

Global Watch Weekly Report

A Weekly Global Watch Media Publication (www.globalwatchweekly.com)

July 3rd, 2015

MORE THAN A CLICHÉ



Global Watch Weekly Report



“The Number one weekly report which provides concrete evidence of a New World Order & One World Government agenda”

www.globalwatchweekly.com

This is a FREE report. Please pass this on to others who you may feel would benefit from this information. Web site owners please feel free to give this away to your site visitors or email lists

Not yet on our mailing list? Then visit the web site link below and sign up to ensure you don't miss out on these free weekly reports

www.globalwatchweekly.com

Global Watch Weekly Report

Welcome to the Global Watch Weekly Report

Dear Global Watch Weekly Member

The Cambridge Dictionary defines the term “new world order” as

“A political situation in which the countries of the world are no longer divided because of their support for either the US or the Soviet Union and instead work together to solve international problems”

Yet bible prophecy ministries, Islamic eschatology and other truth movement organizations define the new world order as the *establishment of a one world government under the control of an Antichrist*, something akin to what George Orwell spoke about in his novel, *1984*.

Despite this rather significant difference between the two perspectives, whenever the term “new world order” is referenced within the political arena it immediately attracts publicity across various truth movements and religious circles.

Furthermore, the new term “new world order” is becoming ever more mainstream, as Hollywood seeks to desensitize the term and strip it off its potency. It has more and more become much of a cliché.

In today’s Global Watch Weekly we examine the very meaning and history behind the most prolifically used term within the conspiracy sector. What is the real geopolitical significance of the new world order and is it more than just a reference to building a new world without the threats of communism or Islamic extremism.

To help us understand we examine an interview which took place with James Corbett, a well respected alternative media investigative journalist.

Enjoy.

Rema Marketing Team

MORE THAN A CLICHÉ

Julian Charles (JuC): Hello, this is Julian Charles of TheMindRenewed.com. Today is the 7th of February 2013, and welcome to the second in a series of interviews: "Does Anyone Really Believe In World Government?" Today, I'm fortunate to be speaking to James Corbett, who joins us from Japan. James Corbett is an alternative media investigative journalist, So James, thank you very much for coming on.

James Corbett (JaC): Well, thank you for the opportunity, Julian. Let me say on-air what I just said to you off-air, that I've been listening to your podcasts for the last few weeks, such as your conversation with Dr. Stanley Monteith (the first part of this series) with which I was quite impressed with that conversation. So, thank you again for inviting me on.

JuC: Yes, it's great stuff. What inspired you to get into this work in the first place? (You're a teacher by profession, I understand.)

JaC: It was about the time of the fifth anniversary of 9/11, and there was a large conference in the US televised on C-SPAN which generated a lot of interest. I believe Charlie Sheen was first going public with his doubts about 9/11 at that time, and that was generating a lot of publicity in the United States.



As a knock-on effect of that, I think, many people were motivated to upload videos to YouTube about 9/11 Truth, so I saw many of those. I believe that was my entrée into this world of research into what has been widely criticized as 'conspiracy theorising'. But, once I started to look into this information for myself and discovered that a lot of it is verifiable, that's when I really went down the rabbit hole, as we say. I started the website not long thereafter.

JuC: As you said, my last interview was with Dr. Stanley Monteith of *Radio Liberty*, and we talked about the various secret societies in the push towards

this New World Order. Now, by that he means the establishment of a One-World Government run by a controlling oligarchy. Naturally, we talked about the usual suspects: the Council on Foreign Relations, the Trilateral Commission and the Bilderberg Group.

Now, from a conventional, historiographical point of view, the term 'New World Order' tends to be seen as just something that's said by statesmen at dramatic moments in world history – like World War I, World War II, or the Fall of Communism – as a way of expressing the hope that there will now be a new era of close co-operation between sovereign nation states.




And that's all it means; it's not a World Government or anything like that. So my question is: How do you understand the term 'New World Order', in the way that you use it in your book, *Reportage: Essays on the New World Order*? How do you mean it as you use it there?

JaC: My forthcoming book, I should stress to the audience. You have broadly outlined the two main definitions for this term. I don't think they're mutually exclusive; that we have to pick one or the other. I think they're both operative. I think it's both a term used in moments of great political upheaval by the political class, and also something that's used as a vision for a type of One-World Government system. (That makes it sound like there's more to it than there really is.) I mean, I think we can see it as just the age-old quest for empire, which has dominated political dynasties since the rise of civilization. I think we've seen it going back thousands of years, looking at the Caesars etc., so I think it's just part of that same old idea that has gripped would-be rulers of all sorts.

But as I say, I think the term 'New World Order' encompasses both meanings. You mentioned that it's a phrase often used by the political class. It was, for example, made popular once again in the modern political era by George H. W. Bush in the early 1990s.

MORE THAN A CLICHÉ

There's a famous media clip of him saying that in a speech talking about the Gulf War and the rise of a New World Order in which nations will be part of a world system of law and order, etc. But, the term itself stretches back much further than that. For some of the more interesting uses, you might look at someone



like H.G. Wells, who of course is popularly known as a science fiction writer from the early 19th Century. But actually, he was quite politically involved, and wrote a lot of non-fiction, including a book called *The New World Order*, which talks about his vision for a future technocratic Utopia. That's where there's a tie into some of

the more nefarious uses of the term: this other type of vision of a One-World Government order. It takes on different hues and inflections depending on who is using it and in what context.

