

NWO PLANS EXPOSED

BY INSIDER IN 1969

August 26, 2011

source: www.rense.com/general94/nwoplans.htm

Introduction.....3

Tape I.....3

Is There a Power, a Force, or a Group of Men Organizing and Redirecting Change?	3
Everything is in Place and Nobody Can Stop Us Now.	3
People Will Have to Get Used to Change	4
The Real and the Stated Goals.....	4
Population Control	5
Permission to have Babies.....	5
Redirecting the Purpose of Sex	5
Contraception Universally Available to All.....	5
Sex Education as a Tool of World Government	5
Tax Funded Abortion as Population Control	5
Encouraging Homosexuality	6
Technology	6
Families to Diminish in Importance.....	6
Euthanasia and the “Demise Pill”.....	7
Limiting Access to Affordable Medical	7
Planning the Control Over Medicine.....	7
Elimination of Private Doctors.....	8
New Difficult to Diagnose and Untreatable Diseases	8
Suppressing Cancer Cures as a Means of Population Control	8
Inducing Heart Attacks as a Form of Assassination	8
Education as a Tool for Accelerating Onset of Puberty and Evolution.....	9
Blending All Religions.....	9
Changing the Bible through Revisions of Key Words	9
The Churches Will Help Us.....	10
Restructuring Education as a Tool of Indoctrination.....	10
More Time In Schools, But They Wouldn’t Learn Anything	10
Controlling Who Has Access to Information	10
Schools as the Hub of the Community.....	10
Some Books Would Just Disappear from the Libraries.....	11
Changing Laws.....	11
The Encouragement of Drug Abuse to Create a Jungle Atmosphere	11
Alcohol Abuse	12
Restrictions on Travel	12
The Need for More Jails, and Using Hospitals as Jails.....	12

TAPE II.....12

No More Security	12
Crime Used To Manage Society.....	12
Curtailment of American Industrial Pre-Eminence.....	13
Shifting Populations and Economies — Tearing the Social Roots	14
Sports As A Tool Of Social Change.....	14
Sex and Violence Inculcated through Entertainment	15
Travel Restrictions and Implanted I.D.	16
Food Control	16
Weather Control.....	16
Politics.....	17
Know How People Respond — Making Them Do What You Want.....	17
Falsified Scientific Research.....	17

Terrorism18
Financial Control.....18
Surveillance, Implants, and Televisions that Watch You.....19
Home Ownership a Thing of the Past20
The Arrival Of The Totalitarian Global System20

Tape III21

INTRODUCTION

This is a transcript of two out of three tapes on the "New World System." Tapes one and two were recorded in 1988 and are the recollections of Dr. Lawrence Dunegan regarding a lecture he attended on March 20, 1969 at a meeting of the Pittsburgh Paediatric Society. The lecturer at that gathering of paediatricians (identified in tape three recorded in 1991) was a Dr. Richard Day (who died in 1989). At the time, Dr. Day was Professor of Paediatrics at Mount Sinai Medical School in New York. Previously he had served as Medical Director of Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

Dr. Dunegan was formerly a student of Dr. Day at the University of Pittsburgh and was well acquainted with him, though not intimately. He describes Dr. Day as an insider of the "Order" and although Dr. Dunegan's memory was somewhat dimmed by the intervening years, he is able to provide enough details of the lecture to enable any enlightened person to discern the real purposes behind the trends of our time. This is a transcript of a loose, conversational monologue that makes for better listening than reading.'

The transcripts of Tape 1 and Tape 2 have been very slightly edited to remove verbal mannerisms and to improve readability.

[The original unedited transcript may be found here.](#)

Tape 3 is an interview by Randy Engel, Director of the U.S. Coalition for Life, with Dr. Larry Dunegan and was recorded on Oct. 10, 1991 in Pittsburgh, Penn.

This set of three audio tapes may be ordered from the Florida Pro-family Forum, P.O. Box 1059, Highland City, FL 33846-1059 (\$20.00).

TAPE I

Is There a Power, a Force, or a Group of Men Organizing and Redirecting Change?

There has been much written, and much said, by some people who have looked at all the changes that have occurred in American society in the past 20 years or so, and who have looked retrospectively to earlier history of the United States, and indeed, of the world, and come to the conclusion that there is a conspiracy of sorts which influences, indeed controls, major historical events, not only in the United States, but also around the world.

This conspiratorial interpretation of history is based on people making observations from the outside, gathering

evidence and concluding that from the outside they see a conspiracy. Their evidence and conclusions are based on evidence gathered in retrospect.

I want to now describe what I heard from a speaker in 1969, which in several weeks will now be 20 years ago. The speaker did not speak in terms of retrospect, but rather predicting changes that would be brought about in the future. The speaker was not looking from the outside in, thinking that he saw conspiracy, rather, he was on the inside, admitting that, indeed, there was an organised power, force, group of men, who wielded enough influence to determine major events involving countries around the world. In addition, he predicted, or rather expounded on, changes that were planned for the remainder of this century.

As you listen, if you can recall the situation, at least in the United States in 1969 and the few years there after, and then recall the kinds of changes which have occurred between then and now, almost 20 years later, I believe you will be impressed with the degree to which the things that were planned to be brought about have already been accomplished. Some of the things that were discussed were not intended to be accomplished yet by 1988. [Note: the year of this recording] but are intended to be accomplished before the end of this century.

There is a timetable; and it was during this session that some of the elements of the timetable were brought out. Anyone who recalls early in the days of the Kennedy campaign when he spoke of progress in the decade of the 60's. That was kind of a cliché in those days —"the decade of the 60's." Well, by 1969 our speaker was talking about the decade of the 70's, the decade of the 80's, and the decade of the 90's.

Prior to that time, I don't remember anybody saying the decade of the 40's and the decade of the 50's. So I think this overall plan and timetable had taken important shape with more predictability to those who control it, sometime in the late 50's. That's speculation on my part.

In any event, the speaker said that his purpose was to tell us about changes which would be brought about in the next 30 years or so, so that an entirely new world-wide system would be in operation before the turn of the century. As he put it, "We plan to enter the 21st Century with a running start." [emphasis supplied]

Everything is in Place and Nobody Can Stop Us Now.

He said, as we listened to what he was about to present,

"Some of you will think I'm talking about Communism. Well, what I'm talking about is much bigger than Communism!"

At that time he indicated that there is much more co-operation between East and West than most people realise.

In his introductory remarks, he commented that he was free to speak at this time. He would not have been able to say what he was about to say, even a few years earlier. But he was free to speak at this time because now, and I'm quoting here,

"everything is in place and nobody can stop us now."

He went on to say that most people don't understand how governments operate and even people in high positions in governments, including our own, don't really understand how and where decisions are made. He went on to say that people who really influence decisions are names that for the most part would be familiar to most of us, but he would not use individuals' names or names of any specific organisation. But that, if he did, most of the people would be names that were recognised by most of his audience. He went on to say that they were not primarily people in public office, but people of prominence who were primarily known in their private occupations or private positions.

The speaker was Dr. Richard Day, a doctor of medicine and a former professor at a large Eastern university, and he was addressing a group of doctors of medicine, about 80 in number. His name would not be widely recognised by anybody likely to hear this.

The only purpose in recording this is that it may give a perspective to those who hear it regarding the changes which have already been accomplished in the past 20 years or so, and a bit of a preview to what at least some people are planning for the remainder of this century, so that they would enter the 21st Century with a flying start.

Some of us may not enter that Century. His purpose in telling our group about these changes that were to be brought about was to make it easier for us to adapt to these changes. Indeed, as he quite accurately said,

"they would be changes that would be very surprising, and in some ways difficult for people to accept,"

and he hoped that we, as sort of his friends, would make the adaptation more easily if we knew somewhat beforehand what to expect.

People Will Have to Get Used to Change

Somewhere in the introductory remarks he insisted that nobody have a tape recorder and that nobody take notes, which for a professor was a very remarkable kind of thing to expect from an audience. Something in his remarks suggested that there could be negative repercussions against

him if it became widely known that indeed he had spilled the beans, so to speak. When I first heard that, I thought maybe that was sort of an ego trip, somebody enhancing his own importance. But as the revelations unfolded, I began to understand why he might have had some concern about not having it widely known what was said although this was a fairly public forum where he was speaking. Nonetheless, he asked that no notes be taken, no tape recording be used. This was suggesting there might be some personal danger to himself if these revelations were widely publicised.

Again, as the remarks began to unfold, and heard the rather outrageous things that were said, I made it a point to try to remember as much of what he said as I could and to connect my recollections to simple events around me to aid my memory for the future, in case I wanted to do what I'm doing now — recording this. I also wanted to try to maintain a perspective on what would be developing, if indeed, it followed the predicted pattern — which it has!

At this point, so that I don't forget to include it later, I'll just include some statements that were made from time to time throughout the presentation. One of the statements was having to do with change. The statement was,

"People will have to get used to the idea of change, so used to change, that they'll be expecting change. Nothing will be permanent."

This often came out in the context of a society where people seemed to have no roots or moorings, but would be passively willing to accept change simply because it was all they had ever known. This was sort of in contrast to generations of people up until this time where certain things you expected to be, and remain in place as reference points for your life. So change was to be brought about, change was to be anticipated and expected, and accepted, no questions asked.

Another comment that was made from time to time during the presentation was:

"People are too trusting, people don't ask the right questions."

Sometimes, being too trusting was equated with being too dumb. But sometimes when he would say that "People don't ask the right questions," it was almost with a sense of regret as if he were uneasy with what he was part of, and wished that people would challenge it and maybe not be so trusting.

The Real and the Stated Goals

Another comment that was repeated from time to time, particularly in relation to changing laws and customs was,

"Everything has two purposes. One is the ostensible purpose which will make it acceptable to people and second is the real purpose which would further the goals of establishing the new system."

Frequently he would say, "There is just no other way, there's just no other way!" This seemed to come as a sort of an apology, particularly at the conclusion of describing some particularly offensive changes. For example, the promotion of drug addiction which we'll get into later.

Population Control

He was very active with population control groups, the population control movement, and population control was really the entry point into specifics following the introduction. He said the population is growing too fast. Numbers of people living at any one time on the planet must be limited or we will run out of space to live. We will outgrow our food supply and will pollute the world with our waste.

Permission to have Babies

People won't be allowed to have babies just because they want to or because they are careless. Most families would be limited to two. Some people would be allowed only one, however outstanding people might be selected and allowed to have three. But most people would be allowed to have only two babies. That's because the zero population growth rate is 2.1 children per completed family. So something like every 10th family might be allowed the privilege of the third baby.

To me, up to this point, the words 'population control' primarily connoted limiting the number of babies to be born. But this remark about what people would be 'allowed' and then what followed, made it quite clear that when you hear 'population control' that means more than just controlling births. It means control of every endeavour of an entire world population; a much broader meaning to that term than I had ever attached to it before hearing this.

As you listen and reflect back on some of the things you hear, you will begin to recognise how one aspect dovetails with other aspects in terms of controlling human endeavours.

Redirecting the Purpose of Sex

Well, from population control, the natural next step then was sex.

He said sex must be separated from reproduction. Sex is too pleasurable, and the urges are too strong, to expect people to give it up. Chemicals in food and in the water supply to reduce the sex drive are not practical. The strategy then would be not to diminish sex activity, but to increase sex

activity, but in such a way, that people won't be having babies.

Contraception Universally Available to All

The first consideration here was contraception. Contraception would be very strongly encouraged, and it would be connected closely in people's minds with sex. They would automatically think contraception when they were thinking or preparing for sex, and contraception would be made universally available.

Contraceptives would be displayed much more prominently in drug stores, right up with the cigarettes and chewing gum. Out in the open rather than hidden under the counter where people would have to ask for them and maybe be embarrassed. This kind of openness was a way of suggesting that contraceptives are just as much a part of life as any other items sold in the store. Contraceptives would be advertised and also dispensed in the schools in association with sex education!

Sex Education as a Tool of World Government

The sex education was to get kids interested early, making the connection between sex and the need for contraception early in their lives, even before they became very active.

At this point I was recalling some of my teachers, particularly in high school and found it totally unbelievable to think of them agreeing, much less participating in, and distributing of contraceptives to students. But, that only reflected my lack of understanding of how these people operate. That was before the school-based clinic programs got started.

Many cities in the United States by this time have already set up school-based clinics, which are primarily contraception, birth control, population control clinics. The idea then is that the connection between sex and contraception introduced and reinforced in school would carry over into marriage. Indeed, if young people when they matured decided to get married, marriage itself would be diminished in importance. He indicated some recognition that most people probably would want to be married, but this certainly would not be any longer considered necessary for sexual activity.

Tax Funded Abortion as Population Control

No surprise then that the next item was abortion. And this, now back in 1969, four years before Roe vs. Wade, he said,

"Abortion will no longer be a crime."

Abortion will be accepted as normal, and would be paid for by taxes for people who could not pay for their own abortions. Contraceptives would be made available by tax money so that nobody would have to do without

contraceptives. If school sex programs would lead to more pregnancies in children, that was really seen as no problem. Parents who think they are opposed to abortion on moral or religious grounds will change their minds when it is their own child who is pregnant. So this will help overcome opposition to abortion.

Before long, only a few die-hards will still refuse to see abortion as acceptable, and they won't matter anymore.

Encouraging Homosexuality

"People will be given permission to be homosexual," that's the way it was stated. They won't have to hide it.

In addition, elderly people will be encouraged to continue to have active sex lives into the very old ages, just as long as they can. Everyone will be given permission to have sex, to enjoy however they want. Anything goes. This is the way it was put. In addition, I remember thinking,

"How arrogant for this individual, or whoever he represents, to feel that they can give or withhold permission for people to do things!"

