

Commentary on *The Open Conspiracy* by H. G. Wells

By Alan Mercer

Edited based on original series at canadianliberty.com—Originally published April 12–June 5, 2010.
This edition: September 20 2020

[I wrote the original series in 2010. In 2020, we see this Open Conspiracy in full throttle locking down the world. I have edited it a little, but I have mostly left the older way of speaking in place. My way of looking at things has changed a little. We should have a system that is in harmony with the values we need, and those values include basic freedoms. I can't insist on how people define words like "freedom" and "liberty." If they have destructive values and intent built in to the meaning of "liberty," then we just need to be more explicit about the values that need to be upheld by the whole society, and we need to learn to recognize when individuals or groups have opposing values instead of assuming otherwise. I associate totalitarian (or extremely authoritarian, controlling policies of surveillance for example) with those who have destructive intent, who are morally abusive, predatory and out of control.]

Part I

I based this commentary on *The Open Conspiracy and Other Writings, 1933, Waterlow & Sons Ltd., London.*

The Open Conspiracy is a non-fiction work by author H. G. Wells, who is more famous for his science fiction stories such as *The Time Machine* and *War of the Worlds*.

Ch. I 'The Present Crisis in Human Affairs'

Certain themes are repeated. Wells writes about the "abolition of distance" as technology brought the world closer together (p. 10).

He complains about an "alarming increase in population" because of the prolongation of life (p. 11).

He emphasizes the ever present danger of another world war, implying all the time that people need to shape up and follow the internationalist prescription for how the world should be rearranged—in order to prevent war. The same type of fear message was still prevalent later during the Cold War:

"Over everything human hangs the threat of such war as man has never known before, war armed and reinforced by all the powers and discoveries of modern science" (p.11).

He talks about how the state structure worked for a while but states now "jostle each other exasperatingly."

"Commerce under the new conditions is perpetually *breaking nationalist bounds* and making **militant raids** upon the economic life of other countries" (p. 12).

By this, he is flipping over the Socialist side of his cap to reveal the Capitalist side—to him, they're not opposite systems—and he is emphasizing how the nation state is just something that gets in the way of international commerce or trade, which we're supposed to assume is legitimate trade in contrast to the looting of resources carried out for hundreds of years by European aristocracies and their corporations.

Think about it. If the government of a nation actually did represent its people, then the nation would be something real, and other nations would have to respect its laws or face consequences. It would be just as if you tried to invade a family's home in which the men of the home stood ready to protect their family, their natural rights and freedoms, their property rights, and their tribal rights from the invaders.

But somehow nations are just slipping away into a worldwide mush, not having done a very good job of defending rights anyway. How convenient that is! It's as though people were really NOT represented by the national government at all, because whatever boundaries they have ultimately count for nothing. By now, internationalists have already taken over to a large degree, and we see our national leaders signing international treaties every other week as they bring us closer to world government.

Wells carries on about war and how bad it is going to be for people:

“gets at the ‘non-combatant’ almost as searchingly as at the combatant, and has acquired weapons of a stupendous cruelty and destructiveness.”

“...We are being continually being urged by our training and traditions to antagonisms and conflicts that will impoverish, starve, and destroy both our antagonists and ourselves” (p. 12).

Here he talks nonsense about “our training and traditions” as if it didn't require incredible propaganda and effort by the ruling class to get ordinary people to participate in the horrible mass death and destruction of World War I.

Wells, playing the role of critic of the system he's a part of, like Bertrand Russell, admits the people:

“*are being misled by those who trade upon the old traditions. ... It is preposterous that we should still be followed about and pestered by war, **taxed** for war preparations, and **threatened** bodily and in our liberties by this unnecessary and exaggerated and distorted survival of the **disunited world of the pre-scientific era**” (p. 12).*

So Wells is really blaming the *separateness*, the *lack of political unity* in the world as the cause of war. And I have heard this kind of message all my life. Is separateness really the cause of war and conflict? Could we not argue that separateness, independence, minding our own business and respecting others' space and rights would more likely lead to peace? Isn't this in line with our own experiences? Are we also to blame conflict on the fact that individuals are separate? It's insanity to eliminate separateness.

Weren't Napoleon and Alexander the Great and others attempting to eliminate separateness through war? And what we have nowadays is just the continuation of their goal— with a mixture of more clever strategies however—militarization, threats, death, propaganda, lies and looting—all attempting to achieve the elimination of separateness.

It is more plausible that there are people with destructive personality traits—in control of nations—causing these incredible, unnatural wars that Wells writes about—who are in constant fear because they do not control all nations, all resources and all individuals. And that is what motivates them and their totalitarian propaganda. Because, no, they will not be happy until everyone is predictable and under their thumb. They don't like competition. They don't like people defending their rights or standing up to them. In other words, a certain kind of person causes war deliberately because he is twisted up. People like that will always be with us, unfortunately, and they try to take advantage of everyone else, and they try to *control* everyone else. If we could stop being fooled by them, and if regular people

stood up for each other, then there would be more hopeful.

Of course Wells doesn't talk about it in these terms. A unified world would just be another kind of world with these kinds of control freak psychopaths running amok over everyone else, with no alternatives. The utopia of world "unity" means only one way of doing things. It means you are controlled, no escape from taxation and regulation, because all regions of the earth will be bound together. You will be even less free than you are now. You will have no alternative way of organizing your life and society. So you will not be a threat to them. No system will be allowed to threaten their control. That's the motivation of world government and that is what they mean by "peace" and the absence of war. No competition.

Peace to an ordinary person means treating others and their rights with respect and administering justice to prevent criminals from taking over, but those natural ideas many take for granted never really get off the ground. Because of indoctrination into the system, most people project their belief in right and wrong onto those who have power and fail to see that the system is a sham to a large extent, because it is dominated by those who are not concerned with justice and protection for citizens.

"Peace" to those at the top who push world government means no opposition, and no resistance allowed. And they don't have the moral values that prevent most people from stealing and killing in order to achieve their ends. But ordinary people are easily fooled and seduced. Most of us never learn and are easy prey.

The word "pre-scientific" implies there is some natural, historical march towards a "scientific" society. It means a planned society, managed by a technical, expert class, a type of feudalism, as opposed to a society based on freedom and individual rights. Progress towards this "scientific" society has been managed by the members of the "Open Conspiracy" Wells writes about.

Part 2

Wells states that there is a:

"new phase of excitement, provocation, menace, urgency and actual or potential distresses. Our lives are part of one another. ... We are items in a **social mass**. **What are we to do with our lives?**" (p. 13)

Wells is raising a type of religious question with his readers, about what they should be doing with their lives, indicating that they should be participating in the "Open Conspiracy."

Ch. II "The Idea of the Open Conspiracy"

Wells hoped readers would say:

"Let us get together with other people of our sort and make over the world into a **great world-civilization** that will enable us to realize the promises and avoid the dangers of this new time." (p. 14)

Wells says this

"conspiracy **against established things** would, by its very nature, go on in the daylight,

and it would be willing to accept participation and help from every quarter. It would, in fact, become an “**Open Conspiracy**,” to adjust our dislocated world” (p. 14).

Wells mentions he was unhappy with the first version of *The Open Conspiracy* he had published in 1928, the current one being a re-write:

“The idea of **reorganizing the affairs of the world** on quite a big scale ... has now spread about the world until nearly everybody has it. It has broken out all over the place, thanks largely to the **mental stimulation of the Russian Five Year Plan**. Hundreds of thousands of people everywhere are now thinking upon the lines foreshadowed by my *Open Conspiracy*, not because they had ever heard of the book or phrase, but because that was the way thought was going” (p. 15).

So he considers the Bolshevik tyranny a source of inspiration for his sort of mentality.

Ch. III “We have to Clear and Clean up Our Minds”

Wells says the “Great War” (World War I) was a “disastrous waste of life” (p. 18) even though we know that he [participated in government war propaganda](#) [2].

The war had “brought home” to him “how ignorant” he was. Voicing a concern that many of us might relate to, he realized that he

“did not know enough about the life in my body and its relations to the world of life and matter outside it to come to proper decisions about a number of urgent matters—from race conflicts, birth control, and my private life, to the public control of health and the conservation of natural resources” (p. 19).

The mentality of the *world planner* is always expressed in his book: constant obsessions over “waste,” inefficiency, control of the economy, etc. Here he mentions “control” of everyone’s health as if each person’s health belongs to the State. And he mentions management of resources that rightfully belong to local inhabitants—as if this kind of God-like planning is acceptable. But it has become old hat. It used to be called feudalism and imperialism. But the imperialists dressed it up in a nice red socialist package. If people could only see how misguided it is to let the international banks, their foundations, their policy think-tanks, and their spokesmen run amok.

Wells explains how three major books of his, *Outline of History*, *Science of Life*, and *Work, Wealth & Happiness of Mankind* had built up a “complete system of ideas upon which an Open Conspirator can go,” an “ideology,” as people say, on which it was possible to think of **building a new world...**” (p. 19).

Ch. IV “The Revolution in Education”

Wells complained that the current educational system left people unprepared for life, and that a

“vigorous **educational reform movement** arises as a natural and necessary expression of the awakening Open Conspirator. A **revolution in education** is the most imperative and fundamental part of the **adaptation of life to its new conditions**” (p. 21).

He claims that the educational world of “backwardness” “yields slowly but surely to the **pressure of the new spirit ...**” (p. 21).

So we can think about what effect Wells’ movement has had historically on the public education system in Canada, the U.S. and other countries—as they caused the “adaptation” of the human clay to its “new conditions.”

I think it must have had a difficult time occasionally overcoming two sources of opposition: religion and individualism. I can remember signs of these two influences in the 70s still in Canadian schools.

Isn’t it the purpose of public education to serve as a tool for policy makers, in order to gradually indoctrinate us according to one agenda or another? It must have been convenient for those who adopted the Open Conspiracy of Wells to at least get started on the minds of the young. And aren’t their cross-hairs trained on whatever is left of non-conforming individualism, family influence and tradition?

And today, we have the Ontario government extending [kindergarten to full days](#) [3]. Do parents want the State dominating the minds of their children from an early age? Is this just a neutral policy that just comes about because of accidental economic circumstances, or one that somehow reflects the will of the people? Or is it one stage in a slow, deliberate series of social and economic changes implemented by an “Open Conspiracy”? Are parents going to “vote” or lobby to reverse this policy as if it was their idea in the first place? If not, then we are all just being herded—pushed and prodded—in the direction of total State control.

Ch. V “Religion in the New World”

“The clear-minded Open Conspirator who has got his modern ideology, his lucidly arranged account of the universe in order, is obliged to believe that only by giving his life to the great processes of **social reconstruction**, and shaping his conduct with reference to that, can he do well with his life” (p. 22).

And Wells describes his idea of a new religion. Wells praises the aspect of religions that “***demand great subordinations of self.***” Because “therein lay their creative force.”

Regardless of the truth of religious doctrines, Wells had an obnoxious attitude towards individual spiritual and moral development. He thinks a personal religion of a “secluded duet between the **individual** and his divinity” “may be regarded as a **perversion** of the religious impulse.” He says a “normal religious process takes the individual out of his egotism for **the service of the community**” (p. 22).

So soulless thoughtless people who can’t stand themselves and their own lives should just run amok “serving” the “community” or following orders from the world directorate. “We don’t need no stinkin’ spiritual development.”

