

RUNNYMEDE GAZETTE

A Journal of the Democratic Resistance

DECEMBER 2015

EDITORIAL

ONCE MORE UNTO THE BREACH

CONTENTS

WE'RE ALL TERRORISTS NOW

Sam Gerrans; Russia Today; via Critical Thinking

THE EUROPEAN UNION IS CRUMBLING RIGHT BEFORE OUR EYES

Joshua Krause; Activist Post

THE EU – A FAILING POLITICAL/BUREAUCRATIC EXPERIMENT

Nigel Moore; Courant Times; via Sonya Porter

THE PLAN FOR THE END OF EUROPE: THE NEW USSR

Jon Rappoport; Activist Post

**THE CRIMINALIZATION OF THE STATE; THE ROADMAP TO A POLICE
STATE**

Prof Michel Chossudovsky; Global Research

**THE USE OF SECRET COURTS CONFIRMS THE END OF DEMOCRACY IN
BRITAIN**

Graham Vanbergen; Activist Post

ID CARDS: SOLVING A PROBLEM THAT DARE NOT SPEAK ITS NAME

Sean Gabb; Libertarian Alliance Blog

ALL OVER FOR ATVOD

UK Column

SMALL VICTORIES

Mike Clayton; Idris Francis

THE WORLD'S FIRST CASHLESS SOCIETY IS HERE – A TOTALITARIAN'S DREAM COME TRUE

Nick Giambruno; Activist Post

“THE BANKSTERS DID IT”: THE CENTRAL BANKS HAVE ENGINEERED THIS FINANCIAL COLLAPSE

James Corbett; Global Research

SOROS'S ‘EUROPEAN VALUES’ MEAN LOSING YOUR NATIONAL IDENTITY

Paul Craig Roberts; Russia Today; via Sonya Porter

WANT CASH? ATMS TO DEMAND BIOMETRIC VERIFICATION: “SMARTPHONE AND EYE SCAN TO DISPENSE MONEY”

Mac Slavo; Activist Post

DARK MARKETS: ANONYMITY IN BITCOIN

Edyta Grabowska; Coinivore

REINVENTING BANKING: FROM RUSSIA TO ICELAND TO ECUADOR

Ellen Brown, The Web of Debt Blog

SWITZERLAND TO VOTE ON ENDING FRACTIONAL RESERVE BANKING

Tyler Durden; ZeroHedge; via Nathan Allonby

EDITORIAL

ONCE MORE UNTO THE BREACH

I look with astonishment at my archives to realise that the *Runnymede Gazette* is now entering its seventh year of publication. So a stocktaking is long overdue.

The original concept behind the Runnymede Project was simple and threefold;-

Firstly to provide an open forum whereby people from what I have often ... hopefully with some accuracy ... broadly described as the 'Democratic Resistance' could meet and exchange views, ideas and experiences, preferably leaving their labels and mutual preconceptions in the cloakroom.

Secondly, to revive interest and learning in our constitutional history and explore new expressions as to how that tradition might be applied to our modern situation,

Thirdly, on the premise that we are now to all intents and purposes living in an occupied state, to aid in the construction of a cellular resistance network.

To put it mildly progress has been disappointing!

There has been some fitful progress in the second of these objectives. As regards the third, there has been sporadic interest. Networks have started here and there, some with the involvement of this project, others not. Little has endured. None have

progressed beyond a small core of the faithful. Mostly such efforts start up with expectations bordering on the delusional only to then flounder and fade into moribund oblivion. Some may well be honeytraps.

Importantly such of this effort as there has been is fragmented into small isolated pieces. No-one talks much, if at all, to anyone else. A good while ago I emphasised the importance of the 'Three C's' ... Communication, Cooperation, and Coordination. So as regards the first objective we have, if anything, gone backwards.

Almost every month this journal publishes items describing how the net of tyranny is closing. Even those most aware both of the dangers and ... in general terms at least ... of what is wrong and what needs to be done, seem to live in a state of self-imposed paralysis. The longer the development of an effective resistance network is delayed, the more urgent the task becomes, until we all reach some point of impossibility, where we all have to resign ourselves, grit our teeth, knuckle down to our fate, and accept that the oligarchs have won.

Over the time there has been several attempts to get a forum together ... to get the movers and shakers of the Democratic Resistance into one place to agree broad objectives and methodology. The only faint light on this horizon in recent times has been the advent of ACCESS Drayton. Even that is now in abeyance for legal reasons.

There is currently another effort to get such a forum going. Any support will be very welcome indeed. Contact me by phone or email at the address given at the end of this journal.

All that said, I get no younger. After several years, the business of trying to hammer the same message home again and again becomes wearisome. I have no desire or intention to become some sad old hobby politician flogging dead horses well into old age ... and I have encountered not a few of those. There has to be a point, and not long into the future, when I too must grit my teeth, bow to defeat and the inevitable and find such solace as I can in my garden and my bird table.

Frank Taylor

WE'RE ALL TERRORISTS NOW

Sam Gerrans; Russia Today; via Critical Thinking

The concept of terrorism has been extended from carrying out physical acts in which innocent people are killed, to wrong opinions, sweaty palms and disagreement with government. If you want to find a terrorist, soon all you will have to do is look in the mirror.

Words are political. They change shape to suite agendas.

In the 1970s, 'terrorist' meant a paid-up member of the IRA, the Irgun, ETA and the like. These were bad people perpetrating evil and indiscriminate deeds upon a defenceless public. They used bombs, worked in cells, and killed people without warning before fading into the shadows.

Although the UK had legislation specifically geared to deal with what is called terrorism on the books, people deemed terrorists, when they were caught, were prosecuted under existing laws – i.e. for actual crimes they had committed. Bobby Sands, for example, who fought and died for the IRA cause, was incarcerated for nothing more sinister than owning illegal firearms.

Since 9/11 and the implementation of the so-called Patriot Act (and equivalent legislation in other countries), the definition of terrorism is itself becoming a source of terror. As part of this process, we are being taught to live with the new nomenclature of 'terror suspect'; that is you haven't done anything wrong, but you might.

The Independent reports that: “315 terror suspects were arrested between September 2014 and September 2015, according to new figures from the Home Office.” The same article continues: “[...] it seems what we are seeing is an increase in terrorism-related fear rather than terrorism itself – totally understandable of course in itself, but not when it leads to the kind of heavy-handed policing that can actually radicalize more people.”

Read another way: the British Government is harassing increasing numbers of innocent people and generating both fear and the chance of more ‘radicalization’ thereby.

The no-fly list

The Huffington Post reports that one can be identified and placed on a ‘no-fly list’ for any number of reasons. It tells us: “government officials have secretly characterized an unknown number of individuals as threats or potential threats to national security. In 2013 alone, 468,749 watch-list nominations were submitted to the National Counterterrorism Center. It rejected only one percent of the recommendations.” This is nearly half-a-million US citizens in one year; this means they are finding almost 1,400 new American enemies a day.

The article goes on to list seven criteria government agencies use to put a person on a list. These criteria are vague and admit to the broadest and most subjective interpretation; in short they break down to: we don’t like the cut of your jib.

Yes, some life-failed bureaucrat you will never meet can decide – extra judicially – that you may not travel on an aeroplane.

The no-gun list

If there is to be no due process, why stop there?

Obama certainly agrees. The Guardian tells us: “Closing the No-Fly List loophole is a no-brainer,” Barack Obama tweeted on Tuesday, arguing that Congress should pass laws to prevent anyone on the government’s terrorist watch list from buying a gun.” I see: the president calmly tweets that revoking the Constitution he swore to uphold is a “no brainer,” and we can all go about our business.

Terrorist events

Since Obama is so concerned with guns, he might want to do something about all the smoking guns that feature so prominently in the so-called terrorist attacks on US soil.

RT’s Marina Portnaya did a piece on the release of a report, which identifies the FBI as the mastermind of 95 percent of all domestic terrorism in the US.

Judge Andrew Napolitano, senior judicial analyst for Fox News, concurs. He tells us that of the 20 terrorist attacks the FBI claims to have foiled on US soil, three were thwarted by members of the public and the remaining 17 were masterminded and carried out by the FBI itself.

Who is a terrorist?

The so-called War on Terror is worldwide.

For its part, the French government is educating its population to spot a terrorist.

The Independent gives us these bonmots: “The French government has launched a campaign which appears to warn parents that their children may have been recruited by terrorists if they stop eating baguettes.” Other tell-tale signs of nascent radicalism include deciding not to watch television.

US airport security staff operate on a much more scientific basis. The Telegraph reports on a leaked document revealing: “Excessive yawning, strong body odour and arrogance are among the suspicious signs that US airport staff are trained to associate with potential terrorists.”

Excessive yawning? Remember that if find yourself on a stopover in a US airport on a long-haul flight. Other warning signs include: “protruding or throbbing neck arteries, whistling, excessive laughter, and verbally expressing contempt for the screening process.”

The full list of 17 ‘fear factors’ staff are trained to spot include: arriving late for a flight, sweaty palms, and a pale face indicating the recent shaving of a beard.

More government

Naturally, the only rational response to this exploding bomb of suspicion is more government. Was there ever any doubt?

The UK government’s website tells you exactly what to do in the event of a terrorist attack: Step 1: run. Step 2: Hide. Step 3: Tell the authorities. Step 4: Wait for armed police to arrive (and keep your hands where they can see them). Step 5: Be ready for those authorities to point guns at you and treat you ‘firmly’ (i.e. brutalize you).

No mention of repealing UK gun laws so that British adults can defend themselves, of course. Imagine what would happen to any real terrorist threat in Britain if one in three Britons carried a handgun.

No. What we need is more government; more intrusion by the very agencies that not only benefit from the events they pretend to protect us from (and use said events to take away our rights), but which – according to all objective analysis – are also central in bringing those events to pass.

So terrorism has morphed from real actions which killed people – the destruction of the King David Hotel by the Irgun or the Iranian Embassy siege – to intuitions about people, sweaty palms and the non-eating of French bread.

The simple definition for such a subjective and arbitrary application of power is this: tyranny.

Why stop there?

Since there is no place for principle or due process in this new tyranny, insanity must follow. Under such a regime things just are because someone – in this case an opinion-leader – says they are. For his part, supposed science guy Bill Nye makes a strong connection between what he calls ‘climate change’ and what he terms ‘terrorism’.

The Huffington Post reports: “Nye’s reasoning hinges on a water shortage in Syria, which researchers have blamed on climate change. As Nye explained, the shortage has stunted farming and pushed young people to look for work in more densely populated areas. “Young people have gone to big cities looking for work. There’s not enough work for everybody, so the disaffected youths, as we say - the young people who don’t believe in the system, believe the system has failed, don’t believe in the economy - are more easily engaged and more easily recruited by terrorist organizations, and then they end up part way around the world in Paris shooting people,” Nye asserts.

The Independent breathlessly informs us that one of the country’s most senior advisers on health has warned: “Obesity is such a threat to women it should be treated as a “national risk” - like terrorism, natural disasters and cyber attacks.”

And Obama claims that the ‘climate change’ conference in Paris (the only outcome of which will doubtless be more government control for them and more taxes for us), offered the chance to show the ‘terrorists’ that the world was standing together against them.

Sound insane? That’s because it is; until we realise that none of this has anything to do with genuine science or actual terrorists – or if there is any correspondence it is purely coincidental.

We are living through a revolution, a play for total power; or in modern parlance: full-spectrum dominance. And we have been here before. Last time round it was called Communism. It accused its critics of being counter-revolutionaries or reactionaries. And it murdered those people – and many besides – in their tens of millions.

This time round it is called Freedom.

And if you disagree with it, or don’t smile fast enough or wide enough – or suffer from body odour or weigh too much – today it can stop you from getting on a plane. Tomorrow it may deny you the right to defend yourself. After that, it may decide on some new arbitrary method of

protecting everyone else from you.

Still think your government is there to protect you? I hope so.

Or you may be a terrorist.

Sam Gerrans is an English writer, translator, support counselor and activist. He also has professional backgrounds in media, strategic communications and technology. He is driven by commitment to ultimate meaning, and focused on authentic approaches to revelation and realpolitik. He is the founder of Quranite.com – where the Qur'an is explored on the basis of reason rather than tradition – and offers both individual language training and personal support and counseling online at SkypeTalking.com.