But that was the terminology that was used. In this regard, clothing was mentioned. Clothing styles would be made more stimulating and provocative. Back in 1969 was the time of the mini skirt, when those mini-skirts were very, very high and very revealing. He said,

"It is not just the amount of skin that is exposed that makes clothing sexually seductive, but other, more subtle things are often suggestive."

Things like movement, and the cut of clothing, and the kind of fabric, the positioning of accessories on the clothing.

"If a woman has an attractive body, why should she not show it?" was one of the statements.

There was no detail on what was meant by 'provocative clothing', but since that time if you watched the change in clothing styles, blue jeans are cut in a way that they're more tight-fitting in the crotch. They form wrinkles. Wrinkles are essentially arrows. Lines which direct one's vision to certain anatomic areas.

This was around the time of the 'burn your bra' activity. He indicated that a lot of women should not go without a bra. They need a bra to be attractive, so instead of banning bras and burning them, bras would come back. But they would be thinner and softer allowing more natural movement. It was not specifically stated, but certainly, a very thin bra is much more revealing of the nipple and what else is

underneath, than the heavier bras that were in style up to that time.

Technology

Earlier he said that sex and reproduction would be separated.

You would have sex without reproduction and then technology was reproduction without sex. This would be done in the laboratory. He indicated that already much, much research was underway about making babies in the laboratory. There was some elaboration on that, but I don't remember the details. How much of that technology has come to my attention since that time. I don't remember in a way that I can distinguish what was said from what I subsequently have learned as general medical information.

Families to Diminish in Importance

Families would be limited in size.

We already alluded to not being allowed more than two children.

Divorce would be made easier and more prevalent. Most people who marry will marry more than once.

More people will not marry. Unmarried people would stay in hotels and even live together. That would be very common — nobody would even ask questions about it. It would be widely accepted as no different from married people being together.

More women will work outside the home. More men will be transferred to other cities and in their jobs, more men would travel. Therefore, it would be harder for families to stay together. This would tend to make the marriage relationship less stable and, therefore, tend to make people less willing to have babies.

The extended families would be smaller, and more remote. Travel would be easier, less expensive, for a while, so that people who did have to travel would feel they could get back to their families, not that they were abruptly being made remote from their families. But one of the net effects of easier divorce laws combined with the promotion of travel, and transferring families from one city to another, was to create instability in the families. If both husband and wife are working and one partner is transferred, the other one may not be easily transferred. Soon, either gives up his or her job and stays behind while the other leaves, or else gives up the job and risks not finding employment in the new location. Rather a diabolical approach to this whole thing!

Euthanasia and the “Demise Pill”

Everybody has a right to live only so long. The old are no longer useful. They become a burden. You should be ready to accept death. Most people are.

An arbitrary age limit could be established. After all, you have a right to only so many steak dinners, so many orgasms, and so many good pleasures in life. After you have had enough of them and you're no longer productive, working, and contributing, then you should be ready to step aside for the next generation.

Some things that would help people realise that they had lived long enough, he mentioned several of these. I don't remember them all but here are a few, the use of very pale printing ink on forms that people are necessary to fill out. Older people wouldn't be able to read the pale ink as easily and would need to go to younger people for help.

Automobile traffic patterns, there would be more high-speed traffic lanes that older people with their slower reflexes would have trouble dealing with and thus, loses some of their independence.

Limiting Access to Affordable Medical

A big item that was elaborated on at some length was the cost of medical care would be made burdensomely high.

Medical care would be connected very closely with one's work but also would be made very, very high in cost so that it would simply be unavailable to people beyond a certain time. Unless they had a remarkably rich, supporting family, they would just have to do without care. And the idea was that if everybody says,

"Enough! What a burden it is on the young to try to maintain the old people,"

then the young would become agreeable to helping Mom and Dad along the way, provided this was done humanely and with dignity. Then the example was — there could be a nice, farewell party, a real celebration. Mom and Dad had done a good job. Then after the party's over they take the 'demise pill'.

Planning the Control Over Medicine

The next topic is Medicine. There would be profound changes in the practice of medicine. Overall, medicine would be much more tightly controlled. The observation that was made in 1969 that,

"Congress is not going to go along with national health insurance, is now, abundantly evident. But it's not necessary, we have other ways to control health care".

These would come about more gradually, but all health care delivery would come under tight control.

Medical care would be closely connected to work. If you don't work or can't work, you won't have access to medical care.

The days of hospitals giving away free care would gradually wind down, to where it was virtually non-existent.

Costs would be forced up so that people won't be able to afford to go without insurance. People pay for it, you're entitled to it.

It was only subsequently that I began to realise the extent to which you would not be paying for it. Your medical care would be paid for by others. Therefore, you would gratefully accept, on bended knee, what was offered to you as a privilege.

Your role being responsible for your own care would be diminished. As an aside here, this is not something that was developed at that time; I didn't understand it at the time that it was an aside.

The way this works, everybody has made dependent on insurance and if you don't have insurance then you pay directly; the cost of your care is enormous. The insurance company, however, paying for your care, does not pay that same amount. If you are charged, say, \$600 for the use of an operating room, the insurance company does not pay \$600; they only pay \$300 or \$400. That differential in billing has the desired effect: It enables the insurance company to pay for that which you could never pay for. They get a discount that's unavailable to you. When you see your bill you're grateful that the insurance company could do that. And in this way you are dependent, and virtually required to have insurance. The whole billing is fraudulent.

Access to hospitals would be tightly controlled and identification would be needed to get into the building. The security in and around hospitals would be established and gradually increased so that nobody without identification could get in or move around inside the building.

Theft of hospital equipment, things like typewriters and microscopes and so forth would be 'allowed' and exaggerated; reports of it would be exaggerated so that this would be the excuse needed to establish the need for strict security until people got used to it.

Anybody moving about the hospital would be required to wear an identification badge with a photograph and telling why he was there, employee or lab technician or visitor or whatever. This is to be brought in gradually, getting everybody used to the idea of identifying themselves — until it was just accepted.

This need for ID to move about would start in small ways: hospitals, some businesses, but gradually expand to include everybody in all places!

It was observed that hospitals can be used to confine people and for the treatment of criminals. This did not mean, necessarily, medical treatment. At that time I did not know the term 'Psycho-Prison' — they are in the Soviet Union, but, without trying to recall all the details, basically, he was describing the use of hospitals both for treating the sick, and for confinement of criminals for reasons other than the medical well-being of the criminal. The definition of criminal was not given.

Elimination of Private Doctors

The image of the doctor would change.

No longer would he be seen as an individual professional in service to individual patients. But the doctor would be gradually recognized as a highly skilled technician — and his job would change. The job is to include things like executions by lethal injection.

The image of the doctor being a powerful, independent person would have to be changed. He went on to say,

"Doctors are making entirely too much money. They should advertise like any other product."

Lawyers would be advertising too. Keep in mind, this was an audience of doctors; being addressed by a doctor. And it was interesting that he would make some rather insulting statements to his audience without fear of antagonizing us.

The solo practitioner would become a thing of the past. A few die-hards might try to hold out, but most doctors would be employed by an institution of one kind or another. Group practice would be encouraged, corporations would be encouraged, and then once the corporate image of medical care gradually became more and more acceptable, doctors would more and more become employees rather than independent contractors.

Along with that, of course, unstated but necessary, is the employee serves his employer, not his patient. So we've already seen quite a lot of that in the last 20 years. And apparently more on the horizon.

The term HMO was not used at that time, but as you look at HMO's you see this is the way that medical care is being taken over since the National Health Insurance approach did not get through the Congress.

A few die-hard doctors may try to make a go of it, remaining in solo practice, remaining independent, which, parenthetically, is me but they would suffer a great loss of income. They'd be able to scrape by, maybe, but never really live comfortably as would those who were willing to

become employees of the system. Ultimately, there would be no room at all for the solo practitioner after the system is entrenched.

New Difficult to Diagnose and Untreatable Diseases

The next heading to talk about is Health and Disease. He said there would be new diseases to appear which had not ever been seen before. Would be very difficult to diagnose and be untreatable — at least for along time. No elaboration was made on this, but I remember, not long after hearing this presentation, when I had a puzzling diagnosis to make, I would be wondering, "Is this a case of what he was talking about?"

Some years later AIDS developed. I think AIDS was at least one example of what he was talking about. I now think that AIDS probably was a manufactured disease.

Suppressing Cancer Cures as a Means of Population Control

Cancer. He said.

"We can cure almost every cancer right now. Information is on file in the Rockefeller Institute, if it's ever decided that it should be released. But consider — if people stop dying of cancer, how rapidly we would become overpopulated. You may as well die of cancer as of something else."

Efforts at cancer treatment would be geared more toward comfort than toward cure. There was some statement that ultimately the cancer cures which were being hidden in the Rockefeller Institute would come to light because independent researchers might bring them out, despite these efforts to suppress them. But at least for the time being, letting people die of cancer was a good thing to do because it would slow down the problem of overpopulation.

Inducing Heart Attacks as a Form of Assassination

Another very interesting thing was heart attacks. He said,

"There is now a way to simulate a real heart attack. It can be used as a means of assassination."

Only a very skilled pathologist who knew exactly what to look for at an autopsy, could distinguish this from the real thing.

I thought that was a very surprising and shocking thing to hear from this particular man at that particular time. This, and the business of the cancer cure, really still stand out sharply in my memory, because they were so shocking and, at that time, seemed to me out of character.

He then went on to talk about nutrition and exercise sort of in the same framework. People would have to eat right and exercise right to live as long as before. Most won't. This in the connection of nutrition, there was no specific statement that I can recall as to particular nutrients that would be either inadequate or in excess.

In retrospect, I tend to think he meant high salt diets and high fat diets would predispose toward high blood pressure and premature arteriosclerotic heart disease. And that if people who were too dumb or too lazy to exercise as they should then their circulating fats go up and predispose to disease.

He also said something about diet information would be widely available, but most people, particularly stupid people, who had no right to continue living anyway, would ignore the advice and just go on and eat what was convenient and tasted good.

There were some other unpleasant things said about food. I just can't recall what they were. But I do remember having reflections about wanting to plant a garden in the backyard to get around whatever these contaminated foods would be. I regret I don't remember the details about nutrition and hazardous nutrition.

With regard to exercise, he went on to say that more people would be exercising more, especially running, because everybody can run. You don't need any special equipment or place. You can run wherever you are. As he put it, "people will be running all over the place."

And in this vein, he pointed out how supply produces demand. And this was in reference to athletic clothing and equipment. As this would be made more widely available and glamorised, particularly as regards running shoes, this would stimulate people to develop an interest in running as part of a whole sort of public propaganda campaign. People would be encouraged then to buy the attractive sports equipment and to get into exercise.

In connection with nutrition he also mentioned that public eating places would rapidly increase. That this had a connection with the family too. As more and more people eat out, eating at home would become less important. People would be less dependent on their kitchens at home. And then this also connected to convenience foods being made widely available — things like you could pop into the microwave. Whole meals would be available pre-fixed. And of course we've now seen this. But this whole different approach to eating out and to previously prepared meals being eaten in the home was predicted at that time to be brought about.

The convenience foods would be part of the hazards. Anybody who was lazy enough to want the convenience foods rather than fixing his own also had better be energetic enough to exercise. Because if he was too lazy to exercise and too lazy to fix his own food, then he didn't deserve to live very long.

This was all presented as sort of a moral judgement about people and what they should do with their energies. People who are smart, who would learn about nutrition, and who are disciplined enough to eat right and exercise right are better people — and the kind you want to live longer.

Education as a Tool for Accelerating Onset of Puberty and Evolution

Somewhere along in here there was also something about accelerating the onset of puberty. And this was said in connection with health, and later in connection with education, and connecting to accelerating the process of evolutionary change. There was a statement that

"we think that we can push evolution faster and in the direction we want it to go."

I remember this only as a general statement. I don't recall if any details were given beyond that.

Blending All Religions

Another area of discussion was Religion. This is an avowed atheist speaking. He said,

"Religion is not necessarily bad. A lot of people seem to need religion, with it's mysteries and rituals — so they will have religion. But the major religions of today have to be changed because they are not compatible with the changes to come. The old religions will have to go especially Christianity. Once the Roman Catholic Church is brought down, the rest of Christianity will follow easily. Then a new religion can be accepted for use all over the world. It will incorporate something from all of the old ones to make it more easy for people to accept, and feel at home. Most people won't be too concerned with religion. They will realise that they don't need it."

Changing the Bible through Revisions of Key Words

In order to do this, the Bible will be changed. It will be rewritten to fit the new religion.

"Gradually, key words will be replaced with new words having various shades of meaning. Then the meaning attached to the new word can be close to the old word — and as time goes on, other shades of meaning of that word can be emphasised, and then gradually that word replaced with another word."

I don't know if I'm making that clear, but the idea is that everything in Scripture need not be rewritten, just key words replaced by other words. The variability in meaning attached to any word can be used as a tool to change the entire meaning of Scripture, and therefore make it acceptable to this new religion. Most people won't know the difference; and this was another one of the times where he said,

"the few who do notice the difference won't be enough to matter."

The Churches Will Help Us

Then followed one of the most surprising statements of the whole presentation: He said,

"Some of you probably think the Churches won't stand for this," and he went on to say, "the churches will help us!"

There was no elaboration on this, it was unclear just what he had in mind when he said, "the churches will help us!"

In retrospect I think some of us now can understand what he might have meant at that time. I recall then only of thinking, "no they won't!" and remembering our Lord's words where he said to Peter, "Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church, and gates of Hell will not prevail against it." So yes, some people in the Churches might help and in the subsequent 20 years we've seen how some people in Churches have helped. But we also know that our Lord's Words will stand, and the gates of Hell will not prevail.

