

**Transcript of Dr Lawrence Dunegan's taped reminiscences
of off-the-record remarks by Illuminati Insider,
Dr Richard Day, 20 March 1969**

The original article may be found on:
http://www.overlordsofchaos.com/html/new_order_of_barbarians.html

The **Overlords of Chaos** website contains a wealth of first class information and analysis about the coming New World Order and the psychopaths behind it.

Note: Some minor cosmetic changes have been made by ZEPHANIAH.EU to improve the flow of these transcripts and make them easier to digest.

This paper is a transcript of three tapes of reminiscences made by Dr Lawrence Dunegan, of a speech given on March 20, 1969 by Dr Richard Day, an Illuminati insider. The tapes were recorded by Randy Engel, National Director of the US Coalition for Life, in 1988.

Dr Dunegan claims he attended a medical meeting on March 20, 1969 where Dr Richard Day made "off the record" remarks during an address at the Pittsburgh Pediatric Society to a meeting of students and health professionals, who were destined to be leaders in medicine and health care. Dr Day died in 1989 but at the time was Professor of Paediatrics at Mount Sinai Medical School in New York and was previously the Medical Director of Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

In Tape Three, a interview by Randy Engel, Dr Dunegan details Dr Day's credentials. These clearly show that Dr Day was an establishment insider privy to the overarching plan of the Elite Group which rules the Western world and which is working toward the creation of a World Dictatorship. This proposed global tyranny is usually called the New World Order and will comprise a secular and a spiritual component – a One World Government and a One World Religion. Most analysts of this plan describe it as Lucifer's Totalitarian World Empire.

Before he began his talk, Dr Day asked everyone to turn off all tape recorders and stop taking notes so that he could tell them, the prospective leaders of organised medicine, what was going to happen in the future. Dr Dunegan sensed that Dr Day's message would be important, ignored the request and noted the points made by him on a set of table napkins. He later wrote up these notes, which formed the basis for the three tapes.

The notes taken by Dunegan reveal, not just what is planned for the entire population of the planet, but how this evil cabal intend to carry out their plan. Anyone who has studied the plan will recognise that Dr Day's remarks are essentially a reiteration of the secret agenda being followed by the Global Elite. This agenda includes the elimination of swathes of humanity by promoting ill health and spurious medical treatments, while at the same time suppressing effective treatments for disease and deliberately introducing man-made pathogens such as AIDS into the human gene pool.

Throughout his talk Dr Day justified his observations by using a philosophy founded upon a spurious theory made famous by the English natural scientist, Charles Darwin (1809-82), namely evolution by "natural selection." This is pithily described by an ardent supporter, the English philosopher and sociologist Herbert Spencer (1820-1903), as the "survival of the fittest." Spencer also applied Darwin's hypothesis to human societies. Thus, while Darwin restricted his formula of organic evolution (wherein new species arise and are perpetuated by "natural selection") to the animal kingdom, others followed Spencer and extended "natural selection" to human society as well. Spencer's theory, often called Social Darwinism (whereby human society mimics the jungle and only those best able to cope with the many testing circumstances survive and perpetuate their characteristics into future generations) is the scientific basis of Eugenics. This dangerous 'science' envisages an ever-increasing separation between an elite racial group and degenerate human stock – namely the masses of humanity.

The German philosopher Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche (1844-1900), best remembered for his concept of the "superman" and for his rejection of Christian values, was one of the philosophical giants of this movement. Dr Day, an ardent atheist, was thus a spokesman for those who view human existence as merely an extension of the jungle and whose self-appointed task is to safeguard what advances have been made to date by humans, epitomised by Western Civilisation. This involves eliminating "weaknesses" and "degeneracy" from the human gene pool.

The aim in doing so is not only to preserve what advances humanity has made in this evolutionary process but to "help" it along. This pernicious philosophy is utterly inimical to the true, God-given purpose of Creation and the natural moral order founded by the will of God. And yet it is central to the dark philosophy of those who wish to bring about a New World Order (NWO). This also explains why Eugenics, incorporating global population reduction and genocide, is a major component in this plan. It is also the reason that proponents of the NWO hate Christianity and seek its destruction.

Although Dr Day spoke about organised medicine and its hidden agenda, specifically to cull the world's population, he was also privy to the wider goals of those who were conspiring to bring about a NWO. In his introductory remarks, he said he would not have been able to say what he was about to say even a few years earlier. However, he was now free to speak (in 1969) because what had formerly been a closely guarded 'Closed Conspiracy' was now more akin to an 'Open Conspiracy.'

Amongst the hitherto secret plans which Dr Day outlined was the revolution in morals that had shaken Western society to its foundations. This would usher in a new world religion – the ‘One World Religion’ of the NWO. This would actually be brought about by the churches themselves, especially the Roman Catholic Church. Moreover, he discussed "bringing the nation to the brink of nuclear war" and the cynical use of "terrorism" to bring about a One World Government.

