

BANKNOTES

DECEMBER 2020

THE NELSON NASH INSTITUTE
MONTHLY NEWSLETTER

"THE GLOBAL LOCK STEP SCENARIO," Part Three, the Conclusion: BILL GATES and the ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

L. Carlos Lara

"LOCK STEP

A world of tighter top-down government control and more authoritarian leadership, with limited innovation and growing citizen pushback."¹

The Rockefeller Foundation on the future SCENARIOS: May 2010

It's November 2020 as I write the last of my *LMR* three-part series that began earlier this year in the midst of the coronaviruses' global lockdowns (April-May 2020). Although the government's orders to close down the country began as a frightening ordeal, climaxed by an enormous financial crisis, and finally culminating in many deaths, violent acts, and the destruction of private property in many cities, there is good news in sight. There are recent developments and stirrings of organizations that are putting important steps in motion to contest future lockdowns and bring to justice all those responsible for having inflicted so many crimes against the world and their societies. You will wonder how they can do it. It's an ingenious strategy that I will explain in more detail later in this article.

But today, we are no better off than we have been and we continue to wait for a safe vaccine that many experts believe may never come. In fact, more and more people are waking up to the government and media's reaction to the coronavirus being a fraudulent swindle. Continuing our exploration of how we got to this incredible frightening level we need to delve deeper into the history of the infamous Rockefeller Foundation, and more importantly, its more recent connection to Bill Gates and his philanthropic organization.

The Richest Man in America.

This remarkable story all starts with John D. Rockefeller, king of the Standard Oil Company. Denounced as a ruthless predator on the level of the devil incarnate, he created an industrial empire on the scale the world had never known. According to Wikipedia, Rockefeller's peak inflation-adjusted net worth is estimated to be approximately US \$418 billion in 2019 dollars, making

IN THIS MONTH'S
ISSUE:

**"THE GLOBAL LOCK
STEP SCENARIO," Part
Three, the Conclusion:
BILL GATES and
the ROCKEFELLER
FOUNDATION**

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

**Becoming Your Own
Banker, PART II Lesson
5, Use It or Lose It**



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

this oil magnate the richest person in American history. It goes further to state that Bill Gates' estate, Warren Buffet's wealth and even that of Amazon's Jeff Bezos, pales in comparison to Rockefeller's fortune. This man is worth studying.

Nevertheless, John D. Rockefeller was the most hated man in America in the early 1900s and was viewed with tremendous suspicion and distrust. Critics accused Rockefeller of engaging in unethical practices, such as predatory pricing and colluding with railroads to eliminate his competitors in order to gain a monopoly in the industry. In 1911, the U.S. Supreme Court found Standard Oil in violation of anti-trust laws and ordered it to be broken up.² As it turned out the Standard Oil Company became worth even more money as separated entities. In effect, the sum of the parts was worth more than the whole. Someone from above must have been on this man's side, or he was even more brilliant than anyone realized.

Further research into Rockefeller's personal life reveals a different sort of man who may have been incorrectly vilified due to implications surrounding, not necessarily him specifically, but rather his huge amount of wealth, a wealth so large that it virtually continued to compound. The idea of successfully controlling such an empire seemed insurmountable even to John D. Rockefeller himself, but to everyone else in the country, his wealth was mostly seen as a scourge. For example, many economic historians—particularly those who are libertarian—argue that Rockefeller achieved his fortune largely through efficient innovation and lowering prices for consumers; see Burton Folsom's *The Myth of the Robber Barons* for more details.

Junior Is Given Stewardship of the Rockefeller Fortune

The answer to this vexing problem came to Rockefeller later in his life with the help of his only son, John D. Rockefeller, "*junior*." He solved the problem by learning how to tactically integrate power with goodness by specifically giving away his money to important institutions and charitable causes, but only to those organizations that would support his

world vision. It was actually John, Jr. who became the steward of the huge Rockefeller fortune which continued to grow long after the senior's death in 1937. His fortune continued to increase in size the way it did because it embraced Rockefeller's original creative philosophy of strategic philanthropy and how it works.

Both father and son had a deep respect for each other. They were both deeply committed to their Baptist church, always teaching Sunday school, and supporting the church's work financially. They did not smoke or drink and prayed daily and often. John D. Rockefeller sometimes participated as the church's janitor and was often seen sweeping the floors. In his old age and once retired, John D. Rockefeller, with the magic and help of public relations, was able to transform himself from a hated financial villain to a kind old man, who loved people, played golf every day, and generally enjoyed life. The interesting thing is that when looking at many of the archived videos of him from the 1930s, it was easy to see that the man was as authentic as portrayed, and not the villain everybody thought. Are our eyes deceiving us, because Adolf Hitler did the same sort of thing?

