

# Joseph Plummer - Tragedy And Hope 101

---

 [joemplummer.com/tragedy-and-hope-made-easy.html](http://joemplummer.com/tragedy-and-hope-made-easy.html)

This is the free HTML version of *Tragedy and Hope 101*.

The paperback and Kindle version are available at [Amazon.com](http://Amazon.com).

Want to raise awareness? Handing out books is expensive, handing out [these bookmarks](#) is not!  
Additional Languages: [Spanish](#) , German (coming soon)

\*Unless otherwise noted, all emphasis in quoted text has been added.

## Introduction by G. Edward Griffin

**If you have ever watched an illusionist perform up-close magic, you know the power of misdirection and sleight-of-hand. Even in a room full of suspicious and attentive observers, the illusionist can fool them all. By exploiting known weaknesses in the human mind and employing his tools of the trade, he will deceive the crowd whether it wants to be deceived or not.**

Imagine what an equally talented “network” of political illusionists can accomplish. Performing before an audience of mostly trusting and casual observers, exploiting known weaknesses in the human mind, and employing their tools of the trade, they, too, will deceive the crowd whether it wants to be deceived or not.

Having spent nearly sixty years of my life researching and writing about the illusionists who control our world, I can say without reservation that you are about to learn some of their closest-held secrets. Joe has done an outstanding job of weeding through Carroll Quigley’s book, *Tragedy & Hope*. He has captured the essence of what Quigley referred to as “the Network” and made this important information accessible to the average person who simply doesn’t have time to read a 1,300-page history book. Even for those who intend to read the entire volume, Joe has created an introduction and study guide that will serve the serious student well.

Knowledge of who Carroll Quigley was and the deceptions that he revealed is essential for understanding the real world of today. His close relationship with the Network and his approval of its aims made it possible to provide an insider’s analysis of the minds and methods of the global elite. Without this knowledge, the actions of those who dominate the U.S. government and the Western world do not make sense. With it, everything falls into place.

Be forewarned. The journey you are about to begin is not for the faint hearted. If you are comfortable with the illusions that currently pass for political reality, this book is not for you because, once you discover how the deceivers perform their magic, the comfort of ignorance is no longer possible. Once the bell is rung, it cannot be unringed.

The bell starts ringing on the next page.

## Chapter 1 Democracy

Have you ever felt like democracy is just an illusion? Have you ever suspected that there are very “powerful people” who’ve created a system that *appears* to be democratic, but actually cuts ordinary

citizens out of the decision-making process? Have you ever wondered: “Who is really running things, and what exactly are they trying to achieve?” If you have, you’re not alone.

Fortunately, a Harvard-educated history professor named Carroll Quigley wrote a handful of books that answer all of these questions and more. Unfortunately, the answers are very disturbing, especially to those who’ve accepted the common myths of “democratic government.”

In Quigley’s work we discover that national constitutions are routinely undermined by the leaders who are elected to defend them. We learn that “all social instruments tend to become institutions,” regardless of their benevolent origin, and, from that point forward, the *institution* is run for the benefit of those who control it (at the expense of its original purpose).<sup>[1]</sup>

Perhaps most unsettling, Quigley reveals that real power operates behind the scenes, in secrecy, and with little to fear from so-called democratic elections. He proves that conspiracies, secret societies, and small, powerful networks of individuals are not only real; they’re extremely effective at creating or destroying entire nations and shaping the world as a whole. We learn that “representative government” is, at best, a carefully managed con game.