THE EUROPEAN UNION IS CRUMBLING RIGHT BEFORE OUR EYES

Joshua Krause; Activist Post

(This and the following two items are included as the first phase of a debate the purpose and nature of which will become more apparent of the next couple of editions - Ed)

Systemic collapse can be a tricky thing to spot. Oftentimes it goes under the radar for decades, until the system in question abruptly explodes. In other cases it's painfully obvious that something is wrong, but still impossible to say when the problems afflicting that system will finally become too overwhelming to bear. If we're talking about the European Union, I think the latter of those two certainly applies.

Ever since the European debt crisis, the EU has been playing a game of whack-a-mole with its constituent nations. Whenever one crisis is "solved," another crisis will pop up somewhere else. None of these problems are ever truly solved though. They're simply contained until further notice, because there are always more pressing issues to deal with. And there are always more pressing issues, because crises that were previously contained start to bubble over again. As you can see, it's an endless feedback loop of failure, and it's constantly compounding itself.

It's hard to say when the breaking point will be. Much like the United States government, anyone who's paying attention knows that the system is beyond repair and beyond reform, but somehow it just keeps clunking along, year after year.

There are still so many people who are heavily invested in the system and can't afford to let it fall apart, even though that's probably the only option left on the table. So they keep it together with all their might, as the system marches straight into oblivion. It's kind of like dumping all of your money into a used car that constantly breaks down, but refusing to discard it because dammit, you've spent so much to keep it running and to give up now would mean that all of that money was wasted.

It's a common fallacy that afflicts all humans from time to time, and it's the biggest reason why anything goes on longer than it logically should. The EU has clearly gone on longer than it ever should have, and every week there are more signs that this union is crumbling.

The foundations of the EU happen to be shaking in Portugal, which provided the perfect example of the cycle of failure that I mentioned earlier. Months after Greece's anti-austerity government threatened to trigger the collapse of the EU before it was cowed into submission, another anti-austerity coalition has risen in Portugal after their left-leaning parties came together to depose their conservative government. And in neighboring Spain, the wealthy province of Catalonia is threatening to secede from the impoverished states that they're anchored to. They've threatened to leave without taking a share of Spain's debt, and if they succeed it will also give Spain's leftist parties a higher percentage of votes in parliament, which again could result in another anti-austerity coalition.

And economics aside, Europe is facing a surge secessionist fervor that could potentially break up their union. This year it was Catalonia, before that it was Scotland, and before that it was Venice. What's interesting is that in all of these cases, these secession movements wanted to stay in the EU, but they still threatened the integrity of the EU. If for instance, the Scottish had managed to secede, it would have left England with a much higher percentage of anti-EU votes in Parliament.

The EU seems to be facing a two-pronged attack from financial insolvency and this resurgent nationalism. As the more debt-ridden southern nations turn more liberal and anti-austerity, the more financially secure nations are turning more conservative and nationalistic. Both are absolutely tearing the EU apart. You can really see these trends coming to a head in Poland, where on Wednesday, tens of thousands of right-wing protesters took the streets. Police said 25,000 people joined the march, which marked the anniversary of Poland's return to independence after the Second World War, while organisers put the numbers at 50,000. "God, honour, homeland," chanted the protesters as they marched under a sea of red-and-white Polish flags.

Demonstrators trampled and burned a European Union flag at one point, while a banner added to the anti-EU theme with the slogan "EU macht frei" ("Work makes you free" in German), a reference to the slogan over the gates at Auschwitz.

"Yesterday it was Moscow, today it's Brussels which takes away our freedom," chanted one group of protesters. Other banners read "Great Catholic Poland" and "Stop Islamisation".

And in the background, the migrant crisis appears to be propping up both of these movements. The veritable flood of refugees is overwhelming the welfare system of every nation they encounter, which will surely cripple their finances. And these migrants are too numerous to ever be assimilated, which of course is fueling the nationalistic right-wing factions in these countries.

Truly, the EU is bursting at the seams on all fronts, as the advantages of being a member are fading for each state, and the problems they face are becoming increasingly insurmountable. While anti-EU sentiment is rising for different reasons in each country, the result is the same. There are too many systemic problems, too many irreconcilable differences, and not enough money. It's only a matter of time before the system buckles under the weight of financial collapse and social upheaval.

Joshua Krause is a reporter, writer and researcher at The Daily Sheeple. He was born and raised in the Bay Area and is a freelance writer and author. You can follow Joshua's reports at Facebook or on his personal Twitter. Joshua's website is Strange Danger

'The difference of natural talents in different men is, in reality, much less than we are aware of; .. The difference between the most dissimilar of characters, between a philosopher and a common street porter, for example, seems to arise not so much from nature, as from habit, custom, and education.'

(Adam Smith; The Wealth of Nations; Chap II, Book 1; thanks to Dave Dewhurst)

THE EU – A FAILING POLITICAL/BUREAUCRATIC EXPERIMENT

Nigel Moore; Courant Times; via Sonya Porter

"The lamps are going out all over Europe, we shall not see them lit again in our life-time."

Sir Edward Grey, Foreign Secretary 1905 -1916

Sir Edward Grey's prescient words on the eve of Europe's ruling elites' tragic and barbarous folly, the First World War, resonate again today. Even the leaders of the European Union (EU) recognise that something is amiss with their idealist political/bureaucratic experiment to create an EU Superstate from diverse countries. Jean-Claude Juncker, the president of the European Commission, recently declaring "Europe is not in good place" – an understatement of their folly and incompetence, which Mr Cameron, for the moment, wants to keep us a part of. He may yet succeed through weight of deception, induced fear and the assertion attributed to Otto von Bismarck (the Iron Chancellor who united Germany by intimidation and force): "The mistakes that have been committed in foreign policy are not, as a rule, apparent to the public until a generation afterwards." If disaster is again in the offing where exactly are we heading?

The future is always guesswork, the unexpected can and frequently does happen. Yet much is

also quite predictable, from basic economics, or the laws of physics, also from some highly influential 'dyed in the wool' behaviour and trends that are already here and can reasonably be expected to continue. For example: ruling elites and bureaucracies tend to pursue their own interests often to the loss of others without power; paradigms or conceptual frameworks (for rulers of knowledge, assumptions and aspirations) are remarkably resilient even in the presence of conflicting evidence or changed circumstances (effectively 'in denial'); major demographic shifts and population movements are occurring (causing major problems); aspirations (of quality of life and democracy, including in poorer countries) are rising; significant economic wealth is transferring from the West to Eastern Asia and within countries of the EU from private to public sectors; the knowledge and Internet based economy is growing and jobs in older or energy intensive industries disappearing; the low wage service economy is expanding (in this country facilitated by readily available cheap labour). Major disruptions or discontinuities, for example, wars and successful new technologies or innovations, tend to be products or outcomes of these quite predictable factors or circumstances.

The EU (including associated British officialdom) has an order of precedence for its direction of travel, mind-set, policy making and actions. Over everything else is its objective, its *raison d'être*, of creating a centralised, homogenised, internal borderless bureaucratic Superstate with territorial ambitions, and advancing its own institutionalised interests. There is also an imperative to expanding control and coercion over countries and our individual lives. In furtherance of its aims, ideology and interests: democratic legitimacy, transparency and accountability can be ignored; laws manipulated; national cultures and heritages, including the Judaeo Christian heritage, undermined or trashed; deceit and deception perpetuated until events become irreversible; corruption tolerated or even facilitated; acquiescence, loyalty and EU-phile propagandising bankrolled; mistakes concealed and their major consequences left unacknowledged and unrectified. This is hardly then an encouraging recipe for future stability, prosperity and general wellbeing in an increasingly competitive, technologically advancing and dangerous world in which the EU is already falling behind.

How will the EU, its political/bureaucratic ruling elite and their privileged fellow travellers cope in a challenging future? Not well, based on their performance to date. The EU will dogmatically follow its existing agenda and be slow to respond even when problems are obvious. The EU is likely to exacerbate existing major problems and facilitate an expanding range of new ones impacting adversely on the peace and security, well-being and quality of lives of populations of member countries. Areas for concern (about the EU) include: falling competence and (ethical) standards; poor economic management and prioritising redistribution of existing wealth rather than facilitating new (per capita) wealth creation; increasing taxation and regulatory burdens (on businesses and the Public) with associated (lost) opportunity costs (the hidden costs of EU membership); increasing 'one size fits all' control of formally national policies and priorities, for example, economic policy and taxation, education, defence and security, health, safety, border control and migration, national infrastructure (roads, railways, air travel, energy), the judiciary, criminal law and punishment, national assets (such as land, agriculture, the coast, fisheries); undermining of traditional personal freedoms (including freedom from fear); ignoring democratic legitimacy, transparency and accountability; extravagance, waste and corruption; expanding corporatism (rule of the few in government bureaucracies and large organisations for the few – powerful vested interests and ruling elites); increasing German hegemony; destabilising territorial expansion. The EU can also be expected to become more dysfunctional (as crises, such as mass migration, terrorism or a financial crash, mount) and 'out of touch' (with ordinary people, events, technological and economic changes and impacts of its policies).

A serious problem with ideologies and the organisations driven by them is the absence of any non-coercive imperative to evolve towards the stated idealist end result with compassion and humanity, or even an empirical 'reality check'. Thus there can be no absolutes of good or evil, or Judaeo-Christian values of love, compassion, pity and humility, just the values of the strong or ruling elite. When 'push comes to shove' or panic sets in, for example, the organisation's future is at stake or the promised goals are clearly not achieved, this is a slippery slope towards tyranny, intolerance and inhumanity. It is a subjective assessment how far the EU and its ruling elite are along this path already and where it could end up in future, but there is a risk.

Being part of the problem, how can the EU be part of the solution? Any meaningful or substantial 'reform' of the sclerotic and increasing obsolete EU is very unlikely even with the obvious existence of strong evidence that change is necessary. Our Prime Minister's 'reforms' and 'renegotiation' then are a misleading chimera created out of a Sisyphean task; renegotiation could have a sting in the tail and freer 'Associate Membership' of the EU would be a short-lived illusion. The will for change isn't there in the EU's officialdom, or the essential mechanisms in place. Whatever superficial change occurs, it will neither be far reaching and irreversible nor change the underlying behaviour and reflexes, culture or aims and direction of travel of the EU. Professor John W Hunt, based on his studies of organisational

behaviour in the EU and other international bodies, concluded that reform always gets pushed to the bottom of the pile. He noted: "International bodies rarely have a power base of their own..... To justify themselves, highly paid, often initially idealistic staff spend their time developing yet more ideas that can't be implemented. The result is the worst of all worlds, there being nothing more cynical than a bunch of rich, demoralised ex-idealists."

THE PLAN FOR THE END OF EUROPE: THE NEW USSR

Jon Rappoport; Activist Post

"If you controlled the meaning of The Good, and you had unlimited propaganda resources and access to the press, and if you also had control over the Armed Forces and the police, you could build a new society in short order. You could wreck centuries of tradition in a few decades. And if you had the education system in your back pocket, you could wipe out the memory of what formerly existed. No one would remember. No one would care. This is happening now, in Europe. Ignorance is enlightenment." (The Underground, Jon Rappoport)

One of the basic principles of elite Globalism is: the end of borders, the end of separate nations.

The European Union was built for this purpose, step by step, out of the ashes of World War 2: a super-bureaucracy and political management system for the whole continent. But that was not enough. There had to be a way to wipe out separate and sovereign nations at ground level, to irrevocably change the landscape.

It is open borders; floods of immigrants; "replacement populations"; an influx of people who have no intention of accepting the customs and way of life in their new homes.

The end result? A de facto reconfiguring of national populations, so that, when you look at the makeup of Europe 20 years from now, you will say: "Why do we think of Germany or France or England? They don't really exist. All of Europe is a vast mix of immigrants. Europe is really one country now. So let's erase all those old artificial borders." Eventually, even uttering words like "Swedes, Norwegians, Germans, French, Dutch..." will be considered micro (or macro) aggressions against the "people of Europe."

Of course, in reaching this point, there will be a certain amount of chaos and violence. The EU is banking on its ability to control it, to put it down where necessary, and to maintain its hold as the one and only governing force in Europe.