Among the topics discussed by Dr Day were:

"Population control; permission to have babies; redirecting the purpose of sex – sex without reproduction and reproduction without sex; contraception universally available to all; sex education and carnalising of youth as a tool of world government; tax funded abortion as population control; encouraging homosexuality, including *anything goes* homosexuality; technology used for reproduction without sex; families to diminish in importance; euthanasia and the "demise pill"; limiting access to affordable medical care and thus making it easier to eliminate the elderly; medicine to be tightly controlled; the elimination of private doctors; new difficult-to-diagnose and untreatable diseases; the suppression of cancer cures to control and reduce the population; induced heart attacks as a form of assassination; education as a tool for accelerating the onset of puberty and evolution; the blending of all religions – the old religions will have to go; changing the Bible through the revision of key words; restructuring education as a tool of indoctrination; spending more time in schools, but pupils "wouldn't learn anything"; controlling who has access to information; schools as the hub of the community; "some books would just disappear from the libraries"; changing laws to promote moral and social chaos; the encouragement of drug abuse to create a jungle atmosphere in cities and towns; promote alcohol abuse; restrictions on travel; the need for more jails, and using hospitals as jails; no more psychological or physical security; crime used to manage society; curtailment of US industrial pre-eminence; shifting populations and economies to tear out social roots; sports to be used as a tool of social engineering and change; sex and violence to be inculcated through entertainment; travel restrictions and implanted ID cards; food control; weather control; using mass psychology to control how people respond and behave; the falsification of scientific research; the use of terrorism and the creation of ‘terrorist’ threats; the use of surveillance devices, implants, and televisions to monitor people; home ownership to be a thing of the past; and, ultimately, the arrival of a totalitarian system of global control."

Tape One

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 around the world. This conspiratorial interpretation of history is based on people making observations from the outside, gathering evidence and coming to the conclusion that from the outside they see a conspiracy. Their evidence and conclusions are based on evidence gathered in retrospect. Period.

I now want to describe what I heard from a speaker in 1969, some 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 organized power, force, group of men, who wielded enough influence to determine major events involving countries around the world. And 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 thereafter, 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 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 Presidency...the Kennedy campaign...when he spoke of "progress in the decade of the '60s"; that was kind of a cliché in those days – "the decade of the '60s." Well, by 1969 our speaker was talking about the decade of the '70s, the decade of the '80s, and the decade of the '90s. So that...I think that [the] terminology that we are looking at...looking at things and expressing things, probably all comes from the same source. Prior to that time I don't remember anybody saying "the decade of the '40s and the decade of the '50s."

So I think this overall plan and timetable had taken important shape with more predictability to those who control it, sometime in the late '50s. 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. Everything is in place and nobody can stop us now."

As we listened to what he was about to present, he said: "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 realize. In his introductory remarks he commented that 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." That's the end of that quotation.

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 organization. But, that if he did, most of the people would be names that were recognized 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 a doctor of medicine, 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 recognized by anybody likely to hear this, and so there is no point in giving his name. 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 we – or 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 and he hopes 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 his... if it became widely known what he was about to say to... our group... if it became widely known that he spilled the beans, so to speak.

When I heard that, first 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, [where the] remarks were delivered. But, nonetheless, he asked that no notes be taken... no tape recording be used – suggesting there might be some personal danger to himself if these revelations were widely publicized.

Again, as the remarks began to unfold, and I saw the rather outrageous things that were said – at that time they certainly seemed outrageous – I made it a point to try to remember as much of what he said as I could, and during the subsequent weeks and months and years, to connect my recollections to simple events around me, both to aid my memory for the future in case I wanted to do what I'm doing now – record[ing] this. And also, 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... just having a general bearing on the whole presentation. One of the statements [had] to do with change. People get used...his 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 [throughout] 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 and say, "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, as well as specific changes, 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 and having it."

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 when [he had described] some particularly offensive changes. For example, the promotion of drug addiction which we'll get into shortly.

Population Control

He was very active with population control groups, the population control movement, and population control was really the entry point into [the] specifics which followed his introduction. He said the population was 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 we will over-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, and the outstanding person or persons 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 word "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 endeavor of the 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 recognize how one aspect dovetails with other aspects in terms of controlling human endeavors.

Sex without Reproduction and Reproduction without 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 is 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

And the first consideration then here was contraception. Contraception would be very strongly encouraged, and it would be connected so closely in people's minds with sex, that they would automatically think contraception when they were thinking or preparing for sex. And contraception would be made universally available. Nobody wanting contraception would find it unavailable. 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 were just as much a part of life as any other items sold in the store. And contraceptives would be advertised and 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, 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, many cities in the United States by this time had already set up school-based clinics which were 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 that 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, 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 diehards will still refuse to see abortion as acceptable, and they won't matter anymore.

Encouraging Homosexuality, Sex, 'Anything Goes'

Homosexuality also was to be encouraged. "People will be given permission to be homosexual." That's the way it was stated. They won't have to hide it. And 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. And, 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. Recall back in 1969 [it] was the time of the mini-skirt, when those mini-skirts were very, very high and 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 [his] 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. And, 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 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 under way 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...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. And, the extended families would be smaller, and more remote. Travel would be easier [and] 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 gets transferred the other one may not be easily transferred. So one either keeps 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. And 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 realize that they had lived long enough – he mentioned several of these...I don't remember them all...here are a few: Use of very pale printing ink on forms that are necessary to fill out, so that 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, traffic patterns that older people with their slower reflexes would have trouble dealing with and thus lose some of their independence.

