

Path to the World Wide Love Blob
Who's Choosing the Trail Markers
by Tom Kinney

"The government is like a baby's alimentary canal, with a happy appetite at one end and no responsibility at the other." --Ronald Reagan

"The inherent vice of capitalism is the unequal sharing of the blessings. The inherent blessing of socialism is the equal sharing of misery." – Winston Churchill

Adlai Stevenson: "The contest between agreeable fancy and disagreeable fact is unequal. Americans are suckers for good news."

UNESCO's first Director-General Julian Huxley declared in 1946, "The task before UNESCO...is to help the emergence of a single world culture, with its own philosophy of ideas, and with its own broad purposes." He wrote, "of the transfer of full sovereignty from separate nations to a world organization." By 1974, they proposed licensing journalists world-wide for control of political support of various leftist causes, had developed an inconceivably bloated budget supplied 25% by the United States, the funds of which went primarily to fund those leftist causes and into the pockets of the then Director-General Mahtar M'Bow and his cronies. The U.S. withdrew from UNESCO, saying the agency "extraneously politicized virtually every subject it deals with. It has exhibited hostility toward basic institutions of a free society, especially a free market and a free press." An example of this duplicity is UNESCO's bioethics thrust in its willing silence in support of the killing of infant girls in China by families wishing a boy under the "one child" policy. UNESCO itself estimates the death rate at over a million female infants per year.

Enthusiasm for the "one world" view has been around a long time. In the beginning days of industrial marvels shortly after the opening of the Suez Canal, David McCullough reports "Men talked confidently of future systems of transport that would bring all peoples into contact with one another, spread knowledge, break down national divisions, and make a unified whole of humanity." On the dig itself, a group of Saint-Simonians, about twenty men, many of them civil engineers, showed up to help. Their messiah was Claude Henri de Rouvroy, the Comte de Saint-Simon, whose radical philosophy was aimed toward a new global order. It was he who wrote, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work." Private property and nationalism were to be things of the past. The leadership of mankind was to be entrusted to an elite class of artists, scientists, and industrialists. Mainly, the good society was to be attained through ennobling, regenerative work. The world was to be saved – from poverty, from war – through immense public improvements, networks of highways, railroads, and two great ship canals through the Isthmus of Suez and the Isthmus of Panama.

Is it a better world? What must we give up?

From "The Creature from Jekyll Island" by G. Edward Griffin.

Many ... categorize the IMF and World Bank as a socialist force created at the Bretton Woods Conference in July, 1944 under the guidance of the Fabians, a group of elitists led, in the early days, by Sidney and Beatrice Webb and George Bernard Shaw. The Fabians' crest includes a sheep in wolf's clothing – great fodder for conspiracy theorists. The World Bank funds loans to third-world countries, most of which are not repaid, but merely rolled over. The source of the funds is from the developed nations' taxpayers, either

directly or more typically through the hidden tax called inflation – that is, the Federal Reserve and other such units print additional money with no backing.

The World Bank distributes these funds in two ways: Sectoral Loans and Structural Adjustment loans. In the first category, only part of the money is to be used for the costs of specific projects while the rest goes to support policy changes in the economic sector. In the second group, ALL of the money is for policy changes, and none of it is for projects. As the money comes from government, goes to government, and is administered by government, the result is the expansion of government.

Is this a way to help the poor? Nowhere is this socialistic pattern more blatant than in Africa. Tanzania's dictator Nyerere is notorious for his "villagization" program in which the army has driven the peasants from their land, burned their huts, and loaded them like cattle into trucks for relocation into government villages. The issue is control. Meanwhile, the economy staggers, farms have gone to weeds, and hunger is commonplace. Yet Tanzania has received more aid per capita from the World Bank than any other nation.

The story in Uganda is well known. The Zimbabwe story is gaining more and more world attention, although the government actions we now see in the media have been ongoing. Shortly after independence, Zimbabwe's Marxist Mugabe confiscated many farms from his white citizenry. The most desirable were given to his favorite senior ruling-party officials, and the rest turned into state-run collectives. They were such miserable failures that even the workers on these farmlands were soon begging for food. Not daunted by these failures, the socialist politicians announced in 1991 that they were going to nationalize half the remaining farms as well. Now that's all. And they barred the courts from inquiring into how much compensation would be paid to the owners. Zimbabwe shortly became a net importer of food, unable to feed its citizens for the first time in history. Finally, the World Bank lightbulb came on, and funds stopped flowing. Not that that hurts Mugabe since he and his family have invested wisely and traded ruthlessly with their neighboring states. Why were young Zimbabwe soldiers sent to die in the Congo war? So Mugabe and his family could protect and increase their holdings in Congo's mines. An entrepreneurial fellow named Paul Mondondo puts a face on this problem. Paul guided sailing safaris on Zimbabwe's side of Lake Kariba. Now Paul, in his mid-fifties, has no work as the violence has chased away the tourists. Instead he has a small plot of ground and begs seed and money from his international friends, including us. Paul didn't used to be poor – he was free-marketing in a growth business when his government got in the way.