As Dr. Stanley Monteith outlined last time, I think there are people who dream or quest for a New World Order as a type of oligarchical World Government ruled by a small elite. Whether or not everyone who employs this term is aware of its full context, or is simply echoing a political catch phrase, is debatable.

So, I think we should consider it on a case-by-case basis. But I think people like George H. W. Bush, Henry Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski and others are quite well aware of its use within certain circles (such as those organizations outlined by Dr. Stanley Monteith last time), and understand its full context.

JuC: I have that quote by George H.W. Bush here:

"Out of these troubled times our fifth objective, a New World Order, can emerge, a new era freer from the threat of terror, stronger in the pursuit of justice, and more secure in the quest for peace, an era in which the nations of the world, East and West, North and South, can prosper and live in harmony."

It sounds really fluffy: world peace, harmony, and all that sort of thing. And then I found Webster Tarpley's view of that. I've got to quote Webster Tarpley, because I love his style.

He says:

"... the breathtaking collapse of the Soviets opened up megalomaniac vistas to the custodians of the Imperial idea in London drawing rooms and English country houses. The practitioners of the Great Game of geopolitics were now

enticed by the perspective of the Single Empire, a worldwide Imperium that would be a purely Anglo-Saxon show, with the Russians and Chinese forced to knuckle under. Like the contemporaries of the Duke of Wellington in 1815, the imbecilic Anglo-American think-tankers and financiers contemplated the chimera of a new century of world domination..."

That's how Webster Tarpley sees Bush using that term in 1990. Do you agree with that analysis?

JaC: I think it certainly has to be taken within that context of the fall of the Soviet Empire and the beginning of this new stage of concerted political action to bring about the Gulf War, and the united action that was taking place on that front at that time.

There certainly was the sense that this was a new era in international politics, one that was free of the old Cold-War encumbrances, which could embrace this new idea of nations acting together in fulfillment of the ideas of the United Nations etc.

On the back of such lofty aspirations, I think it was quite easy to float a phrase like 'New World Order' and for it to seem like a benign entity. But I think that comes from an ignorance of the phrase and its use by various political actors in different political eras, which I think does have that implication or connotation that this is a quest towards World Government of some sort. Whether it's actually called that, or whether it's called a system of law for nations to follow, or whatever fluffy rhetoric is used, I think it ultimately amounts to that.

JuC: Yes, of course that brings up the question: Whose law? I mean a system of law sounds fine, but it depends on who is actually writing the laws.

JaC: And how they're being enforced.

JuC: Indeed. I'd like to ask you about some of the less well-know groups that you mention in your recent article, "*Rings Within Rings : How Secret Societies Direct World Politics*". Here you mention less well-known groups like The Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House), the Canadian Council of Chief Executives, and Common Purpose UK. Could you tell us something about these, and how they fit into the picture?

MORE THAN A CLICHÉ

JaC: This is for a series of reports that I'm doing right now for *BoilingFrogsPost.com*, the website of FBI-whistleblower Sibel Edmonds. The purpose of the series is to shine light on some of the other organizations of influence (or elements within them) that are working in concert with the more well-known groups like the CFR, the Trilateral Commission and Bilderberg.

I think it's important to understand that there are many such organizations. Certainly not all of them are secret societies in the way most people would understand that term: shadowy men meeting in back rooms and chanting séances. A lot of these organizations are quite public, and function above board to a large extent. It's really a question, I think, of how we can relate these organizations to a bigger picture of political control and influence in the modern era.

I don't think it's as simple as saying this or that group necessarily controls world affairs. Rather, there are certain actors within these various groups who work in concert, based on a shared ideology, towards goals which are more-or-less held in common, even if sometimes there may be disputes about how best to implement those ideas. I want to complicate somewhat the simplified notions that are sometimes in the alternative media that there are one, two or three groups that we should focus all our attention on. To the contrary. I think there are many different groups, and I'm just trying to shine a light on some of them.

I think one of the particularly important ones is The Royal Institute of International Affairs, aka Chatham House, which I think is one of the organizations at the root of a lot of other organizations around the world. The Royal Institute of International Affairs has a lot of branch organizations in different countries, including the Council on Foreign Relations, which is a kind of sister organization to the RIIA. Also in various Commonwealth countries: there's an Australian Institute of International Affairs; there's one in Pakistan; and there's a Canadian Institute of International Affairs that morphed into the Canadian International Council, but it's the same organization. This is an interesting organization because it comes directly from a group that was founded by Cecil Rhodes and some of his adherents back in the late 19th/early 20th Century. I've picked this up from G. Edward Griffin, someone I hope your audience is familiar with. He gave a lecture called "*The Quigley*

Formula", talking about Carroll Quigley, who Dr. Stan mentioned in your conversation with him. Griffin identified a structure called *The Ring Within Rings*, which is the idea that these secret societies are not necessarily groups of shadowy men meeting in back rooms, but rather large organizations, sometimes (as in the case of the Council on Foreign Relations) having thousands of members that are publicly known and recorded; but within these organizations there are layers of closeness to the centre of the organization. So, there are outer rings populated by thousands of people, rings further in with perhaps a few hundred people, and yet further in there might be a group of far fewer people. The idea is that each time one progresses further in towards the centre of this organization, one is told, or has the impression, that one is becoming part of the elite: "Oh, now you're the elite; you're in the inner sanctum of the Council on Foreign Relations" (or whatever group it might be). But that might just be a psychological ploy used to make people believe they've entered the inner sanctum, when there is yet another inner sanctum to enter.