Limiting access to affordable Medical Care makes Eliminating the Elderly Easier

A big item – [that] was elaborated at some length – was the cost of medical care would be 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. And 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. And then the real example was – there could be like a nice, farewell party, a real celebration. Mom and Dad had done a good job. And 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 was made: "Congress is not going to go along with national health insurance. That [in 1969, he said] 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... you pay for it, you're entitled to it. It was only subsequently that I began to realize the extent to which you would not be paying for it. Your medical care would be paid for by others. And therefore you would gratefully accept, on bended knee, what was offered to you as a privilege.

Your role [of] being responsible for your own care would be diminished. As an aside here – this is not something that was developed at this time ... I didn't understand it at the time – as an aside, the way this works, everybody's 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 on your part, they pay \$300 or \$400. And 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 use of hospitals

Anyhow, continuing on, access to hospitals would be tightly controlled. 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.

And anybody moving about in a hospital would be required to wear an identification badge with 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...for the treatment of criminals. This did not mean, necessarily, medical treatment. At that time, I did not know the word "Psycho-Prison" as 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 [the] 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 [would] include things like executions by lethal injection. The image of the doctor being a powerful, independent person would have to be changed. And he went on to say: "Doctors are making entirely too much money. They should advertise like any other [service]."

Lawyers would be advertising [their services] 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 diehards 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...as this gradually became more and more acceptable, doctors would more and more become employees rather than independent contractors. And along with that, of course, unstated but necessary, is the employee [who] serves his employer, not his patient. We've already seen quite a lot of that in the last 20 years. And apparently more [is] on the horizon.

The term HMO was not used at that time, but as you look at HMOs 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 [*Note: HMO means Health Maintenance Organisation, akin to group insurance for a range of medical services*]. A few diehard 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 is Health & Disease. He said new diseases [would] appear which had never been seen before. [These] would be very difficult to diagnose and [would] be untreatable – at least for a long 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 what he was talking about? Is this a case of what he was talking about?" Some years later, as AIDS ultimately developed, I think AIDS was at least one example of what he was talking about. I now think AIDS was probably a manufactured disease.

Suppressing Cancer Cures as a Means of Population Control

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 over-populated. You may as well die of cancer as something else."

Efforts at cancer treatment would be geared more toward comfort than toward cure. There was some statement [that] ultimately the cancer cures 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 because it would slow down the problem of over-population.

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. In connection with nutrition, there was no specific statement that I can recall regarding 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 [people] 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 dietary fats [would] go up and predispose [them] to disease.

And he said something [to the effect that] dietary information, [information] about proper diet, would be widely available, but that most people – particularly stupid people, who had no right to continue living anyway – would ignore the advice and just go on and eat whatever 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 [thinking] 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 ... the rest of this ... about 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 glamorized, particularly as regards running shoes, this would stimulate people to develop an interest in running and – as part of a public propaganda campaign – people would be encouraged to buy attractive sports equipment and get into exercise.

In connection with nutrition he also mentioned that public eating places would rapidly increase. This had a connection with the family too. As more and more people ate 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 you could pop in the microwave. Whole meals would be available pre-fixed. And of course, we've now seen this ... and some pretty good ones.

This whole approach to eating out and to eating previously prepared meals in the home was predicted at that time...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 judgment about people and what they should do with their energies. People who were smart, who would learn about nutrition, and who were 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 the onset of Puberty and Evolution

Somewhere 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 to accelerating the process of evolutionary change. There was a statement [to the effect] 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...The Old Religions will have to Go

Another area of discussion was Religion. This is an avowed atheist speaking. And he said: "Religion is not necessarily bad. A lot of people seem to need religion, with its 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 easier for people to accept and feel at home in it. Most people won't be too concerned with religion. They will realize that they don't need it.

Changing the Bible through the Revision 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 emphasized, 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. And 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 those times where he said: "... the few who do notice the difference won't be enough to matter."

The Churches will Help

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. And one of the things I remember connecting [here] with what he said about religion was that, in addition to changing the Bible, he said that the classics in Literature would be changed. I seem to recall Mark Twain's writings being given as an example. But he said, the casual reader reading a revised version of a classic would never even suspect that there was any change. Somebody would have to go it through word by word to even recognize that any change was made in [any of] 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. And 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, [but] I do remember he said that school was planned to go [on] 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 [all] 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 whether he said that.

Students would have to decide at a younger age what they would want to study and get onto their track early, if they would qualify. 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. Where he talked about limited access to other fields, I seem to recall [he was referring] more to the high school and college levels, perhaps. People would be very specialized 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 schooling would become more important in people's overall life. Kids, in addition to their academic [needs], would have to get into school activities unless they wanted to feel completely out of it. But spontaneous activities among kids...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 in connection with drug abuse and alcohol abuse, he indicated that psychiatric services 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. Adults would [continue] 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 get 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, 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. And 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 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 rationale 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 changed. And I know subsequent to that time they have been. Anti-trust laws would be changed, or be interpreted differently, or both.

In connection with the changing of 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 having the impression that it was like competition but [among] members of a club. Nobody outside the club would be able to compete. Sort of like teams competing within a professional 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 [as to] what the rules of competition are – not a really free competition.

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. And if you were fit, you survived. But now we've become so civilised – we're over-civilized – and the unfit are [able] to survive, [but] only at the expense of those who are more fit. And the abusive drugs then, 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.

