

BANKNOTES

THE NELSON NASH INSTITUTE
MONTHLY NEWSLETTER

OCTOBER 2020

The Intellectual Foundation of the West's Slide into Tyranny, Part 2 of 3

Robert P. Murphy

As I explained last month in the first installment of this series, I am showing the reader that the various attacks on our liberties are part of a *coordinated strategy* that was conceived decades ago by avowed socialists. I realize that is a provocative claim, but it is easily demonstrated, as I show in this series. Last time, I focused on the founding of public schools in the US, and the agenda and legacy of the Fabian Society. In the present issue, I'll focus on *the long march through the institutions*, a strategy of socialist infiltration of society through a gradual takeover of the schools, churches, news media, music and art, and the cinema.

"The Long March Through the Institutions"

According to Wikipedia, the slogan was actually coined around 1967 by communist student activist Rudi Dutschke. In his 1972 book *Counterrevolution and Revolt*, Herbert Marcuse—a member of the so-called Frankfurt School who said his best student was the famous Marxist activist Angela Davis—endorsed this strategy:

To extend the base of the student movement, Rudi Dutschke has proposed the strategy of the long march through the institutions: working against the established institutions while working within them, but not simply by 'boring from within', rather by 'doing the job', learning (how to program and read computers, how to teach at all levels of education, how to use the mass media, how to organize production, how to recognize and eschew planned obsolescence, how to design, et cetera), and at the same time preserving one's own consciousness in working with others. (Marcuse 1972)

However, even though Dutschke may have been the first to coin the slogan in the late 1960s, the strategy itself was developed decades earlier by the Italian communist Antonio Gramsci—whom Dutschke himself credits as being an inspiration for his own views. This strategy of ushering communism into the U.S. through a gradual takeover of the cultural institutions is also associated with the so-called Frankfurt School. The rest of this article will elaborate on

IN THIS MONTH'S ISSUE:

The Intellectual Foundation of the West's Slide into Tyranny, Part 2 of 3

Part Two: The Global "Lock Step Scenario."

Becoming Your Own Banker, PART II Lesson 3 The Golden Rule



NELSON
NASH
INSTITUTE

2957 Old Rocky Ridge Road
Birmingham, Alabama 35243
BankNotes archives:
infinitebanking.org/banknotes

Founder - R. Nelson Nash

Editor - David Stearns

david@infinitebanking.org

these individuals.

Prison Notebooks: Antonio Gramsci

Antonio Gramsci was a founding member of the Italian Communist Party, who was imprisoned by Mussolini's Fascist government in 1926. From 1929-1935, Gramsci wrote a series of essays on culture, religion, history, economics, and political philosophy, which were published under the title *Prison Notebooks*.

Gramsci was a Marxist, but recognized that things were not progressing according to the dialectical laws of history. According to Marx, feudalism had given rise to mercantilism which in turn had birthed capitalism, and soon enough the material forces should have burst asunder giving rise to socialism—whether or not any of the comrades helped it along.

Gramsci theorized that there was something holding back the revolution in the advanced Western societies, such as Germany and the United States, preventing the proletariat classes in these countries from rising up as they had done in the backward Russia starting in 1917.

Gramsci argued for the concept of “**hegemony**,” in which the elites used various organs of society in order to manufacture “**common sense**” that supported the capitalist system.

Although it's natural for fans of the free market to recoil from *anything* written by a Marxist, Gramsci's analysis is actually very similar to that of Étienne de la Boétie, who is a hero to modern Rothbardians. In his 1576 *Discourse on Voluntary Servitude*, de la Boétie argues that the political authorities only have the power that their subjects grant them. After all, the ruling class is hopelessly outnumbered—they aren't like the three Kryptonians dressed in black in *Superman II*; they could easily be overthrown if the people suddenly decided to turn on them.

However, even though *ultimately* the people have the power, and all governments are popular in one sense, there is still of course an important sense in which governments rely on *coercion* to maintain their power. This is why a modern-day fan of la Boétie could (a) object to unjust, coercive government while

(b) maintaining that education alone can win the day, if only the masses could be made to see the case for freedom.

Now back to Gramsci. He too recognized this subtle interplay between coercion and consent—anticipating Noam Chomsky's famous concept (and book of the same title) of *Manufacturing Consent*. He argued that the exploitative capitalist structure was maintained through a web of cultural hegemony supported by various institutions. This is why the average worker in a capitalist society would think his status as a wage-slave was just “common sense”—because his entire worldview had been molded by school, church, the media, etc.

Consequently, Gramsci wrote that the socialists could only take power if they first infiltrated and hijacked these various institutions. As a famous quotation attributed to Gramsci puts it: “*Socialism is precisely the religion that must overwhelm Christianity...In the new order, Socialism will triumph by first capturing the culture via infiltration of schools, universities, churches, and the media by transforming the consciousness of society.*”¹

As this necessarily brief sketch of Gramsci should underscore, those of us who “see commies everywhere” aren't being paranoid, as the smug critics would have you believe. No, there really are commies everywhere, and they're simply following the written plan.

