the time of Plato, intellectual elites have dreamed of an all-powerful state governed by philosopher kings . . . by which they naturally meant themselves. As long as wiser heads prevailed, however, such notions seemed innocent enough. When Orwell penned his anti-Utopian masterpiece, *1984,* most such would-be Czars were working quietly behind ivy-covered walls, contenting themselves with the awing of fuzzy-cheeked sophomores. But today the federal government and the vast tax-exempt foundations are providing hundreds of millions of dollars for physical and social scientists working to develop and implement plans and techniques for a collectivist future. These are the self-appointed gods of our increasingly technological society, and they mean to march us into a future of their own making.

One is not surprised to learn that these futurists have already formally organized to facilitate the exchange of ideas and to propagate their faith. Their organization calls itself the World Future Society. According to its monthly magazine, *The Futurist,* the movement took shape in the summer of 1966 in Washington, D.C. Its organizing committee met for the first time on August 3, 1966, on the premises of a federal scientific agency. The World

Future Society has since brought together a wide variety of scientists, academics, government bureaucrats, and assorted nuts and bolts magnetized on futureology. It boasts 6,000 members in some fifty countries around the world.

According to *The Futurist*, most of the founding committee were members of the Rand Corporation, a California-based Think Tank that works almost exclusively for the federal government. The advisory council of the World Future Society includes such worthies as John Dixon of Xerox, Dr. David Goldberg of the U.S. Office of Education, James Kunen of the Eugene and Agnes Meyer Foundation,* and New Left founder Arthur Waskow of the radical Institute of Policy Studies.

The board of trustees of the World Future Society boasts such Establishment luminaries as Daniel Bell, chairman of the Commission On The Year 2000; Roger Blough, former chairman of U.S. Steel; Olaf Helmer of the Rand Corporation; Herman Kahn, founder of the Hudson Institute; Malcolm Moos, president of the University of Minnesota; and, Philbrick Seitz, president of Rockefeller University. Among the directors are Arthur Brach, senior editor of *Changing Times* magazine; Carl Madden, chief economist of the Chamber of Commerce; Glenn T. Seaborg, longtime chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission; and, Orville Freeman, former Secretary of Agriculture and now president of E.D.P. Technology International.

Significantly, Bell, Blough, Kahn, and Seaborg are all members of the Council on Foreign Relations, the subversive inner circle of the American "Establishment." As I have illustrated in many articles in this magazine, the C.F.R. was formed to abolish the United States as an independent sovereign nation and to merge it into a New World Order. *The Futurist* magazine contains many articles by C.F.R. members, mostly promoting the Council's call for that New World Order.†

The Futurist now boasts that President Nixon has "brought futurists onto his White House staff." According to Mr. Nixon: "We can no longer afford to approach the longer-range future haphazardly." Government planning is the keystone of the Socialist State. In a Constitutional Republic, the people make their own plans. But *The Futurist* for August 1970 tells us: "The National Goals Research Staff, created by President Nixon last year, has introduced future-oriented thinking at the highest level of the U.S. Government . . . ."

To direct the National Goals Staff, Mr. Nixon named Leonard Garment, his former law partner and now a Special Consultant at the White House. Mr. Garment, described by friends as "a very liberal Democrat," was aided in his futurist chores by Professor Daniel Moynihan, another "very liberal Democrat." In making his report on National Goals, Professor Moynihan declared in *The Futurist* for August 1970:

> *Given the inter-connections of things, it follows that there is no significant aspect of national life about which there is not likely to be a rather significant national policy. It may be a* hidden *policy.*

Daniel Moynihan made it clear that the government means to bypass democratic procedures to plan every aspect of our lives. Working with Moynihan on this project was Anthony Wiener, chairman of the Research Council of the Hudson

*It was Eugene Meyer, an international banker from the Rothschild orbit, who gained control of the *Washington Post* and turned it into a clarion for socialism and One-World Government.

†You no doubt noted that on President Nixon's recent visit to Red China he emphasized the necessity of America and Communist China working together to build what he actually called a "New World Order." It will be interesting to see if he says something similar on his upcoming trip to the Soviet Union.

Institute – whose futurist founder, Herman Kahn, is referred to even in "Liberal" publications as a "neo-Marxist." Charles Williams Jr., vice president of the radical World Future Society, served on Moynihan's futurist Urban Affairs Research Committee, working out of the White House Executive Offices.

Just how much of the taxpayers' money the federal government is now spending on "futurist planning" and "behavioral research" is impossible to ascertain. Crack columnist Paul Scott calls spending in this field "one of the better kept secrets" in Washington today. "No one in the Executive Branch," reports Scott, "appears to be willing to tell you the amount of federal funds being spent in this questionable research, its purpose, and scope." Congressman Cornelius E. Gallagher (D.-New Jersey) sought information from the General Accounting Office on spending in this field and was told that the task of providing such answers might prove virtually impossible. Their initial check turned up 70,000 such grants and contracts at the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and 10,000 within the Manpower Administration of the Labor Department. According to the G.A.O.'s preliminary survey, thousands of additional "behavioral projects," costing tens of millions of dollars, also are being bankrolled by the Defense Department, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Selling Americans on the need for such projects is another matter. The structured polemics of this operation are as obvious as they are bizarre. The futurist movement maintains that the world is doomed from either an atomic holocaust, the population explosion, or pollution – unless an all-powerful World Government is established with the authority to supersede the sovereignty of this and all other nations.