[The following paragraph actually came after the 'Restrictions on Travel' section below] 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 – to screen out some of the unfit people who were otherwise pretty good – [the planners] would also [provide a way out, but a controlled one]. If they [the abusers] 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 were 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 a kind of a high-handed 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 One]

Tape Two

Change

Change, nothing is permanent. Streets would be re-routed, 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 [a] jungle [feeling], [a] 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 airplanes and railroads and automobiles. All of this to contribute to the feeling of insecurity, that nothing was safe.

{Aside by Dr Dunegan: Not too long after this presentation and I think one or two even before in the area where I live, some newly constructed bridges broke; a defect in another newly constructed bridge was discovered before it broke, and I remember reading just scattered incidents around the country where shopping malls would fall in – right where they were filled with shoppers. And I 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; and 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. There would be the created slums, while other areas [would be] well maintained. Those people able to leave the slums for better areas would learn to better appreciate the importance of human accomplishment. This meant that if they left the jungle and came to civilization, 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 neighborhoods. 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."

Consolidating Policy

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

Anyhow, I remember wondering, "How can he be so confident that the criminal element is going to stay where he wants it to stay?" He went on to say that increased security would be needed in the better areas. That would mean more police, better coordinated 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." And 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 with alarms and locks. The alarms would [connect] to the police department so that people could protect their wealth and their well-being. [However] some of the criminal activity would spill out of the slums into better, more affluent 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 recognized evil and then the self-forgiveness thing..."Well see, we've given you a way out."

Global Interdependence:

"To Create a New Structure, you first have to tear down the Old." 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 in 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 several occasions where he said that, in order to create a new structure, you first have to tear down the old. 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. And this was especially true of our heavy industries – they would be cut back while the same industries were being developed in other countries, notably Japan.

Patriotism would go down the Drain

At this point there was some discussion of [the] steel and, particularly, the automobile [industries]. I remember him 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 [our] foreign competitors.

One example was Japan. In 1969, Japanese automobiles – if they were sold here at all, I don't remember – 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 often, 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 practicalities – if you bought Japanese, German, or [other] imported [vehicle] it would last longer and you would be better off. Patriotism would go down the drain then.

It was also mentioned elsewhere that things would be made to fall apart. I don't remember specific items or if they were even stated [by reference to anything] other than automobiles, but I do recall having the impression...of a surgeon having something fall apart in his hands in the operating room, at a critical time...

Loss of Jobs: Loss of Security

The idea [was to promote insecurity] ... the notion that the world wasn't a terribly reliable place.

The United States was to be kept strong in information, communications, high technology, education and agriculture. It would continue to be sort of the keystone of the 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 smokestacks and industrial waste and some of the .. people could put up with that for a while. This again was supposed to be a "redeeming quality" which Americans could accept. You took away our industry but you saved our environment. So we really didn't lose out.

Population Shifts to Eliminate "Traditions"

Along the line there was talk about people losing their jobs as a result of industrial [policy]. 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 tend to move into the Sun Belt [*Note: This is generally taken to mean the southern third of the USA*]. They would be, 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 changing traditions in a place where people grew up and had an extended family – where they had roots.

Things like new medical care systems. If you pick up from a Northeast industrial city and you transplant yourself to the South Sun Belt or Southwest, you'll be more accepting, for example, of whatever kind of controlled medical care you find there. [You would not accept] the same change in the medical care system where you had roots and the support of your family. Also in this vein it 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 this but it is interesting. If you look around, the most liberal areas of the country...are the seacoast cities. 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 that will 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 moral [beliefs] and their commitment to things will all give way to survival. That's not my philosophy. That's the speaker's philosophy.

World Citizens, World Sports

Anyhow, going back to industry. Some heavy industry would remain. Just enough to maintain a sort of a seedbed 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 worldwide specialization would be carried on.

Perhaps I'm repeating myself but one of the upshots of all of this global interdependence would be that national identities would tend to be de-emphasized. Each area depended on every other area for one or another element in its life. We would all become citizens of the world rather than citizens of any one country. And along these lines then we can talk about sports.

Sports in the United States were to be changed, in part as a way of de-emphasizing nationalism. Soccer, a world-wide sport, was to be emphasized and pushed in the United States. This is of interest because 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 at their school, 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-emphasized 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 [would] give up baseball and either 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. These high salaries would also break the owners and alienate the fans. Then the fans would support soccer and the baseball fields could be used as soccer fields. It wasn't said for definite that this would happen, but if the international flavor didn't come around rapidly enough, this could be done.

There was some comment along the same lines about [American] 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 violence in football, how it met a perceived psychological need, that people had a need for this vicarious violence. So football, for that reason, might be left around to meet that vicarious need.

The same was true of [ice] hockey. Hockey had more of an international flavor and would be emphasized. There was some foreseeable international competition for 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 at all a hockey fan, and I am. And it turns out, he was not. He just knew about the game and [how it would fit into] this changing sports program.

In any event soccer was to be the keystone of athletics because it was already a worldwide sport. [It was] in South America, Europe, and parts of Asia. [So] 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, [rather] than citizens of our narrow nations.

Hunting

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. That's the way it was put.

Sports for Girls: to De-emphasize Femininity

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 need not 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-emphasized 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 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 to look forward to being a mother.