Wikipedia, the Encyclopaedia Britannica, and the History Channel all have interesting excerpts on the life of this man and his five children, and all his grandchildren, one of whom, Nelson Rockefeller, became the governor of New York (1959-1973) and was Vice-President of the United States (1974-1977). John D. Rockefeller's only son, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., had a daughter and five sons: John D. III, Nelson A., Laurence S., Winthrop, and David. All of them were the senior Rockefeller's only male grandchildren. They are the ones who carried the Rockefeller tradition into our present century.

Although religion was a guiding force in John D. Rockefeller's life, he was prone to somewhat strange beliefs. For example, his support of capitalism was based on a perspective of social Darwinism. In one of his most famous quotes on the subject he says, "The growth of a large business is merely a survival of the fittest." His only son, Rockefeller, Junior, is believed to have posted samples of the infamous Dr. Sigmund

Freud in the walls of the new Baptist church in New York city, which, if you are familiar with Freud and his work, is also rather strange, from a Christian religious perspective, as the Rockefellers claimed to be.

But actually, I have researched this form of religious peculiarity previously while I was writing the three-part series for the *LMR*, "Who Runs the World." The focus of this series published in August of 2013 was about the life and enormous wealth of Cecil Rhodes. The effort to build the "Kingdom of God" on earth is obviously a desire manifested in both men and ironically at the same moment in history (early 1900s), although they were in two different countries and, as far as I can determine, did not know each other. Still, they are similar in their religious beliefs.

In the case of Rockefeller, who was born in Richford New York, his behavior regarding his beliefs stems from attendance at an evangelistic revival during his childhood. Known as the "Second Great Awakening," this revival which drew masses to various Protestant churches—especially Baptist ones—urged believers to follow such ideas as hard work, prayer, and good deeds to build, once again, "the Kingdom of God on Earth." It's all very strange and it became even more unusual in the lives of the grandchildren as their beliefs morphed with their transition into the 21st century.

David Rockefeller Becomes the Surviving Family Patriarch

But these simple peccadillos certainly pale in comparison to David Rockefeller's infamous achievements throughout his life. David became the Rockefeller's family patriarch and was the oldest living member of the third generation of Rockefellers. He died in 2017 at the age of 101. A true globalist who preached the coming of "A New World Order," David Rockefeller, above all of the other members of the family, can be most closely linked to our current "Global Lock-Step-Scenarios" that have developed since the coronavirus pandemic—all examples of ideas David fostered and financially supported years ago while still alive.

What's certain is that David Rockefeller was not

ashamed of his beliefs, which we have to assume, he felt had been passed down to him by his famous grandfather, John D. Rockefeller. David Rockefeller, the developer of the "Trilateral Commission" and the "Bilderberg Group," has made several (in)famous statements that almost all conspiracy theorists are familiar with. For example, he wrote in his book, *Memoirs*, the following lines:

"We are grateful for the Washington Post, the New York Times, Time Magazine and other great publications, whose directors have attended our meetings and respected their promises of discretion for almost forty years. It would have been impossible to develop a plan for the world if we had been subject to the bright lights of publicity during those years. But, the work is now more sophisticated and prepared to march forth a world government. The super national society of an intellectual elite and world bankers is surely preferable to a national auto determination practiced in past centuries."³

And again, in this quote from a speech to the United Nations Business Council on September 23, 1994:

"This present window of opportunity, during which a truly peaceful and interdependent world order might be built, will not be open for too long. We are on the verge of a global transformation, all we need is the right major crisis and the nation will accept the 'New World Order.'"⁴

And finally, this one, which he also mentions in his book, *Memoirs*:

"Some even believe that the Rockefeller family is involved in a secret cabal working against the best interest of the United States, and characterizing my family, and me, as an internationalist and of conspiring with others around the world to build a more integrated global political and economic structure. One world, If you will. If that's the charge, I stand guilty, and I am proud of it."⁵

The "Lock Step Scenario." What Exactly Is It?

Developed and released by the Rockefeller Foundation in May 2010, this publication—titled "Scenarios

for the Future of Technology and International Development”—gives several "scenarios" for the future of, supposedly, Technology and International Development. However, one of the scenarios is labeled “Lock Step” and has a markedly obvious connection to the virus pandemics we are experiencing today—just take a look and see if you agree. This 53-page document with revealing photographs that explain the adherence to, and emulation of, another's actions, is worth studying in detail. For this reason, I have cited the report in the resources section at the end of this article.

More specifically, the report consists of four scenarios of political and economic alignments from the strongest to the weakest and adaptive capacity from the lowest to the highest, as the drawing shows. Lock Step, as we stated at the very beginning of this article, represents "a world of tighter top-down government control and more authoritarian leadership with limited innovation and citizen pushback." ⁶

The next scenario narrative is called, "Clever Together. This is a world highly coordinated and successful strategies emerge for addressing both urgent and entrenched worldwide issues." ⁷

Scenario three is called, "Hack Attack. As economically unstable and shock-prone world in which governments weaken, criminals thrive, and dangerous innovations emerge." ⁸

Finally, the next and last scenario narrative is called, "Smart Scramble. This is an economically depressed world in which individuals and communities develop localized, makeshift solutions to a growing set of problems." ⁹

The period of time for these narratives to unfold covers a period beginning in 2010 and moves to 2015, then coincidentally, it moves to 2020. Then it moves to 2025 and finally to 2030. But what does it all mean? That can be best deciphered by examining what is known as "Event 201,"¹⁰ which is the pandemic simulation staged by Johns Hopkins University in conjunction with the World Economic Forum, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Johnson & Johnson, and others in October 2019. These presentations, as

do the Lock Step Scenarios, are connected as they all relate to pandemics.