And here Wells hits upon the critical question of the ideological subversion that has accelerated in our time. How far will the Open Conspirators be able to push the destruction of the individual—his or her freedoms, traditional rights, will and consciousness? How far will humanity allow *the individual* soul to be suppressed in the name of “service” to the so-called “community”?

Part 3

Wells continues to describe his new religion:

“The conception of progress as a broadening and increasing purpose, a conception which is taking hold of the human imagination more and more firmly, turns religious life towards the future. We think no longer of submission to the irrevocable decrees of absolute dominion, but of **participation in an adventure on behalf of a power that gains strength and establishes itself**” (p. 25).

He’s saying surrender reality, surrender the past, surrender truth, tradition, cause and effect. Surrender morality. And join the “adventure” of “progress” as you mindlessly follow the propaganda of an obsessive international corporate gang. As George Bush Sr. said, the New World Order is a [“tool to address a new world of possibilities”](#) [4] as in a world where the previously unthinkable and unspeakable becomes normal, as the techno-tyrants reshape humanity itself.

To me, the religions we have from the past are open to criticisms as (arguably) irrational, often abusive, and frequently used as tools of suppression by those in power. So, Wells is asking us to fall in line with his logic and replace the old religions with the new “religion”:

“It seems unavoidable that if religion is to develop *unifying* and **directive power** in the present confusion of human affairs it must adapt itself to this *forward-looking*, individuality-analyzing turn of mind; it must divest itself of its sacred histories, its gross preoccupations, its posthumous prolongation of *personal ends*. The **desire for service, for subordination**, for permanent effect, for an escape from the distressful **pettiness and mortality of the individual life**, is the undying element in every religious system” (p. 26).

So the subordination of the self—the subordination of the individual—is the aspect of religion that Wells exalts the most.

Ch. VI “Modern Religion is Objective”

“...The idea of inner perfectibility dwindles with the **diminishing importance attached to individuality**. We cease to think of mortifying or exalting or *perfecting ourselves and seek to lose ourselves* in a greater life. We think less and less of “conquering” self and more and more to *escaping from self*. If we attempt to perfect ourselves in any respect it is only as a soldier sharpens and polishes an essential weapon.” (p. 27)

Part 4

“..it is possible now to imagine an order in human affairs from which these evils [referring to tyranny, sickness, famine] have been largely or entirely eliminated” (p. 28).

His utopian dictatorship is dressed up with idealism. Godlike intentions from people with godlike power. Nothing reality-based about it. Think of all the evil that has been done by governments in the name of eliminating evil.

On p. 28, he also talks about how good deeds and consolatory activities are no longer good enough. His

open conspiracy needs to fix the world.

“The way in which our activities conduce to the realization of that conceivable better order in human affairs, becomes the new criterion of conduct...”

So Wells is saying that it's not about how you treat individuals any longer. It's about doing whatever it takes to achieve the “better order.” So the conspirators will judge each other on how effectively they undermined resistance from the old system.

He plays the pacifist as usual and calls for totalitarian domination at the same time:

We “have to make an end to war, and to make an end to war we must be cosmopolitan in our politics. It is impossible for any clear-headed person to suppose that the *ever more destructive* stupidities of war can be eliminated from human affairs ***until some common political control dominates the earth***, and unless certain pressures due to the **growth of populations**, due to the enlarging scope of economic operations or due to **conflicting standards and traditions** of life, are *disposed of*” (p. 28).

And it makes you wonder just how much violence and underhandedness would be unleashed by the Open Conspirators to break down population numbers and to break down traditions that stand in their way, including the traditions of sovereignty and self-determination.

So we accumulate some of the themes of *The Open Conspiracy*: “reform” of education, “reform” of religion, curtailing population, fighting tradition, “eliminating evils,” and world government.

What makes some of us imagine that an earth-dominating common political control will be benevolent? Just propaganda and wishful thinking. Did you get a personal vote during the last G20 meeting – and other international meetings that your taxes fund?

“To avoid the positive evils of war, and to attain the new levels of **prosperity and power** [prosperity and power for who?] that now come into view, an *effective world control*, not merely of armed force, but of the *production and main movements of staple commodities* and the *drift and expansion of population* is required. It is absurd to dream of peace and world-wide progress without *that much control* . . .” (p. 28).

Wells is talking about world government control of armed force, control of population numbers, and control over the production and distribution of staple commodities. “Staple commodity” can be [defined](#) as “any basic food or a raw material which is important in a country’s economy” [5].

In other words, as Wells implies, there can’t be world “peace” and “progress” (!) until a group of people – with only end-justifies-means behavior criteria—called a “world government”, has **total control over global production and distribution of basic foods and other essentials**. Such power could be used to force policies such as population reduction, and to bring rebellious nations to their knees.

Part 5

Ch. VII “What Mankind Has to Do”

“What are the new forms that it is thus proposed to **impose upon human life**, and how are

they to be evolved from or **imposed upon** the current forms? And **against what passive and active resistance** has this to be done?” (p.30)

Again, he dresses his ideas up in a cloak of pacifism:

“But here we are writing for the *modern-minded*, and for them it is **impossible to think of the world as secure and satisfactory until there exists a single world commonweal**, preventing war and **controlling those moral, biological, and economic forces and wastages** that would otherwise lead to wars...”

So the theory he is espousing is that nations just naturally decide to go to war over resources (always supposedly running out). They can't find any possible way to get along with each other and share resources for some reason. He doesn't mention the private interests that profit from war. What he's really saying is that if nations don't submit to a single world government, then wars will just get worse and worse. But when they submit to world government, with the control freaks in charge, everything will be just right, everybody will be doing things the same way, and the control freaks will feel secure. And they won't need to play off nations against each other anymore. With independent nations out of the way, having been slowly undermined from within, looting will be easier and targets of resistance will be softer. However, Wells just doesn't put it like that.

He explains how the new order will operate non-democratically:

“... in a polyglot world **a parliament of mankind or any sort of council that meets and talks is an inconceivable instrument of government**. The voice will cease to be a suitable vehicle. World government, like scientific process, will be conducted by statement, criticism, and publication that will be capable of efficient translation” (p. 31).

Wells describes this elitist technocratic form of government:

“...we should have the collective affairs of the world managed by **suitably equipped groups of the most interested, intelligent, and devoted people**, and that their activities should be subjected to a free, open, watchful criticism...” (p. 31).

He breaks down the main groups that make up the Open Conspiracy:

“The Open Conspiracy, the world movement for the supersession or enlargement or **fusion of existing political, economic, and social institutions** must necessarily, as it grows, draw closer and closer to the questions of practical control. It is likely in its growth to incorporate many **active public servants** and **many industrial and financial leaders and directors...**” (p. 32).

So here he mentions the public and private arms of the Open Conspiracy—“public servants”—government bureaucrats—as well as leaders of corporations and financial institutions.

Wells talks about this movement he describes as a type of intelligent and consuming form of life that grows of its own accord:

“It [the Open Conspiracy] may also **assimilate** great masses of intelligent workers. As its activities **spread** it will work out a whole system of special methods of co-operation. As it **grows**, and by growing, it will **learn** the business of general direction and how to develop its **critical function**. A lucid, dispassionate, and immanent criticism is the primary

necessity, **the living spirit** of a world civilization. The Open Conspiracy is essentially such a **criticism**, and the carrying out of such a criticism into working reality is the task of the Open Conspiracy. It will by its very nature be aiming not so much to set up a world direction as **to become itself a world direction**, and the educational and militant forms of this opening phase will evoke, step by step, as **experience is gained and power and responsibility acquired**, forms of administration and research and correlation” (p. 32).

A disturbing analogy comes to mind about this description of the Open Conspiracy. It reminds me of the [“Terminator”](#) movies, in which the “Skynet” computer, “built to remove human decisions from strategic defence,” “begins to learn at a geometric rate” and suddenly becomes “self-aware”. Then there was some desperate resistance from the people as things went from bad to worse [6].

Part 6

Continuing with Wells describing the new world order:

“...the new **directive organizations of men’s affairs** will *not be of the same nature as old-fashioned governments*. They will be in their nature **biological, financial, and generally economic**, and the old governments were primarily nothing of the sort. Their directive force will be (1) an effective *criticism having the quality of science*, and (2) the **growing will in men to have things right.**”

No limits on their obsessive drive to control.

“The directive force of the older governments was the *uncriticized* fantasies and wilfulness of an individual, a class, a tribe, or a majority.”

None of that “uncriticized” “wilfulness”!

Ch. VIII “Broad characteristics of a scientific world commonweal”

“It is because **we desire a unification of human direction**, not simply for the sake of unity, but as a means of **release to happiness and power ...**” (p. 34)

How do we interpret this? Plato’s *Republic* describes an idealized society with an elite class of “guardians” in charge, and this is what New World Order promoters have in mind. This is their formula and ideal. To suppress individual will and freedom for most of humanity in order to empower and “release” a few from normal biological and economic limitations.

As with Aldous Huxley’s [Brave New World](#) [7], Plato’s [Republic](#) [8] concerns itself with the breeding of human beings for different roles, i.e., eugenics. As mentioned earlier, Wells says the new kind of world State will be based fundamentally around **biology and economics**. “Biological” means State control over reproduction and genetics. Regardless of what Wells had in mind, it could also refer to technological means of interfacing with the human mind and body for control, tagging, monitoring, vaccines, etc.

A sense of this kind of future is portrayed in the movie [Code 46](#) [9] which portrays genetic

engineering, cloning, strict reproductive laws and restrictions on mating, forced abortion, computer-human monitoring of personal lives, the manipulation of memory and moods, as well as direct economic control of travel through insurance tags.

As far as genetics goes, note that the 2010 Canadian federal budget gives [special attention](#) [10] and tax money to a group called [Genome Canada](#). This public-private partnership supports “large-scale genomics and proteomics research projects” in the areas of “human health, agriculture, environment, forestry, fisheries, and new technology development” [11].

Where does it lead? We have biology and economics: the human body, food, fuel, resources, [genetic tags](#) [12], measuring, counting, cataloguing, taxing, licensing, monitoring. Control. To tag is to claim ownership and control. Is it control by you and me over our own lives? No.

And they say they’ll consider all the ethical and social issues. But taxing money from Canadians is arguably unethical in the first place. Diverting tax money towards pet corporatocracy projects is unethical. Diverting tax money towards the re-engineering of life on this planet is unethical. Not asking Canadians for permission to pay Genome Canada this money is unethical. Seeking control and power over others is unethical.

But that’s just my “wilfulness” to say that. So they will do what they are paid to do, whatever they want to do.

How many decisions did you make this week about your country's resources? If the government didn’t ask you for input, then who is directing the future? Not you and me. But if it’s not you and me, then what is the ethical basis for the government doing anything at all with our resources? What right do they have to partner with special private groups and fund the direction of technology, to the exclusion of most Canadians (for example)?

Empowerment of the people depends on maintaining property rights, meaning the right to make our own decisions for our lives and the resources we use.

There should *NOT be one direction for humanity*. There should be MANY directions, MANY people in charge of their own lives, making their own decisions, who set their own ways and protect their own rights.

Privileged groups who are running amok and using governments, playing God with biology and tampering with genetics, are a direct threat via contamination to OUR property rights, to our land, our resources, our homes, and our bodies.

How can any of us just accept things like this, and take this at face value, as if these private and international groups care about our rights!? It’s ridiculous what we put up with. This is just one small but dangerous example of what goes on with OUR TAXES while we remain POORLY INFORMED by government and mainstream media.