Entertainment: Violence, Sex and Desensitization

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 theaters, on television. VCRs 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 VCRs, as well as in the neighborhood theater 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 ... and 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 desensitize 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 towards death would change and they would not be so fearful of it but more accepting of it, and not be so aghast at the sight of dead people

or injured people. We don't need to have a genteel population paralyzed 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 I remember regretting that I took my son. And I remember feeling anger toward [Dr Day]. 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.

"Music will get Worse"

As regards music, he made a rather straightforward statement: "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 publicized, 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 all the folks would have...their own radio stations to hear. He seemed to indicate that, as it got worse and worse, 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, which 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. [*Note: Ex-Illuminati insider, John Todd, spoke extensively about the Satanic dimension of the music industry and the way it is used to spread demonic ideas.*]

Give us the Young

And again, he was right. This aspect was...summarized in 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 be all 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 memories 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 old 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.

'80s & '90s: The Grim Reaper. Travel Restrictions, National ID, the Chip, etc.

Then, the presentation began to get rather grim, because once that generation passed – that would be in the late 80's and early 90's where we are now – most of that [age] group would be gone. 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, 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, and 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 with these skin-implanted IDs, he said, would 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. [Furthermore], 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 realize the dangers of overpopulation. Ultimately, whether the population slows down or not, the food supply is to be brought under centralized 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 [*tape ends abruptly and continues on side two*] ... 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, that 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. [Therefore] 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. He made 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."

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 [*geographical regions*] 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. [*Note: The Illuminati (the Ruling Elite) have been able to do this since the 1970s.*]

Politics

He said that very few people really know how government works. Something to the effect that elected officials are influenced in ways they don't even realize, 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 point. I don't remember just where they were made, but they're valid in terms of the general overall view. One statement: "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."

And 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 a statement admitting that some scientific research data could be – and indeed had been – falsified in order to bring about desired results. [Dr Day] 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 and dispassionately scientific – science being the be all and end all – well, 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...through the UN and a World Court, but not necessarily through those structures. It could be brought about in other ways.

Acceptance of the UN: The End justifies the Means

Acceptance of the UN at that time was not as widespread as [they had] 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 recognized 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 was once useful but is no longer useful. But war is obsolete...because nuclear bombs [meant] war was 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 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 you hear that ... 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 – everybody willingly yielding national sovereignty – then by bringing the nation to the brink of nuclear war. And 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. This would [therefore] bring in the New International Political System.

This was... [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 – possibly more – nuclear weapons. As it was put this would possibly be needed to convince people that "We mean business."

That was followed by the statement: "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 kind of 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 realization that peace was better than war.

War is Good: Cannon-Fodder, keep the Population down, and Die a Hero

In this context – the discussion of war, that war is obsolete – [Dr Day said] that there were some good things about war... One, you're going to die anyway, and people sometimes get a chance in war to display great courage and heroism, and if they die they've died well, and if they survive they get recognition.

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 [he expressed] for war was [that if] the many millions of casualties in WWI and WWII ... had not died but had continued to live, and continued to have babies, there would be millions upon millions [more people on the planet] 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 [whereby] the individual and governments can 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 was once controllable, could get out of control, and so for these two reasons it's now obsolete.

Terrorism: The Great Tool for 'Control'

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 [not considered] necessary in the United States. [However] it could become necessary in the US if the US did not move rapidly enough toward 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 was that it would indeed be 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.

Money and Banking

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 decimal points wherever you want" ...as an indication that inflation is a tool of the controllers.

Money would become predominately credit. It already was. Money was primarily a credit thing, but [the] exchange of money would not be [in the form of] cash or something palpable but [an] 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 [that] but ultimately and basically it would be one single banking system. So 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 [around] with you.

Also computer records could be kept of 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.

[Dr Day stated] that any purchase of significant size like an automobile, bicycle, a refrigerator, a radio, 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 – the 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. [He made a statement which recognised] 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, you're saving instead of spending. You really don't need all that money."

Basically the idea was to prevent people from accumulating any wealth which might have a long range disruptive influence on the system. People would be encouraged to use credit, to borrow, and then also 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 – these 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 ...the advantage of having all of that combined into a single credit card [would be emphasized], serving a single monetary system and then you wouldn't have to carry around all that plastic.

So the next step would be the single card and then the next step [after that] would be to replace the single card with a skin implant. The single card could be lost or stolen, [it could] give rise to problems; [or it] could be exchanged with somebody else to confuse identify. The skin implant on the other hand would be not losable or counterfeitable or transferable to another person, so you and your accounts would be identified without any possibility of error.

The skin implants would have to be put some place that would be convenient for 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. This is 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 Revelation. Shortly after, I became familiar with it and the significance of what he said really was striking. I'll never forget it.

Big Brother is Watching you: While you're watching TV

There was some mention, also, of implants that would lend themselves to surveillance by providing radio signals. This could be [placed] under the skin or [via] 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.

[Dr Day also] 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 [to happen]. The TV set would not have to be on in order for this to be operative. Also, the television set could be used to monitor what you are watching. People could 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 in there at first. This was described by what we now know as cable TV [which has replaced] 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. 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 could just turn on your TV and there would be a way of interacting with your television channel to the store where 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, and 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 heard that time, because 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.

Privately owned Homes – "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 and 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 prices 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. Then these homes could be taken by increased taxes or other regulations that would be detrimental to home ownership [but] acceptable to the majority. Ultimately, people would be assigned [to] where they would live and it would be common to have non-family members living with you ... 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. When the new system takes over people will be expected to sign allegiance to it, indicating that they don't have any reservations [about it] or [any desire to hold] back to the old system.