The most influential of the futurists now playing this game are the members of the semi-secret Club of Rome, an international group of scientists and businessmen which assigned Professor Dennis Meadows of M.I.T. to computerize the world's real (and alleged) problems of population, environment, and consumption of natural resources under a grant from the Volkswagen Foundation. The *London Observer* reports on the conclusions produced by this project:

> *. . . Today's situation of declining natural resources will eventually force a steady reduction of population and a falling "quality of life." But if the drain on the earth's resources is cut – either by saving critical materials or finding more of them – the result may be a runaway pollution crisis which brings population crashing to a fraction of its former level. Yet if pollution is controlled, the computer predicts that a "crowding crisis" will develop which will steady the population growth but drag down the quality of life severely.*

Things are so grave, you see, that only World Government can save us.

The major conclusions of the study, all attributed to the giant computers of the prestigious System Dynamics Laboratory of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, have just been published as a book called *World Dynamics*. Here are some more of them:

> ● *global population growth and industrialization are rapidly approaching the limits of the earth's capacity to support them.*
> ● *we may now be living in a "golden age" when the average quality of life is higher than it ever was in the past or will be in the future.*
> ● *industrialization and capital investment disturb the world's environmental capacity more than pop-*

ulation growth does. Highly industrial societies may be "self-extinguishing," either from resource exhaustion or international strife over pollution and resource rights.

- *programs to control population may be inherently self-defeating. If they work and lead to higher material standards and food supplies for each person, as is hoped, these very improvements may relax the pressure on numbers and trigger another population spurt.*

So, you see, to achieve improvements in the long run, the world must adopt policies that make life much harder in the immediate future. "This is especially treacherous," writes the book's author, Professor Jay W. Forrester. "We are at the point where higher pressures (on growth) in the present are necessary if insurmountable pressures are to be avoided in the future." To achieve this optimum, the rate at which natural resources are used up must be cut by a staggering seventy-five percent, pollution generation must be reduced by fifty percent, capital investment slashed by forty percent, and the birth-rate reduced by thirty percent. Most significant of all, food production must be reduced twenty percent, since hunger has always been the most effective brake on economic and population growth.

This is a hard-line appeal for tyranny – for a massive government takeover – based upon ecological fright peddling at its worst. But few will dispute it because who can refute the wisdom of a giant computer? Of course, those who are familiar with computers know that what a computer feeds back is no better than the "inputs" it is fed. This is known in the industry as G.I.G.O. – garbage in, garbage out. But, to the public, any answer arrived at through the use of computers sounds terribly convincing. And the *London Observer* reports that the Club of Rome is taking no chances that its propaganda will be ignored:

According to Prof. Meadows, in the last two months Club of Rome members armed with the MIT computer's forecast of crisis have made a "tremendous" impact and have reached the highest levels in several countries, including some in the Soviet bloc. "Don't expect any immediate public announcements," he warned, "but you can take it that a lot of rethinking is going on."

The *San Francisco Chronicle* reports the Club of Rome is openly promoting the idea that "society must drastically redistribute its wealth and alter its life styles or face a disastrous collapse." Naturally that idea is not too difficult to sell behind the Iron Curtain, since the Communist and Socialist countries of the world would be the major recipients of the proposed drastic redistribution of wealth. In fact, as everyone knows, such a redistribution is exactly what the Communists have long advocated.

Paul Steiger reveals in the *Los Angeles Times* that, under the Club of Rome plan, incomes would average about $1,800 – "one-half the current U.S. level but triple the world rate today." The *San Francisco Chronicle* of March 4, 1972, notes that Mr. Nixon's Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Elliot Richardson, recently attended a seminar held to discuss the Club report, and "took the contentions by the Club in great earnest." Richardson said any attempt "to shut off the prospect of growth while radically redistributing income" would require government of enormous power and complexity. Obviously the "government of enormous power" required to "drastically redistribute wealth" is a World Government – which is precisely why the international operators of the Club of Rome cranked up the above disaster projections.

And it isn't just "happening." A lot of money and planning has gone into this

slick operation. The Club of Rome was founded by Aurelio Peccei, an international *Insider* who is vice chairman of the board of Olivetti business machines, a member of the board of Fiat, and chairman of the Committee for Atlantic Economic Cooperation. *The Futurist* for August 1971 reports that "Peccei founded the club in 1968 and invited about 50 scientists, humanists, economists, planners, educators, and industrialists of different countries to study the problems of the world future from a global standpoint." Peccei, says the magazine, "urges a union of the Atlantic nations – solidarity with the Soviet bloc – in order to cope with urgent global problems."* As Mr. Peccei explains:

> *The time has therefore come for us to decide, and to demonstrate to the Soviets that we want not to weaken but indeed to strengthen them, and make them our companions and world ally – of course, on certain conditions. These must be reasonable conditions and, again, ought to be dictated by an objective study and consideration of our planet's situation during the next decades.*

The Futurist tells us that, because the planet is in such peril, Peccei wants to build a new "World Order." He stresses that the problems the world faces "cannot be solved by existing nations acting independently. Therefore, we must give first priority to developing the political institutions that the solutions require." Mr. Peccei, says *The Futurist,* is "a strong supporter" of world federal union, another euphemism for World Government.