Since these disturbing truths contradict nearly everything our government, education system, and media have taught us to believe, many will immediately dismiss them as nonsense. “Only wild-eyed conspiracy theorists believe such things,” they will say. However, there is one big problem: Carroll Quigley was no “wild-eyed conspiracy theorist.” Quite the contrary, Quigley was a prominent historian who specialized in studying the evolution of civilizations as well as secret societies. He studied history at Harvard University, where he earned his bachelor’s, master’s, and PhD degrees. He taught at Princeton University, Harvard University, and the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University. He worked as an advisor to the US Defense Department, the US Navy, and the Smithsonian Institution.<sup>[2]</sup>

In short, Carroll Quigley was a well-connected and well-credentialed member of Ivy League society. Based on his own words, and his training as a historian, it appears that he was chosen by members of a secret network to write the real history of their rise to power. However, as Quigley later realized, these individuals did not expect or intend for him to publish their secrets for the rest of the world to see. Shortly after publishing *Tragedy and Hope* in 1966, “the Network” apparently made its displeasure known to Quigley’s publisher, and the book he’d spent twenty years writing was pulled from the market. As Quigley recounts:

The original edition published by Macmillan in 1966 sold about 8800 copies and sales were picking up in 1968 when they “ran out of stock,” as they told me (but in 1974, when I went after them with a lawyer, they told me that they had destroyed the plates in 1968). They lied to me for six years, telling me that they would re-print when they got 2000 orders, which could never happen because they told anyone who asked that it was out of print and would not be reprinted. They denied this until I sent them Xerox copies of such replies to libraries, at which they told me it was a clerk’s error. In other words they lied to me but prevented me from regaining the publication rights by doing so. [Rights revert back to the copyright holder if the book is *out of print*, but not if the book is simply *out of stock*.]...Powerful influences in this country want me, or at least my work, suppressed.<sup>[3]</sup>

### **A Book like No Other**

If you decide to read *Tragedy and Hope*, the first thing you’re likely to notice is its size. At over thirteen hundred pages, approximately six hundred thousand words, and weighing in around five pounds, it’s safe to say that it wasn’t written for the casual reader. Nor was it written like a novel, bursting with scandalous and interesting conspiratorial tidbits on every page. Rather, as one would expect from an Ivy League historian, it is a long and often tedious read of which 95 percent consists of basic economic, political, and diplomatic history. However, within the other 5 percent, you’ll find some truly astonishing admissions about the existence, nature, and effectiveness of covert power.

In both *Tragedy and Hope* and *The Anglo-American Establishment*, Quigley reveals the existence of a secret network that formed to bring “all the habitable portions of the world” under its control.<sup>[4]</sup>

**I know of the operations of this network because I have studied it for twenty years and was permitted for two years, in the early 1960's, to examine its papers and secret records.** I have no aversion to it or to most of its aims and have, for much of my life, been close to it and to many of its instruments. I have objected, both in the past and recently, to a few of its policies...but in general my chief difference of opinion is that **it wishes to remain unknown**, and I believe its role in history is significant enough to be known.<sup>[5]</sup>

Quigley informs us that this wealthy “Anglophile network” cooperates with *any* group that can help it achieve its goal.<sup>[6]</sup> (This includes Communists, which, on the surface, would seem to be the sworn enemy of super-wealthy capitalist conspirators.) He chronicles how the Network formed in the late 1800s in England and immediately began creating front groups. By 1919, it had formed the Royal Institute of International Affairs (also known as Chatham House), and it went on to create other extremely powerful institutes within “the chief British dominions and in the United States.”<sup>[7]</sup> Hiding behind these front groups, the Network began secretly exercising its power.

In the United States the main institute was named the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), which Quigley described as “a front for J. P. Morgan and company.”<sup>[8]</sup> Before long, the Network expanded its operations; spreading like cancer into our universities, media, and especially government “foreign policy.”

On this basis, which was originally financial and goes back to George Peabody,<sup>[9]</sup> there grew up in the twentieth century a power structure between London and New York which penetrated deeply into university life, the press, and the practice of foreign policy. In England, the center was the Round Table Group, while in the United States it was J. P. Morgan and Company or its local branches in Boston, Philadelphia, and Cleveland.