“Cultural Marxists”: The Frankfurt School

The “Frankfurt School” garnered its name because it originally started out as the Institute for Social Research at Goethe University in Frankfurt, Germany. Founded in 1923 during the Weimar Republic, the intellectuals running the Institute decided in 1933 to move it out of Germany, because of the rising threat from Hitler's regime. They first went through Geneva and ultimately landed in New York City—following the same path away from the Nazis as Ludwig von Mises would take.

The big idea associated with the Frankfurt School is the area of Critical Theory (with capital letters). In

addition to Gramsci, another of its major influences was the work on “reification” of the Hungarian Marxist Georg Lukács (whose views are too difficult to summarize here but advanced readers can consult in the endnotes²). Some of the major thinkers associated with the Frankfurt School are Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Erich Fromm, and Herbert Marcuse. For our purposes, we will draw on the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy for a quick introduction to Critical Theory:

Critical Theory has a narrow and a broad meaning in philosophy and in the history of the social sciences. “Critical Theory” in the narrow sense designates several generations of German philosophers and social theorists in the Western European Marxist tradition known as the Frankfurt School. According to these theorists, a “critical” theory may be distinguished from a “traditional” theory according to a specific practical purpose: a theory is critical to the extent that it seeks human “emancipation from slavery”, acts as a “liberating ... influence”, and works “to create a world which satisfies the needs and powers” of human beings (Horkheimer 1972, 246). Because such theories aim to explain and transform all the circumstances that enslave human beings, many “critical theories” in the broader sense have been developed. They have emerged in connection with the many social movements that identify varied dimensions of the domination of human beings in modern societies. In both the broad and the narrow senses, however, a critical theory provides the descriptive and normative bases for social inquiry aimed at decreasing domination and increasing freedom in all their forms.

...

It follows from Horkheimer's definition that a critical theory is adequate only if it meets three criteria: it must be explanatory, practical, and normative, all at the same time. That is, it must explain what is wrong with current social reality, identify the actors to change it, and provide both clear norms for criticism and achievable

practical goals for social transformation. Any truly critical theory of society, as Horkheimer further defined it in his writings as Director of the Frankfurt School's Institute for Social Research, “has as its object human beings as producers of their own historical form of life” (Horkheimer 1993, 21). In light of the practical goal of identifying and overcoming all the circumstances that limit human freedom, the explanatory goal could be furthered only through interdisciplinary research that includes psychological, cultural, and social dimensions, as well as institutional forms of domination. [Bold added.]³

Those readers familiar with modern leftist intellectuals and their tendency to view *everything*—including not just labor contracts but also the Super Bowl and Valentine’s Day—through the lens of “patriarchal white supremacy” will recognize the antecedents of this approach in the Frankfurt School.

To avoid confusing the reader, let me be clear that it is the *opponents* of the Frankfurt School and their modern-day intellectual heirs, who call them “cultural Marxists.” The defenders of the Frankfurt School thinkers argue in contrast that this terminology represents paranoid (and anti-Semitic) right-wing fear-mongering.

In any event, the term “cultural Marxist” signifies that these intellectuals moved beyond a critique of economic class relations in capitalist society, and instead infused a “struggle” dynamic into other areas of the culture, seeing the powerful exploit the weak in various contexts. Rather than focusing exclusively on the worker being exploited by the boss, the cultural Marxists also teach wives that they are being oppressed by their husbands, children that they are being oppressed by their parents and teachers, blacks and other minorities that they are being oppressed by the majority, and churchgoers that they are suckers being ripped off by their pastors.

Herbert Marcuse and Repressive Tolerance

To show how much the thinkers of the Frankfurt School laid the intellectual foundations of today’s slide into tyranny, let us extensively quote from a famous essay

by Herbert Marcuse, originally published in 1965.⁴ (As we noted earlier, one of Marcuse's claims to fame at least among Americans is that he was the professor of Angela Davis, claiming that she was his star pupil.) Here is its opening paragraph:

*THIS essay examines the idea of tolerance in our advanced industrial society. **The conclusion reached is that the realization of the objective of tolerance would call for intolerance toward prevailing policies, attitudes, opinions, and the extension of tolerance to policies, attitudes, and opinions which are outlawed or suppressed. In other words, today tolerance appears again as what it was in its origins, at the beginning of the modern period--a partisan goal, a subversive liberating notion and practice. Conversely, what is proclaimed and practiced as tolerance today, is in many of its most effective manifestations serving the cause of oppression.*** [Marcuse, bold added.]