Part 7

Wells describes the Open Conspiracy as a “candid attempt to take possession of the whole world...” (p. 35).

On population control and eugenics he says,

“Intelligent **control of population** is a possibility which puts man outside competitive processes that have hitherto ruled the modification of species” (p. 35).

“There is a clear hope that, later, **directed breeding** will come within his scope ...” (p. 35).

“...the organized world community conducting and ensuring its own progress, **requires a deliberate collective control of population as a primary condition.**”

So population control is *central* in his conception of world government.

Wells—the “socialist”—should hopefully confuse readers who are locked into the false left-right paradigm. He criticizes “capitalism” for being wasteful and unsystematic in its exploitation of production. But he also praises it for being better than those types of “socialism” which were not obsessed, like him, with eugenics and elite class rule.

“...what is called the capitalist system, that is to say the unsystematic exploitation of production by private owners under the protection of law, has, on the whole, in spite of much waste and conflict, worked beneficially by checking that gravitation to a universal low-grade consumption which would have been the inevitable outcome of a socialism oblivious of biological processes. **With effective restraint upon the increase of population, however, entirely new possibilities open out before mankind**” (p. 36).

Wells discusses the mass collection and organizing of data needed for his world state. His description of this organizing collectivist-corporatist “intelligence” raises again in my mind the science fiction analogy of artificial intelligence.

“... the supreme direction of the complex of human economic activities in such a world **must centre upon a bureau of information and advice**, which will **take account of all the resources of the planet**, estimate current needs, apportion productive activities and **control distribution**... The topographical and geological surveys ... maps ... statistics, are the first crude and unco-ordinated **beginnings of such an economic world intelligence.**”

This idea of taking account of all the planet’s resources completely corresponds to the content of the UN's [Agenda 21](#) [13]. Also, in my mind, it ties in with the functions of [Google Earth](#) [14] including “[Street View](#)” [15].

Wells is talking about a *centrally planned* world:

“Such a great central organization of economic science would necessarily produce **direction**; it would indicate **what had best be done** here, there, and everywhere, ... It would not be an organization of will, imposing its will upon a reluctant or recalcitrant race; it would be a **direction**, just as a map is a direction” (p. 38).

Just a lot of double-speak. Of course the ruling technocrats will impose the “map” on everyone else.

Part 8

Wells talks about the will to have the “map” complete and up to date. The analogy to a living

intelligent system continues:

“And through that will it will produce as the central organ the **brain of the modern community**, a great encyclopedic organization, kept constantly up to date and giving approximate estimates and **directions for all the material activities of mankind**” (p. 38).

And that should remind us now of the use of tax-funded weather “prediction” policy-generating [supercomputers \[16\]](#)—the crystal balls of the new “scientific” power priesthood—to convince us of the supposed need to cut down on our carbon dioxide generation (clean life-giving gas), energy use, travel and number of children. Their message: “Pay up, be poor, die off, OR watch the earth descend into utter darkness and chaos as ice caps melt, etc., blah blah blah.”

And then Wells tries to convince us that his authoritarian utopia of “universal peace” (i.e., no opposition) and science, will not need the typical government methods of “will-bending” and compulsion. Yeah, *right*. But on the other hand, it looks like most of us won’t have a will left by the time his system is in place – after a [temporary phase \[17\]](#) of compulsion and genetic tinkering. (See p. 36 of this [document \[18\]](#)).

Minimizing “will fights”

“must be a primary consideration in arranging the **economic, biological, and mental organization** of the world community...”. (p. 39)

He explains also that the “controversy between Individualism and Socialism” was a waste of time (p. 39). Wells strains to explain how degrees of liberty and personal property can coexist in his elitist totalitarian system. As Orwell's *Animal Farm* explains about its utopia, “All animals are equal, but *some animals are more equal than others*” [19]. Perhaps Wells’ arguments are calculated to appeal to those who think they will end up near the top of the pyramid, who desire “freedom” to control and loot others they despise, and to interfere with *their* property.

There are people who want to interfere with the property, personal space, private lives and personal beliefs of those who *will not conform, or cannot keep up*. These controlling types are tired of being restrained by *middle and working class moral rules about respecting boundaries*. So that’s their idea of “freedom” in my opinion. “Freedom” to exploit, “freedom” to dominate.

Many people incorrectly believe that the dominant form of socialism is intended for the benefit of the many rather than for the benefit of an elite feudal class who are seeking to suppress all forms of competition.

So many have been brainwashed into buying environmentalist or conservationist arguments like those of Wells, these excuses for continued feudalism, for why we are live in servitude and fear of, for example, [“conservation” officers \[20\]](#) who inflict [harsh penalties \[21\]](#).

I think that many are fooled, and are always trying to please, so they tend to make excuses for injustice and cruelty, because it hasn’t happened to them yet. Their attitude is if you just keep doing what you’re told, which they assume to be the right thing, everything will be fine. It’s all for a good reason supposedly, even though no-one ever asked them for their feedback about these laws in their life.

“It’s the law.” “Those are the rules.” They believe they must be good and right. They are thankful for not living in medieval times when someone’s [hand was cut off, or their eye was burned out \[22\]](#) for hunting the “King’s deer” in the “King’s forest” so he could feed his family. Because it belonged to the King, right? All of it! Whatever he says. And how dare anyone take the King's stuff! Or the

corporatocracy's resources.

But what about an enormous fine, or a fisherman's car, truck or boat, or worse being confiscated for taking a few of the wrong fish at the wrong time? Is it really a whole lot worse to get a hand cut off? Some of the laws must be in place for good reasons, but, thinking of Ontario again, why are the penalties so shockingly harsh and contrary to our normal attitudes? Most of us are unaware of these laws—we take them for granted and don't realize how little we are involved in creating them—never mind correcting them, which we should be trying to do.

If there are laws making it so risky to fish, or risky and complicated to have our own business sometimes, the logical conclusion is that we should be indoors playing video games, watching TV and living in virtual worlds.

“Certain things, the ocean, the air, rare wild animals, must be the **collective property of all mankind**... Whatever **collective control** exists must protect these universal properties, the sea from derelicts, the strange shy things of the wild from extermination by the hunter and the foolish collector. The extinction of many beautiful creatures is one of the penalties our world is paying for its sluggishness in developing a **collective common rule**” (p. 40).

So he gets his foothold with the propaganda we are familiar with, using that line of argument we have heard for a long time from elite organizations such as the World Wildlife Fund [23].

First, members of the elite class, for centuries, imperialists and looters such as [Cecil Rhodes](#) [24] run around pillaging the resources that rightfully belong to native peoples and peaceful immigrant settlers.

THEN propagandists like Wells come along and tell us how humanity in general is all SCUM and we're just running around in general like vicious mindless rats, eating and looting all the mineral and genetic resources that the internationalist feudal class want to control for themselves.

That is the purpose for having a single unified world control over these resources.

And they don't stop with those kinds of resources at all! There are no moral boundaries in their minds.

Human beings of the lower and middle classes, to Wells, are just a nasty sort of life, always doing our own thing, always wanting to eat, breath, breed, and prosper.

How they hate to see individuals, families and tribes rope off their own areas and try to protect their own people, their own wealth, their own resources. But they love the furry animals and want to protect them. *Sure they do*. To people like Wells and the World Wildlife Fund propagandists, the animals, the trees, the rocks ARE more important than the mass of humanity.

We are in an ideological battle of values, but it's all one-sided. We are also fooled by their “left” and “right” branches. The major parties all end up going along with the main agenda. Those who truly exploit the world's resources, a collection of [international institutions](#) [25], seek the domination and monopoly of all resources, and they have most of humanity under their thumb. They run the policy institutes that feed policy to governments. That is why we are always threatened with more taxes, more regulations, more restrictions, more lies, more war, more monitoring, more check points, more invasions of privacy.

We are already just about completely submerged in this system. And all that stands between us and total disaster are the remnants of belief in individual rights, in property rights, in local sovereignty, in personal conscience, justice, respect for autonomy and personal freedoms. And we are on the verge of losing everything to those who use all means to disguise their viciousness as if it's holy and idealistic.

They claim to put the earth first, to “protect” the (*their*) environment – from *their competition*. They claim to be spreading *their* “democracy” and “protecting” everyone with [predator drones \[26\]](#) and [depleted uranium \[27\]](#). What is done to others will be done to us.

We must stop making excuses for evil and falling for lies in the name of the “earth” or anything else. We must put humanity first, we must put rights and freedoms first. Saying no and standing up for others is standing up for yourself. That is our only hope.

Part 9

The twisted double-speak continues:

“The raw material of the earth should be for all [collected together by an elite and the remnants doled out to keep people in line] ...not to be withheld from exploitation for the general benefit of any chance claims to territorial priority of this or that **backward** or bargaining person or tribe” (p. 40).

So his attitude towards “all” is clearly expressed. Resources are to be distributed by an authoritarian structure that holds in contempt different ways of life—different opinions, property rights and sovereignty. If we get anything, it will be doled out on their terms. Lucky us.

“But when we have stipulated for the **replacement of individual private ownership** by more **highly organized forms of collective ownership**, subject to free criticism and responsible to the whole *republic of mankind*, in the general **control of sea and land, in the getting, preparation, and distribution of staple products and in transport ...**”

“And if we add to that the necessary **maintenance of a money system by a central world authority ...** and if we conceive credit adequately controlled in the general interest by a **socialized world banking organization**, we shall have defined the **entire realm from which individual property and unrestricted individual enterprise have been excluded**” (p. 41).

So, don’t worry, that’s *all* they’re going to take over! Almost everything. And Wells desperately tries to explain how *beyond all of those areas of life*, individuals—I suppose the ones who still survive the takeover—will be free “to exploit their abilities as they wish.” *Sure* they will. Oh, thank you, thank you so much for allowing us to do whatever is on your short list of exceptions to tyranny! He weaves in a lot of fluff about how his world money system will be fair to workers, money will retain its value, blah blah blah. So he mixes in a little honey with his nasty medicine.

In fact, *we are born with freedoms and rights inherently*. We either believe that or we are doomed. The State or the future World State just interferes with that reality and pretends to be *bestowing or allowing* us to have a little freedom. It also pretends to represent us. In reality, one person has just as much value and inherent power as another, uniform or not, government or not.

A lot of what he is talking about is already reality and has worsened gradually over time. Most of us have never had true property rights and control. Look at the money system we are forced to use. Look at the income tax. Look at the property tax. Who do you think originated these taxes? The Open Conspiracy of course. It’s all long term. Here he describes the feudal nature of the “utopia,” and tarts it

up as usual:

“If the individual landowner or mineral-owner disappears altogether from the world, he will probably be **replaced over large areas by tenants** with considerable security of tenure, by householders and by **licensees under collective proprietors...**” (p. 41).

Just like now. Really. We’re used to this already. Even the so-called “owners” have few rights, because property taxes, other taxes, zoning, “Greenbelt Acts” and “Clean Water Acts” undermine their control of their property and the fruits of their labor. And there are so many laws to break, so many ways to fine us, so many ways to have real assets confiscated by inspectors of different kinds. People are living in dreamland and are not paying attention to what is in the legislation being passed in countries like Canada and the U.S. Mostly, it’s because we think the mainstream media would have warned us, but that’s not their job apparently. And apparently also it’s not the job of the public education system to criticize our blind faith and trust in government.