The American branch of this “English Establishment” exerted much of its influence through five American newspapers (*The New York Times*, *New York Herald Tribune*, *Christian Science Monitor*, the *Washington Post*, and the lamented *Boston Evening Transcript*). In fact, the editor of the *Christian Science Monitor* was the chief American correspondent (anonymously)...It might be mentioned that the existence of this Wall Street, Anglo-American axis is quite obvious once it is pointed out.<sup>[10]</sup>

If the idea of powerful Wall Street insiders joining a secret foreign network to establish dominion over all “habitable portions of the world” and successfully penetrating “into university life, the press, and the practice of foreign policy” sounds like something you should have heard about, you’re right. But the secret to why you haven’t is contained in the story itself. (The successful “penetration” of universities, the press, and the government has proven quite useful to those who wish “to remain unknown.”)

### **The Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR)**

Quigley provides many examples of Network infiltration and manipulation. For instance, on pages 132 and 953 of *Tragedy and Hope*, he exposes yet another “front group” called the Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR). Because the IPR provides priceless insight into the deceptive nature and true power of the Network, we’ll briefly cover it here. Let’s begin with the final report of a US Senate investigation of the IPR. It stated, in part:

The IPR has been considered by the American Communist Party and by Soviet officials as an instrument of Communist policy, propaganda and military intelligence. The IPR disseminated and sought to popularize false information including information originating from Soviet and Communist sources...**The IPR was a vehicle used by the Communists to orient American far eastern policies toward Communist objectives.**<sup>[11]</sup>

To the average person, it sounds crazy to suggest that a network of super-wealthy capitalists is secretly conspiring to gain control of the world. But it sounds even crazier to accuse these same super-wealthy *capitalists* of using their tremendous wealth and power to “popularize” a system of

government (Communism) that would, in *theory* anyway, lead to the destruction of all their wealth and power. Surely, if such an unbelievable story were true, the free press would have shouted it from the rooftops...right? Wrong. Let's jump ahead for just a second and look at how Quigley described the Network-directed media cover up of the Senate investigation:

It soon became clear that people of immense wealth would be unhappy if the investigation went too far and that the "most respected" newspapers in the country, closely allied with these men of wealth, would not get excited enough about any [revelations] to make the publicity worth while, in terms of votes or campaign contributions.

As this demonstrates, the Network fully understands the importance of controlling public opinion. This also provides a glimpse into how it can do so. (If a disturbing truth isn't reported on by a "respected" news outlet, it might as well not exist. The vast majority of citizens will remain forever oblivious.) Additionally, in this particular case, any senator that insisted on taking the investigation "too far" would surely face a smear campaign by the same press that was ignoring the IPR story. Shortly thereafter, the "people of immense wealth" who ordered the smear campaign could be counted on to retaliate financially as well; by shifting all future "campaign contributions" to a more obedient candidate.

Needless to say, this type of *influence* can drastically affect how much attention an issue receives in the media. The merit and importance of a story will often take a backseat to the wishes of those who have the power to keep it quiet. More importantly, similar tactics of control can be applied in other areas as well. Keep that in mind as you read the following short summary of the IPR's activities, because the blueprint for directing perception and policies hasn't changed.

In 1951 the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Judiciary Committee...sought to show that China had been lost to the Communists by the deliberate actions of a group of academic experts on the Far East and Communist fellow travelers whose work in that direction was controlled and coordinated by the Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR). **The influence of the Communists in IPR is well established, but the patronage of Wall Street is less well known.**

The headquarters of the IPR and of the American Council of IPR were both in New York and were closely associated on an interlocking basis. Each spent about \$2.5 million dollars [nearly \$30 million when adjusted for inflation] over the quarter-century from 1925 to 1950, of which **about half, in each case, came from the Carnegie Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation** (which were themselves interlocking groups controlled by an alliance of Morgan and Rockefeller interests in Wall Street). Much of the rest...came from firms closely allied to these two Wall Street interests, such as Standard Oil, International Telephone and Telegraph, International General Electric, the National City Bank, and the Chase National Bank.<sup>[13]</sup>

On the Network's influence over Far East Policy:

There is considerable truth in the...contention that the American experts on China were organized into a single interlocking group which had a general consensus of a Leftish character. It is also true that this group, from its control of funds, academic recommendations, and research or publication opportunities, **could favor persons who accepted the established consensus and could injure, financially or in professional advancement, persons who did not accept it.** It is also true that the established group, by its influence on book reviewing in *The New York Times*, the *Herald Tribune*, the *Saturday Review*, a few magazines, including the "liberal weeklies," and in the professional journals, **could advance or hamper any specialist's career. It is also true that these things were done in the United States in regard to the Far East by the Institute of Pacific Relations, that this organization had been infiltrated by Communists, and by Communist sympathizers, and that much of this group's influence arose from its access to and control over the flow of funds from financial foundations to scholarly activities.**<sup>[14]</sup>

Awards for work in the Far Eastern area required approval or recommendation from members of IPR. Moreover, access to publication and recommendations to academic positions in the handful of great American universities concerned with the Far East required similar sponsorship. And, finally, **there can be little doubt that consultant jobs on Far Eastern matters in the State Department**

or other government agencies were largely restricted to IPR-approved people. The individuals who published, who had money, found jobs, were consulted, and who were appointed intermittently to government missions were those who were tolerant of the IPR line.<sup>[15]</sup>

Amazingly, after admitting all of this, Quigley somehow concludes:

The charges...accepted and proliferated by the neo-isolationists in the 1950's and by the radical Right in the 1960's, that China was "lost" because of this group, or that the members of this group were disloyal to the United States, or engaged in espionage, or were participants in a conscious plot, or that the whole group was controlled by Soviet agents or even by Communists, is not true.<sup>[16]</sup>

In Quigley's defense, the last part of his statement is obviously accurate: the group wasn't controlled by "Soviet agents or even Communists." Rather, according to Quigley himself, the group was controlled by a secret network of individuals who "have no aversion to cooperating with the Communists, or any other groups, and frequently does so."<sup>[17]</sup> But does this fact somehow exonerate them from a charge of "disloyalty"? Does it change the nature of their "conscious plot" to fabricate "consensus" on US policy toward China? Does it lessen their impact on the ultimate fate of China? No.

This is one of many cases where Quigley expresses a clear bias toward the Network and its "instruments." Clearly, this bias clouds his judgment. For instance, he repeatedly describes the Network's methodical deception of others, but apparently he never questions whether he too might have been deceived. He describes the carnage of their "mistaken" policies, but their "good intentions" are always accepted without a second thought.

Combine this favorable bias with his open contempt for "the radical Right" and "neo-isolationists," and poorly reasoned conclusions are nearly unavoidable. His casual dismissal of the IPR's role in the fate of China provides but one shining example. That Quigley can admit the IPR had tremendous financial and political power, a specific agenda, and actually *achieved* its goals, but then attribute the rise of Mao Zedong solely to the "incompetence and corruption" of Chiang Kai-shek's regime is difficult to explain.<sup>[18]</sup>

**Side Note:** It's worth mentioning that shortly after the creation of the IPR in 1925 the civil war in China conveniently began. One possible reason (conjecture) for why the Network might have preferred a Communist regime in China is found in the following statement:

From the broadest point of view the situation was this: The rivalry between the two super-Powers [the United States and Soviet Union] could be balanced and its tensions reduced only by the coming into existence of another Great Power on the land mass of Eurasia. There were three possibilities of this: a federated and prosperous Western Europe, India, or China. The first was essential; one of the others was highly desirable; and possibly all three might be achievable, **but in no case was it essential, or even desirable, for the new Great Power to be allied with the United States.**

**If the Soviet Union were boxed in by the allies of the United States, it would feel threatened by the United States, and would seek security by more intensive exploitation of its resources in a military direction,** with a natural increase in world tension. If, on the other hand, the Soviet Union were boxed in by at least two great neutral Powers, it could be kept from extensive expansion by (1) the initial strength of such great Powers and (2) the possibility that these Powers would ally with the United States if the Soviet Union put pressure on them.<sup>[19]</sup>

The "Great Game" of playing one side off another, engaging in balance-of-power politics, is discussed many times throughout Quigley's book. I've included the reference above only because it provides a potentially *logical* motive (at least logical in the Realpolitik sense of the word) for the Network's policy toward China.