Wikipedia says that the World Economic Forum, established in 1971, is an organization that is often criticized as a wealthy global elite group without any solid connection to the broader societies they often claim they are trying to help, without financial transparency. Add to this what we have previously maintained in our articles, that the problems surrounding the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation in conjunction with the WHO's vaccine experiments on children in India, Africa, and other third world countries, have accused this duo of gross violations in medical safety. But driving the agenda to continue these experiments is the pharmaceutical industry and other health entities with a legacy of corruption. In fact, corruption is systemic throughout global health and national health agencies.

This topic of corruption was featured in the prestigious medical journal, *The Lancet*. ¹¹ The author, Dr. Patricia Garcia, writes, "Corruption is embedded in health systems. Throughout my life—as a researcher, public health worker, and a Minister of Health—I have been able to see entrenched dishonesty and fraud. But despite being one of the most important barriers to implementing universal health coverage around the world, corruption is rarely openly discussed."

This is why I have emphasized that the "Event 201" is the most recent and revealing example of global dubious vaccine information. It contains several slides and photographs that show that these individuals and institutions have been planning out these efforts for quite some time, while we have been busy thinking about other matters—until the coronavirus pandemic crisis hit us unexpectedly. When you put all this together, it's hard not to convince oneself that the Lock Step Scenarios, or those events orchestrated by John Hopkins University, were only simulations.

Once 5G makes surveillance of all cities a reality and we are forced to take vaccines against our wills what more can we say? Let's also not forget to bear in mind that, the WHO, along with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and Anthony Fauci, who oversees the

National Institute for Allergy and Infectious Disease, are leading the efforts to develop a COVID-19 vaccine. And according to them, that vaccine, good or bad, is on the way and everybody must take it.

But, who really is Bill Gates? And, why should we worry?

This YouTube video, titled “How Bill Gates Monopolized Global Health,” has more than 1 million views and best answers these questions. Take a moment to view it. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wQSYdAX_9JY¹²

Dr. Rein Fuellmich and The Coronavirus Fraud Scandal

I promised you some good news before closing out this article and here it is. Meet Dr. Reiner Fuellmich. He is a consumer protection trial lawyer in California and Germany for 26 years and is one of four founding members of the German Corona Extra-Parliamentary Inquiry Committee launched July 10, 2020.

The other three founding members, all lawyers, are Viviane Fischer, Antonia Fischer and Justus P. Hoffmann, Ph.D. Fuellmich is heading up the committees. What these experts are doing is tremendous and badly needed. They are presently filing an international class-action lawsuit against those responsible for implementing the economically devastating lockdowns around the world, as well as using fraudulent testing to exaggerate the apparent danger of the pandemic.

Here is what Dr. Fuellmich says about himself: "I have been practicing law primarily as a trial lawyer against fraudulent corporations such as Deutsche bank, formerly one of the world's largest and most toxic criminal organizations in the world; VW, one of the world's largest and most respected car manufacturers, recently revealed for its notorious giant diesel fraud; and Cunard and Niagara the world's largest shipping company. We're suing them in a multi-million-dollar bribery case. All the above-mentioned cases of corruption and fraud committed by the German corporations pale in comparison in view of the extent of the damages that the corona crisis has caused and

continues to cause. This corona crisis, according to all we know today, must be renamed a corona scandal; and those responsible for it must be criminally prosecuted and sued for civil damages."

On Dr. Rein Fuellmich YouTube video he walks the listener, step by step, through the class-action strategy that will be used and an international lawyer's network that will participate in this effort. Take time to listen to it and I grant you that it will lift your spirits. To motivate you into doing this, read Dr. Fuellmich's final closing remarks. *"To the politicians who believe those corrupt people these facts are hereby offered as a life-line that can help you realign your course of action and start the long overdue public scientific discussion and not go down with those charlatans and criminals."*¹³ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p6QscyQl_sM

Conclusion

As I close this final chapter of my LMR three-part series that began several months ago nothing has become clearer to me than the realization that our United States is in the midst of war. What's become obvious to all of us since the beginning of this year right up to and following the presidential election is that there are clearly two Americas and each side has its own view of reality. We have sensed the hatred among people in the streets and have seen the bloodshed there as well. Although completely new to most of us, the world has always been like this.

We do indeed live in a fallen world and only God can redeem us while we are here. "For we war not against flesh and blood, but against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."

As the Son of God makes clear in the very last book of the Bible, *"Behold, I am coming soon, bringing my recompense with me, to repay each one for what he has done. I am the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end."* Lord, come quickly!