Restructuring Education as a Tool of Indoctrination

Another area of discussion was Education. In connection with education and remembering what he said about religion, was in addition to changing the Bible he said that the classics in Literature would be changed. I seem to recall Mark Twain's writings was given as one example. But he said that the casual reader reading a revised version of a classic would never even suspect that there was any change. Somebody would have to go through word by word to even recognise that any change was made in these classics, the changes would be so subtle. But the changes would be such as to promote the acceptability of the new system.

More Time In Schools, But They Wouldn't Learn Anything

As regards education, he indicated that kids would spend more time in schools, but in many schools they wouldn't learn anything. They'll learn some things, but not as much as formerly.

Better schools in better areas with better people, their kids will learn more. In the better schools learning would be accelerated. This is another time where he said,

"We think we can push evolution."

By pushing kids to learn more he seemed to be suggesting that their brains would evolve, that their offspring would evolve; sort of pushing evolution where kids would learn and be more intelligent at a younger age. As if this pushing would alter their physiology.

Overall, schooling would be prolonged. This meant prolonged through the school year. I'm not sure what he said about a long school day, I do remember he said that school was planned to go all summer, that the summer school vacation would become a thing of the past. Not only for schools, but for other reasons. People would begin to think of vacation times year round, not just in the summer.

For most people it would take longer to complete their education. To get what originally had been in a bachelor's program would now require advanced degrees and more schooling. So that a lot of school time would be just wasted time.

Good schools would become more competitive. I inferred when he said that, that he was including all schools — elementary up through college — but I don't recall if he actually said that.

Students would have to decide at a younger age what they would want to study and get onto their track early. It would be harder to change to another field of study once you get started. Studies would be concentrated in much greater depth, but narrowed. You wouldn't have access to material in other fields, outside your own area of study, without approval.

This seemed to be more where he talked about limited access to other fields. I seem to recall this as being more at the college level perhaps. People would be very specialised in their own area of expertise. But they won't be able to get a broad education and won't be able to understand what is going on overall.

Controlling Who Has Access to Information

He was already talking about computers in education, and at that time he said anybody who wanted computer access, or access to books that were not directly related to their field of study would have to have a very good reason for so doing. Otherwise, access would be denied.

Schools as the Hub of the Community

Another angle was that the schools would become more important in people's overall life.

Kids, in addition to their academics, would have to get into school activities unless they wanted to feel completely out of it. But spontaneous activities among kids; the thing that came to my mind when I heard this was — sand lot football and sand lot baseball teams that we worked up as kids growing up. I said the kids wanting any activities outside of school would be almost forced to get them through the school. There would be few opportunities outside.

Now the pressures of the accelerated academic program, the accelerated demands where kids would feel they had to be part of something — one or another athletic club or some school activity — these pressures he recognized would cause some students to burn out. He said.

"The smartest ones will learn how to cope with pressures and to survive. There will be some help available to students in handling stress, but the unfit won't be able to make it. They will then move on to other things."

In this connection and later on with drug abuse and alcohol abuse he indicated that psychiatric services to help would be increased dramatically. In all the pushing for achievement, it was recognized that many people would need help, and the people worth keeping around would be able to accept and benefit from that help, and still be super achievers. Those who could not would fall by the wayside and therefore were sort of dispensable — 'expendable' I guess is the word I want.

Education would be lifelong and adults would be going to school. There'll always be new information that adults must have to keep up. When you can't keep up anymore, you're too old. This was another way of letting older people know that the time had come for them to move on and take the demise pill. If you got too tired to keep up with your education, or you got too old to learn new information, then this was a signal — you begin to prepare to get ready to step aside.

Some Books Would Just Disappear from the Libraries

In addition to revising the classics, which I alluded to awhile ago and with revising the Bible, he said,

"Some books would just disappear from the libraries."

This was in the vein that some books contain information or contain ideas that should not be kept around. Therefore, those books would disappear.

I don't remember exactly if he said how this was to be accomplished. But I seem to recall carrying away this idea that this would include thefts. That certain people would be designated to go to certain libraries and pick up certain

books and just get rid of them. Not necessarily as a matter of policy — just simply steal it.

Further down the line, not everybody will be allowed to own books. And some books nobody will be allowed to own.

Changing Laws

Another area of discussion was laws that would be changed.

At that time a lot of States had blue laws about Sunday sales, certain Sunday activities. He said the blue laws [Sunday laws] would all be repealed. Gambling laws would be repealed or relaxed, so that gambling would be increased. He indicated then that governments would get into gambling. We've had a lot of state lotteries pop up around the country since then. And, at the time, we were already being told that would be the case.

"Why should all that gambling money be kept in private hands when the State would benefit from it?" was the rational behind it.

But people should be able to gamble if they want to. So it would become a civil activity, rather than a private, or illegal activity.

Bankruptcy laws would be changed. I don't remember the details, but just that they would be. And I know subsequent to that time they have been.

Antitrust laws would be changed, or be interpreted differently, or both. In connection with the changing anti-trust laws, there was some statement that in a sense competition would be increased. But this would be increased competition within otherwise controlled circumstances. So it's not a free competition. I recall of having the impression that it was like competition but within members of a club. There would be nobody outside the club who would be able to compete. Like teams competing within a professional sports league; if you're the NFL or the American or National Baseball Leagues — you compete within the league but the league is all in agreement on what the rules of competition are — not a really free competition.

The Encouragement of Drug Abuse to Create a Jungle Atmosphere

Drug use would be increased. Alcohol use would be increased. Law enforcement efforts against drugs would be increased.

On first hearing that it sounded like a contradiction. Why increase drug abuse and simultaneously increase law enforcement against drug abuse? But the idea is that, in part, the increased availability of drugs would provide a sort

of law of the jungle whereby the weak and the unfit would be selected out. There was a statement made at the time:

"Before the earth was overpopulated, there was a law of the jungle where only the fittest survived. You had to be able to protect yourself against the elements and wild animals and disease, but if you were fit you survived. But now we've become so civilised — we're over civilised — and the unfit are enabled to survive only at the expense of those who are more fit."

The abuse of drugs would restore, in a certain sense, the law of the jungle and selection of the fittest for survival. News about drug abuse and law enforcement efforts would tend to keep drugs in the public consciousness. And would also tend to reduce this unwarranted American complacency that the world is a safe place, and a nice place.

Alcohol Abuse

The same thing would happen with alcohol. Alcohol abuse would be both promoted and demoted at the same time.

The vulnerable and the weak would respond to the promotions and therefore use and abuse more alcohol.

Drunk driving would become more of a problem; and stricter rules about driving under the influence would be established so that more and more people would lose their privilege to drive.

Again, much more in the way of psychological services would be made available to help those who got hooked on drugs and alcohol. The idea being, that in order to promote this — drug and alcohol are used to screen out some of the unfit — people who otherwise are pretty good would also be subject to getting hooked. And if they were really worth their salt they would have enough sense to seek psychological counselling and to benefit from it. So this was presented as sort of a redeeming value on the part of the planners. It was as if he was saying,

"You think we're bad in promoting these evil things — but look how nice we are — we're also providing a way out!"

Restrictions on Travel

This also had connection with something we'll get to later about overall restrictions on travel. Not everybody should be free to travel the way they do now in the United States. People don't have a need to travel that way. It's a privilege! It was kind of the high-handed the way it was put.

The Need for More Jails, and Using Hospitals as Jails

More jails would be needed. Hospitals could serve as jails. Some new hospital construction would be designed so as to make them adaptable to jail-like use.

— End of Tape I —

TAPE II

No More Security

Nothing is permanent. Streets would be re-routed and renamed. Areas you had not seen in a while would become unfamiliar. Among other things, this would contribute to older people feeling that it was time to move on, they feel they couldn't even keep up with the changes in areas that were once familiar. Buildings would be allowed to stand empty and deteriorate, and streets would be allowed to deteriorate in certain localities.

The purpose of this was to provide the jungle, the depressed atmosphere for the unfit.

Somewhere in this same connection he mentioned that buildings and bridges would be made so that they would collapse after a while, there would be more accidents involving aeroplanes and railroads and automobiles. All of this to contribute to the feeling of insecurity, that nothing was safe.

Not too long after this presentation, and I think one or two even before in the area where I live, we had a newly constructed bridge break. Another newly constructed bridge defect was discovered before it too broke. I remember reading just scattered incidents around the country where shopping malls would fall in right where they were filled with shoppers. I also remember that one of the shopping malls in our area, the first building I'd ever been in where you could feel this vibration throughout the entire building when there were a lot of people in there. I remember wondering at that time whether this shopping mall was one of the buildings he was talking about.

Talking to construction people and architects about it they would say, "Oh no, that's good when the building vibrates like that, that means it's flexible not rigid." Well, maybe so, we'll wait and see. Other areas there would be well maintained. Not every part of the city would be slums.

Crime Used To Manage Society

There would be the created slums and other areas well maintained. Those people able to leave the slums for better areas then would learn to better appreciate the importance of human accomplishment.

This meant that if they left the jungle and came to civilisation, so to speak, they could be proud of their own accomplishments that they made it. There was no related sympathy for those who were left behind in the jungle of drugs and deteriorating neighbourhoods. Then a statement that was kind of surprising,

"We think we can effectively limit crime to the slum areas, so it won't be spread heavily into better areas."

I should maybe point out here that these are obviously not word for word quotations after 20 years, but where I say that I am quoting, I am giving the general drift of what was said close to word for word, perhaps not precisely so.

I remember wondering, how can he be so confident that the criminal element is going to stay where he wants it to stay? But he went on to say that increased security would be needed in the better areas. That would mean more police, better co-ordinated police efforts.

He did not say so, but I wondered at that time about the moves that were afoot to consolidate all the police departments of suburbs around the major cities. I think the John Birch Society was one that was saying "Support your local police, don't let them be consolidated." I remember wondering if that was one of the things he had in mind about security. It was not explicitly stated.

Anyhow he went on to say there would be a whole new industry of residential security systems to develop with alarms and locks and alarms going into the police department so that people could protect their wealth and their well being. Because some of the criminal activity would spill out of the slums into better, more affluent looking areas that looked like they would be worth burglarizing.

And again it was stated like it was a redeeming quality: See we're generating all this more crime but look how good we are — we're also generating the means for you to protect yourself against the crime. A sort of repeated thing throughout this presentation was the recognised evil and then the self forgiveness thing, "See we've given you a way out."

Curtailment of American Industrial Pre-Eminence

American industry came under discussion — it was the first that I'd heard the term global interdependence or that notion.

The stated plan was that different parts of the world would be assigned different roles of industry and commerce in a unified global system.

The continued pre-eminence of the United States and the relative independence and self-sufficiency of the United States would have to be changed. This was one of the several times that he said in order to create a new structure, you first have to tear down the old, and American industry was one example of that.

Our system would have to be curtailed in order to give other countries a chance to build their industries, because otherwise they would not be able to compete against the United States. This was especially true of our heavy industries that would be cut back while the same industries were being developed in other countries, notably Japan.

At this point there was some discussion of steel and particularly automobiles — I remember saying that automobiles would be imported from Japan on an equal footing with our own domestically produced automobiles, but the Japanese product would be better. Things would be made so they would break and fall apart, that is in the United States. so that people would tend to prefer the imported variety and this would give a bit of a boost to foreign competitors.

One example was the Japanese. In 1969 Japanese automobiles, if they were sold here at all I don't remember, but they certainly weren't very popular. But the idea was you could get a little bit disgusted with your Ford, GM or Chrysler product or whatever because little things like window handles would fall off more and plastic parts would break which had they been made of metal would hold up. Your patriotism about buying American would soon give way to practicality that if you bought Japanese, German or imported that it would last longer and you would be better off.

Patriotism would go down the drain.

It was mentioned elsewhere things being made to fall apart too. I don't remember specific items or if they were even stated other than automobiles, but I do recall of having the impression, sort of in my imagination, of a surgeon having something fall apart in his hands in the operating room at a critical time. Was he including this sort of thing in his discussion?

But somewhere in this discussion about things being made deliberately defective and unreliable not only was to tear down patriotism but to be just a little source of irritation to people who would use such things. Again the idea that you not feel terribly secure, promoting the notion that the world isn't a terribly reliable place.

The United States was to be kept strong in information, communications, high technology, education and agriculture. The United States was seen as continuing to be sort of the keystone of this global system.

But heavy industry would be transported out. One of the comments made about heavy industry was that we had had enough environmental damage from smoke stacks and

industrial waste. Other people could put up with that for a while. This again was supposed to be a redeeming quality for Americans to accept. You took away our industry but you saved our environment. So we really didn't lose on it.

Shifting Populations and Economies – Tearing the Social Roots

And along this line there were talks about people losing their jobs as a result of industry and opportunities for retraining, and particularly population shifts would be brought about. This is sort of an aside. I think I'll explore the aside before I forget it.

Population shifts were to be brought about so that people would be tending to move into the Sun Belt. They would be the sort of people without roots in their new locations, and traditions are easier to change in a place where there are a lot of transplanted people, as compared to trying to change traditions in a place where people grew up and had an extended family, and had roots.

Things like new medical care systems, if you pick up from a Northeast industrial city and you transplant yourself to the South Sunbelt or Southwest, you'll be more accepting of whatever kind of, for example, controlled medical care you find there than you would accept a change in the medical care system where you had roots and the support of your family.

Also in this vein was mentioned (he used the plural personal pronoun we) we take control first of the port cities — New York, San Francisco, Seattle — the idea being that this is a piece of strategy, the idea being that if you control the port cities with your philosophy and your way of life, the heartland in between has to yield. I can't elaborate more on that but it is interesting.

The heartland, the Midwest, does seem to have maintained its conservatism. But as you take away industry and jobs and relocate people then this is a strategy to break down conservatism. When you take away industry and people are unemployed and poor they will accept whatever change seems, to offer them survival, and their morals and their commitment to things will all give way to survival. That's not my philosophy, that's the speaker's philosophy.