On a cultural level, names like Locke, Shakespeare, Goethe, Mozart, Beethoven, Bach, Lorca, Goya, Cezanne, Monet, Van Gogh, Michelangelo, Rembrandt, Dante, Galileo, Faraday, and even "modern" names like Bartok, Stravinsky, Rimbaud, Orwell, and Camus will be vague dusty ghosts that provoke uncomprehending stares. "The past is dead."

"Oh, but don't worry about that. The important thing is, every person living in Europe is a citizen of Europe, and is entitled to benefits. This is humane, this is The Good, this is the triumph of the benevolent State. Nothing else matters."

All European languages will eventually be reduced. Who has the right to speak words that the majority of people can't understand?

What I'm sketching in here is the grid that will be laid over Europe.

And of course, as automation comes on with a rush, many "citizen-workers of Europe" will become unnecessary. Even great corporations will fall, because they won't be able to sell their products to an impoverished population. They'll hope against hope that the billions of people in the East, China and India, will give them new markets.

Against this background, the individual human being will be looked at, from the top, as a cipher, a unit in "models and algorithms." The question is, how many individuals will take the bait and regard themselves as mere "parts" in the overall system? How many will give in and consider their future a function of how much they can obtain from The State, free of charge? How many will

come to believe that their power, as individuals, is inconsequential—or even a delusion?

Why do I bother bringing this up? Because, regardless of the prevailing collectivist mindset—propagandized and promoted and exploited from an elite level—State repression, in all its forms, falls on each individual.

If the very concept of the individual is wiped out, what is left? In 1859, John Stuart Mill wrote:

If it were felt that the free development of individuality is one of the leading essentials of well-being...there would be no danger that liberty should be undervalued.

Conversely, when the free development of individuality is of no concern, liberty will die.

Boris Pasternak, the Russian novelist and poet, who knew a thing or two about political repression, wrote (1960):

They [the Soviet bureaucrats] don't ask much of you. They only want you to hate the things you love and to love the things you despise.

This reversal is being imposed now, in Europe. Defectors from the old USSR would recognize it in an instant, having lived through it themselves. The European version seems softer and gentler, but that is just a matter of strategy. The culture is being cooked more slowly.

But just because secret police aren't knocking on doors in the middle of the night and making mass arrests, that isn't a sign that individual freedom reigns.

A number of European political leaders are telling their constituencies, "You have no right to oppose the flood of immigration on any grounds. To do so, to utter such public statements, is an offense." Does that sound familiar?

The wet dream of every collectivist is coming true. All power at the top; all conformity (called "unity") everywhere else. The new USSR.

In the old days, the East German police kept records on every citizen and blanketed the population with snitches and spies. The modern Surveillance State has replaced that, searching for "nodes of discontent."

Collectivists may pay lip service to the dangers of State surveillance, but when it is used to root out people who can't envision a better world based on, among other features, open borders, well, this is just an enforcement of The Good upon those who can't discover it for themselves. If The Humanitarian Way needs a nudge and boost, why not?

For dyed-in-the-wool collectivists, freedom isn't just a roadblock; it's an irrelevant illusion. It never existed. All humans are operating according to programs, and have been since birth. Therefore, install a better program, by any means necessary and available. Produce "kinder people."

This is both a political and a technological imperative.

Open borders and unlimited immigration is a good test case. For people who feel imposed upon, who feel their communities are being torn apart, who feel personally threatened, who feel this is, indeed, a covert operation to transform Europe into a new USSR, there is a need for re-education at the deepest level possible. Because, surely, such people are suffering from profound disorders. Their circuits are crossed. Their brains are defective. They can't see the larger picture.

They would never be able to see, for example, the wisdom of the words of Zbigniew Brzezinski, David Rockefeller's alter ego, who wrote, in 1969:

The nation state as a fundamental unit of man's organized life has ceased to be the principal creative force: International banks and multinational corporations are acting and planning in terms that are far in advance of the political concepts of the nation-state.

Here is the Globalist tactician at work, a man who seems to hate the old USSR, but is seeking to install a version of the same collectivism, through other means. If Lenin were alive today, he would look out over Europe and agree that his agenda is alive and well. He might object to the relatively slow pace. He might want more violence. But he would grudgingly acknowledge that his descendants have discovered a few new tricks. He would have to approve of the "humanitarian

altruism,” and the way it is being modelled and manipulated, so that the edifice of The Good appears as a shining beacon in the darkness. Nice movie. Excellent production design. Tears of sympathy rolling down the cheeks of the audience. Minds reduced to one constant: we must care for the less fortunate. Trillions and trillions of dollars devoted to elicit that sentiment, regardless of the circumstances, or the true malignant outcome, or the actual sinister intent of the elite artists of reality.

The author of three explosive collections, THE MATRIX REVEALED, EXIT FROM THE MATRIX, and POWER OUTSIDE THE MATRIX, Jon was a candidate for a US Congressional seat in the 29th District of California. He maintains a consulting practice for private clients, the purpose of which is the expansion of personal creative power. Nominated for a Pulitzer Prize, he has worked as an investigative reporter for 30 years, writing articles on politics, medicine, and health for CBS Healthwatch, LA Weekly, Spin Magazine, Stern, and other newspapers and magazines in the US and Europe. Jon has delivered lectures and seminars on global politics, health, logic, and creative power to audiences around the world.

SOROS'S 'EUROPEAN VALUES' MEAN LOSING YOUR NATIONAL IDENTITY

Paul Craig Roberts; Russia Today; via Sonya Porter

To be part of the European Union means you have to shed your national identity and be part of everybody. It is no longer acceptable to be yourself. This agenda serves the 1 percent and Washington, Paul Craig Roberts, an American economist, told RT in an interview. Billionaire financier and philanthropist George Soros has attracted attention once again, this time saying the European Union should take "at least a million" refugees every year to ease the mass exodus of desperate people from the Middle East and Africa.

Soros wants the EU to dig deep and pay an annual amount of "at least €5,000 per refugee, or €20 billion." And this coming at a time of severe austerity measures pushed onto the European people, not to mention the bailout of entire countries, like Greece.

Thus, it's little wonder that Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orban says philanthropists like Soros must assume part of the blame for the current crisis.

"This invasion is driven, on the one hand, by people smugglers, and on the other hand by those activists who support everything that weakens the nation state," Orban told reporters. "This Western mindset and this activist network is perhaps best represented by George Soros."

Soros responded by issuing an email statement to Bloomberg Business, claiming his international organization works to "uphold European values", while Mr. Orban's efforts to fortify the Hungarian border thereby halting a massive wave of illegal migrants "undermine those values. His plan treats the protection of national borders as the objective and the refugees as an obstacle," Soros added. "Our plan treats the protection of refugees as the objective and national borders as the obstacle."

Paul Craig Roberts offers his own interpretation as to what has precipitated this crisis of epic proportions as millions of foreigners now descend en masse on European communities, many of which are totally unprepared for the influx of foreigners.

It is "Washington's wars," not George Soros per se, that are forcing the refugees to flee their homelands and seek to enter Europe, Roberts believes. "Since the Clinton regime, we've had three two-term American presidents who have been at war," he said. "They have created millions of displaced people and they are now seeking refuge in Europe."

Roberts also asks whether Soros' advice regarding Europe absorbing millions of refugees is based on something other than just humanitarian considerations.

"We have to first ask the question whether Soros' progressive causes are real or merely a cover for rule by the 1 percent," Roberts said. "You see, when political boundaries are broken down the result is a power vacuum to which Washington and the 1 percent can move in their pawns."

One consequence of Washington's wars over the course of three presidencies has been to "destroy stable countries and leave in their place disorganized, small fiefdoms that war on one another," Roberts said.

“What Soros means is: ‘European values’ means you lost your national identity and you become a hodgepodge of different cultures and different nationalities and your traditional historical existence is dissolved in this pot of diverse peoples.” Roberts applauds Hungarian Prime Minister [Viktor Orban], saying he is “exactly correct that this is a threat to the existence of European peoples because they become dissolved in a so-called diverse society of different people, different religions, different cultures, different values.”

But for those individuals - like George Soros - who comprise the 1 percent of the global elite, their goal is to redefine what it means to be a European.

“George Soros is in effect saying: ‘We are redefining Europe. Europe no longer consists of Hungarians, British, French, Germans and Greeks, etc. It now consists of everybody. And all of you historical people to be European means you have to be part of everybody. You can no longer be yourselves.’ That’s the message.” Yet there is little resistance to the agenda because Europeans have heard the same message repeated so many times they have been “brainwashed,” which then makes it “easy for their so-called leaders to open the borders and accept all of these refugees that Washington’s wars have created.”

Roberts also makes a dramatic claim, saying that every country that joined the European Union has committed “an act of national suicide.”

“It seems to me that of all the leaders of Eastern and Western Europe, the Hungarian prime minister is the only one that has any sense. He says: ‘We’re not going to commit suicide.’ If Germany wants to commit suicide, fine. If they want to follow Merkel into suicide, let them. But not us.”

Roberts then turns his attention to Ukraine and the political strife that has rocked the nation, arguing that that non-government organizations were busy behind the scenes destabilizing the country so as to prop up a Western-friendly puppet leadership. Indeed, Western non-government organization have been operating freely in Ukraine since the collapse of the Soviet Union. According to Roberts, it should come as no surprise as to where the funding for such large-scale, operations originates.

“And all of these non-governmental organizations, they are funded by private donors, such as Soros, they are funded by the Department of State, the National Endowment for Democracy and they all serve as agents of Washington foreign policy. And this is the way that very wealthy individuals like Soros come together with the government.”

But this is not just an act of aggression against the Ukrainian people, but “an attack on Russia itself,” Roberts says. “This is an effort to weaken Russia, to threaten Russia, to make Russia back off from its resistance to American hegemony over the world,” Roberts proclaims.

These behind-the-scenes operations, which work under the cover of lofty-sounding agencies, benefit the United States by “making it impossible for a European government to exist independently and therefore Washington does not have to worry about European governments – such as Germany – realizing that their own national interests are contrary to American national interests.”

Ultimately, the work of these philanthropists and non-governmental organizations “is designed to break apart European national identity in order to prevent any sort of loss of the American empire to independent foreign policies among European countries,” Roberts says. “If you don’t have a country, you can’t have a foreign policy. What is the foreign policy of Libya [laughs]? What is the foreign policy of Iraq? What is the foreign policy of Afghanistan? What is the foreign policy of Somalia? They have none; they have no governments. They have no national identities.”

Do not be desirous of having things done quickly. Do not look at small advantages. Desire to have things done quickly prevents their being done thoroughly. Looking at small advantages prevents great affairs from being accomplished.

Confucius; thanks to Libertarian Alliance Blog

THE CRIMINALIZATION OF THE STATE. THE ROADMAP TO A POLICE STATE

Prof Michel Chossudovsky; Global Research

(Yet again it needs saying that although this item is written in the American context, it applies also to the outlook in the UK and EU - Ed)

Author's Note

This article first published by Global Research in February 2004 examines the relationship between terrorist attacks (resulting in the tragic loss of life) and the transition in Western countries towards a totalitarian police State. Former CENTCOM Commander, General Tommy Franks predicted in a 2003 interview with cynical accuracy a scenario, which would result in the repeal of civil liberties and the installation of a de facto totalitarian state:

*"a terrorist, massive, casualty-producing event [will occur] somewhere in the Western world ... that causes our population to question our own Constitution and to begin to militarize our country in order to avoid a repeat of another mass, casualty-producing event."*¹

A "massive casualty producing event" as described by General Franks will invariably result in a campaign of fear and intimidation. In turn, politicians in high office will use the tragic loss of life as a justification for the implementation of sweeping police state measures including the enactment of martial law.

Flash Forward to Paris, November 13, 2015.

The above scenario accurately describes the tragic "massive casualty producing event" in Paris, depicted by France's media as "Le 11 septembre à la française" (9/11 French Style).

Announced in a midnight speech (local time) by the French president, the November 13 terrorist attacks were immediately followed by the enactment of a State of Emergency, the closing of France's borders and the suspension of civil liberties as a means — according to president François Hollande— to safeguarding democratic values.

In this context, the tragic loss of life has been used by the Hollande government (with the support of the media) to harness the public into accepting the implementation of police state measures in the interest of French Republic, namely protecting France's national security against an illusive self-proclaimed "Islamic State" based in Northern Syria, which happens to be a creation of US intelligence.