Notice right off the bat we are in trouble. Later on we get more specifics on what Marcuse opposes:

Tolerance toward that which is radically evil now appears as good because it serves the cohesion of the whole on the road to affluence or more affluence. The toleration of the systematic moronization of children and adults alike by publicity and propaganda, the release of destructiveness in aggressive driving, the recruitment for and training of special forces, the impotent and benevolent tolerance toward outright deception in merchandizing, waste, and planned obsolescence are not distortions and aberrations, they are the essence of a system which fosters tolerance as a means for perpetuating the struggle for existence and suppressing the alternatives. The authorities in education, morals, and psychology are vociferous against the increase in juvenile delinquency; they are less vociferous against the proud presentation, in word and deed and pictures, of ever more powerful missiles, rockets, bombs--the mature delinquency of a whole civilization.

Notice that there is much for a libertarian reader to sympathize with; we too object to horrible government schools and the warfare of the modern American empire. But Marcuse isn't going to rest content with leveling criticism against this oppressive system. No, he eventually concludes with this:

*I have tried to show how the changes in advanced democratic societies, which have undermined the basis of economic and political liberalism, have also altered the liberal function of tolerance. The tolerance which was the great achievement of the liberal era is still professed and (with strong qualifications) practiced, while the economic and political process is subjected to an ubiquitous and effective administration in accordance with the predominant interests. The result is an objective contradiction between the economic and political structure on the one side, and the theory and practice of toleration on the other. The altered social structure tends to weaken the effectiveness of tolerance toward dissenting and oppositional movements and to strengthen conservative and reactionary forces. **Equality of tolerance becomes abstract, spurious. With the actual decline of dissenting forces in the society, the opposition is insulated in small and frequently antagonistic groups who, even where tolerated within the narrow limits set by the hierarchical structure of society, are powerless while they keep within these limits. But the tolerance shown to them is deceptive and promotes co-ordination.** And on the firm foundations of a co-ordinated society all but closed against qualitative change, tolerance itself serves to contain such change rather than to promote it.*

These same conditions render the critique of such tolerance abstract and academic, and the proposition that the balance between tolerance toward the Right and toward the Left would have to be radically redressed in order to restore the liberating function of tolerance becomes only an unrealistic speculation. Indeed, such a redressing seems to be tantamount to the establishment of a "right of resistance" to the point of subversion.

*There is not, there cannot be any such right for any group or individual against a constitutional government sustained by a majority of the population. **But I believe that there is a "natural right" of resistance for oppressed and overpowered minorities to use extralegal means if the legal ones have proved to be inadequate. Law and order are always and everywhere the law and order which protect the established hierarchy; it is nonsensical to invoke the absolute authority of this law and this order against those who suffer from it and struggle against it--not for personal advantages and revenge, but for their share of humanity. There is no other judge over them than the constituted authorities, the police, and their own conscience. If they use violence, they do not start a new chain of violence but try to break an established one. Since they will be punished, they know the risk, and when they are willing to take it, no third person, and least of all the educator and intellectual, has the right to preach them abstention.*** [Marcuse, bold added.]

As the long quotation above illustrates, we should not be shocked by today's reporters telling us about "mostly peaceful protests" as the city burns in the background. These media figures are simply enacting the playbook that the Frankfurt School thinkers developed decades ago.

Conclusion

This essay has sketched the role of Marxist (or formerly Marxist) intellectuals in providing explicitly written strategies for ushering communism into the West by first infiltrating its various institutions. In my next and final installment in this series, I will explain two more pieces of the puzzle: the role of postmodernism and identity politics in the coordinated assault on the Western heritage of Judeo-Christian values and Enlightenment rationalism.

Endnotes

1 This is a famous quotation attributed to Gramsci by various sources. See for example Roger Kiska's article for the Acton Institute in 2019, available at: <https://www.acton.org/religion-liberty/volume-29-number-3/antonio-gramscis-long-march-through-history>.

2 For a summary of Lukács' thought see: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/lukacs/>

3 See Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy entry on Critical Theory at: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/critical-theory/>

PART TWO: THE GLOBAL "LOCK STEP SCENARIO"

The World Health Organization, Dr. Anthony Fauci, Bill Gates, and The Rockefeller Foundation.

L. Carlos Lara

Bob and I wrote "HOW PRIVATIZED BANKING REALLY WORKS -- Integrating Austrian Economics with The Infinite Banking Concept," in 2010. It was only two short years after the 2008 financial crisis that we all know shook most of the financial world. For those of you that have read this book, you know that it covers a lot of historical and economic ground, including the money dishonesty of the emperor Caesar, whose corrupt actions eventually led to the fall of the Roman Empire.

More than once this year during the coronavirus pandemic I have thought about our United States and its eerie resemblance to the Rome of centuries ago. We are certainly not as old as that ancient civilization which spanned a period of one thousand years, yet the U.S. has been the strongest world power since the second world war. And, it's an extremely wealthy nation, measured against all other countries in modern times. So, in that sense there are certainly some similarities.

