GLOBAL EDUCATION

“National security today involves more than military preparation. Global education is one of the essential new dimensions.

“The globalization of the human condition is interweaving the destinies of all nations and peoples at an accelerating rate and affecting many aspects of life. Global education involves multidisciplinary perspectives about the extended human family, the existing condition of mankind and the planet, and foreseeable consequences of present trends and alternative choices.”

Note that the above was written by Robert Leestma of the U.S. Office of Education, a contributor to the 1979 book, Schooling for a Global Age (See bibliography).

While the previous chapter detailed the religion of Humanism and its thrust behind Trilateralism, this chapter seeks to document a massive re-education program of American school age children - and unwilling parents, who remain a major obstacle to a smooth transition to a global society.

On the back dust cover of the above quoted book, it is noted:

“This book is one of a series of three books on issues and practices in schooling. The other two books deal with the arts and education and with school-community relations. The series was commissioned to provide background information for A Study of Schooling in the United States, the results of which will be published subsequently.”

Also noted are the financial backers of the studies:

- The Danforth Foundation
- The John D. Rockefeller III Fund
- Martha Holden Jennings Foundation
- Charles F. Kettering Foundation
- Charles Stewart Mott Foundation
- The Needmor Fund
- The Rockefeller Foundation
- The Spencer Foundation
- U.S. Office of Education
Emphasis is added to note two things: first, the Rockefeller and Kettering foundations originally funded the Trilateral Commission.

Second, public funds are intermixed with private funds to facilitate and implement a non-public supported or authorized endeavor. We have chosen to analyze Schooling for a Global Age because of its authority of scholarship, financial backing and impact. It is not an “official” US government publication, but government officials are quoted and substantial government funds were provided so the study could be undertaken.

In light of this, we can be sure the book typifies the thinking of the National Education Association (NEA), the Department of Education, the various foundations listed and most importantly, the thinking of David Rockefeller et al.

A PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION FOR WORLD CITIZENSHIP

Keeping in mind the last chapter dealing with Humanism, the following “purpose statement” exemplifies the Humanist philosophy on global education:

- “To develop student understanding of themselves as individuals.
- “To develop student understanding of themselves as members of the human species.
- “To develop student understanding of themselves as inhabitants and dependents of planet Earth.
- “To develop student understanding of themselves as participants in global society.
- “To develop within students the competencies required to live intelligently and responsibly as individuals, human beings, earthlings, and members of global society.
- “We endeavor to create in world-centered schools the kind of social order, the organizational climate, the physical environment, and the formal curriculum that support and further the purposes of global education.”

“Identities, loyalties, and competencies as well as rights, duties, obligations, and privileges are associated with each of these goals. For example, students might explore the issues involved and discuss the rights one has by virtue of being a member of the human species. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Humanist Manifesto, and UNICEF and the Rights of the Child are among many documents and other materials which can be used in considering this question.”

According to Irving H. Buchen, the student “...will be capable of sustaining many allegiances, without contradiction, on both a national and international scale, and be closer to being, especially through the concept of global perspectives, a world citizen.”

The Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies paper, American Education and Global Interdependence,
"The educational enterprise has a vital role to play in preparing present and future generations of Americans to cope with inter-dependence. Universities contain intellectual skills needed to develop the knowledge base about global interdependence; developing a more secure knowledge base should facilitate greatly the building of political consensus on what we should do about global interdependence.

The mass media by their very nature are event-centered, imposing on schools and colleges an obligation to provide students with the continuity and depth of understanding demanded by complex long-term interdependence issues.

Schools, furthermore, have the golden opportunity, if they will but use it, of shaping the world views of future generations of Americans along lines more compatible with the realities of global interdependence before these views become hardened through maturation along other less compatible lines. “

Global education requires the conversion of existing local educational systems -primarily those at the elementary and secondary school levels -to produce students who see themselves not as Americans but as participants in a world society.

Why? Because “nationalism” and “individualism” are lumped in with the” other less compatible lines.”

Society must be planned, they say, in overt and covert ways; individual ethnic, cultural and intellectual differences will be subordinated to some predetermined set of characteristics set forth by the elitist group preparing us for global interdependence.