There just won't be any room, Dr Day 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 that 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."

A Few Final Items

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, would probably occur on a weekend in the winter. Everything would shut down on Friday evening and Monday morning, when everybody woke up, there would be an announcement that the New System was in place. During the process of 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 were concerned. Investment instruments would be changing. Interest rates would be changing, so it would be difficult to keep 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 home 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. I was struck by this, and I was again reminded of what had been said many years ago.

I'm hurrying here because I'm just about at the end of the tape. Let me just summarize here by saying – all of these things were said by one individual at one time in one place, relating to so many different human endeavors. [Now] look and see how many of these actually came about ... that is, 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, we must put our faith in God and pray and ask for His guidance. Second, we must 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 endeavors. 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 about – it's a cliché: Let's insist on liberty and justice for all.

[End of Tape Two]

Tape Three

Note: This is **a transcript of an interview by Randy Engel**, Director of the US Coalition for Life, with Dr Larry Dunegan on Oct. 10, 1991 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. On tapes I and II (made in 1988) Dr Lawrence Dunegan, recounted his memories of the lecture he attended in 1969 where a New World Order insider, Dr Richard Day, revealed plans for a "World System" which is usually called the New World Order, i.e. the long planned and awaited feudal-fascist World Government.

In this final tape (Tape Three) Dr Dunegan fleshes out the character of Dr Day and the nature of his "New System."

Randy Engel (R.E.): Why don't we open up with a little bit about the man 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 (D.L.D.): Yeah. Dr Day was the Chairman of the Department of Paediatrics at the University of Pittsburgh from about 1959 thru 1964, about that period of time, and then he left the University and went to fill the position of Medical Director at the Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

R.E: And that was about 1965 to 1968, about that period?

D.L.D: About 1964 or 1965 until about 1968 or 1969, 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 – he would stand in front of the auditorium and [we would] 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 our listeners [are familiar with] names like Mary Calderone [1904-1998, *Medical Director of Planned Parenthood Federation of America*] and Alan Guttmacher [1898-1974, *President of Planned Parenthood and Vice-President of the American Eugenics Society*]. They were medical directors at one time or another for Planned Parenthood, but Dr Day was not well known. As a matter of fact when I went back into the SIECUS [*Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States*] 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 him.

Can you describe the scene of this particular lecture, the approximate date, and what the occasion was, then a little bit about the audience?

D.L.D: This was the Pittsburgh Pediatric Society [which] 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 the 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 the 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 on for. One of the interesting things ... he hadn't finished, it was getting late, and he said: "...there's much much more, but we could be here all night and 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. Some years later when I would 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, take the example of cancer cures.

R.E: Or 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 [were said] that I thought should have been offensive and [should have] elicited a reaction from physicians because they were physicians. I was surprised at how little reaction there was to it. And then [there were] other things that I would have expected people to react to – just because they were human being. I think most of the people at the meeting subscribed more or less to the Judaeo-Christian ethic and codes of behavior, and that was violated [by Dr Day] right and left. One of my friends in particular, whom I thought would be as disturbed as I was about this just sort of smiled ... he 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 such 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 that it is indeed happening right under our noses.

R.E: Before talking about the specific areas, I think there are a lot of benefits [to be had] from these tapes. One of them is that, when you 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 these types of manipulation, and so forth.

You said 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'd balk at doing it 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." They're too trusting. And this was directed, as I recall, mostly at Americans. I had the feeling he thought Europeans were perhaps more skeptical and more sophisticated. That Americans are too trusting and don't ask the right questions.

R.E: With regard to this lack 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 [by Dr Day] – 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 – Dr Day kept on making the point that old people were going by the wayside – so I presume the controllers of the New World Order were really placing the main emphasis on the youth.

D.L.D: Absolutely. Yes. Emphasis on the 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 there's something on homosexuality that I want to expand on. I don't think this came out on the original tape, but there was, first of all, the statement: "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 this where he made 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 [to be certain what] I'm remembering with great confidence and how much is pure speculation, but [he seemed to be saying] ..."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 that this early sex initiation has an overall purpose which I'll get into a little later. This sexualization of the population, which Dr Day spoke about on the tape – "Anything goes" – is something we are now seeing. For example, it's not so much that someone would adopt the homosexual lifestyle for himself, but as a result of the propaganda he will certainly be a lot more tolerant of that type of behavior. So it's a desensitization, even if the individual 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 labelled a homophobe. You dare not be against any of our [feminist] programs for women, otherwise you're a male chauvinist pig. It's like anti-Semitism. If this label gets enough currency in a culture, then people get 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 the family. After hearing this tape, I remember going to a [Catholic] Mass and they happened to have dancing girls on the altar...I thought, as a Catholic...this has been probably been the most difficult and the hardest thing to watch, where our traditional Mass, those things which Catholics have practiced and believed in for so long...everything had begun to turn over on its head...

You look at the little song book [hymnal] – of course, that's changed radically and you see, instead of *brethren*, the word *people*, or you might see something odd happening on the altar 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.