We could quote virtually every prominent futureologist in the same vein, but space mercifully restrains us. Without any exception that we were able to find, the futurists see no danger to the United States in merging our government and economic system with those of the Soviet Union. In fact the danger, according to the futurists, lies in not doing so. The December 1970 issue of *The Futurist* carries this assessment of Communism:

> *Communism is clearly future-oriented, from the standpoint of doctrine. Communism's primary aim is a permanent world society, constructed along Marxist-Leninist lines . . . .*
>
> *Soviet spokesmen are reticent about the details of the incorporation of the nations into a homogeneous whole. Documents from early Bolshevik and Cominform sources show that three stages were envisioned:*
>
> *1. A world federation, achieved perhaps through the annexation of new republics by the USSR or perhaps through a union of earlier continental federations – a Soviet United States of Europe and a Socialist United States of South and Central America were mentioned.*
>
> *2. A unitary world republic.*
>
> *3. A stateless world.*

Not surprisingly, the Communists are very fuzzy about the amount of time that it takes to go from the world dictatorship of the proletariat in Step Three to the "pure" Communism of Step Four! After all, if you want to pose as an idealist, it is a little embarrassing to talk about the necessity of establishing a dictatorship. Step Four, like *mañana* in old Mexico, never comes.

So the goals of the Communists and the futurists are, to say the least, very similar. More important is the fact that a

*Fiat, on whose board of directors Mr. Peccei serves, is already striving for solidarity with the Soviet bloc by building a huge automobile factory in the Soviet Union. The Nixon Administration is striving for solidarity with the Soviet bloc by building the world's largest truck factory in the U.S.S.R.

coterie of the world's largest international bankers and cartelists is also working toward these same goals.* It would seem ironic that such powerful men of wealth should advocate a vast redistribution of the world's goods if one did not realize that these men are not talking about their own wealth – which they can redistribute any time they take a notion to. Their goal is power over every aspect of life in every nation on earth. They are reaching for the golden ring.

We have already mentioned the Council on Foreign Relations, whose wealthy and powerful members dominate the Nixon Administration as they have dominated those of the previous five Presidents. Dominating the C.F.R. is the Rockefeller family, which also helps sponsor the *Comité International de l'Organisation Scientifique*, whose headquarters is in Geneva. This group amounts to a Society of World Planners – bureaucrats already preparing to administer World Government for the ruling elite. Also involved with the *Comité* is the omnipresent Ford Foundation, the cornucopia of funds for a myriad such Leftist projects.

That a World Government is now being prepared is beyond doubt. And that a requisite to this is total collectivism in the United States is equally obvious. Glenn T. Seaborg, longtime chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and a member of the *Insiders'* Council on Foreign Relations, is quoted by *The Futurist* in a speech which sounds as if it were taken directly from the pages of *Atlas Shrugged*:

> *The laws of the marketplace can no longer be the principal guide of the affairs of man. Many natural limitations and manifestations of human stress are already indicating that we are going to have to take a larger, longer look at human affairs on this planet and try to determine more rationally where we want to go and how we want to get there. Thinking and planning on such a cosmic scale as this implies are naturally frightening to most of us. We have learned well the lesson of human fallibility in planning. Planning has always implied restrictions on individual freedom and the need to forego some immediate gratification to achieve a future gain. Often such a sacrifice did not seem necessary.*
>
> *What may be most significant as both a cause and effect in establishing world peace will be a sublimation of man's territorial instinct* [*i.e.*, private property], *and the aggressiveness that is tied to it, to a new feeling, one of the communality of man in the possession of the entire earth. Men are already in some measure sharing the earth through international travel, communication and exchange of resources. As this sharing is enhanced by a parallel releasing of the age-old bond of fear of scarcity – and adjustments in the economic system we have built to institutionalize that bond – we will begin to see the true meaning of the brotherhood of man materialize. And as this happens the tribal loyalty that Arthur Koestler has seen as the root of much of man's conflict will be broken and shift to a new global loyalty – a loyalty of man to all his fellowmen.*
>
> *I have no doubt that many people envision the concept of such a complex, efficient and organic mankind as a nightmare – an anthill civilization in which individuals are mere automatons or mindless cells in an emotionless body. I do not agree with such thinking....*

*See the author's paperback book, *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*, $1.00, Concord Press, Box 2686, Seal Beach, California 90740.

If that kind of talk from our longtime nuclear boss doesn't scare you blue, it can only be because you are in shock.