He waffles over the question of democracy again, about whether “collective bodies” will be

“elected bodies or groups deriving their authority from other sanctions. Their scope and methods of operation, their relations to one another and to the **central bureau of intelligence**, remain also to be defined” (p. 41).

This terminology reminds us of the later **Central** Intelligence Agency, although it’s obvious Wells is talking about a broader and more universal collection of economic and resource data than we normally associate with the function of spy agencies. The close Anglo-American connection between British and American intelligence services, along with some very interesting details, is portrayed in the movie “[The Good Shepherd](#)” [28].

In my opinion, just as the U.S. military and NATO has the planet and [space](#) [29] itself [carved into zones](#) [30], the naming of the *Central* Intelligence Agency gives the impression that the American ruling class Establishment (creators of the UN also) has already long ago set things up for a *world government* to take over U.S. intelligence and military infrastructure from wherever it leaves off.

Ch. IX “No stable utopia is now conceivable”

Wells paints the picture of a world managed according to a regime grounded in population control policies:

“...steadily changing conditions involving continually enlarging and exhilarating opportunities [for the few]. Mankind, **released from the pressure of population**, the waste of warfare [no “warfare” between nations, just [putting down rebellions](#) [31]] and the private monopolization of the sources of wealth [the word “monopolization” is twisted into attacking the opposite: independent control of our own resources], will face the universe with a great and increasing surplus of will and energy.”

“**Change** and novelty will be the order of life...”

We’ve been living “change” all our lives, and listening to “change” slogans all our lives, as the Open Conspirators fund and direct the change *they want to see*. And the cliches come out our ears. We will learn to “LOVE our *change* or else ... we go the way of the dodo, blah blah blah.” Or we are told to

“[ADAPT TO CHANGE](#) [32], or go the way of the dinosaur, blah blah blah.” All these **threats** we’ve heard in seminars and media all our lives, from people telling us how we must adapt to not having the old ways, the old factories, the old traditional structures, as they scrap everything we used to believe in and hold onto. *Why can’t we be in control of how things are done around us? Why do we have to adapt to someone else’s agenda?* All of this change, we go along with it because well-funded think-tanks and media tell us it’s *supposed* to be this way. And where is it all headed? H. G. Wells spells it out.

Part 10

Ch. X “The Open Conspiracy is not to be thought of as a single organization; it is a conception of life out of which efforts, organizations, and new orientations will arise”

Wells explains that the Open Conspiracy

“cannot fail to arouse enormous opposition. ... it is a creative effort that can hardly stir without attacking established things. It is the repudiation of drift, of “leaving things alone.” It **criticizes everything in human life from the top to the bottom and finds everything not good enough**. It strikes at the universal human desire to feel that things are “all right”” (p. 44).

There are some interesting comments Wells makes while half-criticizing and half-praising Russian Bolshevik rule, being critical of Marxist anti-elitist dogma:

“a small oligarchy which has obtained power by its profession does its obstinate best, much hampered by the suspicion and hostility of the Western financiers [Some of them? [I wonder about that statement](#) [33]] and politicians, to carry on a series of *interesting and varyingly successful experiments* in the socialization of economic life...”

However, Wells explains how their brutal dictatorship was not good enough:

“...Marxism and Communism are divagations from the path of *human progress* and that the line of advance must follow a course **more intricate and less flattering to the common impulses of our nature**.”

In other words, he’s saying in this section that the Bolsheviks were too much tied to Marxist dogma about the “workers” and appealing to the interest of the masses and ordinary people. They were too crude and resorted to “malignantly destructive activities,” and not scientific enough for his taste. He could see the Russian form of communism just wouldn’t achieve the world state. Malicious, totalitarian, cruel, **useful for “interesting” “experiments,”** very educational for elitists to observe, but still ineffective in achieving a unified world state. That goal would have to wait for a much more sophisticated strategy.

As a character [says](#) in George Orwell’s *1984*, in the context of resisting tyranny: “The proletariat don’t count” [34]. Wells also recognizes that the mass man is unaware and easily conditioned to his lot in life, that he is not a revolutionary force in any direction – either towards the type of society that Wells envisages (thankfully) or away from it (unfortunately, but I hope that more will wake up to start pulling back). So:

“we clear the way for the recognition of an elite of intelligent, creative-minded people

scattered through the whole community, and for a study of the method of making this creative element effective in human affairs against **the massive oppositions of selfishness and unimaginative self-protective conservatism.**“

So he flatters those he expects to join his Open Conspiracy, and he condemns the people who don't want to be pushed around. He characterizes people who stand up for themselves and their ways of life as “selfish” and “unimaginative.” But of course, Wells has things upside down, because the people who care about their values and traditions and rights will stand up for each other against his Open Conspiracy. That's not selfish.

I think things have changed a lot since his time, and now the heavily conditioned masses are more likely to just go along out of fear and join his alliance of conformists: willing idealistic dupes, opportunistic frauds and power-hungry goons. Because I'm sure that accurately characterizes the majority of the Open Conspiracy. Duped naive idealists are the best of them, and I understand, because I've been duped myself when it comes to authoritarian religion.

What do you think the nature of such a hierarchy would be? Do you really think they would be better than everyone else and more caring and loving towards their fellow human beings? Wells just writes endlessly, obsessively about how he wants to change everything and fix everything and create this perfect world where his kind of “imaginative” *frustrated* people have it all planned out. What kind of people do you think are attracted to that? It's all about desire for POWER, and he shamelessly repeats that concept of power as being a positive thing. It stands out. It's not normal.

Wells contradicts his supposed anti-war persona. Since there are “armies prepared to act coercively,” he says:

“it is necessary that the Open Conspiracy should develop within itself the competence to resist military coercion and ***combat and destroy armies that stand in the way of its emergence.***”

So he makes like that's not being “coercive.” The Open Conspiracy will just “emerge” and will use its military might to defeat anyone who gets scared and thinks their way of life is possibly under attack. He says that's different from being “coercive,” because trying to take over the world to create a world totalitarian system is a very “special” kind of goal, and it isn't the same as “coercively” trying to defend your old “backwards” “selfish” “unscientific” ways of life. So he has the future scripting practically all written out in advance to justify a huge tax-funded, debt-funded, scientifically organized international Open Conspiracy stomping on the little ant-like people who dare to oppose it—and calling it “defense.”

“And when we come to the general functioning classes, **landowners, industrial organizers, bankers, and so forth, who control the present system**, such as it is, it should be still plainer that **it is very largely from the ranks of these classes, and from their stores of experience and traditions of method, that the directive forces of the new order must emerge...**” (p. 46).

He flatters and encourages his [banker buddies](#) [35]:

“...there remains a residuum of original and intelligent people in **banking or associated with banking** or mentally interested in banking, who do **realize that banking plays a very important and interesting part in the world's affairs, who are curious about their own**

intricate function and disposed towards a scientific investigation of its origins, conditions, and future possibilities. Such types move naturally towards the Open Conspiracy. Their enquiries carry them inevitably outside the bankers' habitual field to an examination of the nature, drift, and destiny of the entire economic process."

Part II

Ch. XI Forces and resistances in the great modern communities now prevalent, which are antagonistic to the Open Conspiracy. The war with tradition.

Wells claims that the Open Conspiracy

"does not want to destroy existing controls and forms of human association, but either to supersede or amalgamate them into a common world directorate" (p. 49).

All the power and tyranny will be maintained to push people around, but I doubt that healthy, natural voluntary connections and rules among people will survive being "superseded" and "amalgamated."

Then he says that as long as national governments do their bit in planning for the world directorate, the Open Conspiracy won't hurt them. Long in advance, what he is describing sounds like the world situation since the UN was founded:

"If constitutions, parliaments, and kings can be dealt with as provisional institutions, trustees for the coming of age of the world commonweal, and so far as they are conducted in that spirit, the Open Conspiracy makes no attack upon them" (p. 49).

So those who go along and sign on to the agenda will not be crushed.

It's easy to agree with his criticism of "aggressive nationalists" (p. 49), but he's being a hypocrite to imply that the Open Conspiracy will be anything but more aggressive and more intolerant. And isn't mega-nationalism like imperialism, just a tool of the globalists? Hasn't it just been the same sort of thing as the Open Conspiracy in its elevation of State worship, and its own policies of standardization of huge regions, its attacks on non-conforming cultures and policies of [assimilation](#) [36] of native cultures? Weren't the policies of eugenics and Social Darwinism already dominating the nation states even before the 20th century began, before Wells wrote this?

Isn't the militancy of the neoconservative ["ex"-Trotskyites](#) [37], where they force so-called "democracy" on the world, just a bad-cop "right-wing" form of [militant internationalism disguised as nationalism](#) [38]?

Wells doesn't have any place for certain kinds of employment:

"Machinery and scientific organization have been and still are revolutionizing productive activity by the progressive **elimination of the unskilled worker, the hack, the mere toiler"** (p. 55).

So there is supposed to be this future where nobody will be needed to rake leaves or sweep floors, where machines replace most human workers. And we've been propagandized like this for over a century. This eugenics-economics technocratic propaganda is just a destructive attack on natural human

values.

Wells lets his attitudes all hang out:

“We no longer want that **breeding swarm** of hefty sweaty bodies without which the former civilizations could not have endured. We want watchful and understanding guardians and drivers of complex delicate machines The less disposed these masters of machines are to **inordinate multiplication**, the more room and food in the world for their ampler lives.”

So these are the control freak obsessions of population, eugenics and social engineering that have been propagandized and used to undermine respect for human values.

In response, here are three animations by [PRI](#) [39] that refute the **elitist conspirators'** [40] anti-human and anti-freedom lie of “over-population,” and their efforts to dominate the planet with their **actual** [41] anti-population **policies** [42]: [Overpopulation: The Making of a Myth](#) [43], [2.1 Kids: Stable Population](#) [44] and [Food: There's Lots of It](#) [45].

Part 12

Ch. XII The resistances of the less industrialized peoples to the drive of the open conspiracy

Wells explains part of the transition from the old order to the new world order, referring to “the finer, more energetic minds” of the less industrialized countries who will feel an “immense invitation” from the Open Conspiracy:

“At one step they may go from the sinking vessel of their antiquated order, across their present conquerors, into a **brotherhood of world rulers**” (p. 59).

So Wells gives a surprising description to the Open Conspiracy—a “brotherhood of world rulers”—which builds up an international ruling class from each nation, as long as they can find a few who can fit in to the new system.

So a few natives from those countries would jump ship from their native culture and national feeling, and would be recruited to join the elite class, the Open Conspiracy—a world government in the making. And they would side-step the domination and difficult race relations with the European middle class settlers, and concentrate with the internationalist elite on planning for the coming world order.

However, says Wells, most will see the Open Conspiracy as no better than Western imperialism, and

“they will fight a **mighty liberation** as though it were a further enslavement to the European tradition” (p. 59).

Wells expected acceptance of the Open Conspiracy to emerge from the cultural conflict:

“In the conflict of old traditions and in the consequent deadlocks lies much hope for the direct acceptance of the groups of ideas centering upon the Open Conspiracy” (p. 59).

Wells claims the Russian Soviet government was a “novelty of extraordinary interest.”

Wells expresses empathy for the Soviet government, and seems to be expressing clear disdain for the Russian “peasants and herdsmen” over which the Soviet dictatorship ruled. And he actually implies the looting Soviet government was somehow *morally* superior to those it ruled, which is completely absurd and elitist:

“It finds itself separated, intellectually and morally, by an enormous gap from the illiterate millions over which it rules” (p. 59).