To me, what this boils down to me is that these people are saying, "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...ordinary person is 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, are 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 or whatever, 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 these things I think we should ask ourselves, "What effect does that have on family life, and the family?" 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 the effect of disavowing or hurting 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. Dr Day 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. He said, rather condescendingly, that some people need this and if they need it we'll manufacture something to meet this need. But of course it can't be anything that would [expound] moral absolutes or the natural law. Which means that the main target of these controllers was and is the Roman Catholic Church. He mentioned the Roman Catholic Church specifically.

D.L.D: Religion's important because it is eternal. We who follow the church [should not accept] these rules about change. But if we make our own religion, if we define what counts as religion, then we are changing it to suit ourselves ... I was kind of flattered sitting there as a Catholic, hearing Dr Day state that the Roman Catholic Church was the main obstacle – "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 the Roman Catholic Church would be an exception: "They will [all] help us." Unfortunately...

D.L.D: He was right.

R.E: 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 really important because he mentioned this with regard to a number of things, like the Bible. As someone once put it, "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 'altar' 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 it's VERY important, otherwise why would they bother to change it? Otherwise, why would they go through all this rigmarole if it wasn't important? It's obviously important to them because they know that, with the changing of words, you change ideas.

D.L.D: They're exerting a lot of time and effort 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 capable of thinking. And this 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 Lehar 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* or *sodomite* has been replaced with the term "gay", and this represents an ideology, not only a word. And when you use it, it's the same as saying, "Yes, I accept your interpretation of this."

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, are not.

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...

D.L.D: [This is how they] 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" or "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 all of the popular movements in the US ... Talking about media events and access to the brain, I remember the first speech Bush [Senior] gave in which he talked about the New World Order [January 16, 1991] ... 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 their access to our mind, then we have a shot at escaping the manipulation, if not totally – at least to escape a portion of the manipulation. 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 brains and therefore they were able to survive where others did not.

And in our popular culture we have a number of things, notably TV and radio, by which the opposition has constant access to our brains and to our children's brains. So I think the logical conclusion, and one of the commonsense conclusions, is that if you don't want the enemy to have access you have to cut off the lines of access ...

D.L.D: Take the networks at their 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 where kids are 'at war' with other kids on the playground, there are certain things that are common. It's just that kids on the playground do it on a smaller scale. But you mention cutting off access to your brain. This is when somebody says, "I don't want to hear it." And I remember hearing kids on the playground saying, "Ya-na-na na naa-na." And they're teasing the kid ... and what does he do? He puts his hands over his ears. In effect he's saying, "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: Goebbels 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 ... Dr Day was very much into the whole population control establishment, and he was of course in favor of abortion....I recall one of the population-control books saying that birth control without death control was meaningless...

D.L.D: There was a movie sometime back called *Soylent Green*. Remember that movie? I didn't see the whole movie, but Edward G. Robinson sat in the theatre and listened to Beethoven's *Pastoral Symphony* as he was about to take his demise pill.

R.E: That's right ... as he said, as long as it's done with dignity and humanely ... like putting away your horse.

D.L.D: It's a bit like pornography. Years back kids would come across pornography. It was always poor photography and cheap paper. Then *Playboy* magazine came out with its glossy pages and really good photography. Pornography [became] respectable.

I once took my son to a movie at the Pittsburgh Playhouse. During the [trailers] there was a title I don't remember but it was 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 music then it's art ... 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...

R.E: ...There are currently an awful lot of people who are out work. Dr Day had quite a lot of things to say about, for example, heavy industry ... 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 also spoke about religion, law, education, sports, entertainment, food. How could one individual have that much input? ...

D.L.D: ... the plans are by no means made by one individual or a small number of individuals. Just as industrial corporations which have a board of directors, with people [having various skills] who sit on the board, 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 have representatives from every area you can think of. So they'll have educators, they'll have clothing manufacturers, designers, architects ... [everyone from] across the board. I'm sure they get together and have meetings and plan and everybody gives his input, just like a military operation. 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 give feedback: "Well this is what I think will happen." So it certainly covers a broad range of people. And for one individual [Dr Day] to be able to say all of this in the two hours 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 some point...anyone in the population control [field] would be associated with some powerful foundations, powerful organizations ...

D.L.D: And I'm sure there was a lot more in these plans that he never heard. He wasn't a four-star general in this outfit. He wasn't 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...

When he was talking about the area of sex, he made some interesting remarks. One of them hit me like a ton of bricks, that "We must be open about sex." ...

D.L.D: of their right to investigate even your sex life. Your money will be easy. They'll have it all on computer. They'll know more about it than you do. But they are forming 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.

R.E: Yes. Just like they're listening to concerts and operas, but for the mass media they're pumping out hard rock...

D.L.D: And it creates conflict...which is one of the spin-off benefits to them...

R.E: ...Toward the end of the tape there was a reference to how this New World Order would be introduced... We're just going to wake up one morning and the changes would just be there? What did he say about that?

D.L.D: It was presented in what might be an over-simplified fashion. So, with some qualifications, here's my recollection: That in the winter...on a weekend...an announcement would be made that ... the New World Order was now the system for the World and that 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 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 that everything's closed and people would not have an opportunity to raise questions, to file a protest and say no...there would be 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: ...People would be called on to publicly acknowledge their allegiance to the new authority. This would mean signing an agreement or in some public way acknowledging that you accepted this ... authority. You accepted its legitimacy.

There were two impressions I had about this ... I'm not sure whether the two impressions are necessarily mutually exclusive. Firstly, you would simply have nowhere to go.