Also typical of the futureologists' advocacy of total collectivist rule are the proposals of philosopher-economist Burnham Beckwith (that name even sounds like a character out of *Atlas Shrugged*!), who writes in *The Futurist* for October 1968:

> *Major general social trends include collectivization. The growing substitution of government ownership or control is a product of the industrial revolution . . . ever-growing economic specialization and interdependence, the development of social science (most neo-classical economic theory is applicable only in a socialist economy), a rapid increase in the efficiency of large-scale management in government, and the near universal human desire for economic security and relative equality.*

A related article of faith among futurists is the necessity for a guaranteed annual income for those who can't or won't work. General Electric contracted with Ian Wilson, a member of World Future Society, for a study. Wilson promptly proposed for the United States a program for a guaranteed income which is amazingly like that now being pushed by President Nixon. Another nearly universal prediction of the futurists is a *cashless* society. Communist Yugoslavia is now experimenting extensively with this, and there are minor experiments along these lines being conducted in the United States. The *Cleveland Plain Dealer* of November 1, 1971, featured an article on such an experiment in a suburb of Columbus, Ohio. The *Plain Dealer* reported:

> *The experiment for what may be the cashless and computerized society awaiting us is being conducted in a wealthy suburb of the state capital.*
>
> *Results of the experiment may give economists some idea whether credit cards actually can replace cash and whether the flood of checks into banks and stores can be substantially reduced.*
>
> *The chairman of the City National Bank and Trust Co., John G. McCoy, is conducting the test. IBM and National BankAmericard Inc. are providing the computer hardware and credit card know-how during the six-month trial which began three weeks ago.*

While the *cashless* society may appear to have much to recommend it (particularly if you are in the banking credit-card business), such a scheme would give the government virtually complete control over the economy. Its ability to manipulate and inflate the money supply would be even greater than it is now, and what little is left of any man's financial privacy would disappear.

Big Brother is already watching your bank account lest you try to escape the consequences of his fiscal madness. Consider the following report from the Capitol News Service early in March:

> *The federal government, under a secret order effective Jan. 3, has ordered every check you write photographed and held for the government on microfilm. Additionally, each bank transaction you make for amounts over $5,000 requires the Internal Revenue Service be notified immediately.*
>
> *This information is contained in a memorandum to . . . banking executives which is to be destroyed after banks have implemented the procedures. A copy of the memorandum has come into the hands of Capitol News Service. Internal Revenue Service and individual banks*

have refused comment on the memorandum.

The order is contained in the Bank Secrecy Act which went into effect last November. Under the order, banks were given until Jan. 3 to set up procedures to microfilm all checks processed by them for possible use by the government.

The memorandum further orders procedures to be followed when a bank makes any transaction over $5,000.

According to the memo, a "Currency Transaction Report" form is to be filled out and immediately sent to the Internal Revenue Service computer center. Included are all transactions, deposits, withdrawals from savings accounts, checks, and presumably loans. The form requires such transactions be identified with the Social Security numbers or employer identification numbers of parties involved.

Certain companies and individuals who regularly deal in amounts over $5,000 apparently will escape the scrutiny of the IRS under the regulation. But, somebody who withdraws $5,000 from his savings account to, say, buy a new car, is apparently going to be required to answer some questions for the revenue service.

The memorandum claims authority for the order under titles one and two of Public Law 91-508. And, the Bank Secrecy Act is being quoted in the memorandum as authority to keep the public from knowing of the order.

Although IRS in Los Angeles refused comment on the memorandum, one official offered this off-the-record observation: "We had to find some way of controlling and keeping tabs on gamblers, organized crime and income tax chiselers."

He refused further comment when asked if organized crime wouldn't regularly *deal in amounts over $5,000 and thus be exempt from the order.*

The Big Brother purposes of such a move are all too clear. You and your bank account are being watched. And virtually the whole economy is under attack. Economist Pierre Rinfret, a top Nixon advisor during the 1968 Presidential campaign, is concerned about a complete government takeover. As Dr. Rinfret warns: "This country is going to an absolutely regulated economy." Within ten years, he says bluntly, "50% of our industrial production will be controlled by the government." The key word here, of course, is controlled. Rinfret does not believe that the Administration will opt for outright nationalization of industry. "Washington," he says, "already calls the tune in housing, airlines, railroads and aircraft production." Obviously, *control* is enough. *Dun's Review* for December 1971 comments:

As Rinfret sees it, under the guise of achieving socially useful objectives – for example, pollution control or auto safety – Washington will be making all the basic decisions in such bellwether industries as steel, autos, aluminum, coal and oil. Both the recently enacted Environmental Protection Act and Occupational Health and Safety Act, for example, have already brought the long arm of the federal government into practically every facet of these industries. And this is only the beginning . . . .

Within ten years, Washington will surely be deciding the annual production of our basic industries, as well as their prices, profits and wages. It will also be making the fundamental decisions on such fringe benefits as pensions and

health insurance, and perhaps such basic management prerogatives as plant location and employee lay-offs.

Such total dictatorship is anything but new. Hitler accomplished virtually the same thing in Germany. What is new is the potential for detailed control of the individual. No matter how much the Big Brothers of bygone days might have wanted to watch their subjects at all times, there were basic limitations imposed by transportation and communications problems. But today's technology has made it possible for the government to eliminate all vestiges of privacy. We are rapidly approaching the time when we will have what Orwell described as "a naked society, where every citizen is a denizen in a goldfish bowl."