Now, returning to Quigley's characterization of the IPR conspiracy and the subsequent lack of media coverage referenced earlier: As a result of continuing pressure, spurred on by the "radical Right,"

the Network soon found itself the target of two Congressional investigations. Quigley describes the second of these investigations, the Reece Committee, this way:

A congressional committee, following backward to their source the threads which led from admitted Communists like Whittaker Chambers, through Alger Hiss, and the Carnegie Endowment to Thomas Lamont and the Morgan Bank, fell into the whole complicated network of the interlocking tax-exempt foundations. The Eighty-third Congress in July 1953 set up a Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations with Representative B. Carroll Reece, of Tennessee, as chairman. It soon became clear that people of immense wealth would be unhappy if the investigation went too far and that the “most respected” newspapers in the country, closely allied with these men of wealth, would not get excited enough about any [revelations] to make the publicity worth while, in terms of votes or campaign contributions. An interesting report showing the Left-wing associations of the interlocking nexus of tax-exempt foundations was issued in 1954 rather quietly. Four years later, the Reece committee’s general counsel, Rene A. Wormser, wrote a shocked, but not shocking, book on the subject called *Foundations: Their Power and Influence*.<sup>[20]</sup>

Quigley then closes this chapter on the Network with the following:

The financial circles of London and those of the eastern United States...reflects **one of the most powerful influences in the twentieth-century American and world history**. The two ends of this English-speaking axis have sometimes been called, perhaps facetiously, the English and American Establishments. There is, however, a considerable degree of truth behind the joke, a truth which reflects a **very real power structure**. It is this power structure which the Radical Right in the United States has been attacking for years in the belief that they are attacking the Communists.<sup>[21]</sup>

Again, as Quigley points out, the “power structure” that he exposed isn’t loyal to Communism, or Socialism, or Fascism, or capitalism. The Network is happy to exploit the rhetoric of *any* movement or ideology, prop up any dictator or tyrant, and support any economic or political model, provided it serves their one overarching aim. That aim, to bring “all the habitable portions of the world under *their* control,” is as old as the lust for power itself. The death and suffering that their policies have already caused in pursuit of this aim are incalculable. Allowing them to continue as they have will only bring more of the same. As W. Cleon Skousen states in *The Naked Capitalist*:

As I see it, the great contribution which Dr. Carroll Quigley unintentionally made by writing *Tragedy and Hope* was to help the ordinary American realize the utter contempt which the network leaders have for ordinary people. Human beings are treated *en masse* as helpless puppets on an international chess board where giants of economic and political power subject them to wars, revolution, civil strife, confiscation, subversion, indoctrination, manipulation and deception.

Skousen hit the nail on the head. *Tragedy and Hope* revealed something even more important than “one of the most powerful influences in the twentieth-century American and world history.” It inadvertently revealed the *mind-set* of those who wield such power. It exposed the astonishing arrogance and hypocrisy of those who feel they have the right to rule billions of other human beings.

If there is one goal for this book, it is to expose the attitude and inherent nature of those who seek to dominate others. Don’t worry about remembering all of the dates and names that have been listed. Don’t worry about trying to recall all of the specific events. (All of that information will always be here if you need to find it again.) Instead, make it a point to simply verify the following: there is no lie that these men will not tell. There is no crime that they will not commit. The only measure of “right” and “wrong,” in their view, is whether their tactics succeed or fail. This might sound like hyperbole now, but by the end of this short book you will understand the truth of this assertion. (The Network’s game is won by those who calculate properly, and *moral* considerations only impede accurate calculation.)

### **An Introduction to Realpolitik**

Henry Kissinger personifies the essence of the Network mind-set. In his book *Diplomacy*, he introduces his readers to the amoral concepts of *raison d’état* (translated as “reasons of state,” or state interests) and *Realpolitik*. The basis of both concepts, Kissinger explains, is that individual *men* can be judged negatively on moral grounds, but governments cannot. When it comes to

government action, the only suitable judgment is based on whether or not the government achieves its ends.<sup>[22]</sup> Throughout his book, Kissinger praises those who are “wise enough” to govern by these concepts and practically mocks those who object on so-called “moral” grounds.