Anyhow, going back to industry, some heavy industry would remain, just enough to maintain a sort of a seed bed of industrial skills which could be expanded if the plan didn't work out as it was intended. So the country would not be devoid of assets and skills. But this was just sort of a contingency plan.

It was hoped and expected that the world-wide specialisation would be carried on.

But, perhaps repeating myself, one of the upshots of all of this is that with this 'global interdependence' the national identities would tend to be de-emphasised. Each area

depended on every other area for one or another elements of its life.

We would all become citizens of the world rather than citizens of any one country.

Sports As A Tool Of Social Change

And along these lines then we can talk about sports. Sports in the United States was to be changed, in part as a way of de-emphasising nationalism.

Soccer, a world-wide sport, was to be emphasised and pushed in the United States. This was of interest because in this area the game of soccer was virtually unknown at that time. I had a few friends who attended an elementary school other than the one I attended where they played soccer and they were a real novelty. This was back in the 50's. So to hear this man speak of soccer in this area was kind of surprising. Anyhow, soccer is seen as an international sport and would be promoted and the traditional sport of American baseball would be de-emphasised and possibly eliminated because it might be seen as too American. And he discussed eliminating this.

One's first reaction would be — well, they pay the players poorly and they don't want to play for poor pay so they give up baseball and go into some other sport or some other activity. But he said that's really not how it works.

Actually, the way to break down baseball would be to make the salaries go very high. The idea behind this was that as the salaries got ridiculously high there would be a certain amount of discontent and antagonism as people resented the athletes being paid so much, and the athletes would begin more and more to resent among themselves what other players were paid and would tend to abandon the sport. And these high salaries also could break the owners and alienate the fans. And then the fans would support soccer and the baseball fields could be used as soccer fields. It wasn't said definitely this would have to happen, but if the international flavour didn't come around rapidly enough this could be done.

There was some comment along the same lines about football, although I seem to recall he said football would be harder to dismantle because it was so widely played in colleges as well as in the professional leagues and would be harder to tear down. There was something else also about the violence in football that met a psychological need that was perceived, and people have a need for this vicarious violence. So football, for that reason, might be left around to meet that need.

The same thing is true of hockey. Hockey had more of an international flavour and would be emphasised. There was some foreseeable international competition about hockey and particularly soccer. At that time hockey was international between the United States and Canada. I was kind of surprised because I thought the speaker just never impressed me as being a hockey fan, and I am. And it turns

out he was not. He just knew about the game and what it would do to this changing sports program. But in any event soccer was to be the keystone of athletics because it is already a world wide sport in South America, Europe, and parts of Asia and the United States should get on the bandwagon.

All this would foster international competition so that we would all become citizens of the world to a greater extent than citizens of our own narrow nations.

There was some discussion about hunting, not surprisingly. Hunting requires guns and gun control is a big element in these plans. I don't remember the details much, but the idea is that gun ownership is a privilege and not everybody should have guns. Hunting was an inadequate excuse for owning guns and everybody should be restricted in gun ownership. The few privileged people who should be allowed to hunt could maybe rent or borrow a gun from official quarters rather than own their own. After all, everybody doesn't have a need for a gun, is the way it was put.

Very important in sports was sports for girls. Athletics would be pushed for girls. This was intended to replace dolls. Baby dolls would still be around, a few of them, but you would not see the number and variety of dolls. Dolls would not be pushed because girls should not be thinking about babies and reproduction. Girls should be out on the athletic field just as the boys are. Girls and boys really don't need to be all that different. Tea sets were to go the way of dolls, and all these things that traditionally were thought of as feminine would be de-emphasised as girls got into more masculine pursuits.

Just one other thing I recall was that the sports pages would be full of the scores of girls teams just right along there with the boys teams. And that's recently begun to appear after 20 years in our local papers. The girls sports scores are right along with the boys sports scores. So all of this is to change the role model of what young girls should look to be. While she's growing up she should look to be an athlete rather than to look forward to being a mother.

Sex and Violence Inculcated through Entertainment

Entertainment. Movies would gradually be made more explicit as regards sex and language. After all, sex and rough language are real and why pretend that they are not?

There would be pornographic movies in the theatres and on television. VCR's were not around at that time, but he had indicated that these cassettes would be available, and video cassette players would be available for use in the home and pornographic movies would be available for use on these as well as in the neighbourhood theatre and on your television. He said something like:

"you'll see people in the movies doing everything you can think of."

He went on to say that all of this is intended to bring sex out in the open. That was another comment that was made several times — the term "sex out in the open."

Violence would be made more graphic. This was intended to desensitise people to violence. There might need to be a time when people would witness real violence and be a part of it. Later on it will become clear where this is headed. So there would be more realistic violence in entertainment which would make it easier for people to adjust.

People's attitudes toward death would change. People would not be so fearful of it but more accepting of it, and they would not be so aghast at the sight of dead people or injured people. We don't need to have a genteel population paralysed by what they might see.

People would just learn to say, well I don't want that to happen to me. This was the first statement suggesting that the plan includes numerous human casualties which the survivors would see. This particular aspect of the presentation came back in my memory very sharply a few years later when a movie about the Lone Ranger came out and I took my very young son to see it and early in the movie were some very violent scenes. One of the victims was shot in the forehead and there was sort of a splat where the bullet entered his forehead and blood and I remember regretting that I took my son and feeling anger toward the doctor who spoke. Not that he made the movie, but he agreed to be part of this movement, and I was repelled by the movie and it brought back this aspect of his presentation very sharply in my memory.

As regards music, he made a rather straightforward statement like:

Music will get worse.

In 1969 Rock music was getting more and more unpleasant. It was interesting the way he expressed it, "it would get worse" acknowledging that it was already bad.

Lyrics would become more openly sexual.

No new sugary romantic music would be publicised like that which had been written before that time.

All of the old music would be brought back on certain radio stations and records for older people to hear, and older folks would have sort of their own radio stations to hear and for younger people, their music as it got worse and worse would be on their stations. He seemed to indicate that one group would not hear the other group's music. Older folks would just refuse to hear the junk that was offered to young people, and the young people would accept the junk

because it identified them as their generation and helped them feel distinct from the older generation.

I remember at the time thinking that would not last very long because even young kids wouldn't like the junk when they got a chance to hear the older music that was prettier they would gravitate toward it. Unfortunately I was wrong about that. When the kids get through their teens and into their 20's some of them improve their taste in music, but unfortunately he was right. They get used to this junk and that's all they want. A lot of them can't stand really pretty music.

He went on to say that the music would carry a message to the young and nobody would even know the message was there they would just think it was loud music. At the time I didn't understand quite what he meant by that, but in retrospect I think we know now what the messages are in the music for the young.

And again he was right. This aspect was sort of summarised with the notion that entertainment would be a tool to influence young people. It won't change the older people, they are already set in their ways, but the changes would all be aimed at the young who are in their formative years and the older generation would be passing. Not only could you not change them but they are relatively unimportant anyhow. Once they live out their lives and are gone the younger generation being formed are the ones that would be important for the future in the 21st century.

He also indicated all the old movies would be brought back again and I remember on hearing that through my mind ran quickly the memory of a number of old movies. I wondered if they would be included, the ones that I thought I would like to see again.

Along with bringing back old music and movies for older people there were other privileges that would also be accorded older folks: free transportation, breaks on purchases, discounts, tax discounts, — a number of privileges just because they were older. This was stated to be sort of a reward for the generation which had grown up through the depression and had survived the rigors of World War II. They had deserved it and they were going to be rewarded with all these goodies, and the bringing back of the good old music and the good old movies was going to help ease them through their final years in comfort.

Then the presentation began to get rather grim, because once that generation passed, and that would be in the late 80's and early 90's where we are now, most of that group would be gone and then gradually things would tighten up and the tightening up would be accelerated. The old movies and old songs would be withdrawn, the gentler entertainment would be withdrawn.

Travel Restrictions and Implanted I.D.

Travel, instead of being easy for old folks, travel then would become very restricted. People would need

permission to travel and they would need a good reason to travel. If you didn't have a good reason for your travel you would not be allowed to travel.

Everyone would need ID. This would at first be an ID card you would carry on your person and you must show when you are asked for it. It was already planned that later on some sort of device would be developed to be implanted under the skin that would be coded specifically to identify the individual. This would eliminate the possibility of false ID and also eliminate the possibility of people saying "Well, I lost my ID."

The difficulty about these skin implant that ID was stated to be getting material that would stay in or under the skin without causing foreign body reaction whereby the body would reject it or cause infection, and that this would have to be material on which information could be recorded and retrieved by some sort of scanner while it was not rejected by the body. Silicon was mentioned. Silicon at that time was thought to be well tolerated. It was used to augment breasts. Women who felt their breasts were too small would get silicon implants, and I guess that still goes on. At any rate silicon was seen at that time as the promising material to do both: to be retained in the body without rejection and to be able to retain information retrievable by electronic means.

Food Control

Food supplies would come under tight control.

If population growth didn't slow down, food shortages could be created in a hurry and people would realise the dangers of overpopulation.

Ultimately, whether the population slows down or not the food supply is to be brought under centralised control so that people would have enough to be well-nourished but they would not have enough to support any fugitive from the new system. In other words, if you had a friend or relative who didn't sign on.

Growing ones own food would be outlawed. This would be done under some sort of pretext. In the beginning I mentioned there were two purposes for everything — one the ostensible purpose and one the real purpose, and the ostensible purpose here would be that growing your own vegetables was unsafe, it would spread disease or something like that. So the acceptable idea was to protect the consumer but the real idea was to limit the food supply and growing your own food would be illegal. And if you persist in illegal activities like growing your own food, then you're a criminal.

Weather Control

There was a mention then of weather. This was another really striking statement. He said,

"We can or soon will be able to control the weather." He said, "I'm not merely referring to dropping iodide crystals into the clouds to precipitate rain that's already there, but REAL control."

And weather was seen as a weapon of war, a weapon of influencing public policy. It could make rain or withhold rain in order to influence certain areas and bring them under your control.

There were two sides to this that were rather striking. He said,

"On the one hand you can make drought during the growing season so that nothing will grow, and on the other hand you can make for very heavy rains during harvest season so the fields are too muddy to bring in the harvest, and indeed one might be able to do both."

There was no statement how this would be done. It was stated that either it was already possible or very, very close to being possible.

Politics

He said that very few people really know how government works. Something to the effect that elected officials are influenced in ways that they don't even realise and they carry out plans that have been made for them and they think that they are authors of the plans. But actually they are manipulated in ways they don't understand.

Know How People Respond – Making Them Do What You Want

Somewhere in the presentation he made two statements that I want to insert at this time. I don't remember just where they were made, but they're valid in terms of the general overall view. One statement is,

"People can carry in their minds and act upon two contradictory ideas at one time, provided that these two contradictory ideas are kept far enough apart."

The other statement is,

"You can know pretty well how rational people are going to respond to certain circumstances or to certain information that they encounter. So, to determine the response you want you need only control the kind of data or information that they're presented or the kinds of circumstance that they're in; and being rational people they'll do what you

want them to do. They may not fully understand what they're doing or why."

Falsified Scientific Research

Somewhere in this connection, then, was the statement admitting that some scientific research data could be, and indeed has been, falsified in order to bring about desired results. Here he said,

"People don't ask the right questions. Some people are too trusting."

Now this was an interesting statement because the speaker and the audience all being doctors of medicine and supposedly very objective, dispassionately scientific and science being the be all and end-all. To falsify scientific research data in that setting is like blasphemy in the church, you just don't do that.

Anyhow, out of all of this was to come the New International Governing Body, probably to come through the U.N. and with a World Court, but not necessarily through those structures. It could be brought about in other ways. Acceptance of the U.N. at that time was seen as not being as wide as was hoped. Efforts would continue to give the United Nations increasing importance.

People would be more and more used to the idea of relinquishing some national sovereignty. Economic interdependence would foster this goal from a peaceful standpoint. Avoidance of war would foster it from the standpoint of worrying about hostilities. It was recognised that doing it peaceably was better than doing it by war.

It was stated at this point that war was "obsolete." I thought that was an interesting phrase because obsolete means something that once was seen as useful is no longer useful. But war is obsolete, because of nuclear bombs, war is no longer controllable. Formerly wars could be controlled, but if nuclear weapons would fall into the wrong hands there could be an unintended nuclear disaster. It was not stated who the "wrong hands" are. We were free to infer that maybe this meant terrorists, but in more recent years I'm wondering whether the wrong hands might also include people that we've assumed they've had nuclear weapons all along, maybe they don't have them.

Just as it was stated that industry would be preserved in the United States — a little bit just in case the world wide plans didn't work out; just in case some country or some other powerful person decided to bolt from the pack and go his own way, one wonders whether this might also be true with nuclear weapons.

When he said they might fall into the wrong hands, there was some statement that the possession of nuclear weapons had been tightly controlled, sort of implying that anybody

who had nuclear weapons was intended to have them. That would necessarily have included the Soviet Union, if indeed they have them. But I recall wondering at the time,

"Are you telling us, or are you implying that this country willingly gave weapons to the Soviets?."

At that time that seemed like a terribly unthinkable thing to do, much less to admit. The leaders of the Soviet Union seem to be so dependent on the West though, one wonders whether there may have been some fear that they would try to assert independence if they indeed had these weapons. So, I don't know. It's something to speculate about perhaps.

Who did he mean when he said, "If these weapons fall into the wrong hands"? Maybe just terrorists.

Anyhow, the new system would be brought in, if not by peaceful co-operation with everybody willingly yielding national sovereignty and then by bringing the nation to the brink of nuclear war. Everybody would be so fearful as hysteria is created by the possibility of nuclear war that there would be a strong public outcry to negotiate a public peace and people would willingly give up national sovereignty in order to achieve peace, and thereby this would bring in the 'New International Political System.' This was stated and a very impressive thing to hear then,

"If there were too many people in the right places who resisted this, there might be a need to use one or two or possibly more nuclear weapons."