The IMF was represented in Zimbabwe at the time by Michael Camdessus, the Governor of the Central Bank of France and former finance minister in Mitterand's Socialist Government. After being informed of Zimbabwe's plan to confiscate the farms, Camdessus agreed to a loan valued at 42 billion Rand, knowing much of it would be used for the resettlement project.

Graham Hancock, in his book "Lords of Poverty", speaks of the IMF's Structural-Adjustment Loans as "Corrupt Ministers of Finance and dictatorial Presidents from Asia, Africa, and Latin America tripping over their own expensive footwear in their unseemly haste to get "adjusted". For such people, money has probably never been easier to obtain than it is today – no complicated projects to administer and no messy accounts to keep – and no need to restrain the laughing all the way to the bank."

We can continue with the socialist program of the governments funded by the IMF and World Bank – Ethiopia and its strategic genocide by starvation, Indonesia's uprooting millions from their native homelands in Java, even the Sandinistas in Nicaragua need to be included. Quoting one of the early Fabian leaders, George Bernard Shaw, "Under socialism, you would not be allowed to be poor. You would be forcibly fed, clothed, lodged, taught, and employed whether you liked it or not. If it were discovered that you had not

character and industry enough to be worth all the trouble, you might possibly be executed in a kind manner; but whilst you were permitted to live, you would have to live well.”

At least one think tank paper on how the government should function to expand government control over its people and their money identified war as the only viable governmental tool over the long term for a government to grow its power over its people and perpetuate its existence. This policy paper's assignment was to set aside all considerations of right and wrong, people's rights, etc., in favor of the stability of society and the perpetuation of a government currently in power. In times of peace, people become resentful of ever higher taxes, intrusions into personal freedoms, and bureaucratic intervention into minutiae such as how much water a toilet can use per flush. By declaring war and promoting the magnitude of the threat to arouse human passion and patriotic feelings of loyalty to the nation's leader, no amount of sacrifice in the name of victory will be rejected. Resistance is viewed as treason. The people's attention is diverted. Quoting from a report from the Hudson Institute supposedly commissioned by McNamara and Kahn of the Rand Corp many years ago, only when the citizenry becomes disrespectful of their leaders do they become dangerous to the government. War, alien invasion, and/or environmental threats were suggested as counters to a restless citizenry. Whether or not we dismiss such studies as ill-advised, or even hoaxes, we can see the concept being implemented in small and large countries around the world. Although the alien from outer space in the alien invasion part did not develop the credibility the authors anticipated, it was replaced with an alien invasion of supposed economic masters in the form of global corporations.

The long view New World Order folks considering the progress toward a World Government had the problem of war to solve. How can war be created when we are all one?

Poverty was examined as such a Global potential enemy but rejected as not fearful enough. Most of the world is already IN POVERTY. Only those who had never experienced poverty would see it as a global threat. For the rest, it was simply a fact of everyday life.

Another consideration for a war substitute in the report was alien invasion. The report said experiments along those lines already may have been tried. Public reaction, however, was not sufficiently predictable, because the threat was not “credible.” Remember, this was back in McNamara's time – we now have crop circles and other tools to work with. And credibility with the public is important. Quoting from the report, “credibility, in fact, lies at the heart of the problem of developing a political substitute for war.” Threatening asteroids may be the best that can be done until more people believe intelligent life forms beyond our planet might or probably exist.

The final candidate for a useful global threat was pollution of the environment. The report states, “One exception (to war substitutes to build government power) might be the environmental-pollution model, if the danger to society it posed was genuinely imminent. The fictive models would have to carry the weight of extraordinary conviction, underscored with a not inconsiderable actual sacrifice of life... It may be, for instance, that gross pollution of the environment can eventually replace the possibility of mass destruction by nuclear weapons as the principal apparent threat to the survival of the species.” The report concludes that “It is more probable, in our judgment, that such a threat (war substitute) will have to be invented. Remember once again, this report was commissioned in 1966 and supposedly found its way into the public hands from one of the 15 team member collaborators. Hoax or not, it was predictive. The war on poverty retreated behind a war focused on environmental issues for governmental growth and worldwide management.