The technological wonder of our time, the computer, can in the hands of the government deliver a death blow to personal liberty. And the vast Washington bureaus are even now installing giant data-processing computers at the rate of about five hundred a year. Professor Arthur Miller of the University of Michigan Law School points out that today's laser technology already makes it feasible to store a twenty-page dossier about every American now alive on a piece of tape less than a mile long. As Professor Robert Gerstein of U.C.L.A. observes:

This is the first fact of life in the data prison: The past is inescapable. The computer makes our whole past instantly available to anyone who may be interested. We cannot escape the consequences of our mistakes and our weaknesses, no matter how long ago we overcame them. Our capacity to create ourselves anew, to be what we choose to be without regard to what we may have been, will constantly be limited by the persistence of the image preserved in the computer.

The Executive Branch has access to 10,000 computers which are now being programmed for a common language under a Nixon Executive Order. Once this process is completed the data in the computer system of any one federal agency will be accessible to all other agencies. Total information about everything and everybody will be available at virtually any location in the entire system. When the job is complete, personal privacy will be a thing of the past. As Congressman Cornelius Gallagher observes:

At this point dictatorship in America will become an operational possibility. Anybody in power – anybody at practically any point in the network – could gain access to all this private information and abuse the privilege. There are now no effective laws designed to cope with this new technology and prevent facts about your private life – which are stored in various computer data banks – from being used against you by unauthorized people.

In 1966, Congress killed in Committee a plan for a National Data Bank. Yet, as Congressman Gallagher notes, "today we are heading in exactly that direction. All files of information held by the federal establishment could soon be merged into an 'unofficial' National Data Bank." Whether *de facto* or *de jure*, this will amount to a national dossier in the hands of government on every American.

And, says nationally syndicated financial columnist Sylvia Porter: "By 1975, it's possible we'll be at the embryonic *world* data bank stage." After all, if you want a world dictatorship, Super Brother must have a worldwide data bank. And a United Nations committee has already recommended that all of its agencies join with the World Health Organization, the U.N. Development Program (U.N.D.P.), and other internationalist agencies in establishing a vast data processing facility in

Geneva to be known as the International Computing Centre.

Orwell described a system in which a TV set in every home would watch *you*. Somebody is taking him seriously. Maybe we should too. The federal government has already made enormous inroads into our privacy. Senator Edward Long (D.-Missouri) puts it this way:

> *I must report to you that the right of privacy – the right to go into your home without the fear that someone is secretly watching your every move, the right to talk freely with your attorney, your banker, or your wife without the fear of a hidden recorder or transmitter – this right is today being dangerously and recklessly ignored and violated . . . .*
>
> *Our investigations of Big Brother tactics by federal agencies have turned up some really incredible things . . . .*
>
> *For example, the fact that the Post Office was turning over first-class mail to the Internal Revenue Service, which, in turn, opened the letters . . . .*
>
> *The Internal Revenue Service runs a snooping school where the agent's graduation present is a set of lock picks. This school is still in full operation . . . .*
>
> *One year ago the IRS told us they did not have "bugs" in conference rooms where attorneys meet with clients. Then, after my investigation, they admitted they had a few . . . . After we did some more investigating, they admitted that in 22 cities they had bugged conference rooms and, in 10 cities, conference rooms with see-through mirrors that permit agents to spy on taxpayers . . . .*
>
> *We found . . . one private company which had sold nearly $100,000 worth of snooping equipment to 10 federal agencies. Most of these federal agencies had absolutely nothing to do with national defense or national security.*

Already twenty-three federal agencies have access to your tax returns for an official total of 109 reasons.

One remembers that, in Orwell's *1984*, every citizen was assigned a number so that the government could keep track of all his activities. *U.S. News & World Report* has noted that on July 1, 1969, the armed forces of the United States moved to begin assigning numbers to our servicemen that are the same as their Social Security numbers. *U.S. News* explained what is happening as follows:

> *First major agency to fall in line was the Internal Revenue Service, which has already reassigned individual tax numbers that are, in fact, the same as Social Security numbers.*
>
> *And the Federal Government is not the only body to take such action. Some State and local governments, schools and private firms, are using the numbers to help cut back the flood of digits assigned to the average American.*
>
> ***A wider use.*** *Some officials foresee the Social Security number as the all-inclusive identification – on drivers' licenses, bank accounts, employee personnel records, credit cards, and dozens of other numbered documents.*

Secretary Elliot L. Richardson of Health, Education and Welfare has indicated in testimony before a Congressional Subcommittee that the Administration considers the Social Security number to be a universal identifier, and a bill is now before the U.S. Senate to require issuance of a Social Security number to every American child at the time of admittance to the first grade. Apparently even grade-

school records are to be computerized – a matter we shall discuss shortly.