As it was put this would be possibly needed to convince people that, "We mean business." That was followed by the statement that,

"By the time one or two of those went off then everybody, even the most reluctant, would yield."

He said something about,

"This negotiated peace would be very convincing",

as in a framework or in a context that the whole thing was rehearsed but nobody would know it. People hearing about it would be convinced that it was a genuine negotiation between hostile enemies who finally had come to the realisation that peace was better than war.

In this context discussing war, and war is obsolete, a statement was made that there were some good things about war. One was you're going to die anyway and people sometimes in war get a chance to display great courage and heroism. If they die they've died well and if they survive they get recognition. So that in any case, the hardships of

war on soldiers are worth it because that's the reward they get out of their warring.

Another justification expressed for war was, if you think of the many millions of casualties in WWI and WWII had not died but had continued to live and continued to have babies then there would be millions upon millions and we would already be overpopulated. So those two great wars served a benign purpose in delaying over-population.

But now there are technological means for the individual and governments to control over-population so in this regard war is obsolete. It's no longer needed. And then again it's obsolete because nuclear weapons could destroy the whole universe. War, which once was controllable, could get out of control and so for these two reasons it's now obsolete.

Terrorism

There was a discussion of terrorism. Terrorism would be used widely in Europe and in other parts of the world.

Terrorism at that time was thought would not be necessary in the United States. It could become necessary in the United States if the United States did not move rapidly enough into accepting the system. But at least in the foreseeable future it was not planned. And very benignly on their part. Maybe terrorism would not be required here, but the implication being that it would be indeed used if it was necessary.

Along with this came a bit of a scolding that Americans had had it too good anyway and just a little bit of terrorism would help convince Americans that the world is indeed a dangerous place, or can be if we don't relinquish control to the proper authorities.

Financial Control

There was discussion of money and banking. One statement was,

"Inflation is infinite. You can put an infinite number of zeros after any number and put the decimals points wherever you want",

as an indication that inflation is a tool of the controllers.

Money would become predominately credit. It was already. Money is primarily a credit thing but exchange of money would be not cash or palpable things but electronic credit signal. People would carry money only in very small amounts for things like chewing gum and candy bars. Any purchase of any significant amount would be done electronically.

Earnings would be electronically entered into your account.

It would be a single banking system. It may have the appearance of being more than one but ultimately and basically it would be one single banking system, so that when you got paid your pay would be entered for you into your account balance and then when you purchased anything at the point of purchase it would be deducted from your account balance and you would actually carry nothing with you.

Also computer records can be kept on whatever it was you purchased so that if you were purchasing too much of any particular item and some official wanted to know what you were doing with your money they could go back and review your purchases and determine what you were buying.

There was a statement that any purchase of significant size like an automobile, bicycle, a refrigerator, a radio or television or whatever might have some sort of identification on it so it could be traced, so that very quickly anything which was either given away or stolen — whatever — authorities would be able to establish who purchased it and when. Computers would allow this to happen.

The ability to save would be greatly curtailed. People would just not be able to save any considerable degree of wealth. There was some statement of recognition that wealth represents power and wealth in the hands of a lot of people is not good for the people in charge so if you save too much you might be taxed. The more you save the higher rate of tax on your savings so your savings really could never get very far. And also if you began to show a pattern of saving too much you might have your pay cut. We would say,

"Well, your saving instead of spending. You really don't need all that money."

That basically the idea being to prevent people from accumulating any wealth which might have long range disruptive influence on the system.

People would be encouraged to use credit to borrow and then also be encouraged to renege on their debt so they would destroy their own credit. The idea here is that, again, if you're too stupid to handle credit wisely, this gives the authorities the opportunity to come down hard on you once you've shot your credit.

Electronic payments initially would all be based on different kinds of credit cards which were already in use in 1969 to some extent. Not as much as now, but people would have credit cards with the electronic strip on it and once they got used to that then it would be pointed out the advantage of having all of that combined into a single credit card, serving a single monetary system and then they won't have to carry around all that plastic.

Surveillance, Implants, and Televisions that Watch You

So, the next step would be the single card and then the next step would be to replace the single card with a skin implant.

The single card could be lost or stolen, give rise to problems; could be exchanged with somebody else to confuse identify.

The skin implant on the other hand could not be not lost or counterfeited or transferable to another person so you and your accounts would be identified without any possibility of error. And the skin implants would have to be put some place that would be convenient to the skin; for example your right hand or your forehead. At that time when I heard this I was unfamiliar with the statements in the Book of Revelation. The speaker went on to say,

"Now some of you people who read the Bible will attach significance to this to the Bible,"

but he went on to disclaim any Biblical significance at all. This is just common sense of how the system could work and should work and there's no need to read any superstitious Biblical principals into it. As I say, at the time I was not very familiar with the words of Revelations.

Shortly after I became familiar with it and the significance of what he said really was striking. I'll never forget it. There was some mention, also, of implants that would lend themselves to surveillance by providing radio signals. This could be under the skin or a dental implant, put in like a filling so that either fugitives or possibly other citizens could be identified by a certain frequency from his personal transmitter and could be located at any time or any place by any authority who wanted to find him. This would be particularly useful for somebody who broke out of prison.

There was more discussion of personal surveillance. One more thing was said,

"You'll be watching television and somebody will be watching you at the same time at a central monitoring station."

Television sets would have a device to enable this. The T.V. set would not have to be on in order for this to be operative. Also, the television set can be used to monitor what you are watching. People can tell what you're watching on TV and how you're reacting to what you're watching. And you would not know that you were being watched while you were watching your television. How would we get people to accept these things into their homes? Well, people would buy them when they buy their own television. They won't know that they're on there at first.

This was described by being what we now know as Cable TV to replace the antenna TV. When you buy a TV set this monitor would just be part of the set and most people would not have enough knowledge to know it was there in the beginning. And then the cable would be the means of carrying the surveillance message to the monitor.

By the time people found out that this monitoring was going on, they would also be very dependent upon television for a number of things. Just the way people are dependent upon the telephone today. One thing the television would be used for would be purchases. You wouldn't have to leave your home to purchase. You just turn on your TV and there would be a way of interacting with your television channel to the store that you wanted to purchase. And you could flip the switch from place to place to choose a refrigerator or clothing. This would be both convenient, but it would also make you dependent on your television so the built-in monitor would be something you could not do without.

There was some discussion of audio monitors too, just in case the authorities wanted to hear what was going on in rooms other than where the television monitor was. In regard to this the statement was made,

"Any wire that went into your house, for example your telephone wire, could be used this way".

I remember this in particular because it was fairly near the end of the presentation and as we were leaving the meeting place I said something to one of my colleagues about going home and pulling all of the wires out of my house, except I knew I couldn't get by without the telephone. And the colleague I spoke to just seemed numb. To this day I don't think he even remembers what we talked about or what we hear that time, cause I've asked him. But at that time he seemed stunned.

Before all these changes would take place with electronic monitoring, it was mentioned that there would be service trucks all over the place, working on the wires and putting in new cables. This is how people who were on the inside would know how things were progressing.

Home Ownership a Thing of the Past

Privately owned housing would become a thing of the past.

The cost of housing and financing housing would gradually be made so high that most people couldn't afford it. People who already owned their houses would be allowed to keep them but as years go by it would be more and more difficult for young people to buy a house.

Young people would more and more become renters, particularly in apartments or condominiums.

More and more unsold houses would stand vacant. People just couldn't buy them. But the cost of housing would not come down. You'd right away think, well the vacant house, the price would come down, the people would buy it. But there was some statement to the effect that the price would be held high even though there were many available so that free market places would not operate. People would not be able to buy these and gradually more and more of the population would be forced into small apartments. Small apartments which would not accommodate very many children.

Then as the number of real home-owners diminished they would become a minority. There would be no sympathy for them from the majority who dwelled in the apartments and then these homes could be taken by increased taxes or other regulations that would be detrimental to home ownership and would be acceptable to the majority.

Ultimately, people would be assigned where they would live and it would be common to have non-family members living with you. This by way of your not knowing just how far you could trust anybody. This would all be under the control of a central housing authority.

Have this in mind in 1990 when they ask,

"How many bedrooms in your house? How many bathrooms in your house? Do you have a finished game room?"

This information is personal and is of no national interest to government under our existing Constitution. But you'll be asked those questions and decide how you want to respond to them.

The Arrival Of The Totalitarian Global System

When the new system takes over people will be expected to sign allegiance to it, indicating that they don't have any reservations or holding back to the old system.

"There just won't be any room", he said, "for people who won't go along. We can't have such people cluttering up the place so such people would be taken to special places",

and here I don't remember the exact words, but the inference I drew was that at these special places where they were taken, then they would not live very long. He may have said something like,

"disposed of humanely",

but I don't remember very precisely, just the impression the system was not going to support them when they would not

go along with the system. That would leave death as the only alternative.

Somewhere in this vein he said there would not be any martyrs. When I first heard this I thought it meant the people would not be killed, but as the presentation developed what he meant was they would not be killed in such a way or disposed of in such a way that they could serve as inspiration to other people the way martyrs do. Rather he said something like this.

"People will just disappear."

Just a few additional items sort of thrown in here in the end which I failed to include where they belong more perfectly. The bringing in of the new system he said probably would occur on a weekend in the winter. Everything would shut down on Friday evening and Monday morning when everybody wakened there would be an announcement that the New System was in place.

During the process in getting the United States ready for these changes everybody would be busier with less leisure time and less opportunity to really look about and see what was going on around them.

Also, there would be more changes and more difficulty in keeping up as far as one's investments. Investment instruments would be changing. Interest rates would be changing so that it would be a difficult job with keeping up with what you had already earned.

Interesting about automobiles; it would look as though there were many varieties of automobiles, but when you look very closely there would be great duplication. They would be made to look different with chrome and wheel covers and this sort of thing, but looking closely one would see that the same automobile was made by more than one manufacturer.

This recently was brought down to me when I was in a parking lot and saw a small Ford — I forget the model — and a small Japanese automobile which were identical except for a number of things like the number of holes in the wheel cover and the chrome around the plate and the shape of the grill. But if you looked at the basic parts of the automobile, they were identical. They just happened to be parked side-by-side where I was struck with this and I was again reminded of what had been said many years ago.

I'm hurrying here because I'm just about to the end of the tape. Let me just summarise here by saying, all of these things said by one individual at one time in one place relating to so many different human endeavours and then to look and see how many of these actually came about. Meaning the changes accomplished between then and now [1969—1988] and the things which are planned for the future. I think there is no denying that this is controlled and there is indeed a conspiracy.

The question then becomes what to do. I think first off, we must put our faith in God and pray and ask for his guidance. And secondly do what we can to inform other individuals as much as possible, as much as they may be interested. Some people just don't care, because they're preoccupied with getting along in their own personal endeavours. But as much as possible, I think we should try to inform other people who may be interested, and again put our faith and trust in God and pray constantly for his guidance and for the courage to accept what we may be facing in the near future. Rather than accept peace and justice which we hear so much now. It's a cliché! Let's insist on liberty and justice for all.

— End of Tape II —

TAPE III

Randy Engel (R.E.): Why don't we open up with a little bit about the man who you are talking about on these tapes. Just a little profile and a little bit about his education and particularly his relationship with the population control establishment. I think that probably was his entree into much of this information.

Dr. Lawrence Dunegan (DLD): Yeah. Dr. Day was the Chairman of the Department of Pediatrics at the University of Pittsburgh from about 1959 thru '64, about that period of time, and then he left the University of Pittsburgh and went to fill the position of Medical Director of Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

R.E: And that was what ... about 1965 to '68, about that period?

D.L.D: About '64 or '65 'til about '68 or '69, and then he left there... I don't know specifically why, I did not know him intimately. We were, you know, more than acquainted. I was a student and he would see me at lectures and, so he knew my name as a student, probably corrected some of my test scores and that sort of thing. Of course, I knew him as lecturer. We would stand in front of the auditorium and listen as he talked about diseases, and take notes.

R.E: What's interesting is that this man is not as well known, I think to our listeners as names like Mary Calderone and Allen Gootmacher(sp). They were medical directors at one time or another for Planned Parenthood, but Dr. Day was not well known. And as a matter of fact when I went back into the SIECUS archives there was very little information that had his actual name on it. So he was not one of the better known of the medical directors, but I'd say he probably had the scoop of what was going on as well — if not better — than any of the others before or after he came. Can you describe the scene of this particular lecture, the approximate date, and what was the occasion — and then a little bit about the audience?

D.L.D: This was the... the Pittsburgh Pediatric Society holds about four meetings each year where we have some speaker come in and talk about a medical topic related to pediatrics and this was our spring meeting. It's always late February or early part of March. **This was in March, 1969 and it was held at a restaurant called the Lamont which is well known in Pittsburgh.** Beautiful place. In attendance, I would say somewhere in the neighborhood of 80 people. Mostly physicians, if not exclusively physicians. Predominantly pediatricians, particularly pediatric surgeons and pediatric radiologists — other people who were involved in medical care of children, even though they might not be pediatricians as such.

R.E: And the speech was given after the meal, I presume?

D.L.D: A very nice meal and everyone was settled down, quite comfortable and quite filled and really an ideal state to absorb what was coming.

R.E: But when you listen to the tape, he says some of the most... well not only outrageous things, but things you would think a pediatrician would kind of almost jump out of his seat at... for example when he mentions the cancer cures. There were probably doctors in the audience who were perhaps treating a child or knowing of a child who was in need of a particular cancer cure. And to hear that some of these prescriptions for or treatments for cancer were sitting over at the Rockefeller Institute, and yet, as far as I got from the tape everyone just kind of sat there... didn't say very much. I mean he was talking about falsifying scientific data and everyone just kind of yawns and... How long did this speech go on?