The basis of all this was the organization founded by Cecil Rhodes, which was the direct impetus behind the creation of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, which branched out into these different organizations across the world. And Cecil Rhodes, quite explicitly in his writings and in his life, was seeking to revitalize the British Empire, and to create a One-World Government system.

His adherents may have slightly altered that formula, but they have kept the main goal of a World Government, a World System, as part of their aim. Once one starts to look at this incredibly complex – yet easily understandable – pattern, one sees that it's more a reflection of how power functions in society than some sort of grandiose and nebulous conspiracy theory. What we see are identifiable actors at the heart of these organizations, who are united by a shared ideology. I think it's the ideology that's really key to this, rather than this or that particular group or institution.

JuC: The very structure you've been talking about, with inner circle and outer circles, actually goes back to Cecil Rhodes' organization, doesn't it?

MORE THAN A CLICHÉ


He had the *Association of the Helpers* (the outside ring), and the *Society of the Elect* (Rhodes himself and his group of three cronies.) So, that structure was there right from the beginning, wasn't it?

JaC: It certainly was. In fact, as Griffin points out, Rhodes consciously identified the idea for that structure as coming from the Jesuit Order, and also from the *Order of the Illuminati*, the Bavarian Illuminati that was created by Adam Weishaupt in 1776 (which was itself quite influenced by the Jesuit Order). Rhodes developed this structure, and then it was taken over by his followers in the decades after his death and that I think really is the basis of where this comes from, at least the organizational idea.

JuC: It reminds me of Freemasonry, particularly the idea of different degrees, where people on the lower degrees – perhaps up to the third and fourth degrees – really don't have much idea what's going on in the higher degrees. It's that same kind of thinking.

The Freemasonic Brotherhood/Intelligence Agencies Compartmentalised Power Structure

The Freemasonic secret-society network is intrinsically interwoven into all levels of society's structure — banking, business, police, military, politics, legal system, education, mass media, religion, medical and pharmaceutical industry, illegal drug running and distribution, organised crime and last but not least, the major "think tanks" and manipulators of the masses — the intelligence agencies



JaC: I think so. I think it's a system of social control, which was identified quite a long time ago, and which has thus been implemented time and again in different social institutions. It's always the idea that one is progressing and becoming increasingly elite. I think it's quite easy to take that type of structure and simply assert, "Yes, this is the top of the structure, and you are now the innermost of the innermost", when there may be an even further inner sanctum that the particular adherent doesn't know about. I

think it's quite a powerful system of control; it plays on fundamental human psychology by exploiting people's need to feel superior. That aspect of social control was figured out quite a long time ago, and is simply being implemented in these different organizations.

JuC: You mention in one of your articles that organizations like this are 'hidden in plain sight'. I associate that term with occult architecture, in which buildings and statues depict occult symbols, but people become so familiar with seeing these things that they simply don't notice them. You say this with respect to these groups. What do you mean by their being hidden in plain sight?



JaC: When you look at organizations like *Chatham House*, the *Canadian Council of Chief Executives*, or some of the more well-know ones like the CFR, these organizations to a large extent publish their proceedings, and they have their own publications.

The *Council on Foreign Relations (CFR)* publishes *Foreign Affairs*, *The Royal Institute of International Affairs* has its own publication, and they openly publish policy papers which they hope will be implemented by the governments of their respective countries (and often are). For example, take Hillary Clinton. When she became US Secretary of State, she gave an address to the *CFR*, saying it's handy to have the *CFR's* offices so close to her office in Washington, so that she doesn't have far to go to get her orders.

Perhaps she meant it as a joke, but I think there might be more truth to that than she meant to reveal. I think that's really the way that I envision these organizations having the most blatant and direct effect. All of these papers and publications are openly available on their website. So are the membership lists and the list of organizations (usually large Fortune 500 corporations that publicly support and donate to these organizations).

And yet, with all of this being publicly available, there arises a kind of doublethink in the population. If you point to these organizations and say, "Look at the nefarious influence these are having on governments and society", people will say, "Well, it's an open organization. You can go and read about it on their

MORE THAN A CLICHÉ

Website.

There's nothing insidious about it. So, I think it's a system whereby people are discouraged from looking, because it's public. Another interesting aspect of this is that the idea of the "secret society" has the allure of secrecy and mystery about it, whereas an organization that acts in the public light and makes its documents publicly available is uninteresting. So, there are many ways in which this can be played on, one of which I think is an organization like Wikileaks.

If you simply published a lot of Washington's diplomatic cables, it would be recognised as government propaganda, but if you "leak" cables in such a way as to make them seem like secret information, then suddenly it all becomes more interesting. I think we've seen that political tactic for decades: information is selectively "leaked" to the press, and it becomes newsworthy simply because it has been "leaked". And I think we can see that idea working with these organizations. In order to make them seem bland and uninteresting, all they have to do is openly acknowledge their group and what it's doing, publish their papers, and suddenly most people will simply not be interested in reading them; it just seems like work at that point.

JuC: It's interesting that Dr. Stan was saying that something of the opposite is true with Bilderberg. The fact that Bilderberg is kept secret tends to draw a lot of attention to it; but he thinks that most of the game is not being played there, but rather with the Trilateral Commission.