Wells describes the tyranny as an

“urgent militant necessity for mental unanimity and a consequent repression of criticism...”

“...More open perhaps to **scientific and creative conceptions** than any other government, and certainly more willing to *experiment* and innovate...” (p. 59)

Wells feels the Soviet regime does not hit the mark. He really doesn’t like the fact that the proletariat are free to breed:

“it struggles within itself between concepts of a modern scientific social organization and a vague anarchistic dream in which the “State” is to disappear, and an emancipated **proletariat, breeding** and expectorating freely, fills the vistas of time forevermore” (p. 60).

Wells feels that the vast majority in Russia, even though it was ruled by Communism, and China would not be receptive to the Open Conspiracy because of their “inchoate barbarism”:

“...the hope of China struggling out of it without some **forcible directive interventions** is a hope to which **constructive liberalism** clings with very little assurance” (p. 61).

So it’s historically interesting that he discusses the idea of direct “Open Conspiracy” intervention in China. So it is worth looking into how much input the later Communist Chinese might have received over the years from the agents of “constructive liberalism” in the form of [Western](#) [46] bureaucrats, industrialists, [ex-politicians](#) [47] etc.

Wells sees the Marxist ideology “entrenched in Moscow” becoming

“more and more dogmatic and unprogressive, repeating its sacred credo and issuing its disregarded orders to the proletariat of the world, and so stay ineffectively crystallized **until the rising tide of the Open Conspiracy submerges, dissolves it afresh, and incorporates whatever it finds assimilable**” (p. 61).

And so much later we had the fall of the Berlin Wall, the collapse of the Soviet system, the announcements by President Bush Sr. of the “[New World Order](#),” [48] and the [merger](#) [49] of the [Soviet and American](#) systems [50].

Wells discusses, in his eugenics racist social Darwinist mode, how much difficulty there is in getting Asia and Africa to adopt modern society and “knowledge and ideas that have checked the rate of increase of all the Atlantic populations” (p. 62).

“It seems inevitable that the development of modern means of communication and the

conquest of tropical diseases should end in giving access everywhere to **modern administration** and to **economic methods**, and everywhere the incorporation of the former wilderness in the **modern economic process** means the **destruction of the material basis, the free hunting, the free access to the soil, of such barbaric and savage** communities as still precariously survive..." (p. 62).

He says the Open Conspiracy would need to start with the "Atlantic civilizations" (Europe and North America):

"For the rest of the world, its (the Open Conspiracy's) propaganda, finding but poor nourishment in the local conditions, may retain a missionary quality for many years."

So he is talking about those tribal societies who have their own way of living, and their independent means of survival (who end up being servants to European immigrants he says). They are outside of the "modern" "economic" system, so they are "barbaric" and "savage" according to him. But European elite-run nations who build machine guns and chemical weapons and let millions die in world wars, because their systems are so complicated, so controlling, and so authoritarian, they get to be called "civilized"! Taxation, conscription, corporate welfare, armaments. That's "civilization."

So much for the idea that "economics" is run by people who believe in the free market. If you push your way in to another nation, and start pushing them around, and imposing your system on them, you are INVADING them, invading their property rights and natural rights, and that is what the elite-run corporations and governments still do under various excuses and guises. It's wrong. It's immoral. It always was and they always knew that.

So it's not really laissez-faire. It's "constructive liberalism" as Wells calls the totalitarian survival-of-the-fittest economics ideology which he admires so much. Theft and intervention is not freedom. *Imposing* economic systems on other peoples contradicts freedom. The economic systems we live under are not for freedom and they should not be equated with freedom or "free market." They were created for the convenience of an elite class for the purpose of looting and monopolizing. And variations on these systems have existed for thousands of years. And they are just methods for conveniently taxing and enslaving people. We are just trained by our education and the media to slap the words "freedom" onto them, but we are taxed on income, taxed on purchases, taxed on property, and we have to ask permission to do so many things, and yet people insist that Western countries like Canada are "free," because the charlatans leading us keep using the word "freedom" over and over in their speeches. Government and force is part of the economic system we live under. It's older than socialism. Government is there for the convenience of the elite class. It manages the resources for them.

If the government served the people and had our best interests at heart, there wouldn't be such a serious problem. But it doesn't. The system of "democracy" doesn't deal with our best interests. It bails out banks and other corporations, it puts us in debt to banks, it directs resources towards war, towards technologies it sees as a priority, towards population control, it funds body scanners which violate our privacy, and puts them in airports, it pardons pedophiles and lets other serious criminals out on the street, it puts innocent people in prison for decades. It controls culture (openly in Canada), it controls education, it controls health care, it wars against the peoples' civil rights and property rights under the guise of the "drug war." Why? This is "democracy." It is fake democracy as a gloss on the actual government, to make us think we have a say in things. But when was the last time you had a say in anything or even had something to say, or knew what was going on? Would you tell your federal or

provincial “representative”? Maybe we should try, but I bet most Members of Parliament will just tell us that their Party already decided on the issue.

Ch. XIII Resistances and antagonistic forces in our conscious and unconscious selves

Wells speaks about internal conflicts that true believers have. And he often personifies the Open Conspiracy:

“The Open Conspiracy is in partial possession of us, and we attempt to serve it” (p. 64).

Wells says that the conspirators need to conquer the tumult of their lives and focus on the big issues:

“Aim must prevail over the aimless.”

And he must be trying to appeal to idealists, to get them on board with the power conspiracy. And this is the same problem that we deal with on the other side, those who believe in freedom, individual rights and the value of human life, those of us who are troubled by what the dominant *purposeful* ones are doing in this world.

The masses have no direction until they are hungry and out on the streets. They are aimless. Those trying to wake up are pulled towards a whirlpool of endless diversions, even endless political diversions, not to mention endless work. And by the time we realize how serious life is, and how we shouldn't be just going along with everything, it will all be too late. And the banks will have taken everything, and we will be living under IMF “austerity measures” with our families scattered to the winds, no common ground with our neighbors, no wealth left, no rights, and no freedoms left.

And we will look back at all the time we wasted, and we will wail out loud for being naive, for being suckers, for mouthing empty slogans and wishful thinking about some wonderful future that we're somehow evolving towards, which never comes. And we'll regret so much that we said nothing and did nothing, and we let ourselves be lied to and we let ourselves be stolen from, and we let other people be tortured, bombed and arrested without trial.

Part 13

Ch. XIV The Open Conspiracy begins as a movement of discussion, explanation, and propaganda

Wells lays out the three fundamental issues upon which the Open Conspiracy must agree:

“... the entirely **provisional nature of all existing governments**, and the entirely provisional nature of all **loyalties** associated therewith;

“... the **supreme importance of population control in human biology** ...”

“...urgent necessity of protective resistance against the present traditional drift towards war” (p. 70).

So the the last point he uses as bait to get those who are anti-war on board with his agenda. Peace becomes equated with getting rid of national loyalties and also with reducing population.

Wells gives examples of how he envisages the Open Conspiracy in action, including local people advocating for appropriate books to be put up for sale or placed in their local library. Or parents lobbying for the teaching of Open Conspiracy indoctrination of, for example, what he calls “universal history” (p. 70).

He seems to advocate conscientious objection to war, but he puts provisos on it, and spins it off so that you’re supposed to adopt the whole package he has to offer:

“The time for a conscientious objection to war service is manifestly before and not after the onset of war” (p. 71).

So he’s right that it’s better to start objecting to an unjust war before we get to war. But I wonder if he’s implying that you should just follow along with the war once it starts.

“People who have **by their silence acquiesced in a belligerent foreign policy** right up to the onset of war, have little to complain of if they are then compelled to serve” (p. 71).

Of course it is necessary that people speak up about wars of aggression and war propaganda before the wars begin. However, I believe that it is never too late to wake up and object to an unjust war for the sake of doing the right thing and helping to prevent greater evil. If a large enough group objects and speaks out at *any* time, it may put a stop to the evil. And if you speak out and say no, then others might follow.

“And a refusal to participate with one’s country in warfare is a preposterously incomplete gesture unless it is rounded off by the **deliberate advocacy of a world pax, a world economic control, and a restrained population**, such as the idea of the Open Conspiracy embodies” (p. 71).

In other words, Wells requires you to adopt his whole agenda, not just peace. Wells doesn’t allow his followers to object to war without accepting **world government control of military security, finances and population**.

Many idealistic people who are stuck in the fraudulent left-right paradigm are caught in mental binds like the one Wells tries to impose, for example, those who don’t see themselves as “left-wing,” but who want to protest war. This is all artificial division. Principle is principle regardless of how people are divided into groups.

Wells is a militarist when it comes to military action on behalf of the world government:

“The anticipatory repudiation of military service ... need not necessarily involve a denial of the need of **military action on behalf of the world commonweal** for the suppression of nationalist brigandage, nor need it prevent the **military training of the Open Conspirators**” (p. 71).

Wells lists seven principles that define the collectivist Open Conspiracy (p. 72):

- 1) Asserting the “provisional” (temporary) nature of existing governments.
- 2) Minimizing conflicts of existing governments, militancy and their “interference with the establishment of a world economic system.”
- 3) Replacing “**private, local or national ownership of at least credit, transport, and staple**

production by a responsible **world directorate.**”

4) The “practical recognition of the necessity for **world biological controls**, *for example*, of population and disease.”

5) The “support of a **minimum** standard of individual freedom and welfare” (cleverly worded).

6) The “supreme duty of **subordinating the personal career to the creation of a world directorate** .. and to the general advancement of human knowledge, capacity, and power.”

7) Believing that “immortality ... lies in the race [human race] and not in our individual selves.”

So Wells throws the individual OUT of the picture, and submerges the individual within a monstrous collective entity.

Opposing the will of the world government conspiracy defines his idea of “wickedness” (p. 74) rather than traditional morality which is about whether or not you are hurting other individuals and their rights. So globalists take the counterpart collectivist morality of government worship to the ultimate degree, although we have always had some amount of it in our indoctrination.

Ch. XV Early constructive work of the Open Conspiracy

Wells explains that he didn’t originate the Open Conspiracy:

“In this book we are not starting something; we are describing and participating in something which has started” (p. 73).

Wells explains the importance of being cozy with scientists and how to get them on board with the agenda. And this explains so much about the world we live in today:

“... when it involves **no special trouble for them**, when it is the **line of least resistance for them**, they may be expected to fall in with its convenient and helpful aims...” (p. 74).

So just make it impossible for scientists (and others) to get ahead independently. And in general, seduce everyone into serving the system through fear of poverty and fear of ridicule and social exclusion, etc.

And so we have this world we’re living in where most people just go along and do what they’re told. Personal debt. Government debt. Certification monopolies. Restrictions on use of property. Limitations. Licensing. Taxes. Zoning. Fines. Huge lists of laws to break. Fear of being unemployed. This wonderful “freedom” we pretend we have, which can be taken away at the drop of a hat with some terrorist incident, usually a fake “false flag.” And we’re terrified of speaking out against the government wars—which are internationalist wars—really—often UN-approved wars—and we’re unable to admit the possibility that our governments are really just tied together at the hip internationally, that they are bound by treaties to conform to Open Conspiracy instructions, that they are really just spending all their time lying to us, keeping secrets and manipulating us, doing terrible things to foreigners, as well as using and abusing us, including the troops some people claim they “support.”