The federal government is also using public concern about crime to propose a national surveillance system under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act that would pale Big Brother. Certainly computers can be an enormous aid in police work, but under a federal police system they could lead to a tyrannical "efficiency" of monstrous proportions. As Professor Robert Gerstein has observed:

> *A perfect system of surveillance would prevent crime before it happened. It would also, however, profoundly change the relationship of the individual to the law.*
>
> *Consider a system of criminal justice based entirely on surveillance. Tracking devices at a central location would monitor not only the position but the brain waves of each person. At the onset of undesirable actions or emotions, electrodes in the brain would respond automatically with painful electrical shocks. This would surely be the ultimate in crime control. It would render us incapable of doing the wrong thing.*
>
> *It is extremely unlikely that we will ever have a government requiring all of us to wear tracking devices. What is far more likely, however, is that we will move gradually and imperceptibly toward a society which will resemble this imagined horror in almost all crucial respects.*

Reporter Jonathan Beaty describes a national surveillance system very much like the one the Professor fears – and reveals that it is now being designed by "neo-Marxist" Herman Kahn at his Hudson Institute.

Even so, many "Liberals" are telling us that we should not fight this onrush of totalitarianism, we should welcome it. One argument for "try it, you'll like it" dictatorship is presented in B.F. Skinner's new book, *Beyond Freedom And Dignity*. Harvard Professor Skinner, according to *Time*, "is the most influential of living psychologists." The "Liberal" *Nation* described Skinner's book, which openly advocates authoritarian dictatorship, as "an outstanding publishing success of the 1971 fall season," and noted that "it was received in most of the mass media as though the reviewers had long been awaiting for someone to provide them with the ammunition that Dr. Skinner so bountifully presented."

Like so many social psychologists, Skinner has a passionate hatred for individualism. As he tells us: "Traditional concepts of individual freedom and dignity have made their contribution to man's past, but they've now served their purpose and should be replaced."

Skinner contends that freedom is bad. "My feeling is that this undue regard for the individual and individual rights and freedom could be a fatal trait," Skinner said in an interview. "It could be something which is going to destroy our culture." Professor Skinner went on to say that liberty can be counterproductive in our society and could destroy us through overpopulation, pollution, depletion of natural resources, and social upheaval. "Freedom isn't necessary to human beings," he says. "After all, up until now, men have spent a large part of their lives doing things they don't want to do."

Professor Skinner is the leader of the behaviorist school of psychology. To the behaviorist, man is not an individual; he is one of the herd, a particle in a mass of humanity who does not know what is good for him, and who needs to be saved from himself by a superior elite using intellectual cattle prods. He is to be observed, analyzed, drugged, shocked, injected, herded, and further abused in a seemingly infinite number of ways. Since Skinner, like the Communists, believes that man is no more to be valued than,

say, a snail, he has no qualms about giving omnipotent power to a government as long as it is theoretically for the "greater good." Under the Skinner system, naturally, there would be communal ownership of all property. No wonder his book has received so many rave reviews in the Establishment media!

Reviewer Smith Hempstone was an exception. Here is his comment on the Skinner book in the *Washington Star*:

> *Indeed, there are a couple of places where Skinner's theories are being given practical application and they are called the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the People's Republic of China. There children are introduced to Communist morality almost from birth and live within its framework all their stunned lives. And anyone who has ever met the charmless, humorless automatons produced by this system wouldn't wish it on Pavlov's dog, not to speak of Skinner's ping-pong-playing pigeons.*

Now, here is the clincher: Professor B.F. Skinner wrote his book advocating the abandonment of the freedoms guaranteed to us in the Constitution under a $283,000 grant of your tax money from the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Of course, Professor Skinner's proposals are not new. In his book, *The Impact Of Science On Society*, the influential British Socialist Bertrand Russell wrote in 1953:

> *Scientific societies are as yet in their infancy. It may be worth while to spend a few moments in speculating as to possible future developments of those that are oligarchies.*
>
> *It is to be expected that advances in physiology and psychology will give governments much more control over individual mentality than they now have even in totalitarian countries. Fichte laid it down that education should aim at destroying free will, so that, after pupils have left school, they shall be incapable, throughout the rest of their lives, of thinking or acting otherwise than as their schoolmasters would have wished.*
>
> *But in his day this was an unattainable ideal: what he regarded as the best system in existence produced Karl Marx. In future such failures are not likely to occur where there is dictatorship. Diet, injections and injunctions will combine, from a very early age, to produce the sort of character and the sort of beliefs that the authorities consider desirable, and any serious criticism of the powers that be will become psychologically impossible. Even if all are miserable, all will believe themselves happy, because the government will tell them that they are so.*

Many of the techniques advocated by Russell, and now promoted by Skinner, are already under development. The *Oakland Tribune* of June 16, 1968, reports:

> *At a recent UNESCO conference in Paris on brain research, Dr. K.E. Moyer of the University of Pittsburgh told a fascinated audience that human aggression may now be controlled by a flick of the electric switch or a variety of pills.*
>
> *According to Dr. Moyer, both man and animals possess circuits in the brain which upon stimulation produce both aggressive and peaceful behavior . . . .*

Dr. Moyer went on to discuss other forms of people control: "He pointed out that centers of aggression might well be sensitized by chemicals in the blood,

especially hormones . . . . that man may soon walk around with his own power-pack, and press a button whenever he feels excessive hostility, or conceivably he might take a pill or two, not tranquilizers, but 'anti-hostility agents.' The control of man's aggressive behavior by physiological manipulation is here now, whether we like it or not. It is not inconceivable that specific anti-hostility agents can be placed in the water supply to make a peaceful population . . . ."