AN ACTION PLAN IS UNDERWAY

The Aspen Institute study noted,

“The task of bringing about the kind of transformation which will make education a better instrument for coping with interdependence is formidable.”

To achieve their plan, global educators propose to identify and concentrate action upon what they call “critical leverage points” in our present educational system. The plan is to subvert and change these critical points into a program to achieve global goals.

When analyzed, Aspen’s six point plan of action is nothing less than cultural genocide:

“Point 1: Revise curricula, the content of teacher training and community education toward
global education. It is proposed to use the U.S. Department of Education as well as independent foundations and local school systems for this purpose.

“Point 2: To obtain support from political and educational leaders at both national and local levels, particularly from boards of trustees and professional or organizations, to mold public support for global education.

“Point 3: To use universities and research institutions to develop a “knowledge base” on interdependence in order to help build the political consensus necessary for global policies.

“Point 4: To shape existing world outlooks within American popular culture.

“Point 5: To reach outward to the world through educational institutes, particularly through the United Nations. “Point 6: To influence mass media to these ends, particularly through the use of internships that are part of professional training in mass communications.”

(Authors’ note: there are many college-age students who have been raised in prototype “global schools” who think in global terms and can be “interned” in strategic places within the media.)

Aspen makes it clear that this is an activist plan:

“Achieving the educational transformation, which the future demands will require all of the spirit of conquest and aspiration which we possess.”

CENTRALIZED, GOVERNMENT-CONTROLLED EDUCATION REQUIRED

Globalists recognize that American education is essentially decentralized and that public education has historically played a role in the teaching of American history and government. Thus, one objective is to heavily reduce the amount of time devoted to the study of these subjects now required in the curricula of most states. These America-oriented curricula will be replaced with ones concentrating on world history and politics.

They describe the current educational system as a “constitutional incongruity.” Certain constitutional conflicts do exist which cannot be overcome as long as education remains in the hands of local and state governments. A major answer to this was the creation of the Department of Education, which was heavily lobbied by the global-minded National Education Association (NEA).

The Aspen study also cited Roger Ulrich’s The Control of Human Behavior. According to Ulrich, conditioning is supposed to start at the age of two years. It is recognized within the global education community that the critical years for the establishment of values and ideas is around seven to twelve. Consequently, it is planned to subject students to a curricula which employs behavioral techniques involving so-called “values clarification” and situational ethics.

This manipulates students into an artificial belief structure. Who picks the values they will be taught? Which set of ethics will be used?
These techniques are close to those of Goebbels’ in Nazi Germany, or Soviet and Chinese propagandists of today. These are programs for human behavioristic manipulation, not education!

THE PLAN IS UNDERWAY

Don’t make the mistake of underestimating the forces behind global schooling. This is not some passive, “pie-in-the-sky” ideological exercise of academia -it is highly organized, completely funded and well staffed. It is sweeping the country.

The following “timetable” is quoted exactly from pages 240-241 of Schooling for a Global Age.

“PHASE 1, PREPARATORY PERIOD - BY 1980:
. Every state education department and most school systems and teacher education programs would have a collection of some basic references on global education and would have provided opportunities for selected staff members to become aware of the global education concept, some relevant research, successful programs elsewhere, and local possibilities. . In-service education programs would be available in every region of the country to begin to acquaint teachers and others with the global education concept.

. A survey of the role of the world in the community, region, or state and vice versa would have been conducted, planned, or under consideration in a majority of states.

“PHASE 2 - BY THE MID-1980s:
. Study groups would be at work in a sizeable proportion of state education departments, local school systems, and teacher education institutions to analyze and enrich existing curricula, requirements, and materials from a global perspective. . In-service education opportunities would be available in the majority of states, including through teacher centers. . Pre-service education programs would be offering some orientation to global education, at least as an option. . Initial research agendas would be established and studies and surveys begun.

. A national baseline survey of the knowledge and attitudes of students, teachers, administrators, parents, and community leaders on global education concerns would be completed. . Every state education department and a sizeable proportion of school districts would become involved in an international educational exchange program for students and/ or staff . State and local school board policy statements would be giving explicit support to global education.
. National public awareness and local community support would be growing, in part, because of increased attention to global problems and issues in the mass media, particularly television, and in the schools.