Part 14

Wells writes about the need for Open Conspirators to fund laboratories, etc. all over the world. He says there was a great need for proper storage and indexing of scientific data. And also there was a need to popularize science (p. 75).

Wells says he is using the word “science”

“... in its narrower accepted meaning for what is often spoken of as *pure* science, the search for physical and biological realities, **uncomplicated by moral**, social, and “practical” considerations...”

And, presto, we have this “modern” attitude that moral considerations aren’t important for scientific research. Convenient for some, dangerous for everyone else.

Wells discusses a “parallel system of Open Conspiracy groups”

“in relation to business and industrial life. ... concerned with the huge and more complicated problems of the processes by which even now the small isolated individual adventures in production and trading that constituted the economic life of former civilizations, are **giving place to larger, better instructed, better planned industrial organizations, whose operations and combinations become at last world wide**” (p. 76).

He talks about the “transition from speculative adventure to organized foresight in the common interest” (p. 76).

“Private ownership may not be altogether evil as a provisional stage, even if it has no more in its favour than the ability to transcend political boundaries” (p. 77).

And he says that after dismissing other Socialist efforts at democratic ownership or dictatorship of the proletariat, implying they had not come up with the right formula yet for “that larger ownership we desire.” So it’s obvious again he wanted some kind of elite-run structure.

The Open Conspiracy

“turns to **biology** for guidance towards the **regulation of quantity and a controlled distribution of the human population** of the world...” (p. 77).

About economic reconstruction:

“These economic groups, then, of the Open Conspiracy ... will be working in that vast task of economic reconstruction ... They will be **conducting experiments** ... The whole question of money ... will be examined under the assumption that money is the token of the community’s obligation, direct or indirect, to an individual, and credit its permission to deal freely with material” (p. 77).

So he’s saying money just represents the individual’s child-like relationship to their feudal Guardian he calls the “community” (the State, the Emperor, the King, the Oligarchy controlling the fake Democracy). Money becomes a credit—your **allowance** by Big Daddy who is granting you permission to do anything at all with the resources Big Daddy claims to own (“material”). None of this stuff about “inherent rights” and “owning property” and “freedom” that some of us talk about.

In advance, Wells describes the process of what has been happening for decades in Canada and other societies:

“Instead of the crude proposals to “expropriate” and “take over by the State” of the primitive socialism, the Open Conspiracy will **build up an encyclopaedic conception of the modern economic complex as a labyrinthine pseudo-system progressively eliminating waste and working its way along multitudinous channels towards unity, towards clarity of purpose and method, towards abundant productivity and efficient social service**” (p. 77).

So none of this stuff about “rights” and “individualism” that we worry about. None of that talk about “freedom” from Mr. Wells. We are cogs in a machine, and we are to serve the machine, the economy, which we have heard all our lives—phrases like “for the benefit of the economy” as if the economic system is functioning in a completely natural and ethical way—for the benefit of the people as a whole. And now they add “for the earth,” so we are to sacrifice supposedly for their “earth” in their updated economic system.

To them, our nations are just businesses, and they want all nations to be just one big business with *less people*. And this is, believe it or not, the nature of the “socialism” that has gradually crushed choice and autonomy out of our lives. It’s not “left,” it’s not “right”—there is no such thing. Call it fascism, sure. It is just feudalism reconstituting itself, calling itself “capitalism” one minute, calling itself “socialism” the next. It’s all a lie. Just a group of monopolists lording over us, presuming superiority, presuming to know what is best for us, presuming greater “clarity” than us, obsessing over collecting data, obsessing over “efficiency,” “productivity,” “eliminating waste,” accumulating power and control over everything.

“...until at last the **production and distribution of staple necessities** is apprehended as **one world business**, and we have suggested that this latter movement may gradually pervade and **incorporate a very great bulk of human activities...**”

“...**assimilating** all the confused processes of to-day into a **world community**” (p. 78).

Yes, he wants a world where your food is handed out to you. It sounds nice to the gullible. DISTRIBUTING STAPLE NECESSITIES LIKE FOOD = TOTAL CONTROL. And this, by the way, is the same kind of thing as rationing and controlling the supply of health care. Just two points of control over human biological processes.

Part 15

About education and the Open Conspiracy:

“The forces of the entire movement may be mobilized in a variety of ways to **bring pressure upon reactionary schools and institutions**” (p. 78).

About government:

“Its main political idea, its political strategy, is to **weaken, efface, incorporate, or supersede existing governments**” (p. 78).

The Open Conspiracy

“will be frankly a **world religion**. This large, loose assimilatory mass of movements, groups, and societies will be **definitely and obviously attempting to swallow up the entire population of the world and become the new human community**” (p. 79).

Ch. XVI Existing and developing movements which are contributory to the Open Conspiracy and which must develop a common consciousness. The Parable of Provinder Island.

Wells discusses the “Birth Control movement,” the “movement for the scientific study and control of population pressure,” and how their movement is going to end up self-defeating unless their project is “universal” and brought into line with the Open Conspiracy (p. 80). Once again, he is disparaging towards certain kinds of human beings that have as much right to be on this earth as the kind he elevates.

Then he says that pacifist organizations are “insincere” unless they go along with population control and the agenda of eliminating nation states (p. 81).

And he criticizes socialist and communist groups also – all these groups he wants to alter and absorb into the Open Conspiracy, which he claims is the natural “inheritor of socialist and communist enthusiasm” (p. 81).

In contrast to the socialist critics, he praises the monopolistic type of Capitalism:

“... a thousand times as many clever people have been busy upon industrial, mercantile and financial processes. ... Everywhere competitive businesses have been **giving way to amalgamated enterprises, marching towards monopoly**, and personally owned businesses to **organizations so large** as to acquire more and more the character of publicly responsible bodies” (p. 81).

So he praises the corporate and monopolistic model as if it's some kind of ideal. There are debates online among modern libertarians about the morality of corporations. But the bottom line in my opinion is to think of it from your own individual point of view. When a group or board (instead of a single business owner) is making decisions, the line of least resistance to oppressive government dictates and funding is followed, the line of most profitability is automatically followed and individual choice and conscience is suppressed. So society becomes a collection of machines by analogy, eventually amalgamating into one ultimate “perfect” machine, without conscience, without quirk. So that is the temptation to everyone who adopts the corporate model, to only have to follow profit, to not have to make moral decisions or take risks, to let others lead us instead of participating ourselves, to always get someone else to manage things for us, and to fall in line. The soul is trapped in the mass. And this is why this aspect of “capitalism” is attractive to advocates of tyranny like Wells.

You can't just say economics and making money is morally neutral. Nothing we do is morally neutral when our own governments are violating rights and bombing villages, and creating more and more oppressive laws at home, and massive debt to international banks. And we just keep going on as usual and saying nothing out of fear, or because we're wrapped up in so many other things. If things are not right, we need to stop somehow and fix what we can. This is a dilemma for all of us, and we all tend to be isolated in our ideas from each other and divided in so many ways.

Part 16

Big Business:

“The younger, more vigorous intelligences in the great business directorates of today are beginning to realize the **uncompleted implications of their enterprise**. A day will come when the gentlemen **who are trying to control the oil supplies of the world** without reference to anything else except as a subsidiary factor in their game will be considered to be **quaint characters**. **The ends of Big Business must carry Big Business into the Open Conspiracy just as surely as every other creative and broadly organizing movement is carried**” (p. 82).

So monopolizing tendencies were to be fit together into an agenda of world government. How far have things gone since he wrote that? It is a question that deserves attention as we approach the 2010 G8 and G20 Summits in Canada.

Wells’ whole way of presenting these ideas, using the word “progressive” and “modern,” is to convey the idea of inevitability to his world-encompassing agenda, and by implication the futility of resisting it. He paints the world as full of evil and how it needs to be fixed, but he wants it to be fixed from top to bottom as a whole. It’s just amazing that we should all bow to the opinions and solutions of people like Wells and submit to their judgments and qualifications as high priests and saviors.

How *natural* is this “progressive” agenda really? How much money has gone into it from tax-payers? From debt interest payments? How much tax money has gone into *funding and determining the directions* of science and technology all these years? How much money has had to be paid out from governments and foundations and corporations in societal propaganda? How many assassinations? How many dirty tricks and manipulations to get nations into debt? Think of *Confessions of an Economic Hit Man* by John Perkins.

How much attack on tradition and undermining of institutions, and societal revolution? How many rigged wars have gone into unification and control of resources? How much effort has been spent on international treaties and how much corruption has been involved in undermining nation states and independence movements? Not to mention funding of population control. Think about it. We should all be looking at these questions.

The parable of the Pig of Provinder Island (p. 82–84) is presented as an argument to Wells’ fellow “progressives” about why they should join forces to kill the whole pig, how they should not be stupid and just try individual small efforts at particular reforms as when each of the stranded sailors on the island tackles only a part of the pig. It doesn’t work, because the pig just BITES back when they try that.

His strategy is to destroy the current system as a whole so people like him can rebuild it according to their own design. They want to feed off the whole dead pig, not bits and pieces. They love the bacon flavor, they “love” humanity so much, so they have to go for broke and destroy existing institutions regardless of specific pros and cons—morality, family, religion, nation states, individual rights, autonomy. And then they can complete their wonderful utopian world on top of the wreckage, fitting everything together and arranging it *just so* according to their own tyrannical notions.

This is called the “**policy of the whole hog.**”

Another point about this: if you tried to implement changes in some nations, e.g., certain kinds of taxes,

then people would just move eventually to other nations. So you couldn't control everyone that way. So the globalist institutions work on [treaties](#) [51] to seal off escape. Same with regulations. If people couldn't tolerate certain regulations, off they go to some country where they don't have them. Seal off escape with treaties. If you tried to implement [body scanners](#) [52] in just a few nations, many people might just stop traveling to those nations. They can't have that. Same with population policies. So that's what's going on all the time with international treaties. Globalization means total global control. Globalists can't leave people alone, or else people might decide to go their own way and do their own thing. That's why we have all these international summits, and wars.

Probably there will be nations and individuals and states/provinces raising opposition, but will it be enough? I don't believe personally that the will to resist the Open Conspiracy is enough yet. It doesn't have to a majority at all. But it's not there yet. But it has to be. There needs to be an awakening to the ideas of individual rights and liberty and an understanding of what liberty means and why we have had very little of it. Liberty means respecting the autonomy and rights of other individuals and groups. It means not pushing them around and threatening them. You really think these officials at the G8 and G20 are going to discuss liberty?

Ch. XVII – The creative home, social group, and school: the present waste of idealistic will

“Now in each generation of the Open Conspiracy, until it can develop **its own reproductive methods**, must remain a minority movement of intelligent converts” (p. 85).

And then he discusses the need for the Open Conspiracy to educate its children carefully, and to “experiment in novel educational methods and educational atmospheres...” (p. 85)

“Successful schools would become **laboratories** of educational methods and **patterns for new state schools**” (p. 86).