D.L.D: Two hours. He spoke for over two hours which was longer than most of our speakers go and one of the interesting things... he hasn't finished, it was getting late and he said, **"there's much much more, but we could be here all night but it's time to stop"**.

And I think that's significant, that there was much more that we never heard. In the beginning of the presentation, I don't know whether I mentioned this at the introduction of the first tape or not, but somewhere in the beginning of this he said, **"You will forget most or much of what I'm going to tell you tonight."**

And at the time I thought, well, sure, that's true. We tend to forget. You know, somebody talks for hours you forget a lot of what they say. But, there is such a thing as the power of suggestion and I can't say for sure but I do wonder if this may not have been a suggestion when we were all full of a nice dinner and relaxed and listening — we took that suggestion and forgot, because I know a number of my colleagues who were there when I would — some years later — say, **"Do you remember when Dr. Day said this, or he said that or said the other?"** They'd say, **"Well, yeah, I kind of... is that what he said? You know I kind of remember that"**.

But most were not very impressed, which to me was surprising because... well use the example of cancer cures. But he said a number of things that...

R.E: Like doctors making too much money...?

D.L.D: Yeah, changing the image of the doctor. You're just going to be a high-paid technician rather than a professional who exercises independent judgment on behalf of his independent patient. A number of things that I thought should have been offensive and elicited a reaction from physicians because they were physicians. I was surprised at how little reaction there was to it. And then other things that I would have expected people to react to just because they were human beings and I think most of the people at the meeting subscribed more or less to the Judeo-Christian ethic and codes of behavior, and that was violated right and left. And particularly one of my friends I thought would be as disturbed as I was about this just sort of smiled... wasn't disturbed at all. I thought, gee, this is surprising.

R.E: Was part of it also because of his prominence? I mean he was...

D.L.D: The authority... Authority figure? Yeah, I think there might be something there. This is the authority. We sort of owe some deference here.

R.E: And he couldn't possibly mean what he's saying or there couldn't possibly be any... I mean, he's such a good guy.

D.L.D: I've often heard that phrase, "He's such a good guy. I can't believe he'd actually mean the things"... I can only speculate about this. But I do think at the time there was an element of disbelief about all of this. Thinking, well this is somebody's fairy tale plan but it will never really happen because it's too outlandish. Of course we know step by step it is indeed happening right under our feet.

R.E: Before talking about the specific areas, I think there's a lot of benefits from this tape. One of them is when we have a good idea of what the opposition is about and the techniques he's using — then you can turn around and begin your resistance to all the types of manipulations and so forth. So I think that the... seeing that there were four or five "theme songs" — he kept repeating them over and over again.

For example this business which I think is so important... that people fail to distinguish between the ostensible reason and the real reason. In other words, if you want someone to do something and you know that initially he'll be balky at doing that because it's against his morals or against his religious beliefs, you have to substitute another reason that will be acceptable. And then, after he accepts it and it's a fait accompli then there's just no turning back.

D.L.D: Right. It was in that connection that he said, "People don't ask the right questions." Too trusting. And this was directed, as I recall, mostly at Americans. I had the

feelings he thought Europeans maybe were more skeptical and more sophisticated. That Americans are too trusting and don't ask the right questions.

R.E: With regard to this lack of... almost a lack of discernment. I guess that's basically what he was saying. They were easily tricked or too trusting. The thing that flashed through my mind rather quickly, for example in schools... how quickly so-called AIDS education was introduced.

It did amaze me because if a group stated publicly that they wanted to introduce the concept of sodomy or initiate sex earlier and earlier in children and that was the reason given, most parents I presume wouldn't go for that. So you have to come up with another reason and of course the reason for this so-called AIDS education was to protect children from this disease. But actually, as it turns out, it's really been a great boon for the homosexual network, because through various things like Project Ten they now have access to our children from the youngest years.

These programs are going on from K-12 and I imagine well into college and beyond, so that they are reaching a tremendous segment. Speaking of children, I gather that this speaker... he kept on making the point about, well, old people, they're going to go by the wayside, so I presume that the emphasis for these controllers for this New World Order is really an emphasis on youth.

D.L.D: Absolutely. Yes. Emphasis on youth. This was stated explicitly. People beyond a certain age... they're set in their ways and you're not going to change them. They have values and they're going to stick to them. But you get to the youth when they're young, they're pliable. You mold them in the direction you want them to go. This is correct. They're targeting the young. They figure, "you old fogies that don't see it our way, you're going to be dying off or when the time comes we're going to get rid of you. But it's the youngsters we have to mold in the impression we want."

Now something on homosexuality I want to expand on, I don't think this came out on the original tape, but there was, first of all,

"We're going to promote homosexuality." And secondly "We recognize that it's bizarre abnormal behavior. But, this is another element in the law of the jungle, because people who are stupid enough to go along with this are not fit to inhabit the planet and they'll go by the wayside".

I'm not stating this precisely the way he said it, but it wasn't too far from there where there was some mention of diseases being created. And when I remember the one statement and remember the other statement, I believe AIDS is a disease which has been created in the laboratory and I think that one purpose it serves is to get rid of people who are so stupid as to go along with our homosexual program. Let them wipe themselves out.

Now it's hard for me make clear how much of it is I'm remembering with great confidence and how much is pure speculation. But as I synthesize this — this is I think what happens...

"If you're dumb enough to be convinced by our promotion of homosexuality you don't deserve a place and you're going to fall by the wayside sooner or later. We'll be rid of you. We'll select out... the people who will survive are those who are also smart enough not to be deluded by our propaganda".

Does that make sense?

R.E: Well, it certainly makes sense for them. And I think also this early sex initiation has the over all purpose which I think we'll get to in depth a little later. But of the sexualization of the population... when he said on the tape, basically, "Anything goes", I think that is what we're seeing. It's not so much that, let's say, someone may not adopt the homosexual style for himself, but as a result of the propaganda he certainly will be a lot more tolerant of that type of behavior too.

So it's a desensitization, even for the individual who doesn't go over and accept it for himself.

D.L.D: With the power of propaganda you dare not be against homosexuals, otherwise you get labeled homophobe. You dare not be against any of our programs for women, otherwise you're a male chauvinist pig. It's like anti-Semitism. If this label gets enough currency in the culture that people get shockingly stuck with it. It's easier to keep quiet.

R.E: Another theme was this business about "CHANGE". And I want to get to change in relation to religion and family, but during the period of hearing this tape, I remember going to a MASS and they happened to have at that point DANCING GIRLS FROM THE ALTER. So when I was sitting and getting a chance to listen to the tape I thought, as a Catholic that has been... if you talk about effective change, that has been probably the most difficult and the hardest thing has been to watch our traditional Mass, those things which Catholics have practiced and believed for so long and... at about that time this speech was given which was about late 1969, everything had begun to turn over on its head, so much so that I think many people feel now when they go into a church where there is the Novus Ordo (sp), I think you're almost in a state of constant anxiety because you're not quite sure... What am I going to encounter now?

You look at the little song book; of course that's changed radically and you see, instead of brethren, you see people; or you might see something odd happening up at the alter which is now the "table".

The notion of God as eternal and the teachings of Jesus Christ as eternal, and therefore the teachings of the church as eternal depends on the authority of God, and God brings about change in God's way. What this boils down to me is these people say,

"No, we take the place of God; we establish what will change and what will not change, so if we say that homosexuality or anything is moral today... wasn't yesterday, but it is today. We have said so, and therefore it's moral. We can change tomorrow. We can make it immoral again tomorrow".

And this is the usurpation of the role of God to define what the peon, the ordinary person's supposed to believe.

D.L.D: So, the idea is, that if everybody is used to change most people aren't going to ask, "Well who has decided what should be changed and how it should be changed"? Most people just go along with it, like hemlines, and shoe styles and that sort of thing. So it IS a usurpation of the Rule of God, and if you read the Humanist Manifesto, and somewhere early in the introductory part of it, they say,

"human intellect is the highest good".

Well, to any human being, what you call the highest good, that's your god. So to these people human intellect being the highest good is god. And where does human intellect reside? Well, in the brain of one or more human beings. So these people, in effect... I don't know think they'd be so candid as to say so, but whether they know it or not what they're saying is,

"I am god. WE are gods, because we decide what is moral what is moral tomorrow, what is going to be moral next year. WE determine change."

R.E: That's right. And of course, in a nutshell, you've just explained the human potential, the New Age, all the new esoteric movements that we've seen. But with regard to change, he seemed to acknowledge that there were a couple of entities which traditionally blocked this change and therefore made people resistant to constant manipulation.

And of course one of those is the family, and that would include grandmothers, grandfathers, our ethnic background and so forth and I guess I was impressed by everything he seemed to mention whether it was economics, music... had the overall effect of diminishing the family and enhancing the power of the state.

That was a constant theme, and therefore when we're evaluating things I think one of the things we should generally say to ourselves is, "What effect does that have on family life, and the family and I think if every congressman or senator asked that question we probably wouldn't have

much action up on Capitol Hill, because almost everything coming down the pike has an effect of disavowing, hurting the family life and enhancing and expanding the power of government."

D.L.D: It has an ostensible purpose, and then it has a REAL purpose.

R.E: Yes, and as a so-called helping professional your ability to say that is very interesting. The other factor is this whole factor of religion, and he was talking basically about a religion without dogma, a religion that would have a little bit from all the other traditional religions so no one would really feel uncomfortable, and he said, rather condescendingly, some people need this and if they need it we'll manufacture something that they need. But of course it can't be anything that would declare anything that were moral absolutes or the natural law. Which means that the main target of this group of controllers of course, was and is the Roman Catholic Church and he mentioned the Roman Catholic Church specifically.

D.L.D: Religion's important because it is eternal and we... people who would follow the church will not buy our rules about change. But if we make our own religion, if we define what is religion then we can change it as it suits us. Yes, the Roman Catholic Church... I was kind of flattered sitting here as a catholic, hearing it pointed out that the church is the one obstacle that, he said,

"We have to change that. And once the Roman Catholic Church falls, the rest of Christianity will fall easily".

R.E: I notice that, as the conversation went on, he said, "Now you may think Churches will stand in the way, but I want to tell you that they will HELP us", and he didn't say they will help us, all except the Roman Catholic Church... he said, "They will help us", and unfortunately...

D.L.D: He was right.

RE: He didn't say this explicitly, but again it was one of those themes that came through... he apparently thought the use of words was real important because he mentioned this with regard to a number of things, like the Bible. The very same as the psychiatrist, Miralu(sp?) mentioned that

"if you want to control the people, you control the language first". Words are weapons.

He apparently knew that very well and I think the controllers as a whole know this very well. Of course, it's part of their campaign.

But that little statement about words, that "words will be changed". When I heard that I thought...

"Instead of saying 'alter' you say 'table'. Instead of saying 'sacrifice' you say 'meal' with regard to the Mass", and people say, "That's not important".

Of course, you know that's VERY important, otherwise, why would they bother to change it? Otherwise, why go through all this rigmarole if it isn't important? It's obviously important for them because they know

WITH THE CHANGING OF WORDS YOU CHANGE IDEAS.

D.L.D: They're exerting a lot of effort and time to change it and they're not exerting effort on things that are NOT important, so yes, you're absolutely right. The priest no longer has the role... in some cases he no longer has the role the priest formerly had. Because words carry meaning. There's the dictionary definition, but I think we all know that certain words carry meaning that is a little bit hard to put into words... but they carry meaning.

So yes, controlling the language... you THINK in your language. You think to yourself in English or Spanish or whatever language you're familiar with, but when you think, you talk to yourself and you talk to yourself in words, just the way you talk to other people. And if you can control the language with which one person speaks to himself or one person speaks to another you've gone a long way towards controlling what that person is ABLE — what he is CAPABLE of thinking, and that has both an inclusionary and an exclusionary component to it. You set the tone....

R.E: Take the word GAY, for example. I have some old tapes by Franz Layhar(sp?) and he talks about the GAY Hussars, you know... the happy soldiers... and now you couldn't quite use that same word, could you? But you know, the word homosexual, sodomite has been replaced with the term "gay", represents an ideology not only a word and when you use it, it's tacit to saying, "Yes, I accept what your interpretation of this is".

D.L.D: They probably had a committee working for months to pick which word they were going to use for this. The word "gay" carries a connotation, first of all, which is inaccurate. Most homosexuals are not at all gay. They tend to be pretty unhappy people. Despite all the publicity that tells them they can and should feel comfortable with what they're doing, most of them deep down inside don't... (both talking at the same time here).

R.E: I suppose they're going to come up with a sadophobia for those who have a hang-up about sadomasochism and a pedophobia for those who have difficulties with pedophilia, so we can just look forward to this I think. I guess we can look forward to it to the extent we permit ourselves... that we permit the opposition to have access to the brain.

D.L.D: And to dictate the truth WE use. Sex education is NOT education. It's conditioning, and we should never use

the term "sex education". It's a misnomer. If they control the vocabulary, then they can control the way we can think and the way we can express ideas among ourselves and to anybody. But "sex conditioning", "sex initiation" is much more accurate and we should insist on that. We should never use terms "homophobia" and "gay". Homosexual is homosexual. It's not at all gay.

R.E: That's right. In fact we're probably going to have to do some homework on... probably of all the popular movements in the U.S. Probably the pro-life movement is the most sensitive to words.

Talking about media events and access to the brain, I remember the first speech Bush gave in which he talked about the New World Order... I remember jumping halfway off my seat. That term. Here he is, the president, saying New World Order as if it was something everyone knew about. And someone looking across the room said, "I heard that. What did he say"? And I said, "He said, 'New World Order!'" And they said, "What does that mean? Why is that extraordinary?"

So, I think one of the weapons we have against the controllers is that if we can cut off his access to our mind then we have a shot at escaping the manipulation, if not totally — at least escape a portion of the manipulations. Remember, one of the books on Chinese POWs pointed out that some of their survivors in order NOT to be brainwashed broke their eardrums. And in that way — not being able to hear — the enemy could not have access to their brain and therefore they were able to survive where others did not.