If you don't sign up then you can't [access] your bank account. You won't be able to pay your bills... 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 supermarket, somebody would pick this up and say, "How come? What are you doing with all that food?... You don't have that many people... " ...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. 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 [use] of the IUD's...

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...

D.L.D: Dr Day 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 Nazis came, the Communists came in the middle of the night, people just disappeared and one simple way to do this is to cut off from all economic support and then you have no place to live and nothing to eat ...

I just had a man in the office this morning talking about how he and his child see 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 if a 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 that?

R.E: I recall that when the Chinese Communists came to power one of the first things that they taught in their schools was, not any a specific political ideology, but the theory of evolution, the idea that man is just an animal. And if he is just an animal then we won't mind having masters who herd the animals and keep tabs on them.

[About retirement villages – they cut people off. And no one comes to visit, they're so out of the way.]...

D.L.D: My experience has been that, when people in a retirement home 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 visit, 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 the coin is that children aren't seeing older people either. So, if you don't get used to seeing older people, it's as if they don't exist.

R.E: ...We've already discussed "sex without reproduction." You also said the technology would be there for "reproduction without sex," increased sexual activity but only insofar as it doesn't lead to reproduction. That was the message, right?

D.L.D: Yes, and I would say that this leads to slavery because, if you become enslaved to your gratification, whether it's sex, food or whatever, then you're more easily controlled. This is one of the reasons the celibate priesthood is so important. But so many priests don't even understand this. If you're addicted to sex ... if sex is divorced from reproduction, something you do for gratification only.. then you would have all the desirable attributes of a human being without any claim to human rights.

At present, 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 you mother was a test tube, how can you claim to have human rights? You owe your existence to the laboratory... And there is no God under this philosophy, so you don't have any God-given rights wither. So you're an ideal slave. You have all the attributes of a human being but you can't claim any rights.

R.E: In *Brave New World* [by Aldous Huxley] they had the caste system, the alphas, the omegas, etc. These were made in the decanting, or birthing rooms, where the individual who was to do menial or slave labor ... work in the mines, for example ... received just a little bit of oxygen to the brain, so they learned to love their slavery and they were happy. They didn't know any better. They didn't have the wherewithal to do things, but the more oxygen they gave to your brain the higher you got in the caste system. So they 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 the technology to make people love their slavery...

D.L.D: You may remember the slogan placed above the Nazi concentration camps, something about, "Work is Peace" or "Work is Happiness." I don't remember if it was Buchenwald or Auschwitz [Editor: It was Auschwitz: *Arbeit macht Frei* – "Work brings Freedom"]. 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...

D.L.D: Somewhere in Scripture, I think it was after the flood, God said, "I will write my law on man's hearts." I see a parallel between Dr Day's reaction to what he himself was exposed to and what Huxley was exposed to. Neither seemed to totally accept the philosophy they were espousing. It's as if they were both saying, "Well, there's a certain inevitability to all of this, so let's try to focus on the best parts of it. We want it to be good for people. Technology will be better, quality of life will be better, even if your life span is a little shorter."

Both seemed to be sending out messages without buying into the whole package.

R.E: And maybe wishing that some people would ask more questions. Looking back over history, there were many individuals who had a New World Order in mind, certainly Hitler and Stalin did, but they lacked the technology to bring it about...

D.L.D: Dr Day said: "This time we're going to do it right!"

[Today's technology makes it all possible.] Nobody will have any personal wealth. You will own nothing of value except access to an electronic bank account which operates beyond your control. A cashless society. So when your reward for working is [nothing more than] a signal on a computer, you are under the control of those who run the system.

Up now there was no way the statement in the *Book of Revelation* could make any sense – "No man can buy or sell unless he has the mark of the beast" ... there's no way that could have been enforced. [Editor: **Revelation 13:17**: "And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name." and **Revelation 14:9**: "And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand..."]

...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 [are registered] on my computer."

Right now you have a half a dozen credit cards in your pocket, but pretty soon it will be narrowed to [just] one credit card. And then they will give you an implant [microchip] ... in your right hand or in your forehead.

R.E: [Television broadcasts of the first Gulf War stressed the power of technology to "pinpoint" targets. This is how they will pinpoint renegades in the New World Order..

D.R.D: Exactly. [Surveillance today is even more sophisticated.] 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."

Something also was mentioned by Dr Day – forests could, and if necessary would, be leveled or burned... 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 used to make sure nobody gets outside the control of the system.

Given technological progress, I think it is inevitable that some men will be able to assert total control over all other men. However, in groups like this, internal dissention is bound to arise. The leaders would be at each other's throats...They would create their own seeds of destruction while they're creating the new system.

I wonder if indeed this may be the time for Our Lord to come back and say, "Enough is enough! You're going to destroy the earth. I am in charge of the planet. I am in charge of mankind. Mankind will be destroyed only if I say so. I will not allow my creatures to assume and exert power to this degree, where you're going to destroy the whole thing."

Just as Lucifer set himself up as God in the beginning, some people are now setting themselves up as God and saying, "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 will demonstrate to you that you are not. I am still God. You're just a creature"

[End of Tape Three]

Note: Some minor changes were made by ZEPHANIAH.EU to improve the flow of these transcripts. To read the complete text go to http://www.overlordsofchaos.com/html/new_order_of_barbarians.html