One of the progressive experimental schools of that time, Beacon Hill, was founded by [fellow Fabian, Bertrand Russell](#) [53]. Here are some comments [quoted](#) [54] from his daughter's biography of her father and his school (Lady Katherine Tait). Also, this other [essay](#) [55] about Russell's school by Deborah Gorham is interesting and makes you wonder about the meanings of “freedom” and “libertarian.” We can recommend individual choice for everyone, fine, and encourage children to think for themselves, great. But that is contradicted by the idea of imposing an educational system on parents—or by fooling parents into thinking that it reflects their values, or nullifying the rights of parents. That's not liberty. Letting parents have their own schools is liberty. Yes. Great. But to decide—as a model for state schools (forced on people to one degree or another)—how everyone should think about the world—that's not liberty. Traditional protections in Canada uphold the rights of parents as having natural jurisdiction over their children, and also uphold freedom of religion, expression and conscience. We need these protections. To break down social structures such as monogamy and family will not protect children. To atomize society, which has been done thoroughly in Western countries, will not make us stronger and give us more liberty and rights protection from the State. That's the point. Breaking down all societal structures does not automatically lead to freedom at all. It leads to isolated individuals, as portrayed in Orwell's *1984*, with no one to help them, at the mercy of a totalitarian state. Totalitarians don't want the competition.

We have imperfect structures in society naturally, that are often subject to abuse, but which also

provide stability, namely the family and extended family. But these have been weakened. And then there are moral rules about how to treat others. And many philosophers and academics have been paid big bucks to question morality. But the entertainment industry is working [full steam](#) [56] on [that obstacle](#) [57] to tyranny. Also people get along with each other by following conventions about trade, property and hospitality, etc., and these are often healthy. But they are undermined by arbitrary and unjustified legislation and systems that seem to work against justice rather than uphold justice. Then there are different religions. Then there are political institutions. And some of these might have some good aspects mixed in with serious flaws and corruption.

But then there is the “perfect” World State of the “progressive” Open Conspiracy, raising itself up as God, advanced tax-funded technology and science in its pocket, looting everywhere, propagandizing and seducing everyone, ready to clobber those who don’t submit.

Wells expresses the hope that the

“Open Conspiracy children will become a social elite...” (p. 86).

I think he is right, more so in the past, for youth, that the

“local religious powers ... made a more comprehensive attack upon his conscience and imagination.”

In my case, in the 1980s, it was a worldwide religious media that influenced me rather than local religious authorities. But Wells had a new “faith” for everyone back in his time:

“Now the old faiths are damaged and discredited, and the new and greater one, which is the Open Conspiracy, takes shape only gradually...” (p. 86)

He appeals to youthful idealism:

“It has no natural disposition towards the shallow and confused life. Its demand as ever is, “What am I to do with myself?” ... ” (p. 87)

And many youth are seduced by easy propaganda masquerading as “truth” and idealistic-sounding philosophies that criticize the problems they see with society and offering “new solutions” or promises about the future. I fell for that with my religion also. And what works even better are nice NGO [salaries](#) [58] from idealistic-sounding organizations – with lots of money from [taxpayers](#) [59] also—who are building a world government.

Ch. XVIII – Progressive development of the activities of the open conspiracy into a world control and commonweal: the hazards of the attempt

Speaking of the old political boundaries,

“... the Open Conspiracy will come to grips with the powers that sustain these boundaries” (p. 88).

It will also dissolve and repudiate

“many existing **restrictions upon conduct** and many social prejudices” (p. 88).

So we see today, people “free” in all sorts of ways that don’t help us: virtual worlds, all kinds of entertainment and fiction, all kinds of television and flashing lights and fashion choices. As far as important decisions about having children or how to make a living or what they’re allowed to do with their property (re: Greenbelt Act), if they have any, or what they’re allowed to keep, or input to decisions, opting out, opting in, what they’re allowed to believe, grow, buy, sell, make, use for energy—forget it. It’s bad enough with licensing as it is. The future of those types of freedoms that MATTER is bleak as long as we let things continue in the direction they are being pushed. Do we want to live our own lives and make our own decisions? AT ALL? I think most of us are not even aware there is a problem.

Many seem to already think in this paradigm that they need the government to approve what they do.

He has an unfortunate way of expressing the following:

“The Open Conspiracy **proposes to end and shows how an end may be put to that huge substratum of underdeveloped, undereducated, subjugated, exploited, and frustrated lives** upon which such civilization as the world has known hitherto has rested ...” (p. 88)

People might interpret that in a positive way, but in the context of his eugenics ideas, it means that there won’t be allowance for any such loose ends or alternative ways of living in his economic system. We are already brainwashed into this mindset. So many people already are told to believe that there is some world standard of education, some world standard of development that must be imposed on every culture. As if we even have any idea what is going on with other cultures half way around the world! But these cultures can’t maintain their independence if they are raised to these imposed “standards.” And this tyranny is coated in so much glossy propaganda color, talking out both sides of its mouth, with endless brutal warfare and mandatory sterilization programs. (Read about it: [Uzbekistan \[60\]](#) and [China \[61\]](#) recently. [Peru \[62\]](#) in the 90s.)

Again, he allows for militarism as long as it’s for the cause of his so-called “World Peace” or *Pax Mundi*, meaning world government. So how is that different or less ridiculous from previous war propaganda? It isn’t any different. [War is Peace \[63\]](#) as the slogan goes in Orwell’s *1984*.

“Whenever possible, the Open Conspiracy will advance by **illumination** and persuasion. But it **has to advance**, and even from the outset, where it is not allowed to illuminate and persuade, it must fight. Its **first** fights will probably be for the right to spread its system of ideas plainly and clearly throughout the world” (p. 88).

And I think this explains so much about the wars that are going on now. The Open Conspiracy encounters obstacles to its “light” (its dictates, its communications technology, its culture, its financial systems, its attempts to control resources) and feels the urge to start pounding away physically.

Wells discusses how he doesn’t believe there will be serious resistance to the “dissemination of these views and the early organization of the Open Conspiracy” in English-speaking countries or liberal-minded European countries because of their belief in “liberties of thought” (p. 88, 89).

I wonder if the Establishment protected freedom of speech for so long, mainly so that these types of totalitarian socialist ideas could be freely promoted. In addition, they had tax-payers fund these ideas at Canadian universities, and made them fund arts and culture, and had governments control broadcasting and decide which stations get to broadcast and on what terms. In addition, they had governments determine the technological direction of society in terms of funding for scientific research at corporations and universities, including military technology, for decades.

And as we approach world government (remember the upcoming G8 and G20 meetings), it seems that the ideal of freedom of speech has been gradually [coming to an end](#) [64] in Canada, and is openly being [threatened](#) [65] in the U.S.

Wells hoped that a large portion of the civilized world may have their minds

“readjusted to the idea that their existing governments are in the position of **trustees for the greater government of the coming age**” (p. 89).

The G8 / G20 is not representing YOU as an individual citizen—and they never do. Not even trying. But according to the CBC, they are spending [1.1 billion dollars](#) [66] on the June 2010 G8 and G20 summits.

Wells didn’t believe violence—“police, jail, expulsions, ..., outlawry and warfare”—would be necessary in the highly “civilized” “Atlantic communities.” But if it was necessary,

“the Open Conspiracy, **to the best of its ability and the full extent of its resources, must become a fighting force** and organize itself upon resistant lines” (p. 89).

The Open Conspiracy will play the part of King John “resisting” the backwards Robin Hoods. I’m sure that’s how King John and the Sheriff see the middle and working classes. *Boy, don’t you dare* act all back woods in the New World Order, says Wells, the [Sheriff of Nottingham](#) [67].

Robin Hood wants to hunt in the woods, or build his own small castle. No way, says King John. “Get out of my woods. Stop oppressing my deer and my woods. How dare you cut my trees and burn my fuel! How dare you use my water! How dare you want health freedom? How dare you build on your own land! Who do you think you are? You think you are free? You think you can hunt, travel, drink, eat, smoke, build and [breed without permission](#) [68], without “green” inspections, without road checkpoints, and without carbon taxes?” So there is the voice of King John and the “environmental” movement (banking elites)—to the people.

Yes, the G8 and G20 is a corrupt “resistance” movement, *resisting* INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS, *fighting back* against property rights, autonomy, sovereignty, independence and liberty and people doing things their own way, crushing all the little people that stand in their way, with their [sound cannons](#) [69], and God knows what else *super-cool* sci-fi Wellsian terror technology—paid for with OUR taxes. **Part of that \$1.1 billion that our “freedoms” pay for!**

Sounding like a true neocon, or liberal imperialist, Wells paints his picture:

“In the face of unscrupulous opposition creative ideas must become **aggressive, must define their enemies and attack them.** By its own organizations or **through the police and military strength of governments amenable to its ideas, the movement is bound to find itself fighting** for open roads, open frontiers, freedom of speech, and the realities of peace in regions of oppression. The Open Conspiracy rests upon a **disrespect for nationality**, and there is **no reason why it should tolerate noxious or obstructive governments** because they hold their own in this or that patch of territory. It **lies within the power of the Atlantic communities to impose peace upon the world** and secure unimpeded movement and free speech from end to end of the earth” (p. 89).

Sounds so wonderful, parts of that. Dolls all his tyranny and violence up and repeats the word “freedom” over and over just like a neocon or statist “liberal.” “Peace.” “Open” this and “open” that.

Says the Open Conspiracy: “Open your bloody door or I’ll burn your house down. Like at WACO. Open your gates. Drop your shields. Tear down those walls that are protecting you from us.” That’s fighting “oppression.” Sure it is, buddy. “Unimpeded movement” for the forces and systems of the Open Conspiracy. Unimpeded movement and “free speech” for their “light” so they can tear the whole world down and start over. And anyone who disagrees is “noxious” and “obstructive.” Yes, I get it.

It all sounds so familiar. They’re going to fix the world up using violence and death because they care so much about people. No wonder people are so messed up listening to all the hypocritical war (and other) propaganda and bile coming from the mouths of political leaders, via that disgrace of the mainstream media.

Wells talks further about “imposing disarmament” and even invokes “freedom” before talking about a world that is “pacified and policed.” *Pacified and policed*, a possible slogan for the New World Order. Sounds like “freedom” to people like Wells (p. 89).

Wells criticizes anti-interventionist, anti-imperialist versions of liberalism:

“The most inconsistent factor in the liberal and radical thought of to-day is its prejudice against the **interference of highly developed modern states in the affairs of less stable and less advanced regions. This is denounced as “imperialism” and regarded as criminal...**” (p. 89).

So he says, yes, it was disgusting for so-called nationalist entities to do that, but it’s absolutely okay for a power-hungry resource-hungry world totalitarian structure to interfere in supposedly backwards nations who supposedly don’t know what they’re doing, and who need to be instructed by holy superior world controllers who just want what’s good for everyone:

“as the merger of the Atlantic states proceeds, the possibility and necessity of bringing areas of misgovernment and disorder **under world control** increases..” (p. 90).

World War I wasn’t enough. Wells says there would have to be more war in order to have the perfect society because people still want to do things their own way. He doesn’t like “problems.” And as you know, from listening to the governments of NATO nowadays, of course, they get the military out to go to war, because as they signal by their actions, “VIOLENCE SOLVES PROBLEMS.” And the entire media and society teaches that to your children (if they’re still yours) by its actions, by its war promotion. Maybe you’re okay with that. Maybe you buy into it. Maybe the kids are confused though.

“...there is still **much actual warfare** before mankind, on the frontiers everywhere, against brigands, **against ancient loyalties and traditions** which will become at last no better than excuses for brigandage and obstructive exaction. All the weight of the Open Conspiracy will be on the side of **the world order** and **against that sort of local independence** which holds back its subject people from the citizenship of the world” (p. 90).