JaC: I understood his argument, and I'm not going to argue against it per se, [but] I think Bilderberg is a case in point in this. At the time when it was a hidden organization, 99.9% of the population had never heard of it; it was truly an unknown. I think it was a meeting at which significant people were certainly working behind the scenes to manipulate public opinion, as has been openly admitted, on-the-record, by Etienne Davignon, for example, admitting that the idea for the Eurozone currency was first hammered out at Bilderberg etc. We have this now from leaked Bilderberg documents from 1955, which date back to the second year of the Bilderberg Meeting, in which they started talking about the European Union etc. A lot of those early Bilderberg attendees became the people who actually worked to forge the European Union. We can trace a lot of this quite openly. But I do

suspect, now that Bilderberg is gaining so much coverage, it is probably not as important (as an organization) in driving the world agenda as it was in years past. I think, as it becomes more well-known, it is becoming less effective, [although] it still maintains something of its former stature.

I think the real key to an organization like *Bilderberg* – (and I refer again to the Rings Within Rings idea) – is the *Bilderberg Steering Committee*, which is composed of just a few dozen of people, as opposed to the hundred and twenty or so who are invited on an annual basis. I think it's really this key group, whose membership doesn't change from year to year, that wields much of the power within an organization like this. So, I think it still wields some power, but to an extent it might be more of a talking shop.

Whereas groups like the *Trilateral Commission* and the *CFR* might be the organizations through which the same characters (who might be, say, on the *Bilderberg Steering Committee* and members of the *CFR* and the *Trilateral Commission*, and many of these other organizations) can actually influence and make that influence concrete in political terms. For example, [members of the *Bilderberg Steering Committee*] might put out policy papers, which then get implemented by people who are *Trilateral Commission* members or *Council on Foreign Relation* members. It's a nexus of individuals who are members of many different organizations. I think we should focus more on the individuals involved, how they are united and how they work together in different organizations, than on the organizations per se.

JuC: Let me return to the matter of being 'hidden in plain sight', and what you say about places like *Chatham House*, that all their information is openly available to the public, so they say. Is that really quite right? I ask that because they do operate according to something called the *Chatham House Rule*, which I believe you say is also operative at Bilderberg. How does that work?

JaC: The *Chatham House Rule* is an idea that was defined by *Chatham House*, which takes its name from the house where it's headquartered in London. The Rule states something to the effect that the contents of a meeting can be described in a general way, but the actual participants of the meeting and who said what, should not be disclosed.

MORE THAN A CLICHÉ

The idea, of course, is that this fosters a freer type of dialogue than would be possible in an open meeting, because certain attendees might not want to be publicly associated with certain ideas. That's the cover that's given to it, and that applies to many of the meetings of *Chatham House* (naturally), *Bilderberg*, and even groups like *Common Purpose*. (*Common Purpose* is an interesting charitable organization. It started off in the UK, but expanded to become *Common Purpose International*. It provides Leadership Training Seminars for people from many different walks of life. Certainly its founder has some interesting connections to other organizations, such as the think-tank Demos, which is another organization I suggest people look into.) Anyway, *Common Purpose* follows the *Chatham House Rule* in many of its meetings.


So, the question is: Why don't certain individuals want to be associated with various statements? If the Rule were applied selectively, I could understand that; we can all relate to that in our own lives. We might want to discuss certain things among our friends, but not want a wider public to overhear that conversation. So, in a way, it's playing upon what people understand. But what we must keep in mind is that a lot of the attendees at these types of meetings are political figures, who are at least theoretically responsible to their electorates, and depending on what country this is taking place in, there are usually laws and rules governing what can actually be discussed in private by public officials and public figures. So there are many implications to the Rule; even its legality may be questionable in certain cases, I think.

JaC: You mentioned earlier that the ideology which unites many of these groups is collectivism. I believe this issue was stressed in your interview with G. Edward Griffin. Can you explain how this collectivist ideology works? It has this power to unite, or rather transcend, what people normally think of as the Left and Right in politics. So, how does that work within the New World Order?

JaC: Well, collectivism, quite broadly defined, is a political philosophy that states that individual rights and freedoms should be (at least to an extent) subsumed to that of the group, or the collective. I think the ethical justification put forward for this comes from the philosophy of Utilitarianism, which promotes the idea of 'the greatest good for the greatest number', a moral axiom which was developed in the 19th Century by people like John Stuart Mill. And I

think it sounds quite reasonable at first glance: "Yes, *let's maximise happiness for the greatest number of people. Naturally, we'll have to subjugate some of our own personal freedoms in order to achieve that aim, but it's for the best of society.*" I think we're brought up in our society to be predisposed towards that ethical justification and its political implications.

But those political implications are interesting. They are perhaps most readily identifiable in some of the more extreme political philosophies that developed in the early 20th Century, such as Radical Socialism and National Socialism (aka fascism) in the 1920s and 30s in places like Italy and Germany. I think that's where collectivism was most blatantly apparent: the idea being that we needed centralised authorities to look after society as a whole, to determine the greatest good for the greatest number, and to decide how to implement that. Indeed, I think that's where a lot of the opposing viewpoint – classical liberalism and the idea of individual natural rights – found traction against a philosophy like collectivism: by pointing to the travesties that occurred in the name of socialist and fascist dictatorships within that era.