Resources

1. Scenarios for the Future of Technology and International Development, the Rockefeller Foundation, CBN Global

Business Network, a member of the Monitor Group, this 53-page report was produced May 2010, <https://www.scribd.com/doc/244645819/Scenarios-for-the-Future-of-Technology-and-International-Development-Rockefeller-Foundation-and-Global-Business-Network>

(Important note to our readers: Unfortunately, the report is Scribd, but you can still access it using this resource's first 30-day free offer, which is exactly what I had to do. It has just gotten very difficult of late to obtain good readable information that is not just worthless journalism.)

2. Violation of Anti-Trust Laws, a documentary on the History Chanel, April 9, 2010, <https://www.history.com/topics/early-20th-century-us/john-d-rockefeller>

3. David Rockefeller > Quotes, by Goodreads, 2020 Goodreads, Inc., from David Rockefeller's book, *Memoirs*, October 28, 2003. https://www.goodreads.com/author/quotes/9951.David_Rockefeller

4. David Rockefeller's speech at The United Nations Business Council on September 23, 1994, Attributed by LibertyTree.com, on 20 years of Quotes, claims that the last two sentences were not spoken at that time. <http://libertytree.ca/quotes/David.Rockefeller.Quote.B72F>

5. David Rockefeller, Quotes, by Goodreads, 2020 Goodreads, Inc., from David Rockefeller's book, *Memoirs*, October 28, 2003. https://www.goodreads.com/author/quotes/9951.David_Rockefeller

6. Scenarios for the Future of Technology and International Development, the Rockefeller Foundation, CBN Global Business Network, a member of the Monitor Group, this 53-page report was produced May 2010, <https://www.scribd.com/doc/244645819/Scenarios-for-the-Future-of-Technology-and-International-Development-Rockefeller-Foundation-and-Global-Business-Network>

7. Scenarios for the Future of Technology and International Development, the Rockefeller Foundation.

8. Scenarios for the Future of Technology and International Development, the Rockefeller Foundation.

9. Scenarios for the Future of Technology and International Development, the Rockefeller Foundation.

10. Event 201 Videos, a Global Pandemic Exercise, conducted by Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the World Economic Forum and John Hopkins University in October 2019. <https://www.centerforhealthsecurity.org/event201/videos.html>

11. Corruption in Global Health: The Open Secret, by the Medical Journal, *The Lancet*, by Author Dr. Patricia J Garcia, November 27, 2019, [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(19\)32527-9/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(19)32527-9/fulltext)

12. Part One: How Bill Gates Monopolized Global Health, YouTube video, By James Corbett, The Corbett Report, 05/01/2020 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wQSYdAX_9JY

watch?v=wQSYdAX_9JY

13. Dr. Reiner Fuellmich, German Corona Extra-Parliamentary Inquiry Committee, International Class-Action Lawsuit, YouTube video, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p6QscyQl_sM

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

Part 3 of 3

Robert P. Murphy

In this 3-part 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. In the first installment, I focused on the founding of public schools in the US, and the agenda and legacy of the Fabian Society. In the second installment, I documented the long march through the institutions adopted (though the term was coined later) by the Italian Marxist, Antonio Gramsci and by the Frankfurt School. This was a strategy of socialist infiltration of society through a gradual takeover of the schools, churches, news media, music and art, and the cinema; it is colloquially referred to as "cultural Marxism."

In this third and final installment, I'll focus on postmodernism and Critical Theory, which are essential building blocks to understanding today's identity politics with its attacks on "whiteness" and "the patriarchy."

A Quick Overview

The reader has surely heard these terms thrown around, but let's give a quick explanation of what they mean. Some of this will be a review from the last article, as Critical Theory originally was associated with the Frankfurt School, a.k.a. the "cultural Marxists."

Critical Theory: Growing out of the narrow limits of its original usage by the Frankfurt scholars, there is a more modern and broad definition of Critical Theory that links to today's fields such as Critical

Race Theory and Gender Studies. Here is how the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy entry explains the connection:

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.¹

The reader will see this common element in all of today’s agitation against the patriarchy, white supremacy, European colonialism, etc. Writers and activists in these fields use the tools of Critical Theory to highlight what they perceive as oppression of the powerless by the powerful, and use social, economic, racial, sexual, and other characteristics of personal identity to divide the population into these categories of Oppressed and Oppressor.

Postmodernism: These are the ideas that developed as a reaction against “modernism,” which is basically the worldview we associate with the Enlightenment and the Scientific Revolution. To be honest, it is difficult to briefly define postmodernism; I scanned the Stanford entry on postmodernism and realized it is truly incomprehensible to someone unfamiliar with the doctrine. So let’s just use the Encyclopedia Britannica discussion:

Postmodernism is largely a reaction against the intellectual assumptions and values of the modern period in the history of Western philosophy (roughly, the 17th through the 19th century)... The most important of these viewpoints are the following[:]

1. There is an objective natural reality, a reality whose existence and properties are logically independent of human beings—of their minds, their societies, their social practices, or their

investigative techniques. Postmodernists dismiss this idea as a kind of naive realism. Such reality as there is, according to postmodernists, is a conceptual construct, an artifact of scientific practice and language...