Yet, how many of us, even with the disasters of just this year alone, can actually be convinced that this great country can easily and quickly be reduced to rubble? I would bet, not many. Why do you suppose it's like that? Is it possible that we may have fallen asleep at the wheel, not paying enough attention, or simply resting too much on our laurels? Actually, it's neither. It's the coronavirus pandemic and what all has come with it.

I am reminding ourselves of Augustine of Hippo once again, and especially of what he wrote in 410 A.D. in his greatest treatise *The City of God*. This profound

account was actually written as ancient Rome was being plundered and burned to the ground by invading barbarians who literally began destroying the known civilized world of that time.

My main point is simply this. Augustine, with great amazement, wrote that citizens of Rome could not bring themselves to believe, or even accept, that Rome, with all those beautiful monuments and all that grandeur, was actually collapsing before them—a sobering reminder that it can easily happen in the same way to our own United States, and all of it in the blink of an eye.

So, with these opening comments we pick up our narrative once again where we left off as we introduced to you **Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.**, son of the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy (assassinated in 1968) and nephew of the late President John F. Kennedy (assassinated in 1963). This particular Kennedy has not been a politician, but rather an environmental lawyer. He has spent the last 15 years advocating for proper safety testing of vaccines. He has also achieved an enormous \$2 billion victory against Bayer's Monsanto and its popular weed killer, Round Up, for causing Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma in consumers.

In view of the current coronavirus pandemic, he recently appealed and addressed the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) with an overture signed by 80 people, including theologians, journalists, prelates, doctors, lawyers, and associations. It is a call to action against the violence in view of the recent injustices to our liberties, including the loss of safety for our children (and grandchildren), and an appeal for dignity to the Church of God.

Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., delivered his recent and most powerful speech ever made, not in the United States to Americans where it would certainly be silenced by the media, but in Berlin to a receptive crowd of 38,000 Europeans, (September 1, 2020).¹ Please watch and listen.

In this video of his speech you can sense the *sincerity* of Kennedy and his desire to eradicate the godlessness we are all experiencing. The one important virtue we should notice about him is that he has so much

legitimate and damaging evidence against the measures being used to regulate the coronavirus pandemic and all dangerous vaccines in general.

The amount of information Kennedy has amassed on the various subjects in this article is massive and often technical. There is entirely too much material to cover in a few short sessions. Our readers need to recognize that at times I was forced to paraphrase some of Kennedy's thoughts on certain topics in order to help myself make sense of it and then fit the information on the page. Hopefully, I was careful enough not to misquote him.

When I began looking into Kennedy's background, the man and his vaccine findings, it was at the beginning of our forced quarantined lockdowns earlier this year and no one seemed to know much about him. Most of what I found on him was mostly negative and he was presented as an individual you should not trust. Yet, in a few short months he seems to have catapulted into prominence.

This global pandemic has forced me to rely on my instincts when assessing Robert F. Kennedy Jr. I trust that you will need to do the same. We are all looking for honest and believable answers that will help us take the right actions. Listen to his most current interview with Dr. Ron Paul and weigh the evidence presented for yourself.²

Now, in this THREE-PART **LMR** series, we continue the "Global Lock Step Scenario," highlighting Kennedy's critical vaccine findings and how, and why, he allows us to take aim against The World Health Organization, Dr. Anthony Fauci, Bill Gates, and the Rockefeller Foundation.

Vaccines Are Not Safety Tested

In an interview with Kennedy, special correspondent for "Inside the Vatican," Stefanie Stark, says that Kennedy addresses the safety and efficacy of vaccines by bluntly telling his audience that vaccines are not safety tested at all. He says that "it's an artifact of CDC's (CDC stands for "Center for Disease Control and Prevention") legacy of the public health service, which was originally a quasi-military agency. That is why CDC officials have military ranks such as

"Surgeon General."³

He went on to say that years ago *"the vaccine program was originally developed as a national security defense against biological attacks on our country by the Russians or other Cold War enemies. The objective of the military was to manufacture and deploy a vaccine very quickly to 200 million Americans without regulatory impediments. The military generals understood that testing medicines for safety takes years, so they opted to call vaccines by a different name—"Biologics"—and permanently exempt biologics from safety testing."*⁴

As a result of that decision, Kennedy says, that the 72 vaccines now mandated for American children have never been safety tested with a double-blind placebo. Consequently, Kennedy argues that these control groups all have tainted results making them dangerous and invalid. (For the sake of completeness, the reader should know that defenders of the current system largely agree that there typically isn't a double-blind placebo study used to test the safety and efficacy of new vaccines. They will say this makes perfect sense, however, because it would be unethical to randomly deny a certain number of children access to vaccines when we "know" they are so important for their health. The defenders of the current system argue that there is, nonetheless, plenty of peer-reviewed research giving indirect evidence on vaccines, even though they admittedly lack double-blind placebo studies in many cases.)