“PHASE 3 - BY 1990:
. Teachers in every state would have access to in-service education programs for global education, at least at the awareness level.

. Good case-study material on the initiation or improvement of global education programs in a variety of school and community situations would be becoming widely available. . All school districts, state education departments, and preservice teacher-education programs would have access to information clearinghouses and resource centers on global perspectives in education.

. Teacher certification requirements in a sizeable number of states would begin to reflect global education concerns. . State curriculum requirements in a sizeable number of states would begin to reflect global education objectives. . School accreditation requirements would begin to reflect attention to global education.

. Local, state, and national assessments of educational progress would include attention to global educational concerns.

. Textbooks and other educational materials would increasingly provide more adequate treatment of global issues and perspectives. “12

PARENTS NEED TO BE EDUCATED ALSO

John I. Goodlad wrote in Schooling for a Global Age:

“Parents and the general public must be reached also. Otherwise, children and youth enrolled in globally oriented programs may find themselves in conflict with values assumed in the home. And then the educational institution frequently comes under scrutiny and must pull back. “13

The question basically boils down to this: “Are your values good enough for your children, or not?” We have passed through the UN-sponsored “International Year of the Child” which preached children’s rights. In Sweden it is now against the law to spank your own child who could report you to the authorities for “maltreatment.”
This thought is expanded:

“Parents should understand that developing independent individuals is not a goal of government education,-and this becomes apparent only with an understanding of the educator’s view of an individual: ‘The emerging modern individual places his confidence not in society’s norms, not religion’s rules, nor parents’ dictates, but in his own changing experience. He is, in a very deep sense, his own highest authority. He chooses his own way.’ “14

The greatest obstacle to the implementing of global schooling is not lack of funding, trained teachers or global textbooks -it is the parent who is skeptical about the federal government (with its blurred distinctions between private and public institutions) being better qualified to say how his child should be raised and educated.

“Rebel” parents who have chosen to educate their children at home have become “examples” to globalists who drag the parents into court on civil and criminal charges of negligence.

Private schools across the country have continuously fought an onslaught of legislation that would destroy them, if passed. Whenever a student is transferred to a private school, the public school he or she attended loses state and federal budget funds for the following year. In many cases, the formula for determining funding is disproportionate to the total number of students in attendance; thus, if 40% of the students withdrew to private schools, those schools could lose 70 or 80% of its funding. This is intolerable to public educators, and pressure is put on the parent to re-enroll the student in public school.

One of the key activist groups that deals with parent as well as student problems is the National Education Association (NEA); possibly it is the most powerful special interest group in operation today. The NEA sent more delegates to the Democratic National Convention in 1980 than any other interest group including trade unions.

The NEA worked closely with the Trilaterally oriented Carter administration in setting up the long sought after Federal Department of Education to centralize US education.

A national movement was recently underway to pass legislation allowing tuition tax credits for parents of students enrolled in private schools. This is not surprising in that they are paying for two educations at the same time -private and public. If passed, it would have dealt a fatal blow to global educators because it would have encouraged parents to seek better, private education for their children; in turn, public schools would have their funding automatically chopped.

The National Education Association was successful at blocking this legislation.
HOW GLOBAL EDUCATION IS BEING FINANCED

We noted earlier that the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies is funded primarily by Atlantic Richfield, Rockefeller, Kettering, Weyerhaeuser, Ford and the Markle Foundations. In addition, we saw that almost 40% of Aspen’s funding came from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH).

NEH granted a whopping total of $185.3 million in 1979 to many different Humanistic and globalist endeavors, including Aspen Institute. While the US taxpayer contributes about 80% of NEH’s annual funding, the remaining 20% comes from Lilly Endowment, the Ford Foundation and the Andrew W. Mellon and Alfred P. Sloan Foundations.

Watchers of the Public Broadcasting System will see many global-oriented shows sponsored by Ford Foundation.

The Kettering Foundation, a main backer of the Trilateral Commission, has as its purpose statement:

“To strengthen the mechanisms for citizen participation in public policy formation and implementation, and to support the forces for world order and peace. It supports only innovative, high-risk programs which do not receive sufficient attention from other sources.”