Perhaps the most famous example of that comes from *The Road to Serfdom* written by Frederick Hayek in the early 1940s, right at the height of World War II, obviously as something of a response to the developments of fascistic and communistic socialistic dictatorships across Europe and in the

Soviet Union. (I would say that's one of the best-known works refuting collectivist ideology in the 20th Century.)

But interestingly, I think collectivism has a more subtle variety as well; it is really at the heart of the governing systems of much of the West today. This isn't even a controversial opinion. Even if you look at the Wikipedia entry for collectivism, it does (at the present time at least) indicate that collectivist political systems include representative democracy, wherein not every individual is able directly to assert or defend their own freedoms; some rights or privileges have to be given

MORE THAN A CLICHÉ

up in pursuit of the collective social good.

For example, the majority of people supposedly cast their vote for Barack Obama in the 2012 US Presidential Election; therefore the minority, who did not vote for him, have had to cede some of their political power for that representative democracy to function. Again, that seems quite reasonable, and it's presented to people as such, but I think it should be seen – in the development of political philosophies – a very radical philosophy. It flies in the face of what seems to be a progression and development that was taking place in political philosophy that began to coalesce in figures like John Locke, and was then taken up by figures of the American Revolution era, including most famously people like Thomas Jefferson. This was the idea of natural rights, which was reflected in documents like the Declaration of Independence as inalienable human rights that cannot be infringed upon because they are bestowed by the Creator, to express it in the terms of Thomas Jefferson.

But however it's formulated, this idea seemed to be at the heart of so much Enlightenment thinking, and seemed to be a progression from feudal, medieval peasant society in which the few were ostensibly chosen to rule the world by God, and the rest were chosen to be peasants living under the royal elite. Then there was a development away from that towards the recognition: "No, there are individual human rights which are bestowed upon us, or are ours by virtue of our being human beings, and nothing else; they are not instituted by governments, or any human authority, they come from divine authority (or whatever formulation people want to use for that)." I think that idea is at least indicative of the rhetoric that surrounded something like the American Revolution. But the collectivist idea directly overturns that, by saying things like: "As a matter of fact, there are things that can be taken away from individuals based on this need for the greater good for the greater number." So, I think these two ideas are in something of an ideological war against each other.

To relate this back to our main theme, I think at the very least this is a nice way of masking the oligarchical intentions of the people behind some of these groups. I think a lot of the people who do the work for the few-in-the-ultimate-inner-sanctum do believe in this, but I think those at the very core of the system are probably more interested in their own power.

JuC: It does seem to be a perfect tool for control, because in the end it's they who decide what's good for the collective.

JaC: That's exactly the point. The idea of collectivism is that there needs to be some sort of central authority in order to determine what 'the greatest good for the greatest number' actually is. This, of course, gets interpreted in different ways by different people who make different arguments for various styles of subsuming individual freedoms for the 'greater good'; but it always tends to end up in the same place, such as with the disasters of Nazism and Bolshevism (which became Soviet Stalinism eventually). We can see this indicated, as I say, in the works of Hayek, such as *The Road to Serfdom*, in which he wrote:

"Individual freedom cannot be reconciled with the supremacy of one single purpose to which the whole of society is permanently subordinated."

Writing in WWII, he gives this example:

"To a limited extent we ourselves experience this fact in wartime when subordination of almost everything to the immediate and pressing need is the price at which we preserve our freedom in the long run. The fashionable phrases about doing for the purposes of peace what we have learned to do for the purposes of war are completely misleading, for it is sensible temporarily to sacrifice freedom in order to make it more secure in the future, but it is quite a different thing to sacrifice liberty permanently in the interests of a planned economy."

This, I think, touches on one of the fundamental foundations of collectivist ideology: the constant need for some kind of threat (internal or external) that justifies the taking away of liberties and natural rights for the sake of the collective good, as defined by the people who are in control of the system. So, as you say, I think this is a very convenient tool of control for those who have put themselves in the seats of power. They can pretend to be the mouthpiece for the collective good, and to speak for the collective will.

JuC: That brings me neatly to the so-called War on Terror. Is that such a 'threat', in the sense you've just mentioned? (I mean, are US/NATO actions in the Middle East and North Africa really as the mainstream media present them to be? Or are they moves on a wider chessboard in the game against rival superpowers like China and Russia? Is the so-called War on Terror therefore essentially bogus?) And if so, is this ultimately being orchestrated by groups like

MORE THAN A CLICHÉ

those we've been discussing?

JaC: Well, I think there can be no doubt that the War on Terror needs to be understood in the larger historical context, which makes it apparent that this is not so much a war, as a struggle for control. This has been identified in previous eras as The Strategy of Tension: a psychological warfare tactic that creates some sort of chaos or destabilization – or even terror – in order to justify acts of intervention or protection for the affected people.



It is, in fact, one of the oldest ruses. It has been used by the NATO powers, for example and perhaps most startlingly, in *Operation Gladio*. This is a declassified and fully-admitted operation that stemmed from a NATO plan, which itself was an outgrowth of Strategic Services, aka the CIA, back in the World War II era.

The NATO operation involved arming and equipping right-wing nationalist organizations to act as a potential bulwark against Soviet invasion and occupation of Western Europe. Even though the Soviets never invaded, somehow or other this Operation becoming active, and suddenly there were terror attacks taking place, perhaps most notably, in Italy. (That's the area that has been most studied.) These terror attacks were in fact created, funded, and brought into existence by groups that were part of these NATO 'stay behind' operations. It was all part of a strategy to blame attacks on left-wing organizations in order to justify a crack-down on those left-wing organizations in various countries. This is called the Strategy of Terror.