2. The descriptive and explanatory statements of scientists and historians can, in principle, be objectively true or false. The postmodern denial of this viewpoint—which follows from the rejection of an objective natural reality—is sometimes expressed by saying that there is no such thing as Truth.

3. Through the use of reason and logic, and with the more specialized tools provided by science and technology, human beings are likely to change themselves and their societies for the better....Postmodernists deny this Enlightenment faith in science and technology as instruments of human progress...

4. Reason and logic are universally valid—i.e., their laws are the same for, or apply equally to, any thinker and any domain of knowledge. For postmodernists, reason and logic too are merely conceptual constructs and are therefore valid only within the established intellectual traditions in which they are used.

5. There is such a thing as human nature; it consists of faculties, aptitudes, or dispositions that are in some sense present in human beings at birth rather than learned or instilled through social forces. Postmodernists insist that all, or nearly all, aspects of human psychology are completely socially determined.

6. Language refers to and represents a reality outside itself. According to postmodernists, language is not such a “mirror of nature”...²

Incidentally, I omitted points 7 and 8 from the Britannica discussion, because I think the first six give the reader the gist of postmodernism.

Now that we have an idea of what these doctrines are, we can better understand how they have been used to further the West’s slide into tyranny.

Disclaimer, Courtesy of Thaddeus Russell

At this point, let me confess that my knowledge of these topics is derived primarily from secondary sources. In other words, I have not read much from the actual postmodernist thinkers, or writers in the area of Critical Race Theory, Gender Studies, etc. Having said that, I still thought it important to show *LMR* readers the connection between these fields and the modern culture wars.

There is admittedly a danger in setting up a strawman punching bag, when in reality any actual thinker is going to be more nuanced than his or her angry critics might allege. The canonical postmodernists such as Jacques Derrida certainly said more than, “You can’t know anything,” or “A book means anything you want it to!” Along these lines, Thaddeus Russell is a historian (with a popular podcast) who passionately claims that libertarians should *embrace* postmodernism as a bulwark against technocrats trying to run our lives. After all, Russell argues, if postmodernism fosters a healthy skepticism of alleged Truth coming from scientists in white lab coats, then it limits the State’s ability to regulate and control society.

I personally debated Russell on this topic, and even people he agreed are experts on postmodernism—namely Stephen Hicks, Michael Rectenwald, James Lindsay, and Helen Pluckrose—did so as well. (Consult the endnotes for links to the various videos of these debates.³) Whether it was me as an amateur, or the others as experts, we all pushed back hard against Russell’s claims that right-wingers were unfairly caricaturing the postmodernists.

Are the Critics Unfair to Postmodernism?

Let me give an example of how these debates went. Russell criticized Jordan Peterson for popularizing the bogeyman of “postmodern cultural Marxists” which were supposedly taking over college campuses, the workplace, and even social media. Why, this is just ignorant fear-mongering, claimed Russell, showing that Jordan Peterson doesn’t know what he’s talking about! After all, postmodernism at its core rejects any “grand narrative” of historical development, while Marxism offers a very specific theory (in the form

of dialectical materialism) of how society evolves through the stages of slavery, feudalism, capitalism, and ultimately communism. So for Thaddeus Russell, the very phrase “postmodern Marxist” is a contradiction in terms; there could be no such person.

And yet, the other experts I’ve named above were much more sympathetic to linkage of these ideas. For one thing, there’s a big “coincidence” that the big guns in postmodernism are former Marxists (or at least very leftist). And a simple perusal of the policy demands from today’s postmodernists (with a few notable exceptions) shows that they detest capitalism.

If the reader wants a truly scholarly discussion of the evolution in the academic literature, through which the old school postmodern ideas were linked to the more recent articles on overthrowing the (ostensible) oppression of the bourgeois white patriarchy, I strongly recommend Russell’s own podcast episode where he invited James Lindsay and Helen Pluckrose as his guests. (Again, see the endnotes for the link.⁴)

But for our purposes here, let me make two points on the alleged impossibility of a postmodern Marxist. First of all, Marxism contains lots of contradictions already, as Ludwig von Mises frequently noted. For example, classical Marxism contains the two doctrines of (a) the progressive immiseration of the proletariat, by which the workers get poorer over time, and (b) the doctrine of the iron law of wages, by which the workers at any moment are paid the barest subsistence level while the rest of their labors’ fruits are siphoned off by the capitalists. As Mises asks, how can these doctrines both be true? If the worker is always being paid the subsistence level to avoid starvation, then he can’t get paid less and less over time, right? (For what it’s worth, the Wikipedia entry on “immiseration thesis” suggests two possible reconciliations: Marx himself changed his views over time, or we could interpret the immiseration as a relative phenomenon, not an absolute one.)