Is this the end of the French Republic?

America's leaders in Washington and Wall Street firmly believe in the righteousness of war and authoritarian forms of government as a means to "safeguarding democratic values". According to Homeland Security "the near-term attacks will either rival or exceed the 9/11 attacks".

An actual "terrorist attack" on American soil would lead to the suspension of civilian government and the establishment of martial law. In the words of Homeland Security Secretary Tom Ridge: "If we go to Red [code alert]... it basically shuts down the country,"

"You ask, 'Is it serious?' Yes, you bet your life. People don't do that unless it's a serious situation." (Donald Rumsfeld)

The "Criminalization of the State", is when war criminals legitimately occupy positions of authority, which enable them to decide "who are the criminals", when in fact they are the criminals.

A terrorist attack on American soil of the size and nature of September 11, would lead ---according to former CENTCOM Commander, General Tommy Franks-- to the downfall of democracy in America. In an interview last December, which was barely mentioned in the US media, General Franks outlined with cynical accuracy a scenario, which would result in the suspension of the Constitution and the installation of military rule in America:

a terrorist, massive, casualty-producing event [will occur] somewhere in the Western world – it may be in the United States of America – that causes our population to question our own Constitution and to begin to militarize our country in order to avoid a repeat of another mass, casualty-producing event. 1

Franks was alluding to a so-called "Pearl Harbor type event" which would be used to galvanise US public opinion in support of a military government and police state. The "terrorist massive casualty-producing event" is presented by General Franks as a crucial political turning point. The resulting crisis and social turmoil is intended to facilitate a major shift in US political, social and institutional structures. It is important to understand that General Franks was not giving a personal opinion on this issue. His statement very much reflects the dominant viewpoint both in the Pentagon and the Homeland Security department as to how events might unfold in the case of a national emergency.

The statement comes from a man who has been actively involved in military and intelligence planning at the highest levels. In other words, the "militarisation of our country" is an ongoing operational assumption. It is part of the broader "Washington consensus". It identifies the Bush administration's "roadmap" of war and Homeland defense.

The "war on terrorism" which constitutes the cornerstone of Bush's national security doctrine, provides the required justification for repealing the Rule of Law, ultimately with a view to "preserving civil liberties". In the words of David Rockefeller:

We are on the verge of global transformation. All we need is the right major crisis and the nations will accept the New World Order. 2

A similar statement, which no doubt reflects a consensus within the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), was made by former National Security adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski in his book, *The Grand Chessboard*:

As America becomes an increasingly multicultural society, it may find it more difficult to fashion a consensus on foreign policy issues, except in the circumstances of a truly massive and widely perceived direct external threat."]

Similarly, the NeoCons' Project for the New American Century (PNAC), published in September 2000, barely a few months before George W. Bush's accession to the White House, called for:

some catastrophic and catalyzing event, like a new Pearl Harbor. 3

What is terrifying in these assertions is that they emanate from the architects of US foreign policy. In other words, America's leaders in Washington and Wall Street firmly believe in the righteousness of war and authoritarian forms of government as a means to "safeguarding democratic values".

The repeal of democracy is portrayed as a means to providing "domestic security" and upholding civil liberties. Truth is falsehood and falsehood is truth. Realities are turned upside down. Acts of war are heralded as "humanitarian interventions" geared towards upholding democracy. Military occupation and the killing of civilians are presented as "peace-keeping operations."

This dominant viewpoint is also shared by the mainstream media, which constitutes the cornerstone of the propaganda and disinformation campaign. Any attempt by antiwar critics to reveal the lies underlying these statements is defined as a "criminal act". In other words, the "Criminalization of the State", is when war criminals, supported by Wall Street, the "big five" defense contractors and the Texas oil giants, legitimately occupy positions of authority, which enable them to decide "who are the criminals", when in fact they are the criminals.

From Orange to Red Code Alert

The "terrorist massive casualty producing event" has become an integral part of the Bush administration's propaganda campaign. The Administration has put the country on "high risk" Orange Code terror alert five times since September 11, 2001. Without exception, Osama bin Laden's Al Qaeda has been identified as "a threat to the Homeland". The official announcement invariably points to "significant intelligence reports" or "credible sources" of a terrorist attack "from the international terrorist group al-Qaeda".

Since 9/11, Americans have accepted these terrorist warnings at face value. Al Qaeda is viewed as an enemy of America. The terror alerts have become part of a routine: people have become accustomed in their daily lives to the Orange Code terror alerts. Moreover, they have also accepted the distinct possibility of a changeover from Orange to Red Code Alert (as stated time and again by Homeland Security) in the foreseeable future, which would result from an actual terrorist occurrence.

Needless to say, the disinformation campaign, which is fed on a daily basis into the news chain, supports this process of shaping US public opinion. The hidden agenda ultimately consists in creating an environment of fear and intimidation, which mobilizes public support for an actual national

emergency situation, leading to the declaration of martial law.

The Terror Alerts were based on Fabricated Intelligence

The evidence suggests that the Orange Code "high risk" alerts on February 7, 2003, and December, 21, 2003 were based on fabricated intelligence.

Orange Code Alert had been ordered on 7 February 2003, one day after Colin Powell's flopped presentation on Iraq's alleged weapons of mass destruction to the UN Security Council. Powell's intelligence dossier had been politely dismissed. The rebuttal came from UN Inspector Hans Blix, who showed that the intelligence used as a pretext to wage war on Iraq had been blatantly fabricated.

Colin Powell addressed the UN Security Council on the 6th. On the 7th, the Bush administration declared an 'Orange Code' Terror Alert. This "save face operation" contributed to appeasing an impending scandal, while also upholding the Pentagon's planned invasion of Iraq. Media attention was immediately shifted from Colin Powell's blunders at the UN Security Council to an (alleged) impending terrorist attack on America. Anti-aircraft missiles were immediately deployed around Washington. The media became inundated with stories on Iraqi support to an impending Al Qaeda attack on America. The objective was to present Iraq as the aggressor. According to the New York Post, (11 February 2003):

The nation is now on Orange Alert because intelligence intercepts and simple logic both suggest that our Islamic enemies know the best way to strike at us is through terrorism on U.S. soil.

Another story allegedly emanating from the CIA on so-called 'radioactive dirty bombs' had been planted in the news chain.⁴ Secretary Powell warned that "it would be easy for terrorists to cook up radioactive 'dirty' bombs to explode inside the U.S. ... 'How likely it is, I can't say... But I think it is wise for us to at least let the American people know of this possibility.'" ⁵ Meanwhile, network TV had warned that "American hotels, shopping malls or apartment buildings could be al Qaeda's targets as soon as next week..."

The hidden agenda in the weeks leading up to the invasion of Iraq was to link Baghdad to Al Qaeda, muster unbending support for President Bush and weaken the anti-war protest movement. Following the announcement, tens of thousands of Americans rushed to purchase duct tape, plastic sheets and gas-masks. It later transpired that the terrorist alert was fabricated by the CIA, in all likelihood in consultation with the upper echelons of the State Department. ⁶

The FBI, for the first time had pointed its finger at the CIA.

This piece of that puzzle turns out to be fabricated and therefore the reason for a lot of the alarm, particularly in Washington this week, has been dissipated after they found out that this information was not true," said Vince Cannistraro, former CIA counter-terrorism chief and ABCNEWS consultant. (...) According to officials, the FBI and the CIA are pointing fingers at each other. An FBI spokesperson told ABCNEWS today he was "not familiar with the scenario," but did not think it was accurate. ⁷

While tacitly acknowledging that the alert was a fake, Homeland Security Secretary Tom Ridge decided to maintain the 'Orange Code' alert:

Despite the fabricated report, there are no plans to change the threat level. Officials said other intelligence has been validated and that the high level of precautions is fully warranted. ⁸

A few days later, in another failed propaganda initiative, a mysterious Osama bin Laden audio tape was presented by Sec. Colin Powell to the US Congress as 'evidence' that the Islamic terrorists "are making common cause with a brutal dictator". ⁹ Curiously, the audio tape was in Colin Powell's possession prior to its broadcast by the Al Jazeera TV Network.¹⁰

Tom Ridge's Christmas Terror Alert

On December 21st, 2003 four days before Christmas, the Homeland Security Department, again raised the national threat level from "elevated" to "high risk" of terrorist attack. ¹¹ In his pre-Christmas Press Conference, Homeland Security department Secretary Tom Ridge confirmed in much the same way as on February 7, 2003, that: "the U.S. intelligence community has received a substantial increase in the volume of threat-related intelligence reports". According to Tom Ridge, these "credible [intelligence] sources" raise "the possibility of attacks against the homeland, around the holiday season..."¹²

While the circumstances and timing were different, Secretary Tom Ridge's December 21 statement

had all the appearances of a "copy and paste" (Déjà Vu) version of his February 7 announcement, which according to the FBI was a hoax, based on fabricated intelligence. What is disturbing in the December 21 statement is the fact that an "actual" or "attempted" Al Qaeda terrorist attack seems already to be in the official pipeline. Al Qaeda is once again identified as "the Outside Enemy", without of course mentioning that Osama bin Laden's Al Qaeda is a creation of the CIA and an "intelligence asset" controlled by the US.¹³

Needless to say the atmosphere of fear and confusion created across America, contributed to breaking the spirit of Christmas. According to the media reports, the high-level terror alert is to "hang over the holidays and usher in the New Year".

Terrorists still threaten our country and we remain engaged in a dangerous - to be sure - difficult war and it will not be over soon," warned Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld. "They can attack at any time and at any place."

With America on high terror alert for the Christmas holiday season, intelligence officials fear al-Qaeda is eager to stage a spectacular attack - possibly hijacking a foreign airliner or cargo jet and crashing it into a high-profile target inside the United States. 14

The official Christmas announcement by the Homeland Security Department dispelled any lingering doubts regarding the threat level:

the risk [during the Christmas period] is perhaps greater now than at any point since September 11, 2001;

It also warned Americans, in no uncertain terms, but without supporting evidence, that there are:

indications that [the] near-term attacks ... will either rival or exceed the [9/11] attacks. And it's pretty clear that the nation's capital and New York city would be on any list...

Following Secretary Ridge's announcement, anti-aircraft missile batteries were set up in Washington:

And the Pentagon said today, more combat air patrols will now be flying over select cities and facilities, with some airbases placed on higher alert." Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld: "You ask, 'Is it serious?' Yes, you bet your life. People don't do that unless it's a serious situation. 15

According to an official statement: "intelligence indicates that Al Qaeda-trained pilots may be working for overseas airlines and ready to carry out suicide attacks." ¹⁶

More specifically, Al Qaeda and Taliban terrorists were, according to Homeland Security, planning to hijack an Air France plane and "crash it on US soil in a suicide terror strike similar to those carried out on September 11, 2001."

Air France Christmas flights out of Paris were grounded. F-16 fighters were patrolling the skies. Yet it turned out that the stand down orders on Air France's Christmas flights from Paris to Los Angeles, which were used to justify the Code Orange Alert during the Christmas holiday, were based on fabricated information. According to the official version of events, Washington had identified six members of Al Qaeda and the Taliban on the Air France passenger list:

U.S. counter-terrorism officials said their investigation was focusing on the "informed belief" that about six men on Air France Flight 68, which arrives in Los Angeles daily at 4:05 p.m., may have been planning to hijack the jet and crash it near Los Angeles, or along the way.

That belief, according to one senior U.S. counter-terrorism official, was based on reliable and corroborated information from several sources. Some of the men had the same names as identified members of Al Qaida and the Taliban, a senior U.S. official said. One of the men is a trained pilot with a commercial license, according to a senior U.S. official.

U.S. law-enforcement officials said the flights were canceled in response to the same intelligence that prompted... Homeland Security... to ratchet up the nation's terror-alert level to orange...

With that information, U.S. authorities contacted French intelligence ... They prevailed upon Air France to cancel [their flights], because the original intelligence information warned of more than one flight being commandeered. 17

Other media confirmed that "the reports gathered by American agencies were 'very, very precise'" Meanwhile Fox News pointed to the possibility that Al Qaeda was "trying to plant disinformation, among other things to cost us money, to throw people into panic and perhaps to probe our defenses to see

how we respond?"¹⁸

"Mistaken Identity"

Needless to say these fabricated media reports served to create a tense atmosphere during the Christmas holiday. Los Angeles International airport was on "maximum deployment" with counter-terrorism and FBI officials working around the clock. Yet following the French investigation, it turned out that the terror alert was a hoax. The information was not "very very precise" as claimed by US intelligence.