When we look at the current War on Terror with that rubric, we see that it fits very much into that historical context. We can look back at the British Empire in the early 19th Century, and see how it used these tactics going back, for example, to the formation of the *Muslim Brotherhood*, and deep involvement of British and American Intelligence in a lot of these groups going back to the beginning of the 20th Century. We can follow that through to the terrorists against whom the War is supposedly being waged right now. This is

all part of a broader strategy to create bogeymen of one form or another. (I'm not saying these people don't exist, or that they don't believe in the ideologies for which they're dying; but that they're being manipulated as part of a grander geopolitical game in order to create the justification for military operations in various countries.) So, for one microcosmic example, we can look at the recent operations in Libya, where NATO forces were actively and openly collaborating with groups like the LIFG [*Libyan Islamic Fighting Group*], which is an al-Qaeda-linked organization. That, of course, doesn't seem to matter at all given that they were on the side that was attempting to overthrow Gaddafi, which was admittedly and on-the-record the aim of the NATO powers. So, again, it shows there's a charade going on for the sake of geopolitics.

At the end of the day, I think many of the puzzle pieces do tend to converge on the idea of an encirclement of China and Russia by NATO, and the attempt (at the very least) to cut those countries off from other sources of support – to effect some sort of military encirclement and, presumably at some point, conflict with those powers. That's where this seems to be heading in a geopolitical sense.

But then there's the deeper question to ask as to whether these really are two opposing sides, or whether, like the Cold War turned out to be, it's really something of a charade created by collectivists. Just as both sides of the Cold War were expressing (at least outwardly) this idea of collectivism, but were being controlled by the same people, we might ask: Are both sides of the War on Terror being controlled by the same people? Are both sides of the China-Russia/NATO conflict being controlled by the same people? It's at that point, I think, that we come back to those organizations of influence that we identified earlier, and their aspirations for World Government.

JuC: Do you also see the massive expansion of domestic surveillance in the West as part of this design?



MORE THAN A CLICHÉ

JaC: Well, I think this is the other side of the equation. The Strategy of Tension is employed to create the conditions for something to happen. On one side of the equation, the War on Terror creates convenient justifications to invade countries at will: “Oh, *al-Qaeda* is present, therefore we have to go in and get them”. But the other side of the equation provides opportunity on the domestic front for unimpeded growth of state apparatus and power, all in the name of protecting the homeland. (And to use the phrase ‘homeland’ in reference to the United States would have been politically unthinkable just a couple of decades ago, given the Nazi connotations. But now, it’s not only viable, it’s actually becoming one of the most unwieldy bureaucracies of the US Government: the *Department of Homeland Security*.) So, of course, this provides the perfect opportunity to expand state power and create all sorts of institutions, methods and processes that would have been politically untenable in any other era.

For example, in the wake of 9/11, we had the unveiling of the NSA’s warrantless wire-tapping programme, whereby the NSA was enabled (supposedly due to a Presidential directive in 2002) to start conducting surveillance on people supposedly connected with, or talking to, *al-Qaeda*, whether they were in the US or anywhere else, without a warrant as required by law. Not that they needed this programme to step around things like the *FISA Court (the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court)*, because for a long time FISA has admittedly served as a rubber stamp for the American Government. Almost never in its entire history has it denied a warrant to the Government when it’s presented information. But the fact that they felt the need to step around this shows that this is part of a larger power grab. And that’s just one aspect of this police-state surveillance grid that’s being formalised and put in place right now. So, The War on Terror provides a nice pretext for the establishment of a type of surveillance grid that would have seemed almost unthinkable in any other era.

JuC: Let me ask a rather long question. Let’s consider the two main areas in which a push towards a New World Order can be most clearly seen (at least as it seems to me). On the one hand, we have US-NATO expansionism, which many people would see as a kind of corporate-fascist expansionism making way for Western-style, corporate, industrial domination. Just for the sake of argument, I’ll label that right-wing. On the other hand, we clearly see moves towards a

New World Order through things like *The Earth Charter, Agenda 21* and the Climate Change agenda. (Indeed, Lord Christopher Monckton made it clear at one of the UN climate conferences that the phrase “World Government” was in view there. I think it appeared in one of the draft treaties.) These, it’s often claimed, have to do with the destruction of industrial nations, and the redistribution of wealth between nations (as it says in *The Earth Charter*.) I’ll label that left-wing, again for argument’s sake. So, my question: Are there, ultimately, different elites behind these moves, or could we be seeing a kind of 21st-Century manifestation of what Antony Sutton believed was happening in the 20th Century? (I think you were alluding to that a few minutes ago.) Sutton argued that the same inner circle of collectivists were behind the financing of both Nazi Germany and Communist Russia. So, do we have in the modern era a kind of globalist Right Wing and a globalist Left Wing, both ultimately being manipulated by the same elite?

JaC: I would say so, but it’s not necessarily as definitive as that. I think there may be overlap between various factions, each faction being composed of individuals who are united by the ideology of World Government; but there are different paths towards its establishment.