Table I gives you an idea of what Kettering considers “innovative, high risk.”

We noted earlier that Kettering was a supporter of Schooling for a Global Age. That book also states, “Sub-study on the teaching of global education in schools [is] supported by an additional grant from the Charles F. Kettering Foundation.” (Emphasis added.)

Among the Kettering directorship, we find two notable Humanists:

George Gallup and Norman Cousins. Cousins is a director of National Educational Television and the U.N. Association of the U.S. Gallup surveys, which are supposed to be so “unbiased,” are usually called for when globalists want to “prove” their case to the public by doing a public opinion survey.

While the authors have not done an exhaustive tabulation on the amount of money distributed by public and private institutions for globalist ends, it is estimated that well over $1 billion per year is sunk into “high risk” programs that would otherwise find no support.

MASS MEDIA AND THE MARKLE FOUNDATION
The Markle Foundation was identified as a prime contributor to the Aspen Institute and ties to the Morgan banking establishment were noted in the previous chapter.

Markle’s statement of purpose reads: “The goal of the current program is to strengthen educational uses of the mass media and communications technology.”18 This foundation deserves extra space as a prime purveyor of global education. The president of Markle Foundation is Lloyd N. Morrisett. Over ten years ago, when Morrisett was a vice-president of Carnegie Corporation, he and Joan Cooney (wife of Trilateralist Peter G. Peterson) originated the idea for Sesame Street.

He is currently chairman of the board of trustees at Children’s Television Workshop, which produces Sesame Street.

According to the 1978 Annual Report of the Markle Foundation:

“In its first operating year, 1969-1970, the Workshop had 36 employees and a budget of $6.8 million. Almost all this money came from three sources: The Office of Education, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and the Ford Foundation. The Workshop itself was able to provide only $119,000 from its own income. “19

It later stated that:

“CTW has established its status as a public charity under the Tax Reform Act of 1969. The value of the public charity classification to an organization such as CTW is that it allows the receipt of individual or corporate contributions on a fully tax deductible basis for the donor. It also facilitates philanthropic donations by foundations. “20

Which foundations contribute to support Sesame Street so it can stay on the air? Surprisingly, not Markle Foundation, even though they are closely linked, Markle spends its funds on more “high risk” ventures just starting out (see Table II).

What is interesting to see is that these ventures, like Sesame Street, were persistently bailed out financially, year after year, because they could not make their own way.

Further, major funds to this end came from your taxes, as well as various foundations.

CONCLUSIONS:

. A main tenet of Humanism is to institute global education to create a generation of “global citizens.”
Global education is being financed by the same foundations that finance Humanism and the Trilateral Commission.

Massive amounts of public funds are also being used to these ends.

There is a plan, a timetable, sufficient personnel and funds to carry out the plan.

Global education ideology is in direct conflict with the Constitution of the United States.
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CHAPTER FOUR
TRANSCENDING POLITICAL SYSTEMS: CAPITALISTS VS. MARXISTS

One of the most pervasive—but downright erroneous themes in modern textbook history is that of a competition between Capitalist and Marxist systems. In fact, given objective examination of all facts nothing could be further from the truth. The two political power groups cooperate with each other, nurture each other and in general are jointly responsible for much of the pain and suffering of the average man on the street in this world.

Much of the confusion stems from an unwillingness to define monopoly capitalism for what it is: a political power system that is much like state socialism. State socialism, as in the Soviet Union, is also remarkably akin in its operations to that of a monopoly. Thus, a Brezhnev and a Rockefeller have much in common. Both are monopolists and both thrive on use of political power to retain their monopoly.

With this parallel in mind, let’s summarize the facts on the almost continuous involvement of American elitist capitalists in the buildup of Soviet military power over the past 63 years. It has been a deliberate policy. That it was done shortsightedly for financial gain is rather obvious. No one—not even a multinational businessman—commits suicide knowingly, but it is not unheard of for avarice to overcome common sense.