And in our popular culture we have a number of things... TV and radio probably primarily, that are the constant means by which the opposition has access to our brain and to our children's brains. So I think the logical conclusion, and one of the common-sense conclusions is that if you don't want the enemy to have access you have to cut off the lines of access... which would be in homes to simply either eliminate altogether, or control by other forms....

D.L.D: Take the networks at there word. They say, "if you don't like our programming, turn it off". And we should. We should say, "Yeah. You're right." And we should turn it off. And let the advertisers spend their money on an audience that isn't there.

As a pediatrician I'm always interested in how kids do things and how kids are like adults, and whether you're talking about International politics where one nation goes to war with another or kids on the playground, there are certain things that are common. It's just that kids on the playgrounds do it on a smaller scale. But you mention cutting off access to your brain... somebody says, I don't want to hear it. And I remember hearing kids on a playground... somebody says..."ya-na-na na naa-na", and they're teasing the kid... What's he do? He puts his hands over his ears. Says I'm not going to listen. And the kid

who's trying to torment him will try to pull his hands away and be sure that he listens. And it's the same....

R.E: Words. Words entering. And the child knows. Words have meaning. They're hurting him.

D.L.D: Goebels knew it. Lenin knew it. CBS knows it. It's interesting; the principle stands — across the board. It just gets more complicated as you get older. More sophisticated. But watch kids on a playground and you'll learn a whole lot about adults.

R.E: Yes. We're all nodding our heads at that one. This Dr. Day was very much into the whole population control establishment, and he was of course in favor of abortion. But as he started talking about the aged and euthanasia I recall one of the population control books saying that birth control without death control was meaningless.

And one of the advantages in terms... if one was favorable toward the killing of the aged... one of the favorable things is in fact abortion for the simple reason that — universally speaking — abortion has the result of bringing about a rather inordinate chopping off of population at the front end. That is, at the birth end. And the inevitable effect is that you will have a population that is top heavy with a rapidly aging population which is the current state in the United States.

So, inevitably, if you are going to go about killing the young, especially at the pace we seem to have adapted ourselves to in this country, then invariably you're going to have to do something about all those aging populations. Because, the few children who are born, after all, they cannot be expected to carry this tremendous burden of all these people. So you're cutting one end and therefore, inevitably, as you pointed out on the tape, he was saying, "Well, these few young people who are permitted to be born will feel this inevitable burden on them and so they'll be more desensitized."

They'll be more warmed up to the idea of grandma and grandpa having this little party and then shuffle them off to wherever they shuffle off to. And whether it's taking the "demise" pill or going to a death camp, or....

D.L.D: There was a movie out sometime back called "Soilant Green". Remember that movie? I didn't see the whole movie, but Edward G. Robinson liked to sit in the theatre and listen to Beethoven's Pastoral Symphony as he was to take his demise pill.

R.E: That's right. He also made the point that the food the people were eating were each other. But as he said, as long as it's done with dignity and humanely... like putting away your horse.

D.L.D: That's a little bit like pornography. Years back kids would come across pornography. It was always poor photography and cheap paper. Then Playboy came out with the glossy pages and really good photography, so then

pornography is no longer cheap. It's respectable. We went to a movie at the Pittsburgh Playhouse. I took my son along. It was the Manchurian Candidate. During the previews of the things that are going to come there was a title I don't remember but it was (inaudible) in technicolor with classical music in the background.

And it was a pornographic movie. And I said, well, if you have a guitar then it's pornography; but if you have classical movie then it converts it into art. It was pornography.

It's an example of what you were saying. As long as it's done with dignity, that's what counts. If you kill someone with dignity, it's ok. If you have pornography with classical music it's art. That was the point I was trying to make.

R.E: Again, talking about the family. Currently I know there are an awful lot of people who are out of jobs and he [Dr. Day] had quite a lot of things to say about, for example, heavy industry. I guess the shock was that this man... I wasn't surprised that he knew a lot about population control, abortion, and at the other end — euthanasia.

But what DID surprise me was that he was an individual who was talking about religion, law, education, sports, entertainment, food... how could one individual have that much input? Now one could say, "well, it didn't pan out". But we know listening to these recollections twenty years later... except perhaps for some minor things, everything that he has said has come to pass and almost beyond imagination. How COULD one individual talk with such authoritative, non-questioning... that this was the way THIS was going to happen and THIS was going to happen in "fashion" and THIS was going to happen on TV and there were going to be video recorders before I ever heard of the word.

D.L.D: I think what happens... certainly one individual hears this, but the plans are by no means made by one or a small number of individuals. Just as industrial corporations which have a board of directors, with people from all sorts of activities who sit on the board of this corporation, and they say, "Now if we do this to our product, or if we expand in this area what will that do to banking? What will that do to clothing? What will that do... what impact, ripple effect will that have on other things?" And I'm sure that whoever makes these plans they have representatives from every area you can think of.

So they'll have educators, they'll have clothing manufacturers — designers; architects... across the board. I'm sure they get together and have meetings and plan and everybody puts in his input, just the way a military operation goes. What will the Navy do? Will they bombard the shore? What will the Air Force do? Will they come in with air cover? What will the infantry do? It's the same thing. These people, when they plan, they don't miss a trick.

They have experts in every field and they say, "Well, if we do this, that and the other.. John, what will that do to your operation?" And John will be in position to feed back, "Well

this is what I think will happen." So it certainly covers a broad range of people. And for one individual to be able to say all of this in the two hours that he spoke to us, really tells us that he was privy to a lot of information.

R.E: That's right. He must have been sitting in on one of those boardrooms at least at some point. And I think not at the highest level from his position, but enough, because anyone in the population control would be associated with names of foundations... powerful foundations, powerful organizations...

D.L.D: And I'm sure there was a lot in the plans that he never heard. He wasn't a four-star general in this outfit. He wouldn't be in on the whole story.

R.E: Well, too bad he couldn't have talked for six hours instead of two, and we might have had a lot more information. There was another aspect that I found fascinating in listening to this. This whole aspect of privacy... he mentioned that as the private homes went by we would have individuals, non-family members perhaps sharing our apartments.

As I understand that is becoming more popular out in California. Could California and New York being the coast states, did he say... That's right... PORT cities that bring in things so that they can eventually work their way to middle America. But this is about privacy. When he was talking, for example, about the area of sex, he made some interesting remarks. One of them that hit me like a ton of bricks was this business about; "We must be open about sex". As if there can't be any fear of the person that does not hesitate to open up to the public. Now, if you look at these so-called sex initiation programs in the schools where the children are forced either through writing or through verbal expression to talk about all aspects of the sexual sphere...

[end of side one ends abruptly — side two follows]

D.L.D: ... of our right to investigate even your sex life. Your money will be easy. We'll have it all on computer. We'll know more about it than you do. But we have to form a generation where the most intimate activity which two people can have is public, or can be public. Therefore, it's harder to have any private thoughts and you can't buck the system if everything you think and do is public knowledge. But the planners won't be that open about their own lives. They'll reserve their privacy. It's for the rest of us.

R.E: Yes. Just like their listening to concerts and operas, but for the mass media they're pumping in hard rock. That was another fascinating thing. For example, the... and I know this has come to pass because I deal with a lot of young people... the young people have their own radio stations for their music and adults have their own and never the twain shall meet. And when they do there's usually a clash. And I think the same is probably true with a lot of the classical movies. I can remember when I was growing up and my dad had the radio on, I think it was a kind of general music. I didn't say, "Dad, I don't like that music;

turn to another station". Whereas now there is a fabricated generational gap which puts the family at the disadvantage.

D.L.D: And it creates conflict within the family, which is one of the spin-off benefits to them. If you're constantly fussing at your kids, you don't like the music they're playing, and they're constantly fussing at you because they don't like what you're playing... that does bad things to the bonds of affection that you would like to be nurtured in the family.

R.E: It would appear, that any resistance movement against the population controllers would probably be based on families strengthening themselves in a number of ways. One of them being to make sure that children know about grandma and grandpa and where did they come from and developing a whole... getting out the family albums and making sure that children know they have roots, first of all. And secondly, that their family is stable. One father, one mother, with children, with grandfathers. Those of us who have them should hold on to them.

Toward the end of the tape there was a reference — at the time everything would be coming together — how this New World Order would be introduced to a population which, at this point I think they would assume would be acceptable to it... how was this put? We're just going to wake up one morning and changes would just be there? What did he say about that?

D.L.D: It was presented in what must be an over-simplified fashion, so with some qualifications, here's the recollections I have... That in the winter, and there was importance to the winter — on a weekend, like on a Friday an announcement would be made that this was or about to be in place... That the New World Order was now the System for the World and we all owe this New World Order our allegiance.

And the reason for winter is that — and this was stated — people are less prone to travel in the winter, particularly if they live in an area where there's ice and snow. In summer it's easier to get up and go. And the reason for the weekend is, people who have questions about this, Saturday and Sunday everything's closed and they would not have an opportunity to raise questions, file a protest and say no.

And just that period over the weekend would allow a desensitizing period so that when Monday came and people had an opportunity maybe to express some reservations about it, or even oppose it... there would have been 48 hours to absorb the idea and get used to it.

R.E: What about those who decided they didn't want to go along?

D.L.D: Somewhere in there it was that... because this is a "New Authority" and it represents a change, then, from where your allegiance was presumed to be, people would be called on to publicly acknowledge their allegiance to the new authority. This would mean to sign an agreement or in some public way acknowledge that you accepted this...

authority. You accepted its legitimacy and there were two impressions I carried away. If you didn't... and I'm not sure whether the two impressions are necessarily mutually exclusive because this wasn't explored in great detail... one of them was that you would simply have nowhere to go.

If you don't sign up then you can't get any electric impulses in your banking account and you won't have any electric impulses with which to pay your electric, or your mortgage or your food, and when your electric impulses are gone, then you have no means of livelihood.

R.E: Could you get these things from other people, or would that be... in other words, let's say if you had a sympathetic family...

D.L.D: No you could not because the housing authority would keep close tabs on who is inhabiting any domicile. So the housing authority would be sure that everybody living there was authorized to live there.

R.E: Could I get some food?

D.L.D: Your expenditures, through electronic surveillance would be pretty tightly watched so if you were spending too much money at the super market, somebody would pick this up and say, "How come? What are you doing with all that food? You don't look that fat. You don't have that many people. We know you're not entertaining. What are you doing with all that food?" And these things then would alert the...

R.E: I have seven people in my basement who object to the New World Order and I'm feeding them and then they said, well, one has to go.

D.L.D: They don't belong there and you can't feed them and since you're sympathetic to them, maybe your allegiance isn't very trustworthy either.

R.E: Yes. We see this... I think the Chinese experience tells us a great deal about certain things. For example, when they wanted to enforce the "One child family"... they cut off all education for the second child. Your food rations were cut so you couldn't get the right amount of food, and if they found ways around that, they instituted compulsory abortions and compulsory plugging in of the IUD's.

Somewhere in the tape this business about "People can carry two conflicting ideas around — or even espouse two conflicting ideas as long as they don't get too close together". And what immediately came to mind is... here we have an organization like Planned Parenthood... "freedom to choose", yet they support population control programs which is of course NOT the freedom to choose. And then when they're called into account and someone says, "Now wait a minute here. You're, 'freedom to choose — freedom to choose' here, but you're supporting the Chinese program which is compulsory.

I remember a statement from the late Allen Gutmacher, one of the medical directors of Planned Parenthood and he said, "Well, if people limit their families and do what we say, fine. But if we need compulsory population control, we're going to have it."

What would happen with people who wouldn't go along, and particularly that point about, "There wouldn't be any martyrs"? That was significant, because I recall having watched some movies about the Third Reich that many times they would come late in the evening and people would be taken from their home, but neighbors would never ask, "Where did they go?" They knew where they went!

D.L.D: Solzhenitsyn mentions that in the Gulag Archipelago.

R.E: I think this is very similar to what we would see. People would just disappear and you would not ask because it might endanger yourself or your family. But you would know where they went. If you ask questions, you draw attention to yourself and then you might follow them to where they went. So you mind your own business and step over the starving man on the street who didn't go along.

D.L.D: He didn't go into detail about precisely how this would come about but it's not too hard to imagine. Yes. In the past, the Nazi's came, the Communists came in the middle of the night, people just disappeared and one simple way to do this is that if you're cut off from all economic support and you have no place to live and nothing to eat... we already see a lot of homeless now.

I just had a man in the office this morning talking about he and his child seeing people living in boxes in downtown Pittsburgh today. When the New World Order is here and you're living in a box, we can't have people littering the place, so you come around in the wagon and you pick them up.

If your frame of mind as you're growing up and formed is that, "Human value resides in being productive; you have to have a prestigious position or at least perform something useful — make a contribution", and the truck comes by to pick up some guy living in a box and he's not making any contribution, who's going to get excited about it? You know... he's sub-human; he's a fetus; he's a zygote; he's a derelict, and fetuses and zygotes and derelicts are all the same animal. So what do you do with them? You dispose of them. Who gets excited about it?

R.E: I recall that when the Chinese Communists came into power one of the first things that they taught in schools was not any thoughts about specific political ideology, but about evolution and that man was just an animal and if man was just an animal then we won't mind being herded and having masters who keep tabs on the animals and we're one big ant colony and we've got someone to direct traffic and...

Speaking of traffic. We talked about the aged and again — people hearing this tape, it's phenomenal how many times

these things on this tape will hit you. I just came back from New Jersey which has a lot of retirement-type villages and I've been there over a period of years and there's a structure around a retirement home which has been uncompleted for at least two or three years. Now they've recently completed it. It's kind of a roadway, but I think it would be easier to get out of a complex at a play-land it is so complicated. And yet the whole area has elderly people driving.