The six Al Qaeda men turned out to be a five year old boy, an elderly Chinese lady who used to run a restaurant in Paris, a Welsh insurance salesman and three French nationals.¹⁹ On January 2nd, the French government confirmed that the intelligence communicated by Washington was erroneous: There "was not a trace of Al Qaeda among the passengers."

Yet, these "inconsistencies" regarding US intelligence had already been uncovered on the 23d of December by France's antiterrorist services, which had politely refuted the so-called "credible sources" emanating out of the US intelligence apparatus. France's counter-terrorism experts were extremely "sceptical" of their US counterparts:

We [French police investigators] showed [on 23 December] that their arguments simply did not make sense, but despite this the flights were cancelled... The main suspect [a Tunisian hijacker] turned out to be a child... We really had the feeling of unfriendly treatment [by US officials] (ils nous appliquent un traitement d'infamie). The information was not transmitted through normal channels. It wasn't the FBI or the CIA which contacted us, everything went through diplomatic channels... 20

The decision to cancel the six Air France flights was taken after 2 days of intense negotiations between French and American officials. They were cancelled on the orders of the French Prime minister following consultations with Sec. Colin Powell. This decision was taken following the completion of the French investigation. Despite the fact that the information had been refuted, Homeland Security Secretary Tom Ridge insisted on maintaining the stand-down order. If Air France had not complied, it would have been prevented from using US air space, namely banned from flying to the US.

It was only on January 2nd, once the holiday season was over that the US authorities admitted that they were in error, claiming that it was a unavoidable case of "mistaken identity." While tacitly acknowledging their error, Homeland Security insisted that "the cancellations were based on solid information."

Emergency Planning

Needless to say, had the flights not been cancelled, the Administration's justification for Orange Code Alert would no longer hold. In other words, Homeland Security needed to sustain the lie over the entire Christmas holiday. It also required an active Orange Alert to launch emergency planning procedures at the highest levels of the Bush Administration.

The day following Secretary Ridge's Christmas announcement (December 21st), President Bush was briefed by his "top anti-terror advisors" in closed door sessions at the White House. Later in the day, the Homeland Security Council (HSC) met, also at the White House. The executive body of the HSC, the so-called Principals Committee (HSC/PC), headed by Secretary Tom Ridge. includes Donald Rumsfeld, CIA Director George Tenet, Attorney General John Ashcroft, FBI Director Robert Mueller and Michael D. Brown, Under Secretary, Emergency Preparedness and Response, who oversees the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).²¹

In the wake of the HSC meeting held on 22 December, Secretary Ridge confirmed that:

we reviewed the specific plans and the specific action we have taken and will continue to take 22

According to the official statement, which must be taken seriously, an "actual terrorist attack" in the near future on American soil would lead to a Red Code Alert. The latter in turn, would create conditions for the (temporary) suspension of the normal functions of civilian government, as foreseen by General Tommy Franks. This scenario was envisaged by Secretary Tom Ridge in a CBS News Interview on December 22, 2003:

"If we simply go to red ... it basically shuts down the country," meaning that civilian government bodies would be closed down and taken over by an Emergency Administration. 23

Preparing for Martial Law

In preparation for a Red code Alert, the Homeland Security department had conducted in May 2003 a major "anti-terrorist exercise" entitled TOPOFF 2. The latter is described as "the largest and most comprehensive terrorism response and homeland security exercise ever conducted in the United States."

In a Strangelovian logic, this "national response capability" translated into a military style exercise by federal, State and local level governments, including Canadian participants, establishes various "scenarios" under a Red Code Alert. In essence, it was conducted on the same assumption as military exercises in anticipation of an actual theater war, in this case, to be waged by foreign terrorists, examining various WMD attack scenarios and the institutional response of State and local governments:

It assessed how responders, leaders, and other authorities would react to the simulated release of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) in two U. S. cities, Seattle, WA and Chicago, IL. The exercise scenario depicted a fictitious, foreign terrorist organization that detonated a simulated radiological dispersal device (RDD or dirty bomb) in Seattle and released the pneumonic plague in several Chicago metropolitan area locations. There was also significant pre-exercise intelligence play, a cyber-attack, and credible terrorism threats against other locations. 24

The terror exercise including the WMD scenarios is based on a big lie.

Let us be very clear on what is happening in America. We are no longer strictly dealing with a fear and disinformation campaign. Actual "terrorist massive casualty producing events" constitute the basic premise and driving force behind the Homeland Emergency response system, including its Ready.Gov instructions to citizens, its "anti-terrorist" legal framework under the Second Patriot Act, etc.

What we are dealing with is not only a criminal act, but a carefully engineered act of treason emanating from the highest levels of the US State apparatus. In short, what we are dealing with is "the Roadmap to a Police State" in America, to be implemented in the wake of an national emergency, either under a military form of government or under a police state, which maintains all the appearances of a functioning two party "Democracy".

Notes

1. Tommy Franks Interview, Cigar Aficionado, December 2003
2. David Rockefeller, Statement to the United Nations Business Council, 1994
3. See <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/NAC304A.html>
4. ABC News, 13 February 2003.
5. ABC News, 9 February. 2003.
6. ABC News, 13 February 2003, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/CRG302A.html> .
7. Ibid
8. Ibid
9. US official quoted in The Toronto Star, 12 February. 2003.
10. Ibid
11. See Department of Homeland Security at <http://www.dhs.gov/dhspublic/index.jsp>
12. For complete statement of Secretary Tom Ridge, 21 December 2003, <http://www.dhs.gov/dhspublic/>
13. See Selected References at <http://globalresearch.ca/articles/11SEPT309A.html>
14. Boston Globe, 24 December 2003
15. ABC News, 23 December 2003
16. quoted by ABC News, 23 December 2003.
17. Seattle Post Intelligence, 25 December 2003.
18. Fox News, 28 December 2003.
19. Le Monde, Paris and RTBF TV, Bruxelles, 2 January 2004
20. quoted in Le Monde, 3 January 2003.
21. White House Briefing, 22 December 2003.
22. AFP, 23 December 2003.
23. The scenario is presented in detail at the Homeland department's Ready.Gov website at <http://www.ready.gov/>
24. For full text see, Department of Homeland Security, Summary Conclusions From National Exercise, Office of the Press Secretary, December 19, 2003, <http://www.dhs.gov/dhspublic/display?content=2693>

“To find yourself, think for yourself.”

~ Socrates; thanks to Libertarian Alliance Blog

THE USE OF SECRET COURTS CONFIRMS THE END OF DEMOCRACY IN BRITAIN

Graham Vanbergen; Activist Post

The use of secret courts is where trials take place that are not open to the public, nor generally reported in the news and generally no official record of the case or the judge's verdict is made available. Often there is no legal allegation. The accused is usually not able to obtain the counsel of an lawyer or confront witnesses for the prosecution, and the proceedings are characterised by a perceived miscarriage of justice to the benefit of the ruling powers of the society. This is the stuff of cold war Russia and Nazi Germany – right? Think again.

In the English-speaking world, one of the most notorious secret courts was the Star Chamber as it was used under Charles I in the early 17th century. The abuses of the Star Chamber were one of the rallying points of the opposition that organized around Oliver Cromwell, and ultimately resulted in the execution of the deposed king. The term “star chamber” became a generalized term for a court that was accountable to no one (except the chief executive) and was used to suppress political dissent or eliminate the enemies of the regime.

The inherent lack of objectivity of politically motivated charges has led to substantial reforms in English law. Clearly there is something very dangerous and pernicious about secret courts.

During the First and Second World Wars there were a number of spy trials held behind closed doors and the odd one thereafter, but secret trials in Britain is an affront to openness dating back to Magna Carta and have never been used in civil cases.

Then came a Conservative Bill called the Justice and Security Bill and was roundly opposed by everyone, literally everyone. From GlobalResearch –

The Bill was savaged by the Lords, but returned to the Commons with all the Lords' amendments struck out. On the day of the vote on gay marriages it slipped through the vote in the select committee with the vote of one backwoods Ulsterman rushed in at the last minute. (The vote was held at the same time as members were in the lobbies voting on the gay marriage Bill). ... This law when passed, as it will be, can then be applied to all and any offence, even as lowly as a traffic accident. Accused persons will never be told of what they are charged and of course it is very unlikely they would be found 'not guilty.'

That was back in 2013, today we have no idea what cases are being tried in this way.

Britain's alleged complicity in the kidnap and rendition of suspects sent to Libya for torture is an alarming case in point. One only has to imagine a situation where an innocent person is suing the government for damages for torture and kidnap, in one case including that of a wife and 12-year-old daughter, then losing the case, without being present or ever knowing the reason why or what was said.

Phillip Johnston of The Telegraph wrote an excellent piece entitled “Secret trials: ‘Democracies die behind closed doors’” which is well worth the read. It relays the real life horror of justice being used as a political weapon in modern-day Britain.

In another piece by The Bureau of Investigative Journalism entitled “How do you prove you're not a national security risk?” a man was sacked by the Home Office on ‘national security grounds’ without ever being told why or for what reason. Overnight, this man's life lay in ruins with his lawyers arguing against the Government's controversial use of secret evidence and closed court hearings.

In a recent 150-page study, examining the use of secret evidence in a number of leading EU countries, state requests for evidence considered in secret on the grounds of national security was found to “significantly hinder” the judiciary system from ensuring fair trials. One has to remember we are discussing members of the European Union here, not North Korea.

Commissioned by the European Parliament's Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE), the report says the use of secret evidence undermines human rights and poses a “threat to the rule of law” in Europe. One shouldn't forget that the Conservatives are aiming to scrap Human Rights laws as well. However, the UK's Ministry of Justice today told the European Parliament it was “not the business of MEPs” to interfere with national security issues because these are the

responsibility of member states alone.

The report laid out particular criticism for the UK. One of the report's authors said that Britain was a "worrying example of what can go wrong". France, Spain, Sweden, Germany, the Netherlands and Italy all have secret courts but it appears that not one of them have gone anywhere near as far as the UK in the systematic use of secret evidence in trials.

Many people do not realise the widespread use of secret courts in the UK. They are commonly used in deportation and immigration hearings but also employment tribunals amongst many others.

The Investigatory Powers Tribunal, hears complaints about surveillance by public bodies such as MI5, the police or even local government—in fact, the only Tribunal to whom complaints about the Intelligence Services can be directed and hears evidence in secret. In one such case, Poole Borough Council were spying on a family to see if they were lying about which school catchment area they lived in. This is the only time the court has found against the authorities and the only reason we know about it.

In these cases the government department or agency asks the judge to present evidence to the court without the defendant even being granted access to any of that information or evidence against them.

In a bizarre twist of irony, secret evidence may include material which has been gained via the illegal interception by the security services of the defendant's communications including that of conversations deemed legally privileged with lawyers as in the case of Libyan Abdel-Hakim Belhaj, who was abducted by MI6 and the CIA and tortured in Libya.

Alarmingly, the report also disclosed that there was an extreme lack of formal rules on the quality of admissible evidence. This meant that 'hearsay', evidence from a second- or even third-hand contact could be admitted with no confirmed source attributed as a means of validity. Here we are seeing the emergence of something far more sinister.

It should surprise no one that the government response to this report via a Ministry of Justice spokesperson simply said: "The EU Treaties are quite clear that matters concerned with national security are the concern of Member States, not the EU."

Gaining Royal Assent on 25th April 2013, openDemocracyUK said "It is only a matter of time before secret courts are in use in civil cases across the United Kingdom." openDemocracyUK's excellent article headed "Secret Courts: 8 nightmare scenarios" is also well worth the read because as it has turned out, nothing is now conjecture or speculation, secret courts have expanded and covert evidence is used for them.

In another rather shady piece of legislation, the law now allows police to present transcripts of indistinct audio they have listened to many times – in the role of a so-called "ad hoc expert" and present evidence as fact even though nothing distinguishable can be determined.