Hence, because standard Marxism contains many internal contradictions—at least, that’s what its critics like Mises allege—then it’s not outlandish to suggest that Marxists, or at least people with

Marxist sympathies, would also adopt the doctrines of postmodernism if it suits their ideological goals. The fact that this move would produce a contradiction wouldn't faze someone whose worldview is already full of them.

The second point I want to make is that the claim from Jordan Peterson and others isn't that today's socialist/communist activists were genuinely persuaded by the intellectual merits of postmodernism. Rather, they saw it as a way to advance their pre-existing agenda. And it is undeniable that those seeking to overthrow capitalism have grabbed postmodern ideas for this purpose.

Let me end this section with an example of what I mean about fidelity to principles versus advancing a pre-existing agenda. When I was researching postmodernism, I learned that many of the biggest names associated with it—including Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, and Jean-François Lyotard—signed a petition in 1977 to overturn French “age of consent” laws. In other words, they wanted to decriminalize sexual relations (so long as they were consensual) between adults and minors, including those as young as 13.⁵

My point is bringing up this example isn't to criticize them as moral monsters for endorsing what many *LMR* readers view as scandalous activity. Rather, my point is that the same arguments these thinkers used to endorse decriminalization of adult/minor sex could also have been used to get rid of regulations on business. For example, if Foucault wants to argue that a 13-year-old girl has the power and competence to meaningfully consent to sleeping with a 40-year-old man, then surely a grown *woman* has the power and competence to decide if she wants to buy a pharmaceutical that hasn't been certified as safe by the government, or if she wants to work for less than the minimum wage. And yet, my research indicated that the major thinkers associated with postmodernism are all quite leftist in their views about government regulation of business.

So to sum up, yes we should be careful to be fair to postmodernists and other thinkers with whom we may

disagree, but it's hardly a defense to point out that their own official doctrines don't (on paper) support some of the crazier things coming out of college campuses these days. It's standard practice for intellectuals to treat philosophies as a buffet, picking and choosing those implications that suit their pre-existing views.

Postmodernism Is Literally Anti-Christ

I realize this is provocative, but the easiest way to show how antithetical postmodernism is to Western civilization is to point out that it is literally anti-Christ. Now to be clear, I'm not saying any particular postmodern thinker is the anti-Christ, meaning a person. Rather, I am saying the doctrines themselves go against the very nature of Christ, and thus Western civilization, to the extent that it was built on a Judeo-Christian foundation.

Consider: One of Jesus' names or titles is *Logos* (in the Greek). As the King James Bible says in the gospel of John, chapter 1:

¹ *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.*

² *The same was in the beginning with God.*

³ *All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.*

⁴ *In him was life; and the life was the light of men.*

To repeat, Jesus is the Word, or *Logos*. As theologian R.C. Sproul explains, that word “*Logos*” is the foundation of our word “logic,” but also the intellectual disciplines that end in -ology, such as theology, biology, geology, etc.

Notice what is happening here. Jesus Himself is called by a name that flows through language itself—He's *the Word*, remember—and scientific, rational inquiry. Far from there being a tension between science and religion, it was actually a belief in a rational, orderly universe—created by an intelligent Designer—that motivated the great religious scientists such as Isaac Newton.

So does the reader see how postmodern attacks every single element of this edifice? The postmodernists cast skepticism upon the ability of language to capture

meaning, and of rational inquiry to discover truth. Indeed, some of the most extreme postmodernists deny that there *is even such a thing* as objective reality.

This is the sense in which I claim that postmodernism is quite literally anti-Christ. Even for those readers who aren't religious, I hope you can see how dangerous this set of doctrines is. Postmodernism seeks nothing less than the complete eradication of the intellectual foundations of Western civilization.

Deconstruction

In case the reader thinks I am engaged in hyperbole, consider that one of the classic terms associated with postmodern is *deconstruction*. Here's how Britannica defines it, and applies it to more modern academia:

Deconstruction, form of philosophical and literary analysis, derived mainly from work begun in the 1960s by the French philosopher Jacques Derrida, that questions the fundamental conceptual distinctions, or "oppositions," in Western philosophy through a close examination of the language and logic of philosophical and literary texts.

...

Deconstruction's influence widened to include a variety of other disciplines....Some strands of feminist thinking engaged in a deconstruction of the opposition between "man" and "woman" and critiqued essentialist notions of gender and sexual identity. The work of Judith Butler, for example, challenged the claim that feminist politics requires a distinct identity for women. Arguing that identity is the product or result of action rather than the source of it, they embraced a performative concept of identity modeled on the way in which linguistic acts (such as promising) work to bring into being the entities (the promise) to which they refer. This perspective was influential in gay and lesbian studies, or "queer theory"...