More importantly, Kennedy questions our rights to force healthy children to take risky medicine against their will? He argues that the question has already been answered in numerous treaties and universally accepted ethical statements like the "Siracusa Principals," the "Nuremberg Charter," and the "United Nations Charter," which state that no government has a right to force citizens to take medicines against their will. But, you might ask, "What about forcing these medications on people while considering the importance of, not so much the individual, but the benefits of the greater good?"

Kennedy's answer to that question is essentially this:. Once we begin telling doctors that they are no

longer functioning to serve the individual patient, but rather society as a whole, we enter a slippery slope of troublesome issues. Case in point are the elderly. "We know that 80% of our nation's medical costs go to treat senior citizens during their last years of life. It could be argued that letting those citizens simply die, or even killing them, would serve the greatest good."⁵

He mentions China as an example. We all know that Chinese parents who gave birth to more than one child was working against what the authorities deemed was the greater good. As a result, the government implemented a policy of forced abortions. That was the Chinese law up through 2013 (when it began to be phased over the provinces to a *two*-child policy over a couple of years), and Kennedy stresses that these are the types of scary places where you eventually end up, once that way of thinking is paramount.

Is the COVID-19 vaccine safe?

Robert F. Kennedy, Jr, says *no*. He says that 30 years of experience with the coronavirus and its peculiarities has taught doctors and experienced medical staff that any attempts to make a coronavirus vaccine has always resulted in making vaccinated people sicker. There are dire warnings on this subject already coming from qualified experts like Dr. Paul Offit, Dr. Peter Hotez, Dr. Ivan Lipkin, and even Anthony Fauci himself, who, according to Kennedy, have already put the public on notice that a coronavirus vaccine may end up making people sicker rather than keeping them safe from the disease.

Why does Fauci seem so eager to introduce the new virus vaccine? Is it the billions that stand to be made? But it's not just Fauci, it's also Bill Gates and his foundation. Only recently has there been a growing mountain of evidence starting to implicate these two individuals in their efforts to control the sale and distribution of "medications" and vaccines. Most of us by now have come to recognize the scenario, and also that the push back against Fauci and Gates is not coming only from Robert F. Kennedy, Jr..

Is COVID-19 a Wild Virus? Or, was it Created?

The truth is that before the forced lockdowns, most non-medical individuals knew very little about vaccines and how they operated. I was certainly one of them. The initial scare, we came to understand was essential in making us all heed the government lockdown orders. This left us grappling for questions we could not answer. Then the death tallies began mounting on television by the news media, immediately followed by the violence that only scared people all the more. But these men, Fauci and Gates, already knew what was coming and were very prepared when the pandemic hit earlier this year. Watch this YouTube video of Bill Gates's 2015 Ted Talk, which will give you a great overview of how prepared he really was. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6Af6b_wyiwI

Furthermore, and most recently, a "Columbia Journalism Review"⁶ revealed the following facts: Bill Gates' Foundation has steered over \$250 million to major news outlets, including the BBC, NPR, NBC, Al Jazeera, and the *New York Times*, just to mention a few of the 19 press outlets on the extensive list. Consequently, these purchased and basically brain-dead news outlets gave the public zero information during the heat of the pandemic lockdown. What they did instead was to point the spotlight on Anthony Fauci and also represent Bill Gates as a public health expert—despite his lack of medical training, or regulatory experience.

In addition, Gates's army of "independent" fact checkers help silence his detractors and report them as conspiracy theorists. This allows Gates to continue to champion "biometric chips, vaccine identification systems, satellite surveillance, and COVID vaccines," as an editorial by RFK Jr. asserts.⁷

Tim Schwab, freelance journalist for *Columbia Journalism Review* (CJR),⁸ says that twenty years ago, journalists criticized Bill Gates and his philanthropic endeavors as simply being a scheme to enrich himself. Or, as a PR exercise to salvage his battered reputation following Microsoft's bruising antitrust battle with the Department of Justice. But today, Bill Gates and his foundation are portrayed by most publications worldwide with only glowing reports of good works—until we start looking at recent developments.

A Closer Look at Gates and Fauci.

The first COVID-19 vaccine trial began in mid-March 2020. This trial was funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and was developed by scientists at the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) in partnership with the pharmaceutical company Moderna, Inc. According to Kennedy, the concern in the absence of public awareness, is that such vaccines operate by altering DNA expression many times using aborted fetal tissue.

Kennedy explains that fetal tissue has also been rendered carcinogenic, which means that it can cause cancer. According to Kennedy, "a lot of the fetal tissue these vaccines use was taken from a 14-week-old child who in 1966 was forcibly aborted from a woman in a mental institution. There are DNA snippets from that child that are injected with the vaccines. And we have no idea what the implications are for sexuality when male DNA is injected into female babies, and for cancer when tumor cells are injected into healthy babies. There is a possibility that they are permanently altering the human genome with the mass vaccination of this child's DNA."⁹ These are scary issues putting aside the moral implications, Kennedy says.