Apparently only one US institution has been clear-sighted on the buildup of Soviet power. From the early 1920’s until recently only one institution has spoken out. That institution is the AFL-CIO. From Samuel Gompers in 1920 down to George Meany, major unions consistently protested the trade policies that built the Soviet military power. Why? Because workers in Russia lost their freedom with the Bolshevik Revolution, and the products used to expedite the killing of union members in Korea and Vietnam were made with the help of American elitist controlled multinational company technology.

But today Trilateral Commissioner Kirkland rules the AFL-CIO and the protest is muted.

THE BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION (1917)

The March, 1917, Russian Revolution overthrew the regime of the Romanov Czars and installed a free, constitutional government. In November the fledgling republic was destroyed by the totalitarian Bolsheviks and the Russian hope for freedom evaporated. The powerful American elite was involved because Wall Street financiers and attorneys intervened in support of the Bolsheviks.

A few examples of this support are:
Key Wall Streeters assisting the Bolsheviks included William Boyce Thompson (director of Chase National, forerunner of Chase Manhattan), Albert H. Wiggin (president of Chase Bank), establishment attorneys and Morgan bankers.

The Wall Street bankers pressured the US and British governments to support Bolsheviks, much as Rockefeller and Kissinger pressured Carter into admitting the Shah of Iran into the US in 1979. The Wall Street pressures were to assist Bolshevik propaganda, encourage formation of a Soviet army and supply arms to the Bolsheviks.

Some statements by American elitist businessmen on the early Soviets include the following letter from William Saunders, chairman of Ingersoll-Rand Corporation, to President Wilson, on October 17, 1918: “Dear Mr. President: I am in sympathy with the Soviet form of government as that best suited for the Russian people.”

And another from Thomas D. Thacher, Wall Street attorney and member of the establishment law firm Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett (former Secretary of State Vance is today a member of this same firm): “...The fullest assistance should be given to the Soviet government in its efforts to organize a volunteer revolutionary army.”

Wall Street bankers, including Chase National bankers, aided the Bolshevik Revolution by intervention with the United States and British governments and were crucial to its success.

THE EARLY YEARS OF SOVIET RUSSIA

Wall Street then came to the aid of the newborn Soviet government. Armand Hammer (now chairman of the Occidental Petroleum Corporation) received the first concession contract in 1920 because his father, Julius Hammer, was then Secretary of the Communist Party in the US. However, the Rockefellers were not far behind. Under the guidance of Reeve Schley (a Chase VP) the American-Russian Chamber of Commerce was formed in partnership with Russian agents to break the U.S. government ban on trade with the Soviets.

What could not be done legally was done illegally -even to the export of military aircraft engines. By the late 1920’s Wall Street and German bankers had put the infant Soviet Russia on its feet.

In 1925, a complete program to finance imports of Soviet raw material to the United States and to export vital machinery and technology to the Soviets was agreed upon by Chase National and Prombank (a German bank).

At the same time -even though a government ban still existed on all trade with the Soviet Union -Chase National was trying to arrange for export of Liberty motors for military planes. Years later, when writing Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development, the co-author (Sutton) found the evidence in State Department files and learned that the Department of Justice was one step ahead of Chase National and intervened to stop illegal exports.
Along with Equitable Trust, Chase National was in the forefront of financing Soviet economic and military development in the 1920’s. When acceptance of gold was halted by the State Department, the Chase-Soviet business was arranged on the basis of platinum credits.

Above all, the formation of the American-Russian Chamber of Commerce, with Chase VP Reeve Schley as its president, was the major factor in circumventing the ban on US technology for the Soviet Union. The Chamber was active in pressing the need for “cooperation” and “peaceful trade.” The Chamber representative in Moscow was none other than Charles Haddell Smith, previously in Soviet employ and a member of the Soviet Peasant International.

By the late 1920’s, Chase was even attempting to raise loans for the Soviets in the US, the first being a $30 million deal with principal and interest, payable in dollars -flatly prohibited by State Department regulations.

We also find in State Department files, letters from Chase refusing to break off the illegal relationship when instructed to do so. Public comment at that time was more caustic than in today’s tame media.

Chase was called -among the more delicate descriptions -“an international fence," “a disgrace to America... They will go to any lengths for a few dollars profit.”