A specific example might help. In the US political context, there are people like Henry Kissinger, for example, who has traditionally been associated with the right of the left/right political spectrum. He has served many Republican administrations, and I think broadly-speaking he represents that global-domination-by-force idea of NATO-US expansionism: a path towards some sort of World Order at the end of the barrel of a gun. (I’m speaking very broadly here. I wouldn’t want to simplify it to that degree.) Another person, who I think would be the mirror image of that, coming more from the left side of that spectrum, would be someone like Zbigniew Brzezinski. He has had enormous influence, certainly in a number of Democratic administrations, most notably in the Jimmy Carter Administration where he was National Security Advisor. I would say his strategy might represent a more palatable idea of World governance and dominance by the left side of that political spectrum, whereby it’s not necessarily confrontation and bombing countries to smithereens directly, but more like playing different sides off against each other from a distance, and being seen as the innocent bystander at the side-lines.

MORE THAN A CLICHÉ

JuC: So, the picture is: a kind of convergence between various groups and individuals, all of whom just happen to believe that some sort of World Government is a necessity, a kind of desirable goal for history. Is that essentially what we're looking at?

JaC: Well, I think it's hard to psychologize these people. People at different levels have different motivations and understandings. I think we should avoid the tendency to simplify this; there are as many reasons for people to be involved in these vast, sprawling, multilevel organizations as there are people themselves. A popular way to understand this is to say: "Oh, it's about greed. These people want to control the purse strings." That's understandable, because most people work for their living, and so finance is a defining question for most people's lives.

But I think it's too reductionist a way to account for the motivation behind this philosophy that's driving those who are in the core of this rings-within-rings structure. I think those people are well beyond the need to provide for their families in material ways. I think we're talking about the wildest dreams of avarice, where money doesn't even have meaning. These are the people who control the central banks that actually create money itself. So, I think this has to be understood in terms of the lust for power and control.

I think that might be explained in terms of psychopathy. There are important scientific studies into that idea, suggesting that there are people whose brains process the world differently from the vast majority of people: that they do not have the standard empathies and emotions as the vast majority of the population. The best estimates are that around 4% of the population falls into that category. So, I think psychopathy provides at least one interpretive framework with which to understand the people we've been talking about.

Of course, there's also the spiritual aspect, which I don't tend to go into in my own work, but which people like Dr. Stan do; and it's absolutely important for people to look into that. I think there's something much more fundamental to this than money itself.

This also ties into another driving force behind this political agenda: eugenics. I think there's a desire to maintain certain blood lines among some of these people at these elite levels of society. They want to perpetuate their genes, and to eliminate others from the gene pool. I think that's an important part of the

picture that needs to be understood.

JuC: It's a curious thought, but from their perspective, that would no doubt be seen as purely a good thing! Obviously enough, if they are the superior ones, then the best thing for the world would be for them to be in control.



Exactly right. And this is exactly why eugenics was developed in the late 19th Century by British gentlemen scientists, who came up with the theory that British gentlemen scientists and their ilk were the crème de la crème of the human species, and thus deserved to be at the apex of civilization (as they so self-evidently were). And of course, it's not only racist, it's pseudoscience; it's quackery on so many levels, and has been discredited scientifically. But unfortunately eugenics still persists to the current day under different guises. I think we can identify that motivation [among other motivations] behind many of the United Nations' operations, such as the Climate Change agenda etc.: a lust to depopulate the majority of the planet. I think this is another key idea that unites different factions in this New World Order quest.

I think another thing that unites many of them is the drive towards a smaller, more manageable humanity, fit for the type of totalitarianism they ultimately want to bring in, a totalitarianism going far beyond anything that's been seen before in history. A lot of people dismissively say that the New World Order is just the same Old World Order, but I think we are on the cusp of a scientific revolution that could enable a type of tyranny, the likes of which could never have been imagined before in human history. We are getting to the point where we can actually engineer the human species at the genetic level. When we start taking that into account as part of the game plan for this New World Order system, we can see why it's absolutely important for people to be informed about this and to engage with this, not just for sake of ourselves and our loved ones, but for the sake of humanity itself.

MORE THAN A CLICHÉ

Again, I am not here to provide definitive answers for people; I am simply here to pass on information and useful sources.

JuC: Well, by way of paradox, let me jump from the dawning of this technological nightmare to ask you a positive question. How can we resist this New World Order? Allow me for a moment to employ a bit of biblical imagery. In your podcasts you say that we shouldn't fight the Beast physically, because if we do that we will just give the Beast greater justification to strike back at us. Neither should we simply protest to the Beast to bring about change, because that serves further to legitimise the Beast. Rather, we should stop feeding the Beast, and that's something we have the power to do. Could you explain what that power is?

JaC: Well, I'm intrigued by the idea that we've been given false templates to follow in terms of solving our problems, one being to fight our enemies, templates provided for us through so much social conditioning and the Media. Here, the idea is that we must find the heart or the head of the organization, and somehow kill that person or that group, or whatever it is; eliminate that, and everything will magically turn to the better. Thinking in broad terms, that false template appears in virtually every science fiction dystopia you've ever seen: if it turns out well in the end, it's only because they have managed to decapitate the Head of the Beast, whether it be The Lord of the Rings or Tron, or any such movie. I think that's fundamentally and completely the wrong way to look at it, because at the end of the day the particular individuals who may or may not be holding the 'Ring of Power' are replaceable. Indeed, there are very many people who would be chomping at the bit to get into that position of power should that old guard be swept away for whatever reason.