But, Kennedy informs us that there is such a thing as "created organisms" that are very virulent and extremely transmissible and this is the type of research that the Wuhan lab was conducting in order to develop vaccines. Kennedy says that the Wuhan lab published many studies on them. These studies are also sometimes known as "gain of function" organisms, but are highly controversial because they train the virus to jump several types of species leading to the infection of rats, and then they grow them into human lung tissue.

These experiments, according to Kennedy, were known by many scientists to be extremely risky because sometimes the deadly virus would escape the lab. Nevertheless, Anthony Fauci continued to be a huge champion of gain of function organisms until a petition of 200 scientists angrily denounced the experiments as too dangerous and the U.S. government during President Obama's administration shut them

down in 2014. Fauci, according to Kennedy, simply moved his operation to the Wuhan Lab and started funding gain of function studies again in Wuhan for the same purpose—to develop a coronavirus.

A NEWSWEEK article dated March 28, 2020, by correspondent Fred Guterl expanded on the work in question. *"A decade ago, during a controversy over gain-of-function research on bird-flu viruses, Dr. Fauci played an important role in promoting the work. He argued that the research was worth the risk it entailed because it enables scientists to make preparations, such as investigating possible anti-viral modifications, that could be used if and when a pandemic occurred.*

...The work entailed risk that worried seasoned researchers. More than 200 scientists called for the work to be halted. The problem, they said, is that it increased the likelihood that a pandemic would occur through a laboratory accident.

*...'We have serious doubts about whether these experiments should be conducted at all,' wrote Tom Inglesby of Johns Hopkins University and Marc Lipsitch of Harvard. 'With deliberations kept behind closed doors, none of us will have the opportunity to understand how the government arrived at these decisions or to judge the rigor and integrity of that process.'*¹⁰

Yes, getting to the truth seems to be our problem as well. We never really know who is making the vital decisions. We are simply told what to do and ordered to keep our masks on.

You may have asked yourself if it was possible for one lab in Wuhan, China, to have accidentally or intentionally released a contagious virus on the world? Kennedy in his interview with Stefanie Stark of "Inside the Vatican," explained that the U.S. funding ran out on Wuhan on September 30, 2019, and the scientists there were dismissed.

The spread of the virus accidentally or intentionally in this way could have given those now unemployable scientists continued job security, Kennedy explained. *"That's actually what happened with the Anthrax virus in 2001. All of the Anthrax attacks on the U.S.*

*Congress, when traced back, were coming from the psychiatrist who was the head of the Anthrax program that had been defunded. He apparently committed suicide as the FBI closed in on him.'*¹¹

More Problems With Vaccine Safety

This next topic discussing Kennedy's vaccine findings is immensely controversial, and covered with conspiracy theory claims. This is possibly due to a little-known arrangement the government provides the pharmaceutical companies and vaccine makers. In a May 14, 2020 article, Dr. James Hamblin, staff writer on health issues for the ATLANTIC magazine, explains that over the past three decades, the U.S. government has paid more than \$4 billion to people who claim to have been harmed by vaccines.

The irony is that prior to 1970 an injured party would typically sue the pharmaceutical company, or vaccine maker, for payment until a new law in 1986 changed all of that. All of this started soon after polio began to fade from memory and the public began to worry about vaccine related injuries. During the 1970s through the 1980s, Dr. James Hamblin says that the average claim increased from \$10 million to \$47 million. These findings actually measure up against one of Kennedy's primary claims—that you cannot (even to this day) make a safe vaccine.

In light of these mounting lawsuits, manufacturers of medications and vaccines began to withdraw from the business as profits dropped against shareholder expectations. *"In the midst of this, public-health officials grew concerned about the stability of the country's continued supply of existing vaccines—and the dwindling business incentive for companies to invest in developing new ones. It was on these grounds that Congress passed the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986 (also known as the Vaccine Act), indemnifying drug companies from further lawsuits.'*¹²

By the U.S. government having indemnified the pharmaceutical companies that marketed vaccines and medications, the business became highly profitable once again. But, Kennedy says, that these new government measures have opened the door to massive fraud and corruption.

Corruption and The World Health Organization (WHO).

Richard Gale and Dr. Gary Null are frequent contributors of the Center for Research on Globalization and the Global Research website.¹³ Speaking on the coronavirus, they both stress that the ultimate international authority for infectious diseases is the World Health Organization (WHO). The WHO is the final word in determining whether the spread of a serious pathogen is ruled as a pandemic or not. On matters of global health, the WHO holds dominance.

Gale and Null explain that we are currently being told by the Director General of the WHO that the solution for curtailing the Covid-19 pandemic are self-isolation, distancing, masks, and, for those in acute stages of infection, ventilation. To date there is no drug that has been found to be universally safe and effective. (This is all very familiar information and is exactly the narrative we generally get from television news).