This intimate link between Chase National (which became Chase Manhattan in the 1950’s) and the Soviets is unbroken throughout six decades.

THE FIRST FIVE YEAR PLANS (1930-45)

In 1930, Chase National was one of four American banks that financed construction of the Five-Year Plans (master plans devised to expedite economic expansion through rapid industrialization of the once largely agricultural society) and, according to State Department files, its advisor was Soviet agent Alexander Ginsberg. In 1930, according to the U.S. Treasury, all Soviet accounts were with the Chase National Bank. Today the principal Chase Manhattan correspondent bank in Russia is Narodny Bank.

The Five-Year Plans have been hailed in the history books as a triumph of Soviet engineering. In fact, the Plans were entirely packaged and implemented by non-Russian companies mostly American -for the profit of Wall Street. Rockefeller interests received a large portion of the money that flowed from this initial effort to modernize the Soviet Union.
This included its war industries, ammunition, modern aircraft, tanks and warships.

**WORLD WAR II**

Lend Lease (the US program offering assistance to the Allies during World War II) provided the means for the Soviets to resist Nazi aggression. The Soviet Union was the recipient of the latest in US military technology during World War II - once again for the profit of large US multinationals.

**POST WORLD WAR II**

The buildup of Soviet economic and military power has continued from 1945 down to the present day under the guise of peaceful trade.

A good example is the truck industry: any truck plant that produces civilian trucks can also produce military trucks. All Soviet automobile, truck and engine technology comes from the West, and chiefly from the United States. The Soviet military has over 300,000 trucks - the bulk of which came from these US-built plants.

Up to 1968 the largest motor vehicle plant in the USSR was at Gorki • and it was built by the Ford Motor Company and the Austin Company as a part of so-called “peaceful trade.” The Gorki plant produced many of the trucks American pilots saw on the Ho Chi Minh Trail. The chassis for the GAZ-69 rocket launcher used against Israel was also produced there, along with the Soviet jeep and half a dozen other military vehicles.

In 1968, while the Gorki plant was building vehicles to be used in Vietnam and against Israel, further equipment for the plant was ordered and shipped from the US.

Also in 1968 there was the so-called “Fiat deal” - a plan to build a plant at Volgograd three times bigger than the one at Gorki. Dean Rusk and Walter Rostow told Congress and the American public this was “peaceful trade,” that the Fiat plant could not produce military vehicles. However, as previously stated, any automobile manufacturing plant can produce military vehicles. The main design contract for the Volgograd plant was held by Fiat, whose chairman was soon-to-be Trilateral Giovanni Agnelli. Agnelli is also on the International Advisory Committee of Chase Manhattan Bank. (The IAC chairman is Henry Kissinger).
Fiat in Italy doesn't make automobile manufacturing equipment; they use U.S. manufactured equipment. Fiat did send 1,000 men to Russia for the erection of the plant -but over half of the equipment came from the United States, namely Gleason Works, TRW Inc. of Cleveland, U.S. Industries, Inc. and New Britain Machine Co. So in the middle of a war that killed 46,000 Americans and countless Vietnamese with Soviet weapons and supplies, Trilaterals doubled Soviet auto output.

In 1972, the Soviets received equipment and technology from the West to build the largest heavy truck plant in the world the Kama plant -to produce 100,000 ten-ton trucks per year -more than produced by all US manufacturers put together. It is also the largest plant in the world, covering over 36 square miles.

Does the Kama truck plant have military potential? The Soviets themselves answered this one. The Kama-produced truck is rated 60 per cent higher than the ZIL-130 truck, and the ZIL series trucks are standard Soviet army trucks used in Vietnam, the Middle East and Afghanistan.

In the opening paragraphs of this chapter we quoted the support from William Saunders, chairman of Ingersoll-Rand, for the Bolsheviks in 1918.

Today we find the same firm Ingersoll-Rand aiding the military buildup of the Soviet Union for military equipment in use by the Soviets. According to Business Week:

“Meanwhile, a smaller but politically still more inflammatory shipment is also rolling -toward Russia’s Kama River truck plant. New Jersey’s Ingersoll-Rand Co. expects to complete by late this year an $8.8 million order of automated production-line equipment used to make diesel engines at the Soviet manufacturing which produced trucks used in the invasion of Afghanistan. The shipments are authorized under the Commerce Department’s general licenses, not yet under strict controls.”