In praise of Cardinal de Richelieu (a seventeenth-century French statesman), Kissinger writes:

Though privately religious, [Richelieu] viewed his duties as minister in entirely secular terms. Salvation might be his personal objective, but to Richelieu, the statesman, it was irrelevant. “Man is immortal, his salvation is hereafter,” he once said. “The state has no immortality, its salvation is now or never.” In other words, states do not receive credit in any world for doing what is right; they are only rewarded for being strong enough to do what is necessary.<sup>[23]</sup>

As the King’s First Minister, [Richelieu] subsumed both religion and morality to *raison d’état*, his guiding light.<sup>[24]</sup>

Richelieu was indeed the manipulator described, and did use religion [as a tool of manipulation]. He would no doubt have replied that he had merely analyzed the world as it was, much as Machiavelli had. Like Machiavelli, he might well have preferred a world of more refined moral sensibilities, but he was convinced that history would judge his statesmanship by how well he had used the conditions and the factors he was given to work with.<sup>[25]</sup>

To clarify, according to statesman like Kissinger, the moral and legislative laws that limit the actions of ordinary men do not apply to a select few. To escape accountability, the ruling class needs only to invoke the name of the state. This, of course, is the same position held by past rulers who justified theft, deceit, torture, slavery, and slaughter *in the name of God*. The tactic has simply been modernized. Our new rulers have substituted “the state” for God. And conveniently for them, they *are* the state...and not just any state; they are the emerging, omnipotent, *global* state.

Though citizens have been conditioned to believe that their statesmen and government instruments are in place to serve *them*, nothing could be further from the truth. Both the instruments and statesmen are part of an institutional apparatus that exists for the benefit of those who control it. Put another way: the *state* is nothing more than a collection of men and women who direct the resources and policies of government. Contrary to popular belief, it is an *institution* that exists for its own sake, to ensure its own “salvation,” and to prevent the rise of anything that might challenge its power.

This is a harsh reality, and some will surely object on the grounds that the modern state is different. After all, it is built on the consent of the people. Democratic elections enable citizens to vote for who their leaders will be. They can choose from Republicans or Democrats. They can throw either out of office if they break their campaign promises.

But what if our so-called representative government is all a carefully crafted illusion? What if the Network *chooses* the candidates that we get to vote for? What if the Network’s “experts,” not the figureheads placed in official positions of power, are the ones who ultimately determine government policy? What if both political parties, right and left, are controlled by the exact same people? Quigley shines some light on this topic as well:

The argument that the two parties should represent opposed ideals and policies, one, perhaps, of the Right and the other of the Left, is a foolish idea acceptable only to doctrinaire and academic thinkers. Instead, **the two parties should be almost identical, so that the American people can “throw the rascals out” at any election without leading to any profound or extensive shifts in policy.**<sup>[26]</sup>

Quigley goes even further when describing the system that’s now emerging:

It is increasingly clear that, in the twentieth century, **the expert will replace...the democratic voter in control of the political system...Hopefully, the elements of choice and freedom may survive for the ordinary individual** in that he may be free to make a choice between two opposing political groups (even if these groups have little policy choice within the parameters of policy

established by the experts)...**in general, his freedom and choice will be controlled within very narrow alternatives.**<sup>[27]</sup>

Does that statement alarm you? Let's hope so.

## Facing Reality

Using Quigley's work as a starting point, this book will highlight how a small group of dominant men were able to secure control of local, national, continental, and even global policy. Though the power of this network is not complete, they are moving inexorably in that direction. Without increased awareness (and resistance), their unelected and unaccountable global state will become a reality. And though the illusion of national sovereignty might be maintained, the freedom of the world's citizens "will be controlled within very narrow alternatives."