However, Gale and Null point out that all efforts with massive funding are being devoted to rapidly getting a coronavirus vaccine on the market. And in this effort, the WHO is a close ally and advocate in the US's federal health system, notably the CDC and the national Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) headed by Dr. Anthony Fauci. (This is the organization we earlier learned from Robert F. Kennedy Jr., that makes vaccines that use DNA expression using aborted fetal tissue).

But the most blistering condemnation leveled against the WHO by this Global Research team has to do with the institute's incompetence and misinformation about the medical risks of vaccines and other health-related chemicals. Most people assume the WHO acts independently from private commercial and national government interests for the welfare of the world's population. However, they stress, that at best this is an assumption.

The organization has been accused of conflicts of interests with private pharmaceutical companies and mega-philanthropic organizations such as Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, as well as being riddled

with political alliances, ideologies, and profiteering motives.

But at this point we have just skimmed the surface of the many other harmful activities that the WHO has been involved in for years. There are serious matters of double standards of vaccine safety, illegal vaccine experiments of depopulation efforts with vaccines, sterilization of children in India, Africa, Nicaragua, the Philippines, Kenya, and countless other third world countries. Millions of children have been infected, injured and/or died. Dr. Jacob Puliyel, of the Indian government's National Technical Advisory Group on Immunization concluded, "It is as if the deaths of children in low (and middle) income countries are of no consequence."

We will look deeper into these issues in my next and final issue in this series. In the meantime, bear in mind that the World Health Organization (WHO), along with the Bill Gates and Anthony Fauci at the National Institute for Allergy and Infectious Disease, are the two individuals/people at the helm of developing a COVID-19 vaccine. They are well aware of the fact that there is a lot of money at stake, money that they stand to make, and at the moment they are in complete control. Just how safe should we feel about that?

In the next *LMR* issue: Part Three, The Conclusion "The Global Lock Step Scenario," Bill Gates and the Rockefeller Foundation.

Resources

1. Robert F. Kennedy Jr., Speaks At Protest in Berlin About 'Elitist Plan to Enslave Us All', More than 38,000 take part in rally, August 29, 2020, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IdNp-fJATbU>
2. Dr. Ron Paul, interviews Robert F. Kennedy Jr., on the Liberty Report, September 25, 2020 https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=6&v=_kJdOtnBUcw&feature=emb_logo
3. Stefanie Stark, Special Correspondent for "Inside the Vatican," Interviews Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., June/July 2020 Issue <https://insidethevatican.com/magazine/robert-f-kennedy-jr-on-coming-covid-vaccines/>
4. Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., on "Biologics." <https://insidethevatican.com/magazine/robert-f-kennedy-jr-on-coming-covid-vaccines/>
5. Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., Answer to "The Greater Good." [https://insidethevatican.com/magazine/robert-f-kennedy-jr-on-](https://insidethevatican.com/magazine/robert-f-kennedy-jr-on-coming-covid-vaccines/)

coming-covid-vaccines/

6. Press in His Pocket: Bill Gates Buys Media to Control the Messaging, Article by "Columbia Journalism Review." <https://www.cjr.org/criticism/gates-foundation-journalism-funding.php>

7. Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., "Press in His Pocket: Bill Gates Buys Media to Control the Messaging," <https://childrenshealthdefense.org/news/press-in-his-pocket-bill-gates-buys-media-to-control-the-messaging/>

8. Tim Schwob, Freelance Journalist for the "Columbia Journalism Review (CJK)," confirms "Ethical Issues—With Billionaire Philanthropists' Bankrolling the News," article, <https://www.cjr.org/criticism/gates-foundation-journalism-funding.php>

9. Robert F. Kennedy Jr., "Explains the Dangers of Fetal Tissue in Vaccines," interview article for "Inside the Vatican" June/July 2020 Issue, <https://insidethevatican.com/magazine/robert-f-kennedy-jr-on-coming-covid-vaccines/>

10. NEWSWEEK, Dr. Fauci Backed Risky Coronavirus Research, ARTICLE BY: FRED CUTERL, April 28, 2020, <https://www.newsweek.com/dr-fauci-backed-controversial-wuhan-lab-millions-us-dollars-risky-coronavirus-research-1500741>

11. Robert F. Kennedy Jr., Explains the Anthrax Virus in 2001, interview with, Stefanie Stark, Special Correspondent with "Inside the Vatican" June-July 2020 Issue, <https://insidethevatican.com/magazine/robert-f-kennedy-jr-on-coming-covid-vaccines/>

12. Government Indemnification for Drug Companies, By: James Hamblin, Staff Writer for the ATLANTIC magazine, May 14, 2020, <https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2019/05/vaccine-safety-program/589354/>

13. Richard Gale and Dr. Gary Null, Center for Research on Globalization, Explain the World Health Organization (WHO) and Dr. Anthony Fauci, Article, May 10, 2020, https://www.globalresearch.ca/world-health-organization-deserves-distrust/5712347?utm_campaign=magnet&utm_source=article_page&utm_medium=related_articles



Eighteenth in a monthly series of Nelson Nash's personally written Becoming Your Own Banker® lessons. We will continue these lessons until we have gone through the entire book.