The pro-Soviet stance of American businessmen today, as well as in 1918, is well typified by Dresser Industries. The company is now finishing a drill bit plant worth $146 million at Kuibyshev. The Soviets need high-quality drill bits to step up oil exploration, and oil is needed to fuel its overseas expansion program.

Dresser has not only continued to press ahead with the plant, but is attempting to keep its Soviet role quiet to avoid public backlash in the US. To quote Dresser’s senior vice-president Edward R. Luter:

“Dresser is keeping a low profile on the plant. We’re not looking for any publicity, because we’re afraid if our name comes up, and the project is called to people’s attention, they might remember that they wanted to do something to stop it. We hope we can let sleeping dogs lie, and let things continue to roll.”

The reason that Dresser wants to keep its role from the public is simple: according to Department of Defense expert Dr. William Perry the Soviets “will be able to detect and monitor all US subs using oil exploration equipment sold to them by the US.”
KISSINGER AND SOVIET MILITARY BUILD UP

Henry Kissinger has been intimately connected for two decades with the Rockefeller family as a family advisor before going to Washington in 1970. In the March 1979 issue of The Trilateral Observer the annual cash payments from Nelson Rockefeller to Henry Kissinger were listed from 1958 to 1969 (Kissinger entered the White House as National Security Advisor to President Nixon in 1969).7

Each year, cash payments averaging at least $12,000 were made to Henry Kissinger. An official report on these transactions concluded that the payments “were for work done for the family rather than on a consulting basis through any governmental agency.”8 Kissinger can be described as the intellectual hired hand of the Rockefellers. Kissinger was responsible for brushing aside information that our exports to the Soviets had military potential and for forcing US government officials to approve export of equipment with military potential.

The co-author’s (Sutton) personal knowledge of the role of David Packard (later Secretary of Defense, from 1969 to 1971) in suppressing information of military potential, and the intimate relations of David Rockefeller and Henry Kissinger, suggests that the Trilateral group was the origin of the 1970’s phase to profit from the building of the military power of the Soviet Union.

Kissinger’s personal role can be gleaned from documents leaked to columnist Jack Anderson, which read in part:

“At the time (1972) some officials, including then Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, voiced concern that the Russians might use the central Asian truck plant the biggest in the world - to produce military equipment.”9

Kissinger brushed the misgivings aside. A confidential Commerce Department memorandum states that in 1971 Kissinger “ordered the Secretary of Commerce to grant three pending applications” for construction of the Soviet plant.10 Another secret memo set the final value of US-licensed equipment and technology at $1.5 billion. Others - notably our Western European allies - were not so sure.

On March 20, 1975, Kissinger cabled US officials in Paris on the best way to quiet such doubts.

“Kama trucks are not tactical military vehicles with cross-country capabilities,” the secret cable said. “Some may ultimately be outfitted with front-wheel drive for muddy or icy environment. However, trucks will not be equipped for deep fording or have other features typical of military models.”

Kissinger’s cable concluded that “we see little likelihood of diversion to military uses”12 even though there was ample evidence on file in Washington that diversion to military uses would be made.
THE TRILATERAL VIEW OF COMMUNISM

In the light of the above material it becomes critical to know the Trilateral opinion of Communism.

In Triangle Paper No. 13, Collaboration with Communist Countries in Managing Global Problems: an Examination of the Options, we find the Trilateral view of cooperation with Communist countries.

The objective for making the report was prompted “by a desire to exploit any opportunities with the Communist countries for cooperative management of certain international problems”.13

The report did not have the objective of finding if such “cooperative management” would be advantageous to the United States or if it would enhance or reduce the security of the United States or whether it would lead to a more peaceful world. The objective assumes that “cooperative management” with Communist countries would be advantageous and beneficial to the United States.