Before moving on to the next chapter, here are some of the key insights that we will cover in this book:

- *Real* power is unelected. Politicians change, but the power structure does not. The Network operates behind the scenes, for its own benefit, without ever consulting those who are affected by its decisions.
- The Network is composed of individuals who *prefer* anonymity. They are "satisfied to possess the reality rather than the appearance of power."<sup>[28]</sup> This approach of secretly exercising power is common throughout history because it protects the conspirators from the consequences of their actions.
- A primary tactic for directing public opinion and "government" policy is to place willing servants in leadership positions of trusted institutions (media, universities, government, foundations, etc.). If there is ever a major backlash against a given policy, the servant can be replaced. This leaves both the institution and the individuals who actually direct its power unharmed.
- Historically, those who establish sophisticated systems of domination are not only highly intelligent; they are supremely deceptive and ruthless. They completely ignore the ethical barriers that govern a normal human being's behavior. They do not believe that the moral and legislative laws, which others are expected to abide by, apply to them. This gives them an enormous advantage over the masses that cannot easily imagine their mind-set.
- Advances in technology have enabled modern rulers to dominate larger and larger areas of the globe.<sup>[29]</sup> As a result, the *substance* of national sovereignty has already been destroyed, and whatever remains of its shell is being dismantled as quickly as possible. The new system they're building (which they themselves refer to as a *New World Order*), will trade the existing illusion of democratically directed government for their long-sought, "expert-directed," authoritarian technocracy.<sup>[30]</sup>

To be sure, it's difficult to accept these statements upon first hearing them. They challenge our world view and force us to reconsider everything that we've been taught to believe. It's much easier to dismiss these facts without further investigation; it's easier to accept comforting lies that alleviate our anxieties. But this, of course, is exactly the opposite of what must be done. If we allow ourselves to be manipulated, we empower the Network at our own expense.

Edward Bernays, perhaps more than anyone, helped establish the modern system of public manipulation. Drawing on the psychoanalytical techniques of his uncle, Sigmund Freud, Bernays became known as the father of propaganda.<sup>[31]</sup> His low opinion of the masses is best expressed in his own words. The following quotes are taken from his book *Propaganda*:

No serious sociologist any longer believes that the voice of the people expresses any divine or specially wise and lofty idea. The voice of the people expresses the mind of the people, and that



mind is made up for it by the group leaders...and by those persons who understand the manipulation of public opinion.

If we understand the mechanism and motives of the group mind, is it not possible to control and regiment the masses according to our will without their knowing about it?

Whatever attitude one chooses toward this condition...we are dominated by the small number of persons who understand the mental processes of the masses. It is they who pull the wires which control the public mind and contrive new ways to guide the world.

Political campaigns today are all sideshows...A presidential candidate may be "drafted" in response to "overwhelming popular demand," but it is well known that his name may be decided upon by half a dozen men sitting around a table in a hotel room.

The conscious manipulation of the masses is an important element in democratic society. Those who manipulate this unseen mechanism of society constitute an invisible government which is the true ruling power of our country.

Bertrand Russell, historian, philosopher, mathematician, cofounder of analytic philosophy,<sup>[32]</sup> and expert on the "scientific method" of human manipulation, describes a global "society of experts" this way:

The society of experts will control propaganda and education. It will teach loyalty to the world government, and make nationalism high treason. The government, being an oligarchy, will instill submissiveness into the great bulk of the population...It is possible that **it may invent ingenious ways of concealing its own power, leaving the forms of democracy intact, and allowing the plutocrats or politicians to imagine that they are cleverly controlling these forms...whatever the outward forms may be, all real power will come to be concentrated in the hands of those who understand the art of scientific manipulation.**<sup>[33]</sup>

Purveyors of the *democratic* illusion assure us that sophisticated *conspiracies* and powerful *secret societies* exist only in the mind of paranoids and extremists. Their assurances are a lie. With Quigley as our guide, we'll trace the origins and operations of the Network that, by "concealing its own power," seeks to secretly dominate our world.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---