...In anthropology, deconstruction contributed to an increased awareness of the role that anthropological field-workers play in shaping,

rather than merely describing, the situations they report on and to a greater concern about the discipline's historical connections to colonialism.⁶

In Kirby Dick's (excellent) 2002 documentary "Derrida," there is an early scene where an interviewer introduces Derrida to her audience by saying (in French), "Born in El Biar, Algeria, Jacques Derrida's name is now known on five continents. He's a thinker of lightning thoughts whose work is like that of miners who work by exploding the beams supporting their shafts." Upon hearing such a description of his scholarship, Derrida gives the interviewer a mischievous smile.

For more evidence that Derrida's work undercuts the intellectual foundations of modern society, check out this passage from his *Dissémination*, a book published in 1969: "It is thus not simply false to say that Mallarmé is a Platonist or a Hegelian. But it is above all not true. And vice versa."

If the reader is confused by the above quotation, that's a good thing. Read it again to absorb the full enormity of Derrida's style. After she herself flags this particular quotation from Derrida, Barbara Johnson comments: "Instead of a simple either/or structure, deconstruction attempts to elaborate a discourse that says neither 'either/or,' nor 'both/and' nor even 'neither/nor,' while at the same time not totally abandoning these logics either."⁷

It's because of such rhetorical moves that Jordan Peterson dismissively refers to Derrida as a "trickster."

Judge Them By Their Fruits

I hope the reader by now sees the connection with these abstruse doctrines and the craziness of today's debates. Serious academics—including Thaddeus Russell!—argue with a straight face that gender is a social construct, and that an individual can decide to be a man or woman just as surely as an individual can decide to be a Republican or a vegetarian.

To make things even crazier, earlier this year James Lindsay—who has a math PhD—got into a huge debate on Twitter with people when he claimed that $2+2=4$. I promise, I am not making this up. And

the people arguing with Lindsay themselves had advanced degrees.

For example, one academic pointed out that some readers might doubt whether $2+2 = 4.0$. This is because, for those trained in engineering or the physical sciences, you have to be careful to keep “significant figures” the same in your inputs and outputs. If your thermometer really only gives you readings accurate to one decimal place, then you shouldn’t report temperature readings with three decimal places.

Yet of course, when James Lindsay was arguing that $2+2=4$, he wasn’t challenging the standard warnings about precision of estimates. He was making a basic point to challenge the postmodern attempts at deconstructing all knowledge.

Yes folks, we’ve gotten to the point where math PhDs have to argue that $2+2=4$, and other academics disagree. I hope the reader by now can understand how useful this rhetorical device is, in the hands of the socialists and communists. What possible defense can economists give of private property and free enterprise, when college kids are being taught that sex has nothing to do with biology and that $2+2$ doesn’t necessarily equal 4?

Conclusion

This article concludes my 3-part series on the intellectual foundations of the West’s slide into tyranny. In conclusion, I want to be clear that I am not accusing any particular thinker of necessarily being complicit in a grand conspiracy. Rather, I have shown how some socialists and communists have indeed conducted a grand campaign of subversion, working through various institutions. As part of this agenda, they have cherry-picked from various doctrines and philosophies that suited their purposes, whether or not the developers of these ideas would have approved.

And so we see, it is no coincidence that our economic, civil, and religious liberties are under a coordinated assault. That was the plan all along, and now I’ve shown you, the reader, some of the background scholarship that made it all possible.

Endnotes

1. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy entry on “Critical Theory,” available at: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/critical-theory/>.
2. See the Encyclopedia Britannica discussion at: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/postmodernism-philosophy>.
3. Here are the debates involving Thaddeus Russell on postmodernism as a defense (or attack) on liberty: (1) His debate with me, on the Bob Murphy Show: <https://youtu.be/ibUS9uNMFuE>. (2) His debate with Stephen Hicks, at the SoHo Forum: <https://youtu.be/Qb9Eajt0KVA>. (3) His debate with Michael Rectenwald, on the Tom Woods Show: <https://tomwoods.com/ep-1784-postmodernism-debate-russell-v-rectenwald/>. (4) Thad’s discussion (but with disagreement) with James Lindsay and Helen Pluckrose: <http://www.thaddeusrussell.com/podcast/110>.
4. See <http://www.thaddeusrussell.com/podcast/110>.
5. See the Wikipedia entry, “French petition against age of consent laws,” at: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/French_petition_against_age_of_consent_laws.
6. See the Britannica entry at: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/deconstruction>.
7. Quoted in John M. Ellis, *Against Deconstruction* (Princeton University Press, 1989), p. 6.



Twentieth 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 5 Use It or Lose It

Content: Page 35, *Becoming Your Own Banker* Fifth Edition

In our look at the Basic Understandings as taught by The Infinite Banking Concept we come to the last of the human considerations which must be faced if we are to be successful at becoming our own banker. This thought is closely allied to the one we looked at last, The Arrival Syndrome.

Please note that all the points that we have addressed so far – Parkinson’s Law, Willie Sutton’s Law, The Golden Rule, The Arrival Syndrome and now, Use It

or Lose It – have to do with overcoming human nature. All human progress is predicated on this matter. It is not easy to conquer but it is absolutely necessary. It is like recognizing the fact that we must attend to bodily hygiene or face the consequences. Don't brush your teeth regularly and they will rot! Neglect the flossing of them and you will end up with gum diseases!