On the questions of whether such cooperation would strengthen the Soviet Union, the report makes statements flatly inconsistent with well-documented fact. For example:

“Some analysts have expressed concern about the consequences that are likely to flow from successful East-West collaboration in strengthening the economic capacity and therefore the international power of the Soviet Union.”14

To which question the report answers, “These consequences are likely to be limited.”15

ESTABLISHMENT COVER UP

Today the massive contribution of the Eastern Establishment to Soviet military development is widely known. It can no longer be suppressed as it was in the early 1970’s.

Since previously “well-kept secrets” have leaked out, the new tactic is to mislead the American public into believing that it was an innocent mistake on the part of Washington policy makers.
Specifically, when Jim Gallagher in the Chicago Tribune cites the Bryant Grinder case (precision ball bearing grinding machines were supplied to the Soviets and these machines assisted and enabled Soviet development of a family of MIRV nuclear missiles with multiple war heads) and cases where electronic equipment was converted for use in missile guidance systems he says,

“In both of these cases the Soviets were able to overcome serious gaps in technology with the inadvertent assistance of the United States.”16

“Inadvertent,” indeed! Many credible and acknowledged experts were vocal in the early 1970’s concerning these precise shipments and identified the exact military end uses. At the Republican Convention in Miami Beach (1972) the co-author (Sutton) explained at length how such shipments would be used by the Soviets.

The shipments were not inadvertent: they were deliberate and made with the full forewarning of military end uses. In the past, warnings of the possible consequences of U.S. technological aid to the Soviets have fallen on “tuned-out” ears. As the criticism became more adamant, specific attempts were made to silence it.

So we can conclude:

1. The military build-up the Soviet Union by some “American” multinationals through technological transfers goes back 60 years, and today is centered in the Trilaterally represented companies.
2. The blame lies almost entirely with a few international banks and big business interests. Most important among them are Chase National (now Chase Manhattan) and the Rockefeller-influenced General Electric and RCA complexes.
3. Warnings of the expansion of the capabilities of the Soviet military inevitably resulting from American technological aid have either been ignored, suppressed or those daring to criticize have been vilified.
4. These elitist interests are the prime source of virtually every major crisis facing the United States today. Their greed and shortsightedness has placed the United States in the most precarious position in its entire history.

DAVID ROCKEFELLER AND SOVIET MILITARY POWER

There is no question that Trilaterals -David Rockefeller included have been stung by repeated strong and widespread criticism of the Trilateral Commission.

At a 1980 World Affairs Council luncheon in Los Angeles, Rockefeller voiced concern that “Misrepresenting the motives of good and dedicated people will only narrow instead of broaden participation in the group’s discussion of international affairs.”17
Rockefeller specifically and at length denied that Trilateral multinationals deal with the Soviet Union for “the sake of financial gain.” The Wall Street Journal excerpts from the Los Angeles speech boxed this Rockefeller comment to emphasize its importance:

“To some extremists, the Trilateral Commission is pictured as a nefarious plot by an Eastern Establishment of businessmen in the service of multinational corporations who will do almost anything including going into cahoots with the Kremlin for the sake of financial gain.” 18

These are strong words. The use of buzz words such as “extremists” and “nefarious” suggests an attempt is under way to cover facts with diversionary tactics.

The weak position of Trilaterals in general is reflected in their treatment of objective, factual criticism. The usual Trilateral response to any criticism, whether valid or not, is to label it “extremism.” The critic is immediately tagged either “far right” or “far left” or, if the facts are too accurate for comfort, the critic is merely ignored.

David Rockefeller argued further:

“Far from being a coterie of international conspirators with designs on covertly ruling the world, the Trilateral Commission -like the Los Angeles World Affair Council -is, in reality, a group of concerned citizens interested in fostering greater understanding and cooperation among international allies.” 19

Examine the facts above and compare them to the Rockefeller rhetoric. The co-author (Sutton) has written five books since 1968 on the build-up of the Soviet Union by Western capitalists. Three of the books are academic in nature, published by the Hoover Institution at Stanford University. No one, including David Rockefeller and David Packard, has denied the factual basis of these books. The Soviets have also remained silent. They know the facts are accurate.

Moreover, Commissioner David Packard, a Trustee of the Hoover Institution, is well aware of the Stanford books. Hoover Institution financed part of the research and in the early 1970’s Packard was personally involved with suppressing those parts that dealt with the build-up of Soviet military power.
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