In July last year the then Justice Minister Chris Grayling published an extremely short report about the 'closed material procedure' which was clearly designed to tell us as little as possible about secret courts. We learn from the report that in five cases the Secretary of State showed judges secret, undisclosed evidence. Yet nobody knows what these cases were, and even charities like Liberty have been forced to admit they don't actually know which cases he's referring to. We don't even know if there more cases.

As we are now seeing, the government uses 'national security' as a shield to hide behind whenever it has inconvenient information that it wants to keep hidden for whatever reason. The problem is, as said before "democracies die behind closed doors."

The European Courts have done nothing as the corrupt heart of Europe will always put big business over citizens' rights. TTIP is evidence of this. The most controversial part of the deal is the Investor State Dispute Settlements (ISDS). These provisions essentially allow private corporations to sue national governments in guess what ... secret courts.

You can read more from Graham Vanbergen at his site TruePublica.org.uk

'They (land laws) are founded upon the most absurd of all suppositions, the supposition that every successive generation of men have not an equal right to the earth, and to all that it possesses, but that the property of the present generation should be restrained and regulated according to the fancy of those who died perhaps five hundred years ago'
(Adam Smith; The Wealth of Nations; Chap II, Book 3; thanks to Dave Dewhurst)

ID CARDS: SOLVING A PROBLEM THAT DARE NOT SPEAK ITS NAME

Sean Gabb; Libertarian Alliance Blog

Writing in the Daily Telegraph on the 10th December 2015, two Members of Parliament – Frank Field and Nicholas Soames – regret the cancellation, in 2010, of the previous Labour Government’s identity card scheme. They argue that the threat of terrorism requires us to think again.

By all means, let us think again. However, since no material facts have changed, I see no reason for reaching any different opinion from the one I have always held. Identity cards are an astonishingly bad idea – so bad that it is hard to make a case for them with any semblance of good faith.

Undeniably, there are benefits to having a single and authoritative means of identification. We all need to identify ourselves several times a week, sometimes more often. There are times when the authorities have legitimate need to identify us. Fraud appears to be a growing problem – so too illegal immigration. A biometric identity card would simplify large parts of our lives. It would smooth many of our interactions with the authorities.

The problem is that these benefits are not as great as we are told. Those European countries that already have identity cards do not seem to have less crime than we have. Certainly, France, which has a comprehensive identity card system, has suffered much more terrorism in the past few years than we have – large scale terrorism that gets reported in our news, and a continuous round of intercommunal violence that is not reported. In most cases, identity cards are irrelevant to solving these crimes. The problem is less the identification of suspects once arrested than finding someone to arrest in the first place. For the rest, identity cards are no more secure than bank cards and passports and bank notes. Whatever document is issued and has value can and will be forged by the dishonest.

As for identifying ourselves, most of us already have passports and National Insurance cards and bank cards and driving licenses. The inconvenience we face is, at most, trivial.

Against these doubtful or minor benefits, there are the substantial costs of an identity card scheme. Some of these costs are financial. Issuing everyone with secure biometric identity cards will be expensive, and we do already have a large budget deficit. The main costs, though, will be to our traditional way of life.

Preventing Islamic terrorism is clearly not a main objective of the authorities. If it were, they would not have opened the borders after 1990, and kept them open. They would also not have done so much to cover up various kinds of wrongdoing in our Islamic communities. Fighting crime against life and property is equally not a main objective.

Far more important objectives of the British State, so far as I can tell, are to stop us from smoking and drinking and looking at pornography – and to keep us from organising against our increasingly Potemkin liberal democracy. There is already a vast database, filled with who we are and what we are doing. Identity cards would be a useful front end to this. It would allow us to be tracked as we went about our daily business. It could be used to see who was buying cigarettes or drink, and who was attending meetings of anti-corporate or identitarian pressure groups.

And the knowledge that we were being watched would change our behaviour. Raise even the potential costs of nonconformity, and there will be fewer nonconformists. Would you go to a gay strip club, or to a meeting of the British National Party, if there was a policeman outside with a pretext for checking the identity cards of everyone going in? How many cigarettes or bottles of gin would you buy, if you had to show an identity card at the checkout, and if you knew the records would be shared with the National Health Service and the child protection authorities?

In short, identity cards enable a soft totalitarian police state. To be watched is to be controlled. Without a single concentration camp or rubber cosh in sight, they will take us into a world that has become a stage on which we act at all times under the watchful eye of the authorities.

Look at the history of the debate over identity cards. Every real or alleged problem we have faced in the past quarter century – football hooliganism, bank and welfare fraud, personation in driving tests, selling stolen goods, being drunk in public, terrorism, illegal immigration – has been made into an argument for

identity cards. If another Black Death were to wipe out a third of the population, the surviving officials in the Home Office would make this into an argument for identity cards. The problems change. The solution stays the same. The obvious reason is that the authorities really want to know what we are doing, and to scare us into stopping.

And so, my response to Messrs Field and Soames is: I will take my chance with the terrorists; you go back to Westminster and do the job we elected you to do. This is to protect our lives and property and traditional rights from a British State that is going, or has already gone, out of control.

ALL OVER FOR ATVOD

UK Column

In February 2014, the UK Column was contacted by the Authority for Television On Demand (ATVOD), a private company outsourced by Ofcom. They told us that they were beginning an investigation into the UK Column to determine if we were running a “video on demand service”. ATVOD’s definition of “service” seemed a little loose, and following several conversations, I established that the “service” we were running, allegedly, was our Youtube channel.

To us, this allegation that we were somehow running a service came as a great surprise. We understood that Google was running the Youtube service, and that we were simply posting videos on Google’s service.

Further discussion established that as far as ATVOD was concerned, the fact that the UK Column is more or less a voluntary/amateur news organisation did not matter. Yes, there would be a discount based on our turnover, but that’s as far as it went. We would, it seemed, be operating on a level playing field with the BBC as far as state regulation was concerned.

We were not prepared to accept this. It seemed to us that ATVOD was not only overstepping its authority, but it was doing so in a particularly dangerous way. If they were claiming that users of an online service like Youtube were, in fact, providing a service themselves, then literally everyone would fall under their remit, and they would be attempting to regulate the entire internet. By July 2014, all discussion over, ATVOD made their final determination, and the UK Column was going to have to submit to regulation.

So rather than fight them through their appeals process, we chose to effectively close our Youtube channel. The effect of this was that ATVOD had to close their telephone lines for several days.

Another effect of this was that we were contacted by representatives of the online pornography industry. We were told that since they had been regulated by ATVOD for many years, that they understood ATVOD’s agenda, and particularly that of Peter Johnson, the Chief Executive. They confirmed for us that yes, Mr Johnson was indeed extremely interested in regulating the entire internet.

Well, following the public backlash, ATVOD backed off from the UK Column, and they backed off completely from any attempt to regulate users of Youtube. Others who contacted them in the days following our action were told a completely different story to that given to me. They were told, “no, no, if you’re using Youtube you do not need to notify us”.

Just over a year on, it is pleasing to report that ATVOD as an organisation has been wound up. It’s remit for regulation of video on demand content will be brought into OFCOM. ATVOD will formally cease to exist on 31st December 2015.

What this means for regulation of video content on the internet remains to be seen. The fact that Peter Johnson will no longer be running his personal vendetta against internet videographers is a positive development.

It is, of course, impossible to know what contribution the UK Column made to ATVOD’s demise. We can say for sure, though, that as with state regulation of the press through our coverage of the agenda behind the Leveson Inquiry and the Media Standards Trust, we at least delayed state regulation of Youtube and other online video services.

For more on this story, please see [ATVOD: A Major Risk To Freedom of Speech on the Internet on the UK Column website](#).

SMALL VICTORIES

(A couple of small pieces. The first, from Mike Clayton, was received without a title. Both contain a germ which many of us seek. A little bit of personal rebellion; finding a small victory; a fragment of counter-economics with a slightly agoristic flavour. By all means send me your own ideas - Ed)

Mike Clayton

This is a simple example of living outside of the establishments system and helping to starve banksters of money they are using to enslave us.

The wood in the log burner has been collected all year (cost £0 but a bit of hard graft) so gives free heating. I loaded the fire up and it has been on all night cooking a large ham joint - smells lovely now! I paid £15 cash for this joint at a market, ie I didn't use a 'cashless' card, scan a bar code, go to a supermarket but helped a brit with my money.

I've just put the copper kettle (bought cash) on to boil my reverse osmosis filtered water so I don't use expensive electric that is paid to a corporation or drink medicated water (fluoride is a neuro toxin and causes cancer!!). I use this whenever I can to become 'off grid' as much as I can - just like the good old days!

If everyone became off grid and rebellious (like many of you on this distribution :-), then they wouldn't be able to control us all.

Idris Francis

Divert junk phone calls to 0333 88 88 88 88

If a web site or form insists on a phone number you would prefer them not to have, enter 0333 88 88 88 88 which leads to a recorded message saying you prefer not to receive the call. Miss off the last 8 if no room for it.

THE WORLD'S FIRST CASHLESS SOCIETY IS HERE – A TOTALITARIAN'S DREAM COME TRUE

Nick Giambruno; Activist Post

Central planners around the world are waging a War on Cash. In just the last few years:

- Italy made cash transactions over €1,000 illegal;
- Switzerland proposed banning cash payments in excess of 100,000 francs;
- Russia banned cash transactions over \$10,000;
- Spain banned cash transactions over €2,500;
- Mexico made cash payments of more than 200,000 pesos illegal;
- Uruguay banned cash transactions over \$5,000; and
- France made cash transactions over €1,000 illegal, down from the previous limit of €3,000.

The War on Cash is a favourite pet project of the economic central planners. They want to eliminate hand-to-hand currency so that governments can document, control, and tax everything. This is why they're lowering the threshold for mandatory reporting of cash transactions and, in some instances, simply making it illegal to pay cash.

In the U.S., central planners ratchet up the War on Cash every time the government declares a

made-up war on something else...a war on crime, a war on drugs, a war on poverty, a war on terror. They all end with more government intrusion into your financial affairs.

Thanks to these made-up wars, the U.S. government is imposing an increasing number of regulations on cash transactions. Try withdrawing more than \$10,000 in cash from your bank. They'll treat you like a criminal or terrorist.

The Federal Reserve is at the center of the War on Cash. Its weapons are inflation and control over the currency denominations. Take the \$100 note, for example. It's the largest bill in circulation today. This was not always the case. At one point, the U.S. had \$500, \$1,000, \$5,000, and even \$10,000 notes. But the government eliminated these large notes in 1969 under the pretext of fighting the War on Some Drugs.

Since then, the \$100 note has been the largest. But it has far less purchasing power than it did in 1969. Decades of rampant money printing have inflated the dollar. Today, a \$100 note buys less than a \$20 note did in 1969. Even though the Federal Reserve has devalued the dollar over 80% since 1969, it still refuses to issue notes larger than \$100. This makes it inconvenient to use cash for large transactions, which forces people to use electronic payment methods. This, of course, is what the U.S. government wants.

It's exactly like Ron Paul said: "The cashless society is the IRS's dream: total knowledge of, and control over, the finances of every single American."

Policymakers or Central Planners?

On stories related to the War on Cash, you may have noticed that the mainstream media often uses the word "policymakers," as in "policymakers have decided to keep interest rates at record low levels." When the media uses "policymakers," they are often referring to central bank officials. It's a curious word choice. As far as I can tell, there is no difference between a policymaker and central planner.

Most people who want to live in a free society agree that central planning is not a good idea. So the media uses a different word to put a more neutral spin on things. To help you think more clearly, I suggest substituting "central planners" every time you see "policymakers."

The World's First Cashless Society

In 1661, Sweden became the first country in Europe to issue paper money. Now it's probably going to be the first in the world to eliminate it.

Sweden has already phased out most cash transactions. According to Credit Suisse, 80% of all purchases in Sweden are electronic and don't involve cash. And that figure is rising.

If the trend continues – and there is nothing to suggest it won't – Sweden could soon be the world's first cashless society. Sweden's supply of physical currency has dropped over 50% in the last six years. A couple of major Swedish banks no longer carry cash. Virtually all Swedes pay for candy bars and coffee electronically. Even homeless street vendors use mobile card readers. Plus, an increasing number of government restrictions are encouraging Swedes to dump cash. The pretexts are familiar...fighting terrorism, money laundering, etc. In effect, these restrictions make it inconvenient to use cash, so people don't.