And we are a fairly middle-aged couple and for the life of me we couldn't figure out how we were going to get out, what we were going to do and so I asked some of the residents... "Doesn't it bother you that they haven't fixed this road for years and now you can't just go across the street which would have been the logical thing?" You have to go down and they have a jug-handle and you have to go over and under, so it takes you so long, and the woman replied to me, "Well you know, we just don't go out. We just don't go out".

So here we have this little retirement village where they've made it very difficult for a population, maybe several hundred homes in this plat with only one exit and the exit involves such a great deal of bother, they say they just cut down on the number of times they have to go out shopping.

D.L.D: Right away it makes me wonder... if it's difficult to get out, it's also difficult to get in probably for visitors.

R.E: These retirement homes sort of remind me of an elephant burial ground. The one thing you notice is that there are no children. There's not the laughter of children in these homes.

D.L.D: My experience has been, these people in the retirement homes, when they see a child they just blossom. They're really delighted to see a child. Sure they're happy to have their sons and daughters come and other adults, but when they see a child — and it doesn't have to be their own — it has a very beneficial effect on their mood. And if these older people aren't seeing children, the other side of that coin is, the children aren't seeing older people either. So if you don't get used to seeing older people, they don't exist.

R.E: And that's why, with the family, making sure your children see their grandparents very often, no matter how much that entails, the trouble with the logistics, etc... it's certainly worth while because, again if you never see someone and you don't learn to love them and you never have any contact with them, when someone says, "Well it's time for your grandpa to check out", it's like, "Who's that?"

Who's going to defend and fight for someone they never even saw before? Oh, I remember one of the phrases. So many of these things... you only have to hear them once and they stick in your mind. It's so jarring.


We've already discussed "sex without reproduction", then you also said the technology would be there for "reproduction without sex" and this is a whole other area because it's contradictory. If a land is so overpopulated,

then you would want to diminish sexual activity, get rid of pornography, get rid of everything that was sexually stimulating. But, no. It's a contrary. You want to increase sexual activity but only insofar as it doesn't lead to reproduction. That was the message, right?

D.L.D: Yes, and this is my own extension. He didn't say this, but that leads to slavery because if you become enslaved to your gratification, whether it's sex, food or whatever, then you're more easily controlled, which is one of the reasons the celibate priesthood is so important. And so many priests don't even understand that. But if you're addicted to sex... if sex is divorced from reproduction, something you do for gratification only — I won't try to parallel that with food because you can't go without food — then you can be more easily controlled by the availability or the removal of the availability of sex.

So that can become an enslaving feature. Now, reproduction without sex... what you would get then would have all the desirable attributes of a human being without any claim to human rights. The way we do it now, we say, you're human because you have a father and mother... you have a family and so you're a human being with human rights. But if your father was a petrie dish and your mother was a test tube, how can you lay claim to human rights? You owe your existence to the laboratory which conveys to you no human rights.

And there is no God, so you can't go for any God-given human rights, so you're an ideal slave. You have all the attributes of a human being but you don't have any claim on rights.

R.E: In  "[Brave New World](#)" they had the caste system, the alphas, the omegas, etc. The way they brought about the different caste systems was that in the decanting, or birthing rooms, the individual who was to do menial or slave labor... work in the mines... received just a little bit of oxygen to the brain so they learned to love their slavery and they were very happy.

They didn't know any better. They didn't have the wherewithal to do things, but the higher in the caste you got, the more oxygen you got to your brain. So we actually had a group of sub-human beings who loved their slavery. In the past slaves probably didn't love their slavery very much, but in this case, we have this technology which will make people love their slavery, and each caste loved being what they were in "Brave New World". And any of our listeners who hasn't read that recently...

D.L.D: You may remember the slogan that was above the Nazi concentration camps... something about, "Work is Peace and Work is Happiness". I don't remember if it was Buchenwald (sp) or Auschwitz. My recollection of words isn't precise, but the idea is what counts. And here's Huxley, writing Brave New World, saying basically the same thing before Hitler was even in power, so Huxley knew something.

R.E: He came from a family that probably contributed at least in part to this New World Order. A number of the English authors... H.G. Wells... from that period and from those associations who highlighted the concepts of what was coming down the path.

I can remember reading Brave New World in high school, and thought, "Boy, is this fantasy land". Thirty years later and I said, "This is scary". There seems to be kind of a similarity between his writings and the talk given by Dr. Day, because you get kind of a mixed message in Brave New World, that these things are not really good. It would be better if man still had a sense of humor, a sense of privacy, if the family still existed.. but, it's inevitable. They're going to go. Too bad. I feel a little sorry about that. A little sentiment, but the New Order has to come in and we have to make room for it.

And I got that same impression from the things that were said about this Day tape. He wasn't real happy about some of the things, but they're going to occur anyway, so make it easier on yourself. The more you accept it the easier it's going to be when it comes around, and I'm kind of doing you a favor — you physicians out there this evening — I'm going to make it easier for you by telling you in advance what's coming and you can make your own adjustments.

D.L.D: Somewhere in Scripture... I think it was after the flood, God said, "**I will write my law on man's hearts**", and I feel the same parallel that you do between Dr. Day's reaction to what he was exposed to and mine... seeming not totally accepting of this. Huxley seeming not totally accepting of what he wrote about but both saying, "Well, there's a certain inevitability to all of this, so let's try to talk about the best parts of it. It's going to be good for people. Technology will be better, quality of life will be better... so you live a few years shorter."

But they both do seem to send out messages not buying the whole package...

R.E: And maybe wishing some people would ask more questions. Looking back over history there are many individuals who had an idea of what a New World Order should be, certainly Hitler and Stalin did, but what was lacking during these periods is that they lacked the technology to carry many a many of the things out... surveillance, constant monitoring... but in this so-called New World Order it's going to be very difficult to escape because technology will provide those means which had been lacking those totalitarian individuals from years ago.

D.L.D: I can't remember on the original tapes, did I mention the phrase where he said, "This time we're going to do it right!" ?

R.E: No. You didn't.

D.L.D: There were so many details to remember. But when he mentioned bringing in the New World Order, he said, "**This time we're going to do it right**".

And right away, I'm wondering, "what do you mean, 'this time'?" There was no explicit explanation of that, but I think it's fairly easy to infer that previous efforts had to do with the Third Reich... Your point about the technology is critical with computers and all means of exchange being controlled by electronic impulse.

Nobody has any wealth. You own nothing of value except access to electronic impulses which are beyond your control. A cashless society. So when your reward for working is [nothing more than] impulses on the computer and the only claim you have is these impulses and the people who run the system can give or take them as they choose. Up until this time there was no way the statement in the Book of Revelation that said, "No man can buy or sell unless he has the mark of the beast"... there's no way that could have been enforced.

People could say I'll trade you a bushel of tomatoes for a bushel of wheat. If you'll drive my kids to school I'll give you six ears of corn. Bartering. And even not going necessarily that primitive, there was always gold and silver and other forms of money that were even better than bartering. But with this cashless society, I believe this is the first time in the history of the human race where the entire population of the world can be controlled economically so that somebody can say, "**I pushed the right buttons and I know how much credit you have electronically; I know where you spend your money electronically; and you cannot buy, you cannot sell unless you get on my computer.**"

Right now you have a half a dozen credit cards in your pocket, but pretty soon it will be narrowed to one credit card and then when we... you know the ostensible reason is that when people loose their credit cards and we have to get rid of that and put the implant in... where it has to be accessible to the scanner... in your right hand or in your forehead.

R.E: Speaking of scanner. When we had the TV War..... the Gulf War? It was the first war where you just sit there and 24 hours a day just like being on the battlefield there. There were several points made about the advances in technology and how they could spot just one little individual down in... they used the constant reference to pinpoint... "pinpoint". I imagine with the different technologies they can also pinpoint a couple of renegades in the New World Order. The technology which was applicable to a so— called 'enemy' can also be applicable to this controlling the order.

D.R.D: Exactly. It's infra-red stuff that's... I'm sort of amateurish about this, but any heat source like a deer, a human being, a renegade... can be picked up by an infra-red scanner and you get sort of an outline of whether it's a deer or sheep or whatever.

My first hearing about them was in the Vietnam War where our troops used them to detect the enemy. That's twenty-some years ago, so they're probably even more sophisticated now than they were then; but with this kind of

surveillance it would be pretty hard for anybody to escape and say, "Well, I'm just going to go out into the mountains and be a hermit and escape the New World Order. I can shoot deer and eat berries and survive and I've got a wife who's pretty sturdy and she'll be able to survive and we'll do what the Indians did before Columbus got here and we'll all survive". The New World Order will say, "No you won't because we're gonna find you".

R.E: Even in Brave New World they had a group of people who still lived as a family and the women breast-fed and they were called savages. But we won't have any savages. We're cultured, we'll be thin and our teeth will be straight.

D.L.D: Something also that was mentioned; forests could — and if necessary would — be leveled or burned. Now this comes out of this movement... goddess mother earth, and how we have to protect the environment... but if we want to get someone who's trying to get away we'll burn down the whole forest. We'll find them. That was stated. Deforestation could be and would be brought about to make sure that nobody gets outside the control of the system.

R.E: We're drawing to a close here. How did you feel after... well, it's been about 22 years now since that original lecture and there probably isn't a day that goes by — at least since I've heard the tape — that I don't think about the things that this Dr. Day said.

D.L.D: You get constant reminders. Not a day goes by something doesn't say, "That reminds me of..." such and such, whether it's surveillance or security...

R.E: ... or clothing. I opened up a toy catalogue the other day and noticed there didn't happen to be any baby dolls in this toy catalogue... of course going back to the idea that we don't want little girls to be thinking about babies. They only had one little doll and it was kind of an adult doll. And nothing that would raise anyone's maternal instincts. Well, Doc, what's the prognosis?

D.L.D: Left to man alone I think the technology is already here and with technological progress, I think it is inevitable — if man is left to his own devices — that some men will be able to assert total control over other men... other people. Man left to his own devices... the tendency is — in groups like this, then — is for internal dissention to arise where the leaders would be at each other's throats too... each saying, "No, I'm more powerful than you. I deserve more than you".

R.E: Who will control the controllers?

D.L.D: Yeah. They would stab themselves. I think so. They would create their own seeds of destruction while they're creating the system. But the other thing I wonder if indeed this may be time for our Lord to come back and say, "Enough's enough. Because you're going to destroy my planet earth. I am in charge of the planet. I'm in charge of mankind. Mankind will be destroyed if I say. I will not

allow my creatures to assume and exert this degree of control where you're going to destroy the whole thing.

R.E: What I was just thinking as you were just saying that is that in the past, dictators could kill people, they could torture them, but essentially they could not change what it meant to be a human being. They could not change human nature. Now we are going to have with this new Genome Project, a multi-billion dollar project where they're going to be getting a tab on everyone's genes. No one shall escape. Everyone shall have their genetic codes and with this opens the door to manipulation to change the very meaning of what it MEANS to be human.

And if one has an entity then that no longer has free will, you just have to wonder if that point out Lord says, "Enough".

D.L.D: Just as Lucifer set himself up as God in the beginning, some people now would set themselves up as God and say,

"I control the computers, I control the genomes, I control everything, I am God..."

and at that point He would have to say, "No, you are not! I have to demonstrate to you... you're NOT. I'm still God. You're just a creature" [human+Being]

RE: And as you said on the original tape, we believe in what our Lord has said, in that He will not leave us orphans. He will be with us 'til the end of time.

D.L.D: This right away now begs the questions, when they come around and say, "It's your turn to sign the allegiance form"... what are you going to do? When Henry the eighth came around and said, either sign here and join... and while he was saying it they were throwing the noose over the limb of the oak tree, and slipping the noose around your neck and saying, "you want to sign this or do we slap the horse out from under you?" and a lot of people said I won't sign it and they were martyred.

Despite his having said there will be no martyrs, certainly there will be martyrs. The implication of his statements were that they would not be recognized as martyrs, but there will be martyrs and they will be RECOGNIZED as martyrs. Maybe not the same way as in the past but I think this is something people should sort of prepare themselves for.

When I'm nose to nose with this choice, "ether sign this allegiance or we're going to put you in a boxcar and you're going out to Arizona, to the desert..." I think we have to be prepared to make a decision.

R.E: I think it would be an understatement to say that this tape has great meaning and it's like a forewarning and it gives us ideas of things we should do and things we shouldn't do and I think everybody listening to the tapes

will come up with things he can do on a small scale. I think that's the beauty of this thing. As he was talking... it wasn't real earth shattering things he was talking about. He was talking about little things. Television. Things that we do every day. Things that are under our control. The books we read.

And I think some of these changes if they are going to occur will occur with the individual person within that family, with him getting the word out and then doing the little things. I think they matter over the long haul, the most.

D.L.D: Just as with the prisoners who survived the brainwashing, I think people who are Spiritually oriented, who are thinking about God, thinking about their relationship WITH God, are the ones who will then be better prepared or equipped to survive this world and the next. Whereas, those who are just focused on meeting their needs right now, strictly the material needs of the day, they're more easily controlled.

Under the threat of losing your comforts or losing your food or losing your head or whatever, certainly some people are going to yield, and those who I think will survive and I really mean both in this life and the next — they're going to have to be the ones who are prepared because it's my belief when the time comes to make the decision... "Are you going to sign on or not?"... it's too late to begin preparation and start saying, "Well, let me think about this."

You won't have time to think about it. You're either going to say yes or no. I hope a lot of us make the right decision.

R.E: I do so too, and I think the tape will change as many lives and have hopefully as good an effect as it had on mine and on yours and so let me thank you very much. For further information please contact the U.S. Coalition for Life; Box 315, Export, Penn 15632. Your comments and criticism and any other information which you might have regarding this tape will be most welcome.