Yale University's Dr. José Delgado maintains: "In the past the mind belonged to the philosopher. Today it belongs to the neuro-physiologist." What is needed now, he says, is to establish which kinds of behavior to modify. Delgado says that some of the behavior-control procedures now possible include:

- Implanting electrodes deep in the brains of mental patients and preventing or provoking certain kinds of behavior by stimulating brain centers with tiny electrical charges.
- Implanting tiny tubes in the brain and releasing into them drugs which change the activity of brain centers and hence behavior.
- Having a direct line of communication from a brain to a computer and back to the brain without having information pass through the sense organs. This is done by implanting electrodes in several brain centers. Electrical discharges from one center go to the computer, which reads them and sends a message to another center, which reacts to stop the discharges from the first center. This procedure makes it possible to control behavior in mental patients by programming the computer to send a counteracting signal every time a brain center responsible for antisocial behavior begins firing. So far the computer-brain tie-up has been tested only on chimpanzees, but the futurists anticipate that it will soon be possible to directly control human behavior without visible wires or electrodes.

Other futurist scientists are working on remaking man before he is born through the alteration and manipulation of genes – calling their "science" *genetic engineering.* The next twenty years may well see the laboratory fertilization of humans, pre-determination of the sex of unborn children, control of aging, development of an artificial placenta, asexual reproduction of human beings (cloning), the production of animal-human hybrids (chimera), and even genetic surgery.

The list of immediately recognizable "advances" in this area is awesome; the possible unknown or unrecognized "breakthroughs" give reason for pause. Recently, Leon R. Kass, a noted biochemist, observed: "We need only consult Aldous Huxley's prophetic novel *Brave New World* to get an indication of where we are likely to be going. In Huxley we encounter a society dedicated to homogeneity and stability, administered by means of instant gratification, and peopled by creatures of human shape but of stunted humanity. They consume, fornicate, take 'soma,' and operate the machinery that makes it all possible. They do not read, write, think, love, or govern themselves. Creativity and curiosity, reason and passion, exist only in rudimentary and mutilated form. In short, they are not men at all."

While the geneticists, biologists, and related scientists are working on such exotic projects as those described above, others are making more mundane efforts. Dr. Peter Breggin of the faculty of the Washington (D.C.) School of Psychiatry has recently written a lengthy and detailed article on the growing use of lobotomies. Dr. Breggin explains:

> *In lobotomy and psychosurgery parts of the brain which show no demonstrable disease are nonetheless mutilated or cut out in order to affect the individual's emotions and personal conduct. In each of the studies presented here, the expressed purpose will be the control*

of some form of behavior – most often aggressive behavior – or the blunting of an emotion, usually "tension" or "anxiety."

Lobotomies, says Dr. Breggin, fell into disfavor several years ago, but are making a strong comeback today:

The first wave of lobotomy and psychosurgery, which claimed 50,000 persons in the United States alone, was primarily aimed at state hospital patients with chronic disabilities. The current wave is aimed at an entirely different group – individuals who are relatively well-functioning, the large majority of them with the diagnosis of "neurosis," many of them individuals who are still living at home and performing on the job . . . .

Again and again we will find this phenomenon – that the psychosurgeon picks out the symptom that he wants to focus upon, then destroys the brain's overall capacity to respond emotionally, in order to "cure the symptom . . . .

The patients include a wide variety of people with depressions, including psychotics and obsessive-compulsive neurotics, and the cases were purposely selected to limit them to individuals with "basically sound personality structure" rather than to hopelessly deteriorated individuals.

Yes, "basically sound personalities," perhaps like yours or mine. The day may well come when Big Brother, "for the greatest good for the greatest number," will decree that all those who are not "right thinkers" shall be subjected to a tranquilizing lobotomy. You and I will then be happy, totally complacent vegetables.

Unfortunately, there are already a myriad psychiatrists prepared to certify that anyone deviating from official "Liberal" Leftthink is mentally unbalanced and a menace to society. Remember the 1964 Presidential campaign when the late *Fact* magazine found a small army of psychiatrists to certify that Barry Goldwater was absolutely mad?

Of course the Establishment *Insiders* and their futurists are well aware that tomorrow's obedient little automaton is created in today's classroom. Again, Lord Russell laid it out in his book, *The Impact Of Science On Society*. Here is the word from the ungood lord:

I think the subject which will be of most importance politically is Mass Psychology. Mass Psychology is, scientifically speaking, not a very advanced study, and so far its professors have not been in universities; they have been advertisers, politicians, and above all, dictators. This study is immensely useful to practical men, whether they wish to become rich or to acquire the government . . . . Its importance has been enormously increased by the growth of modern methods of propaganda . . . . It may be hoped that in time anybody will be able to persuade anybody of anything, if he can catch the patient young and is provided by the State with money and equipment. This subject will make great strides when it is taken up by scientists under a scientific dictatorship . . . .

Various results will soon be arrived at. First, that the influence of home is obstructive. Second, that not much can be done unless indoctrination begins before the age of ten . . . .