So he characterizes independent nations as practicing “misgovernment” and as nothing better than oppressive robbers that hold back their people. There must be some truth to that criticism about many countries. But how convenient that is for the world order to hold itself up as a godlike savior by diminishing independent nations in their propaganda. And how familiar it sounds. The current world order characterizes itself as loving people and giving them aid and education (and debt and war). But we need to examine the actions of the United Nations, the United States and key globalist powers in the world objectively. Will their actions and the results of their policies in human terms stand up to clear-

eyed scrutiny?

Wells worries about how much opposition there may be:

“No one can yet estimate the possible strength of reaction against world unification ...” (p. 90).

Wells explains that as long as the Open Conspiracy is just a discussion, it may spread because it is not noticed (p. 90).

But

“as its organization becomes more effective and aggressive, as it begins to lay hands upon education, upon social habits, upon business developments, as it proceeds to take over the organization of the community, it will marshal not only its own forces but its enemies....” (p. 90).

Ch. XIX – Human life in the coming world community

Just like I heard from my religious gurus, Wells sells readers on how happy mankind will be in his utopia. He has it all worked out:

“Not one of us is yet as clear and free and happy within himself as most men will some day be” (p. 92).

Man won't be constrained by current limitations, but (those who are allowed to be born) will have the full benefit of biological eugenics control and scientific dictatorship. It's like the Olympics all year long:

“A graver humanity, stronger, more lovely, longer lived, will learn and develop the ever enlarging possibilities of its destiny” (p. 92).

I would like to skip over it, but Wells seems to imply that Open Conspirators living back in his time will live again using some kind of advanced technology:

“And so mankind, **ourselves still living, but dispersed and reconstructed again in the future**, will recall with affection and understanding the desperate wishes and troubled efforts of our present state” (p. 92).

And this recalls the Resurrection of the elect in the New Testament and the Book of Revelation. So Wells never fails to terrify with his ideas, and he lets them all hang out. And anyone could dismiss the non-fiction ideas of Wells as a science fiction writer speculating about the future, if they ignored his [propaganda, government](#) [70] and [policy](#) [71] work. He would be easier to dismiss if he was the only one with these ideas. But [he wasn't](#) [72].

The liars and power-mongers always have something to offer us—just as soon as they're done destroying all resistance, and violating basic moral injunctions against murder, theft and lying.

We are lied to our whole lives and threatened and forced to pay up endless taxes and pay the banks endless money and we're limited and regulated and stopped at checkpoints by control freaks. But this same type of person, Wells, is offering us a future full of happiness, “knowledge and power” and

“possibilities” (p. 92). But there won’t be freedom, really, but he’ll call it freedom anyway. Sort of like [New Freedom](#) [#73] where you get to be drugged.

Their battle

“is with cruelties and **frustrations**, stupid, heavy, and hateful things from which we shall escape at last, less like victors conquering a world than like sleepers awaking from a nightmare in the dawn” (p. 93).

And it’s true, you know, that this world is oppressive and frustrating for so many people, but are we really going to expect a better world from the members of the Open Conspiracy who want total control? What exactly are all their “frustrations” and hatreds? I can only imagine what goes on in the minds of these types of people as they get frustrated with others doing their own thing.

How can we have happiness without the chance of real freedom? How can there be happiness in a world that is totally controlled and planned?

Doesn’t happiness come from a clear conscience, from doing the right thing with respect to our fellow human beings, from treating others justly and respecting their rights and autonomy? We should be promoting freedom and rights for ourselves and our neighbors and insisting on these things.

We should be exercising our own control and our own decisions in our own lives now. We need to stand up for these things in this world. So we can be happy NOW—on the track towards spiritual wholeness NOW, standing up for the truth, happy with our selves in the present day, regardless of what happens to us.

Our lives are short. We should not be waiting for a perfect world with a perfect future with perfect masters. This is *our* world already, or we have as much right to it as those who rule over and abuse others. We have rights. We have responsibilities to protect those rights. We were born here too. We have our own individuality and our own ways. And these things need our protection.

And we should not let ourselves be sold [pie-in-the-sky](#) [74] any more by totalitarians. Throw the pie back in their face.

References

[1] *The Open Conspiracy and Other Writings*, 1933, Waterlow & Sons Ltd., London.

[2] Participated in government war propaganda: <http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0920229/bio>

[3] kindergarten to full days:

<https://web.archive.org/web/20100116064243/https://torontosun.com/news/canada/2010/01/11/12426446.html>

[4] tool to address a new world of possibilities: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/30309168/Invisible-Empire-A-New-World-Order-Defined-Bibliography>

[5] defined: <http://dictionary.bnet.com/definition/staple+commodity.html>

[6] Terminator: <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0103064/quotes>

- [7] Brave New World: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brave_New_World
- [8] Republic: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Republic_%28Plato%29
- [9] Code 46: <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0345061/>
- [10] special attention: <http://www.budget.gc.ca/2010/plan/chap3c-eng.html>
- [11] Genome Canada: <http://www.genomecanada.ca/en/about/>
- [12] genetic tags:
http://www.science.uottawa.ca/~gblou656/cours_conservation/presentations_cons/genetics.pdf
- [13] Agenda 21: <http://canadianliberty.com/understanding-agenda-21-1/>
- [14] Google Earth: <http://earth.google.com/>
- [15] Street View: http://www.google.com/intl/en_us/help/maps/streetview/
- [16] supercomputers: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-1209430/Weather-supercomputer-used-predict-climate-change-Britains-worst-polluters.html>
- [17] temporary phase: <http://canadianliberty.com/uk-ministry-of-defence-strategic-trends-reports/>
- [18] document:
http://canadianliberty.com/documents/20100202GST_4_Global_Strategic_Trends_Out_to_2040UDCD_CStrat_Trends_4.pdf - quote the section from page 36
- [19] Animal Farm: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Animal_Farm
- [20] conservation officers:
<http://www.mnr.gov.on.ca/stdprodconsume/groups/lr/@mnr/@letsfish/documents/document/286927.pdf> see pages 4, 8.
- [21] harsh penalties: <http://boating.ncf.ca/fish.html>
- [22] hand was cut off, or their eye was burned out: <http://www.docstoc.com/docs/33512235/The-Medieval-Forest>
- [23] World Wildlife Fund: <http://canadianliberty.com/may-31-2009-rule-by-ngos-libertarian-rejection-of-smart-growth/>
- [24] Cecil Rhodes: <http://canadianliberty.com/h-g-wells-imperialism-and-the-open-conspiracy-part-4-addendum/>
- [25] international institutions: <http://canadianliberty.com/h-g-wells-imperialism-and-the-open->

[conspiracy-part-i/](#)

[26] predator drones: <http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2009/10/up-to-320-civilians-killed-in-pakistan-drone-war-report/>

[27] depleted uranium: http://www.seattlepi.com/national/95178_du12.shtml

[28] *The Good Shepherd*: <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0343737/>

[29] Space Command: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Air_Force_Space_Command

[30] carved into zones: <http://www.modernghana.com/news/274485/1/new-colonialism-pentagon-carves-africa-into-milita.html>

[31] putting down rebellions: <http://canadianliberty.com/uk-ministry-of-defence-strategic-trends-reports/>

[32] adapt to change:
http://www.google.ca/#hl=en&q=adapt+to+change&aq=f&aql=&aql=&oq=&gs_rfai=&fp=532402f01ea7247a

[33] I wonder about that statement: <http://www.amazon.ca/Street-Bolshevik-Revolution-Antony-Sutton/dp/089968324X>

[34] says: http://www.script-o-rama.com/movie_scripts/n/1984-script-transcript-george-orwell.html

[35] banker buddies: <http://canadianliberty.com/h-g-wells-imperialism-and-the-open-conspiracy-part-i/>

[36] assimilation: <https://topdocumentaryfilms.com/unrepentant-kevin-annett-canadas-genocide/>

[37] ex-Trots: <http://canadianliberty.com/h-g-wells-imperialism-and-the-open-conspiracy-part-3/>

[38] militant internationalism disguised as nationalism: <http://canadianliberty.com/the-official-911-story-was-a-lie-to-kick-off-all-these-wars/>

[39] PRI: <http://overpopulationisamyth.com/>

[40] conspirators': <http://canadianliberty.com/georgia-guidestones/>

[41] actual: <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/asia/article7099417.ece>

[42] policies: <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/asia/article7107200.ece>

[43] Overpopulation: The Making of a Myth: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vZVOU5bfHrM&feature=channel>

[44] 2.1 Kids: Stable Population: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zBS6f-JVvTY>

- [45] Food: There's Lots of It: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OXrN9HhnCcM>
- [46] Western bureacrats: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maurice_Strong
- [47] ex-politicians: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Richard_Nixon
- [48] New World Order: <http://canadianliberty.com/h-g-wells-imperialism-and-the-open-conspiracy-part-3/>
- [49] merger: <http://www.indymedia.org.uk/en/2004/12/302870.html>
- [50] Soviet and American systems: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IMVZSsPzaTc>
- [51] treaties: <http://canadianliberty.com/international-government-tax-cooperation/>
- [52] body scanners: <http://canadianliberty.com/body-scanners-violate-individual-rights/>
- [53] fellow Fabian Bertrand Russell: <http://canadianliberty.com/h-g-wells-imperialism-and-the-open-conspiracy-part-i/>
- [54] quoted: <http://triablogue.blogspot.com/2007/10/my-father-bertrand-russell.html>
- [55] essay: <http://digitalcommons.mcmaster.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1109&context=russelljournal>
- [56] full steam: <http://canadianliberty.com/boycott-hollywood-a-sinister-propaganda-engine/>
- [57] that obstacle: <http://canadianliberty.com/ontario-science-centre-trashing-human-life/>
- [58] salaries:
http://www.google.ca/#hl=en&q=ngo+careers+canada+salaries&aq=f&aqi=&aql=&oq=&gs_rfai=&fp=b7168b5ce7624c0a
- [59] taxpayers: <http://www.ucalgary.ca/cissa/workabroad#NGO>
- [60] Uzbekistan:
<https://web.archive.org/web/20100531193006/http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/asia/article7107200.ece>
- [61] China:
<https://web.archive.org/web/20100605021649/http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/asia/article7099417.ece>
- [62] Peru: <http://www.independent.org/newsroom/article.asp?id=1417>
- [63] War is Peace: <http://www.online-literature.com/orwell/1984/2/>

- [64] coming to an end: <http://canadianliberty.com/december-27-2007-continued-assault-on-freedom-of-speech-nothing-personal/>
- [65] threatened: http://www.economist.com/blogs/lexington/2010/05/kagan_and_free_speech
- [66] \$1.1 billion dollars: <http://www.cbc.ca/politics/story/2010/05/26/g8-g20-security-summit-toews.html>
- [67] Sheriff of Nottingham: <http://www.imdb.com/media/rm577211648/nm0532193>
- [68] breed without permission: <http://www.financialpost.com/story.html?id=2314438>
- [69] sound cannons: <http://www.thestar.com/news/gta/torontog20summit/article/815061--toronto-police-get-sound-cannons-for-g20?bn=1>
- [70] propaganda, government: <http://canadianliberty.com/h-g-wells-imperialism-and-the-open-conspiracy-part-2/>
- [71] policy: <http://canadianliberty.com/h-g-wells-imperialism-and-the-open-conspiracy-part-i/>
- [72] he wasn't: <http://canadianliberty.com/the-despicable-george-bernard-shaw/>
- [73] New Freedom: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_Freedom_Commission_on_Mental_Health
- [74] pie-in-the-sky: <http://bookangles.com/AnimalFarm/tabid/326/Default.aspx>