PART II Lesson 3 The Golden Rule

Content: Page 31, Becoming Your Own Banker Fifth Edition

The Golden Rule – Those who have the Gold make the rules! We all have the tendency to chuckle when we see this perversion of a principle that was learned in childhood, one that serves us very well – that we should do unto others as we would have them do unto us! But this corruption is very true, also! I think that it is a pity that it is not often looked upon with favor. Perhaps it is because we have almost lost the concept of what capitalism is all about. The common man has become so infatuated with living for today that the importance of saving – of creating wealth – is all but a lost value. The American savings rate is miserably low. At the time of this writing it has been negative for over eighteen months.

As a result, someone else must provide the capital that is necessary to sustain our way of life. This strategy carries with it a very high cost, and we all suffer the consequences. It all begins with faulty premises.

Let me build the case this way – what could be more idyllic than a marriage of Japanese capital and Mexican labor? Here is one group of people who need employment desperately and there is another group that has more money than you can imagine! If we can only get them together on a project, it would be paradise!

A number of years back Panasonic wanted to build a plant in Mexico to solve the obvious equation. But, in the infinite wisdom of the Mexican government at that time, they required that Mexicans should own 51% of the business. That means Mexicans control the business.

The typical Japanese strategy runs something like this – you put money into a business, and you should expect to lose money for five years. When you start making money you should plow it all back into the business for five more years. Only after this time should you expect to take money out of the business. But, the typical Mexican outlook on a business venture is to demand a bonus at the very start – like the signing bonus for a star athlete!

Do I have to tell you what happened? Panasonic pulled out of Mexico and went somewhere else where capital is appreciated and managed with care. Who won and who lost in the story? Panasonic had the Gold and so they made the rules! It can be no other way. Capital is a responsibility and should be treated with great respect. If not, then all parties involved will lose. It is really difficult to write or talk about this fact, perhaps because it is so blatantly obvious.

When you have a large amount of cash on hand all sorts of good opportunities will appear, and you can also negotiate very favorable purchase prices. If this understanding were generally accepted and practiced widely among the population many of life's problems would disappear.

A word of caution is in order – do not think that everyone must conduct his financial affairs in this manner. It is not a numbers game. Individuals can reap the rewards that such discipline yields. In fact, we all need to remind ourselves that whatever you do in the financial world is compared with what everyone else is doing.

Then, why is there general despair in our country regarding financial matters? Why are people “paying through the nose” for capital? Why the feelings of helplessness and futility? I say again, it all begins with faulty premises. We all operate from a paradigm and the *Infinite Banking Concept* is a major paradigm shift for most people.

This explains what I mean when I say, “Most people know there is a play going on out in the financial world – but they don't understand it. Worse than that, they can't get the characters in the play straight!” Recalling that Shakespeare said, “All of the world is a stage and the people are the actors thereon.” People just don't play their proper role in the scheme of things. They have abdicated their opportunity/responsibility as it pertains to the banking function in the economy. They are depending on someone else to perform that job – and that character in the play is making most of the money! And rightly so, because of The Golden Rule – those who have the gold make the rules! It can be no other way.

Take control of your financial world by
Becoming Your Own Banker

Find a Practitioner Near You

The following financial professionals joined or renewed their membership to our *Authorized Infinite Banking Concepts Practitioners* team this month:

- Dan Allen, Lloydminster, Alberta
- Wade Borth, Fargo, North Dakota
- Clayton Campbell, Houston, Texas
- LaToya Chamblee, Middletown, Delaware
- Tony Chamblee, Middletown, Delaware
- Jamie Freed, Attica, Kansas
- Sarbloh Gill, Edmonton, Alberta
- Rich Gane, Barrie, Ontario
- Lauren Gidley, Williamsville, New York
- Darryl Ho, New Westminster, British Columbia
- Patrick Johnson, McMinnville, Oregon
- Hannah Kesler, Port Orange, Florida
- Winnie Lau, Edmonton, Alberta
- Thomas Laune, Franklin, Tennessee
- Harold McGee, Austin, Texas
- Dapo Orukotan, Sunrise, Florida
- Joe Pantozzi, Las Vegas, Nevada
- Chris Spencer, Gothenburg, Nebraska
- Grant Thompson, Amarillo, Texas
- Donald Turnbull, Pickering, Ontario
- Jerold Wood, Robertsdale, Alabama
- Tim Yurek, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania

You can view the entire practitioner listing on our website using the Practitioner Finder.

IBC Practitioner's have completed the *IBC Practitioner's Program* and have passed the program exam to ensure that they possess a solid foundation in the theory and implementation of IBC, as well as an understanding of Austrian economics and its unique insights into our monetary and banking institutions.