Although this science will be diligently studied, it will be rigidly confined to the governing class. The populace will not be allowed to know how its convictions were generated. When the technique has

been perfected, every government that has been in charge of education for a generation will be able to control its subjects securely without the need of armies or policemen. As yet there is only one country which has succeeded in creating this politician's paradise.

Contemporary behavioral scientists have already concocted a "new education" in which learning becomes largely irrelevant, but "relating" is very important. Even elementary schoolrooms are being turned into sociology laboratories, and teachers into "learning clinicians" whose job is to produce "change" in the attitudes of the students.*

Under one technique, such "change" is to be measured through continuous sensitivity sessions. The teacher then fills out a form on how little Johnny views the world and the results are put into a regional computer bank. If little Johnny is not showing the proper "progressive" attitudes, he is simply recycled through the sensitivity classes until his little mind is properly laundered and he has accepted "Libthink." What emerges over the years is a complete psychological profile of Johnny – a profile available to Big Brother for the rest of Johnny's life. This system is already being established statewide in California, and Mr. Nixon's Department of Health, Education and Welfare is encouraging its establishment – first on a regional, and then on a national, basis. It is all part of the basic concept held by the totalitarian Planners that your children do not belong to you, but to the state.

The ultimate target of the People Planners is the individual, but to break the individual you must also break the family. Many of the futurists advocate what they call "progressive monogamy" in which mates are encouraged to play musical beds. The more progressive of their number advocate group marriage. *The Futurist* for April 1970 reported:

As researchers studying multilateral marriage (often called group marriage) we find ourselves in contact with developments at the very edge of marriage and family relations. Multilateral marriage is an essentially egalitarian marriage relationship in which three or more individuals (in any distribution by sex) function as a family unit, sharing in a community of sexual and interpersonal intimacy. We feel that the multilateral marriages we have studied over the past year, and related phenomena with which we have had contact, are definite precursors of a significant new social process . . . .

Swinging and wife swapping, the socially structured mutual exchange of sexual partners, as well as the ubiquitous affair, are merely ineffective derivatives of the inadequacy of a single marital model to satisfy the needs of many individuals. Numerous writers have observed that the rise in interest in communes and intentional communities parallels the decline of and substitutes emotionally for the extended family. In multilateral marriages we find many of the missing elements supplied by free choice and intrinsic to a cohesive structure, in contrast to past "solutions."

What about the children in such a situation? Why, they never had it so good, says *The Futurist*:

To our initial surprise, children seem to respond exceptionally positively to a multilateral marriage by their parents. They thrive on the extra attention and affection, the multiplied security, the more re-

*See my article on "New Education" in *American Opinion* for May 1971.

laxed, less-harried parents. The multiplicity of adult models enables a wider expression of their own selves, avoiding the stereotypification engendered by a single pair of parents. Though a major longitudinal study is clearly called for, at present it appears that the laterally expanded family is a much improved child-rearing environment.

Other important futurists advocate that children be taken away from their parents and raised in a state commune *á la* Red China. As Dr. Urie Bronfenbrenner, a participant in Mr. Nixon's 1970 White House Conference on Children, declared:

Communal forms of upbringing have an unquestionable superiority over all others.

When these contracted families (i.e., *those who have placed their children in the communal institutions of upbringing) recognize that it is not sensible to expend so much work on maintaining an independent household for just two people, the family as an economic unity, having fused with other families and become incorporated into a large economic collective, will dissolve within the context of the future social commune.*

It may be a long way to Tipperary, but it is only a short trip to 1984. The perverters of legitimate science and technology are in the saddle of the academic horse and are charging headlong into a world of communal horror — all supported by millions and millions of your tax dollars. As Aldous Huxley wrote:

Who will mount guard over our guardians, who will engineer the engineers? The answer is a bland denial that they need any supervision . . . . Ph.D.s in sociology will never be corrupted by power. Like Sir Galahad's their strength is as the strength of ten because their heart is pure; and their heart is pure because they are scientists and have taken six thousand hours of social studies.

Right on, Mr. Huxley!

Then who will run the "New World Order"? It will be the same *Insiders* of the Establishment (the *Inner Party* as Orwell called them) who are ruining America today and promoting the creation of a totalitarian World Government. In his brutally frank book, *The Open Conspiracy*, socialist H.G. Wells laid it on the line as follows:

And when we come to the general functioning classes, landowners, industrial organisers, bankers and so forth, who control the present system such as it is, it should be still plainer that it is very largely from the ranks of these classes and from their stores of experience and traditions of method, that the directive forces of the new order *must emerge. The Open Conspiracy can have nothing to do with the heresy that the path of human progress lies through an extensive class war.*

The ruling elite will be the same as it is today. Only, if we don't stop them, we will be their slaves. This is 545-44-8583 signing off. ■ ■

CRACKER BARREL

■ The lady from the East wanted to know why all Westerners were supposed to die with their boots on. "Well," drawled the cowboy, "if we die with our boots on it won't hurt our toes when we kick the bucket."

■ Three things America should do: return to the Gold Standard; make constant use of the Golden Rule; and, stop killing the goose that lays the golden egg.