So far, Swedes have passively accepted the government and banks' drive to eliminate cash. The push to destroy their financial privacy doesn't seem to bother them. This is likely because the average Swede places an unreasonable amount of trust in government and financial institutions. Their trust is certainly misplaced. On top of the obvious privacy concerns, eliminating cash enables the central planners' latest gimmick to goose the economy: Negative interest rates.

Making The Negative Interest Rate Scam Possible

Sweden, Denmark, and Switzerland all have negative interest rates. Negative interest rates mean the lender literally pays the borrower for the privilege of lending him money. It's a bizarre, upside-down concept.

But negative rates are not some European anomaly. The Federal Reserve discussed the possibility of using negative interest rates in the U.S. at its last meeting.

Negative rates could not exist in a free market. They destroy the impetus to save and build capital, which is the basis of prosperity.

When you deposit money in a bank, you are lending money to the bank. However, with negative rates you don't earn interest. Instead, you pay the bank. If you don't like that plan, you can certainly stash your cash under the mattress. As a practical matter, this limits how far governments and central

banks can go with negative interest rates. The more it costs to store money at the bank, the less inclined people are to do it.

Of course, central planners don't want you to withdraw money from the bank. This is a big reason why they want to eliminate cash...so you can't. As long as your money stays in the bank, it's vulnerable to the sting of negative interest rates and also helps to prop up the unsound fractional reserve banking system.

If you can't withdraw your money as cash, you have two choices: You can deal with negative interest rates...or you can spend your money. Ultimately, that's what our Keynesian central planners want. They are using negative interest rates and the War on Cash to force you to spend and "stimulate" the economy.

If you ask me, these radical and insane measures are a sign of desperation.

The War on Cash and negative interest rates are huge threats to your financial security. Central planners are playing with fire and inviting a currency catastrophe. Most people have no idea what really happens when a currency collapses, let alone how to prepare...

Nick is Doug Casey's globetrotting companion and is the Senior Editor of Casey Research's International Man. He writes about economics, offshore banking, second passports, value investing in crisis markets, geopolitics, and surviving a financial collapse, among other topics. He is a CFA charterholder. In short, Nick's work helps people make the most of their personal freedom and financial opportunity around the world.

“THE BANKSTERS DID IT”: THE CENTRAL BANKS HAVE ENGINEERED THIS FINANCIAL COLLAPSE

James Corbett; Global Research

Good news, everybody! The markets are rebounding! Yes, we just hit a minor bump in the road there, but don't worry, everything is back to normal now. Let's forget about the tail end of last week and this week's Black Monday, shall we? Pay no mind to the uncomfortable low lights of the global stock rout:

- The staggering \$5 trillion wipeout of funny money paper promise "wealth" since the yuan deflation began (\$2.7 trillion on Monday alone).
- The all-time record spike on the volatility index (aka the "Fear Index").
- The 1000 point Dow plunge off the opening bell on Monday morning.
- The halting of every major US index during the market mayhem.
- The 4500 mini crash events that forced indices worldwide to halt and unhalt at a dizzying pace.
- The amazing magic levitating act courtesy of our friends at the Plunge Protection Team that brought about the largest intraday point swing in Dow history.

Nope, nothing to see here. And now that this dead cat bounce is underway, surely there will be no more commodity deflation or global economic slowdown or worldwide currency war or historically unprecedented bond bubbles to worry about, right?

OK, enough sarcasm. Readers of this column will know by now that the phony baloney stock markets, manipulated as they are from top to bottom and juiced as they are on the Fed's QE heroin, are no longer reflective of economic reality. The only question is how far this particular dead cat market will bounce, and whether it will be helped along with more heroin from the Fed.

But there is already one vitally important take away from these events that the independent media must articulate now, before it's too late. Namely: This crisis was engineered by the central banks. It is their fault.

Let me repeat that again in case you missed it: This crisis was engineered by the central banks. This point is not even controversial. It has been the universal consensus of institutions ranging from the Bank for International Settlements to the Official Monetary and Financial Institutions Forum, and from OECD officials to former Fed Governors and even Alan "Bubbles" Greenspan himself.

In fact, analyst after analyst and pundit after pundit—including the most mainstream of mainstream publications—have been sounding the alarm on the stock market bubble for much of the past year.

This tells us two things: the current market mayhem was perfectly predictable (and predicted), and the central banks not only stayed the course but actually doubled down with more and more QE injections. It is

the central banks that have created this mess, and what's more they have created this mess in the full knowledge that their actions would lead to disaster. And now, one can be sure, the same central bankers and their political puppet mouthpieces will use this crisis to continue the construction of the "New World Order" that they called for in the wake of the 2008 collapse.

Anyone who can't see the endgame now—global government by the bankers, of the bankers and for the bankers—is either blind or wilfully ignorant.

It is especially important to state these obvious truths now, because we can already see a false narrative underway. This narrative has two main thrusts: one is to paint China as the culprit for the global downturn and the other is to assume that only central banks can save the day (with even greater liquidity injections and even deeper rate cuts).

The China-as-economic-villain narrative ranges from the subdued ("China's 'Black Monday' sends markets reeling across the globe") to the blatant ("Chinese Economy Causes Markets to Fall") to the silly ("Don Yuan Causes Heartbreak"), but they all convey the same message: China has brought this on the world all by itself. It's not that China is reacting to a global monetary environment created by the Fed and fostered by other central banks, or a global economic slowdown that is biting into a heavily export-driven economy, or the conflicting pressures on the country as it tries to navigate its way toward global reserve currency status. Nope, it's just a bull in a china shop (or is that a China in a bull market?) knocking things over and causing mayhem (Trump was right!).

The only-central-banks-can-save-us narrative is even more infantile, but also more dangerous. We are told that the crash came because China's central bank failed to act. We are told that it's now up to Turkey's central bank to bolster the flagging lira. We are told that the Lehman collapse occurred because of too little central bank intervention. We are told that only the European Central Bank is capable of "riding to the rescue" and preventing a market rout. In other words the very same institutions that engineered this crisis are the only ones that can save us.

It is the height of insanity that anyone would believe this nonsense, but then again the world fell for it after Lehman, and they're likely to fall for it again. Unless we spread the word.

The banksters did it. And unless we derail their agenda, they're going to do it again.

WANT CASH? ATMS TO DEMAND BIOMETRIC VERIFICATION: "SMARTPHONE AND EYE SCAN TO DISPENSE MONEY"

Mac Slavo; Activist Post

Some of the longest standing fears have been based around the idea that once cash is fully banned, the last remaining vestiges of freedom will go with it. While that remains to be seen in total, it is clear that a digital matrix of computer-based spending, surveillance and control is taking over more and more of our lives. Now that system wants to scan your iris and even talk with your smartphone in order to allow you to access your own hard-earned money.

Sadly, this eerie new world order scenario is closer to reality than ever before.

While cash will still be around for now, it is about to become more tightly controlled than ever before. Most banks are now limiting withdrawals and flagging customers with large cash requests as suspicious to law enforcement or federal agencies.

Meanwhile, the next generation of ATMs – while still spitting out bills – will focus more on technological verification of patrons, and even biometric verification. With growing concerns over digital security and authentication, privacy is all but dead.

NBC News reports on the surprising changes that could be fast approaching the cash machine you frequent around the corner or down the street:

No card reader, no PIN pad, no touch-screen display — how you bank at your ATM could drastically change in the not-so-distant future. Citigroup is testing an automated teller machine made by Canton, Ohio-based Diebold that relies on your smartphone and perhaps an eye scan to dispense your cash.

Diebold's so-called "Irving" system works like this: Let's say you want to get \$100 from your ATM. Instead of taking your bank card with you, you schedule your withdrawal ahead of time on your phone via your bank's mobile app. When you walk up to the screenless machine, it identifies you in one of several ways: Near Field Communication (NFC, the same type of technology used in Apple Pay's mobile payment service), QR Code (for Quick Response Code, a machine-readable bar code that's been used extensively in Japan) or biometrics (scanning your iris, a technique that's considered far more fail-safe than fingerprints as a form of ID). The machine then spits out the cash and you go on your merry way. Diebold said the entire transaction could be completed in less than 10 seconds. The new system is more secure than traditional ATMs, in part because you wouldn't need a card and wouldn't have to punch in a PIN, the company said. [...] "Our latest concepts embody a new era of banking and put the user experience at the top of the pyramid to connect consumers with their money when and how they see fit," Frank Natoli, Diebold executive vice president, self-service technology, said in a press release.

While Diebold has been in the ATM machine business for many years, it is hardly reassuring that the big banks will be teaming up with the company known for its voting fraud scandals to keep "your" money secure from meddling. What could possibly go wrong?

Moreover, the more entangled and dependent our system of commerce becomes on technology, the worse it will be if/when the grid collapses. While it is already true that ATMs won't be available in the event of a massive power outage, the requirement for not only ATMs, but smartphones and other devices to all work seems to invite trouble and further complications.

ATMs already represent sharp fees and tight control of cash – the price is high and the amount per day is strictly limited – though its distribution happens at a nearly infinite number of points. Banks see cash as a problem because it can be freely exchanged on the black and grey markets, stuffed under the mattress and used without direct surveillance. Moreover, cash is an instrument that allows customers to circumvent their institution and fees, and keeps them from leveraging that balance many times over.

This new era may have many conveniences, but the near-total electronic control of currency will put a handful of institutions in control of the economy, and will make history as the most invasive and authoritarian form of money ever created. Already, things are only shades away from the Mark of the Beast system so many have warned against and watched for... the masses will be somewhere between cogs in the machine and slaves to the system.

DARK MARKETS: ANONYMITY IN BITCOIN

Edyta Grabowska; Coinivore

Bitcoin is a powerful and successful digital currency. Based on cryptography and a decentralized ledger, it has simultaneously been heralded as the future of finance and a gateway to the criminal underworld. Governments around the world are pushing an agenda which would see the banning of end-to-end encryption on one hand and the anonymity of Bitcoin on another. End-to-end encryption has become increasingly popular across consumer software from Apple's iMessage to WhatsApp.

The government argues it needs to be able to court-order access to private data in order to counter terrorism. This comes at the cost of both privacy and security for the general public. This threatens anonymity, one of the most powerful characteristics of Bitcoin, and the hope for crypto-anarchists who would see the Bitcoin protocol development continue along the path to true anonymity. Bitcoin's ability to circumvent oppressive governments and offer a safe haven from the data harvesting of Google, Facebook and Amazon would disappear if de-anonymization occurred on a mass scale.

"True anonymity in Bitcoin is only a myth, currently," notes Vijay Michalik, Research Analyst for Digital Transformation at Frost & Sullivan. "There is full visibility of all transactions. While they're only linked to a pseudonym and not a real-world name or address, every transaction is viewable through a number of different blockchain browsers."

Blockchain analysis, as a relatively new market sector within Bitcoin, demonstrates the weakness of pseudonymity. Its main function is a data source for exchanges other financial services businesses to comply with financial regulations. They collect metadata, incidental information attributed to transactions, and IP addresses linked to nodes and use these to identify and blacklist criminals.

True financial privacy doesn't exist on the Bitcoin blockchain. Without a redesign, this should be a serious concern. Not only for the politically oppressed, criminals and crypto-anarchists. Blockchain analysis techniques can only improve. It's believed that huge swathes of addresses could be de-anonymized over time. It doesn't take much to put everything together once you have a few pieces of the puzzle. This would leave a complete history of your financial information publically available, forever.

"For most users, income and complete spending history would be available for anyone to see. From friends to colleagues, commercial businesses, governments and criminals," comments Michalik. "For businesses operating in Bitcoin, cash flow, supply, demand and other competitive information would be exposed to their rivals. In this case, Bitcoin is a worse option than traditional finance channels."

Despite these technical shortcomings, Bitcoin is a powerful tool, whether for payments, remittances, microfinance or government circumvention. Bitcoin's secure peer-to-peer system provides important new capabilities to financial technology and cost savings for consumers. Comprehensive action, inspired by regulation, towards de-anonymization would minimize the potential benefits of Bitcoin.