The Arrival Syndrome produces a comfort zone that causes people to lapse into their old way of doing things – a lifetime of accumulated information that determines how one conducts oneself. The fact that this conclusion may be based on fallacious information is beside the point!

Another description of a paradigm would be a pattern of behavior. I remember a speaker years ago demonstrating this. He asked members in the audience to cross their arms across their chest, one forearm over the other. Now cross them the other way with a different forearm on top. It just didn't feel right and most of the audience had a problem doing it. They kept ending up with the same forearm on top!

I illustrate the point by telling people, "What I'm teaching is equivalent to teaching that the world is round – when most folks think that it is flat. Technically, that is a very simple thing to explain – but if you are one of those who think that it is flat, then it becomes a very difficult problem!" The Infinite Banking Concept is dealing with a totally different paradigm. This amounts to a personal monetary system.

In the last lesson we introduced the Economic Value-Added concept that was developed by Stern-Stewart consulting firm. Many large corporations have achieved phenomenal success once they adopted EVA. The concept begins with the recognition of the fact that your own capital has a cost of money as well as that which has been borrowed from banks. That is the very first point made in The Infinite Banking Concept "Basic Understandings" page in the textbook. Among those corporations featured was Coca Cola, who, by the way, was on the cover of the March 1996 issue of FORTUNE as "the most admired company in America."

A follow-up story in FORTUNE in May 1995 was

titled, EVA WORKS – BUT NOT IF YOU MAKE THESE COMMON MISTAKES." The points made looked like this:

- They don't make it a way of life.
- Most managers try to implement EVA too fast.
- The boss lacks conviction.
- Managers fuss too much.
- Training gets short shrift.

Accepting a totally new point of reference means that one must develop new habits. In talking with members of the Infinite Banking Concepts think tank we continue to notice that many are still caught up in the posture of thinking that it is all a function of interest rates. This is a fatal error. It has to do with recognizing where money is flowing to and the failure of charging interest to yourself for the things that you buy using your own banking system. Anytime that you can cut out the payment of interest to others and direct that same market rate of interest to an entity that you own and control, which is subject to minimal taxation (life insurance companies do pay taxes), then you have improved your situation.

Just like EVA, to be effective, The Infinite Banking Concept must become a way of life. You must use it or lose it. And in Mark 4:25 Jesus says to his disciples, "For he that hath, to him shall be given, and he that hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he hath."

This concludes the first part of the course. It is the foundation upon which the rest of the course sits. I hope that you have learned it well and will adopt its teachings in order to improve your own financial world.

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:

- John Urbik, Peachtree City, Georgia
- Kyle Fuller, Mesa, Arizona
- Michele Boyer, Lakewood, Colorado
- Josh Steinfeld, Oxnard, California
- David White, Hurst, Texas
- Harper Jones, Knoxville, Tennessee
- Brian Moody, Irwin, Pennsylvania
- John Blalock, Birmingham, Alabama
- Sonda Frattini, Charlotte, North Carolina
- Patrick Eddins, Sunst Hills, Missouri
- Robert Zuniga, Davidson, North Carolina

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.

The *IBC Practitioner* has a broad base of knowledge to ensure a minimal level of competency in all of the areas a financial professional needs, in order to adequately discuss IBC with his or her clients.

The Foundations of IBC

We are excited to announce the launch of our online **video series** for the general public. The videos are developed to provide a comprehensive introduction to the *Infinite Banking Concept*.

The first four modules are free, you can view them here: infinitebanking.org/foundations

The remaining eight modules are subscription-based, costing \$49.95 for all eight. *Or contact your Authorized IBC Practitioner and ask for a coupon code that will enable you to watch all twelve modules FREE.*

Module 1: *Introduction to the Nelson Nash Institute*

Module 2: *What the Infinite Banking Concept Is*

Module 3, Part 1: *How IBC Works*

Module 3, Part 2: *Policy Loans & The Nature of Collateral*

Module 3, Part 3: *How to Read a Policy Illustration*

Module 4: *Why Nelson Calls It The Infinite Banking Concept*

Module 5: *The Life Insurance Industry*

Module 6: *Why Not Buy Term and Invest the Difference?* [Scheduled Release Date November 2020](#)

Module 7: *Using IBC to Pass Wealth to Future Generations* [Scheduled Release Date December 2020](#)

Module 8: *The MEC Rule and Policy Design* [Scheduled Release Date January 2021](#)

Module 9: *Does IBC Work for Older People?* [Scheduled Release Date February 2021](#)

Module 10: *IBC for the Business Owner* [Scheduled Release Date March 2021](#)

Module 11: *Using Your IBC Policy: Premiums, Dividends, and Policy Loans* [Scheduled Release Date April 2021](#)

Module 12: *IBC as a Way of Life* [Scheduled Release Date May 2021](#)