I think what's needed is a more fundamental revolution: not of overthrowing a specific instantiation of this idea, but of overthrowing the idea altogether. And that can only come, I think, from building up an alternative system to which people actually want to apply themselves. I think we have to detach ourselves from this system that we've been woven into. Unfortunately that's probably as difficult to do as that analogy would make it sound, because we are so woven into the fabric of society that it's difficult to imagine extricating ourselves from all these processes.

We rely for so many of our daily needs on this vast, unwieldy corporate system that ties into these very organizations that pull the strings of governmental institutions, that it can seem quite overwhelming. How can a single individual affect this? But I think we have to look for any and every possible point at which we can start to detach ourselves from those systems of control, and to start to reassert some kind of independence. That can be an extremely small thing like, just for example: instead of buying groceries at the grocery store, perhaps buy them at a farmers' market, or at least some of your groceries. Or perhaps you could grow them yourself in a vegetable garden. Something of that sort is a tiny thing on the individual level, but I think it's the only thing in the long run that can lead to the type of society we want to bring to fruition.

Again, I think it's small things like that, if we start to apply ourselves with diligence and perseverance, that will eventually be able to overthrow this. But, unfortunately, as I say, we are on the cusp of this scientific revolution which makes scientific dictatorship possible, so unfortunately we don't necessarily have generations of time. That gives a time perspective to all this – I won't say it's a time bomb – but you get the idea. We don't have a lot of time to waste.

We have a choice. Either we continue going into this technological, corporate matrix – which involves even things like buying the next generation of iPhone, which they're already saying is going to have its own fingerprint scanning technology, and all of these corporate, military, Big Brother elements to it that we're willingly signing up to every day of our lives, and actually paying money for – or we start to create alternative structures which don't rely on that system. It's a choice that we have to make in our lives, I would say more quickly than has been apparent at any other time in human history.

JuC: That's interesting, because it's tempting to think that's all too ineffectual; it's too small-scale. How can we really make any difference that way? Surely the best way is to get out there and protest, perhaps as a group, because that seems to be the way we've been brought up to think. Your suggestion is more radical in a way: each person making slightly different choices in their life.

MORE THAN A CLICHÉ

JaC: I think this really comes back to ideology. I mean, if we are resisting this collectivism that's being espoused by the people in these organizations, then obviously the way to combat it is not going to be through some sort of collectivist movement. (That would involve subsuming our individual identities, hoping we can form some sort of political basis for action with enough members of the community in agreement, and all of the compromises that come from that political process.)

If people truly believe in the opposite of collectivism, and in the power of individuals to transform society, then surely we can't look to those types of collectivist ideas. Clearly, it has to come from something more individual. The point is: we don't have to wait for everyone else to be part of the same movement, to think the same way, and do the same things. I think we have to start expressing that in our own lives in whatever small form that might take, and hoping that that might make others join us.

We won't be compelling them to do so; they'll be seeing that it's a better way to live their lives. I think if there is anything to the critique we're laying out here, it has to be exemplified through our own lives and our own actions. It can't be something we simply talk about, hold meetings about, and hope to manage some kind of protest movement in order to achieve. It has to be something we can demonstrate to other people. The more effectively we can do that, the more effectively we'll be able to overcome this system.

JuC: How much of your book has been written by now?

JaC: I would say the majority of it. I'm now in the process of going through first drafts, double-checking, sourcing and adding information, which is tedious and time-consuming. It's very difficult to balance my daily duties with that extra work, so I hope I will get the time to do that. I might have a bit of time in the near future, because my wife and I are about to have our first child, which I imagine will greatly change the way that I am able to create podcasts etc., but it might free some time to do things like work on the book.

JuC: Well, congratulations! It will certainly change your life; it changed mine.

JaC: All I can say is I'm looking forward to it absolutely, unequivocally. I think it's the most exciting

thing that's ever happened to me in my personal life. I'm so excited about it, and very much looking forward to it, but I'm under no illusions that I'll be able to continue my work in the same way that I'm doing it at the moment.

JuC: You'll have to do it between changing nappies (as we call them here in the UK), I'm afraid.

JaC: Absolutely.

JuC: Well James, thanks ever so much for sparing the time to come on The Mind Renewed. I've been listening to you since early 2009, so it's a great privilege to have you on the Podcast.

JaC: Well, thank you again for the opportunity. As I'll mirror this on my own website, could you tell new listeners about The Mind Renewed?

JuC: This is a project which has been influenced by many people. You have been influential (as I said before), but also Christian researchers and thinkers like Dr. Stanley Monteith and Rev. Dr. Francis Schaeffer, a Presbyterian Minister who analyzed the modern world from a Christian perspective. One reason for setting up The Mind Renewed was to address a concern of mine that people in many of the Christian churches don't seem to be very open to the idea of the Truth Movement and its questions about 9/11 and various other issues.

There's a tendency to look upon that whole scene as so much (and I'll use the phrase) 'conspiracy theorizing', so I felt that I needed to address this from a Christian perspective. My second reason is that, because of this reluctance among Christians to look at these matters, I fear that people looking on from the outside might see Christians as people wedded to the establishment, who are unable to think outside the box. So, it was my desire to clear the air, so to speak, that prompted me to start The Mind Renewed.

JuC: Well, thank you very much. And let me thank you again for all the great work you've done over the years.

JaC: Thank You.

End of Interview