Anonymity is a powerful promise of Bitcoin, which unencumbered, is a tool for transformation of business and finance. Heavy regulation or de-anonymization would stunt its growth irrevocably.

For more information on Bitcoin, please contact Edyta Grabowska, Corporate Communications at Frost & Sullivan, at edyta.grabowska@frost.com

REINVENTING BANKING: FROM RUSSIA TO ICELAND TO ECUADOR

Ellen Brown, The Web of Debt Blog | News Analysis

Global developments in finance and geopolitics are prompting a rethinking of the structure of banking and of the nature of money itself. Among other interesting news items:

- In Russia, vulnerability to Western sanctions has led to proposals for a banking system that is not only independent of the West but is based on different design principles.
- In Iceland, the booms and busts culminating in the banking crisis of 2008-09 have prompted lawmakers to consider a plan to remove the power to create money from private banks.
- In Ireland, Iceland and the UK, a recession-induced shortage of local credit has prompted proposals for a system of public interest banks on the model of the Sparkassen of Germany.
- In Ecuador, the central bank is responding to a shortage of US dollars (the official Ecuadorian currency) by issuing digital dollars through accounts to which everyone has access, effectively making it a bank of the people.

Developments in Russia

In a November 2015 article titled "Russia Debates Unorthodox Orthodox Financial Alternative," William Engdahl writes:

A significant debate is underway in Russia since imposition of western financial sanctions on Russian banks and corporations in 2014. It's about a proposal presented by the Moscow Patriarchate of the Orthodox Church. The proposal, which resembles Islamic interest-free banking models in many respects, was first unveiled in December 2014 at the depth of the Ruble crisis and oil price free-fall. This August the idea received a huge boost from the endorsement of the Russian Chamber of Commerce and Industry. It could change history for the better depending on what is done and where it further leads.

Engdahl notes that the financial sanctions launched by the US Treasury in 2014 have forced a critical rethinking among Russian intellectuals and officials. Like China, Russia has developed an

internal Russian version of SWIFT Interbank payments; and it is now considering a plan to restructure Russia's banking system. Engdahl writes:

Much as with Islamic banking models that ban usury, the Orthodox Financial System would not allow interest charges on loans. Participants of the system share risks, profits and losses. Speculative behavior is prohibited There would be a new low-risk bank or credit organization that controls all transactions, and investment funds or companies that source investors and mediate project financing. . . . Priority would be ensuring financing of the real sector of the economy

On September 15, 2013, Sergei Glazyev, one of Vladimir Putin's economic advisers, presented a series of economic proposals to the Presidential Russian Security Council that also suggest radical change is on the horizon. The plan is aimed at reducing vulnerability to western sanctions and achieving long-term growth and economic sovereignty.

Particularly interesting is a proposal to provide targeted lending for businesses and industries by providing them with low-interest loans at 1-4 percent, financed through the central bank with quantitative easing (digital money creation). The proposal is to issue 20 trillion rubles for this purpose over a five year period. Using quantitative easing for economic development mirrors the proposal of UK Labour Leader Jeremy Corbyn for "quantitative easing for people." William Engdahl concludes that Russia is in "a fascinating process of rethinking every aspect of her national economic survival because of the reality of the western attacks," one that "could produce a very healthy transformation away from the deadly defects" of the current banking model.

Iceland's Radical Money Plan

Iceland, too, is looking at a radical transformation of its money system, after suffering the crushing boom/bust cycle of the private banking model that bankrupted its largest banks in 2008. According to a March 2015 article in the UK Telegraph:

Iceland's government is considering a revolutionary monetary proposal - removing the power of commercial banks to create money and handing it to the central bank. The proposal, which would be a turnaround in the history of modern finance, was part of a report written by a lawmaker from the ruling centrist Progress Party, Frosti Sigurjonsson, entitled "A better monetary system for Iceland".

"The findings will be an important contribution to the upcoming discussion, here and elsewhere, on money creation and monetary policy," Prime Minister Sigmundur David Gunnlaugsson said. The report, commissioned by the premier, is aimed at putting an end to a monetary system in place through a slew of financial crises, including the latest one in 2008.

Under this "Sovereign Money" proposal, the country's central bank would become the only creator of money. Banks would continue to manage accounts and payments and would serve as intermediaries between savers and lenders. The proposal is a variant of the Chicago Plan promoted by Kumhof and Benes of the IMF.

Public Banking Initiatives in Iceland, Ireland and the UK

A major concern with stripping private banks of the power to create money as deposits when they make loans is that it will seriously reduce the availability of credit in an already sluggish economy. One solution is to make the banks, or some of them, public institutions. They would still be creating money when they made loans, but it would be as agents of the government; and the profits would be available for public use, on the model of the US Bank of North Dakota and the German Sparkassen (public savings banks).

In Ireland, three political parties - Sinn Fein, the Green Party and Renua Ireland (a new party) - are now supporting initiatives for a network of local publicly-owned banks on the Sparkassen model. In the UK, the New Economy Foundation (NEF) is proposing that the failed Royal Bank of Scotland be transformed into a network of public interest banks on that model. And in Iceland,

public banking is part of the platform of a new political party called the Dawn Party.

Ecuador's Dinero Electronico: A National Digital Currency

So far, these banking overhauls are just proposals; but in Ecuador, radical transformation of the banking system is under way. Ever since 2000, when Ecuador agreed to use the US dollar as its official legal tender, it has had to ship boatloads of paper dollars into the country just to conduct trade. In order to "seek efficiency in payment systems [and] to promote and contribute to the economic stability of the country," the government of President Rafael Correa has therefore established the world's first national digitally-issued currency.

Unlike Bitcoin and similar private crypto-currencies (which have been outlawed in the country), Ecuador's dinero electronico is operated and backed by the government. The Ecuadorian digital currency is less like Bitcoin than like M-Pesa, a private mobile phone-based money transfer service started by Vodafone, which has generated a "mobile money" revolution in Kenya.

Western central banks issue digital currency for the use of commercial banks in their reserve accounts, but it is not available to the public. In Ecuador, any qualifying person can have an account at the central bank; and opening one is as easy as walking into a participating financial institution and exchanging paper money for electronic money stored on their smartphones. Ecuador's banks and other financial institutions were ordered in May 2015 to adopt the digital payment system within the next year, making them "macro-agents" of the Electric Currency System.

According to a National Assembly statement:

Electronic money will stimulate the economy; it will be possible to attract more Ecuadorian citizens, especially those who do not have checking or savings accounts and credit cards alone. The electronic currency will be backed by the assets of the Central Bank of Ecuador.

That means there is no fear of the bank going bankrupt or of bank runs or bail-ins. Nor can the digital currency be devalued by speculative short selling. The government has declared that these are digital US dollars trading at 1 to 1 - take it or leave it - and the people are taking it. According to an October 2015 article titled "Ecuador's Digital Currency Is Winning Hearts!", the currency is actually taking the country by storm; and other countries in Latin America and Africa are not far behind.

The president of the Ecuadorian Association of Private Banks observes that the digital currency could be used to finance the public debt. However, the government has insisted that this will not be done. According to an economist at Ecuador's central bank:

We did it from the government because we wanted it to be a democratic product. In any other countries, [digital currency] is provided by private companies, and it is expensive. There are barriers to entry, like [expensive fees] if you transfer money from one cellphone operator to another. What we have here is something everyone can use regardless of the operator they are using.

Banking Moves Into the 21st Century

The catastrophic failures of the Western banking system mandate a new vision. These transformations, current and proposed, are constructive steps toward streamlining the banking system, eliminating the risks that have devastated individuals and governments, democratizing money, and promoting sustainable and prosperous economies. They also raise some provocative questions:

- Would issuing "quantitative easing" to the tune of 20 trillion rubles for Russian development and trade trigger hyperinflation?
- Could merging the Iceland version of the Chicago Plan with a public banking initiative return the power to create money to the public without collapsing credit?
- How does the Ecuadorian national digital currency mesh with the "war on cash" underway in

Europe?

*Ellen Brown is an attorney, president of the Public Banking Institute, and author of twelve books including the best-selling *Web of Debt*. In *The Public Bank Solution*, her latest book, she explores successful public banking models historically and globally. Her websites are *Web of Debt*, *Public Bank Solution*, and *Public Banking Institute*.*

Related Stories

Banking "Technocrats" Undermine Democracy

By Paul Jay, The Real News | Interview & Video

Banking Union Time Bomb: Eurocrats Authorize Bailouts and Bail-Ins

By Ellen Brown, Web of Debt Blog | News Analysis

Russia Blamed, US Taxpayers on the Hook, as Fracking Boom Collapses

By Ben Ptashnik, Truthout | News Analysis

SWITZERLAND TO VOTE ON ENDING FRACTIONAL RESERVE BANKING

Tyler Durden; ZeroHedge; via Nathan Allonby

One year ago (and just two months before the shocking announcement the Swiss Franc's peg to the Euro would end, dramatically revaluing the currency, and leading to massive FX losses around the globe and for the Swiss National Bank) the Swiss held a referendum whether to demand that their central bank should convert 20% of its reserves into gold, up from 7% currently. After the early polls showed the Yes vote taking a surprising lead, the Diebold machines kicked in and the result was a sweeping victory for the No vote, without a single canton voting for sound money.

Ironically, this unexpected nonchalance about the Swiss central bank's balance sheet by one of Europe's more responsible nations took place just before the same bank announced CHF30 billions in losses on its long Euro positions following the revaluation of the CHF. It also took place when not just Germany, but the Netherlands and Austria announced they would repatriate a major portion of their gold in a move which, all spin aside, signals rising concerns about the existing monetary system. Bloomberg Sponsored Content

We wonder if the Swiss have changed their mind about just how prudent it is to have their central bank operate as one of the world's largest - and worst - after its CHF 30 billion loss in Q1 FX traders, and hedge funds with \$94 billion in stock holdings, since then.

We may soon have the answer, because in what is shaping up to be another historic referendum on the treatment of money, earlier today the Swiss Federal Government confirmed that it had received enough signatures and would hold a referendum as part of the so-called "Vollgeld", or Full Money Initiative, also known as the Campaign for Monetary Reform, which seeks to ban commercial banks from creating money, and which calls for the central bank to be given sole power to create the money in the financial system. In other words, an initiative to ban fractional reserve banking, and revert to a 100% reserve.

As Finanzen.ch reports, after 111,763 signatures urging a referendum were submitted, of which 110,955 valid, the Federal Chancellery announced on Thursday that the popular vote would take place. Under Switzerland's direct democracy, a referendum can be held if a motion gains 100,000 signatures within 18 months of launching.

"Banks won't be able to create money for themselves any more, they'll only be able to lend money that they have from savers or other banks," said the campaign group.

Ever since the SNB was established in 1891, it has had exclusive power to mint coins and issue Swiss banknotes. However, as with every other fractional reserve banking system, over 90% of the money in circulation in Switzerland, as in every other country, now exists in the form "electronic" cash created by private banks, rather than the central bank.

It is this threat of uncontrolled money creation and the risks to systemic stability that the Vollgeld campaign is seeking to stem. "Due to the emergence of electronic payment transactions, banks have regained the opportunity to create their own money," said the Swiss Sovereign Money campaign. "The

decision taken by the people in 1891 has fallen into oblivion."

So with the referendum now docketed, will this vote too be mysteriously "lost" in the final minutes of voting? According to the Telegraph, unlike the gold vote - which was seen as a precursor to re-introducing the Gold Standard in Switzerland - economists have been more supportive of the idea of "sovereign money" as a way to stabilize the economy and prevent excess credit growth.

A date for the Swiss referendum has not been set.

If the vote passes, and if Swiss banks are barred from creating deposits (by way of loans), it would shake to the core the entire modern financial system, which these days is exclusively reliant on runaway fractionalization of sound money, as more and more layers are added to the top of the Exter's Pyramid, as the only possible "growth" left in a world that has never seen so much debt, is to find new and creative ways to borrow from the future, with banks getting all the benefits and stuffing taxpayers when the inevitable collapse happens.

RUNNYMEDE GAZETTE EDITED BY:- FRANK TAYLOR,
2 CHURCH VIEW, ST GILES TERRACE, CHETTON, BRIDGNORTH, SHROPSHIRE, WV16 6UG

Tel: (01746) 789326

frankinshropshire@hotmail.co.uk