

Notes on *Between Two Ages* by Zbigniew Brzezinski

By Alan Mercer

This revised edition of my series at canadianliberty.com (from June 2010-January 2013) was completed on February 27, 2021. We have endured almost a year of COVID-19 policies--the Great Reset of the World Economic Forum. I think readers will see how relevant Brzezinski's 1970 book is to understanding current policies.

***** I *****

Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technetronic Era, by Zbigniew Brzezinski, 1970, The Viking Press, New York [[1](#)].

Background

The acknowledgments for my edition are dated 1969. The back cover describes Brzezinski as "the director of the Research Institute on Communist Affairs and Professor of Government at Columbia University."

The movie "[Invisible Empire: A New World Order Defined](#)" [[2](#)] contains information about Brzezinski. Author and former Canadian diplomat, [Peter Dale Scott](#) [[3](#)], is interviewed for the film (and its "extras"), and states that they were in the same class together at McGill University in Montreal, Canada.

There is a long bio from the [Center for Strategic and International Studies website](#) [[4](#)]. Much of the bio relates facts that occurred after *Between Two Ages* was written. Extracting part of it, Brzezinski was a member of the

"Policy Planning Council of the Department of State from 1966 to 1968 ... director of the [Trilateral Commission](#) [[5](#)] from 1973 to 1976 ... From 1977 to 1981, Dr. Brzezinski was national security adviser to President Jimmy Carter. In 1981, he was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom for his role in the normalization of U.S.-China relations and for his contributions to the human rights and national security policies of the United States. He was also a member of the President's Chemical Warfare Commission (1985), the National Security Council-Defense Department Commission on Integrated Long-Term Strategy (1987-1988), and the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (1987-1989). In 1988, he was cochairman of the Bush National Security Advisory Task Force, and in 2004, he was cochairman of a [Council on Foreign Relations](#) [[6](#)] task force that issued the report *Iran: Time for a New Approach*. Dr. Brzezinski received a B.A. and M.A. from McGill University (1949, 1950) and Ph.D. from Harvard University (1953)...."

According to the [New York Sun](#) [7], Zbigniew Brzezinski has also been a top foreign policy adviser for Barack Obama.

In a [1998 interview](#) [8], translated from French and published by *Counterpunch*, Brzezinski explains how the Carter administration began the aid to the Mujahadeen before the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Relevant Youtube video: here [9] (amazing speech by Brzezinski to the Mujahadeen) [10]. Also the documentary, *Our Own Private Bin Laden* [11], is very relevant.

***** II *****

Brzezinski (p. xiv) writes about the emerging “**post-industrial**” society, but he uses his own term “**technetronic**” instead:

“the most industrially advanced countries ... are beginning to emerge from the industrial stage of their development. They are entering **an age in which technology and especially electronics – hence my neologism “technetronic” – are increasingly becoming the principal determinants of social change, altering the mores, the social structure, the values, and the global outlook of society**” (p. xiv).

When we come across terms like “post-industrial”, or “stage of development,” I think it’s normal to assume that it is some kind of natural evolution for humanity. But why assume that? Here is an academic who works in institutions that actively plan policies for the future. Since there is so much planning, why wouldn’t the idea of “post-industrial” be planned also?

Brzezinski calls the United States a “social pioneer” and “guinea pig for mankind” (p. xv), as though the United States has a type of revolutionary function assigned to it. Whether or not he has that in mind, I believe this idea is referred to in [The Secret Destiny of America](#) [12] by Manley P. Hall. Regardless, American technology and culture has changed the world.

Hermann Hesse, *Steppenwolf* [13], is quoted:

“Human life is reduced to real suffering, to hell, only when **two ages**, two cultures and religions overlap... There are times when a whole generation is caught in this way **between two ages, two modes of life, with the consequence that it loses all power to understand itself and has no standard, no security, no simple acquiescence**” (p. 1).

So, as everyone knows, we are living in a time of constant change, constant growth in knowledge and technology, where many of us feel the ground slipping

underneath our feet. The church I used to attend was heavy on prophecy, so I tend to think of Daniel 12:4 [14] which refers to the "time of the end," when "*many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased.*" The "end" refers to the *end of an age*, before the beginning of a supposedly perfect utopian age. Nowadays I don't look at the passages in Daniel or Revelation as necessarily God's will. I look at these as an ancient formula for control. (You can find out more about this idea from [Alan Watt \[15\]](#). The interpretation of [Bill Cooper \[16\]](#) is relevant also).

The technology itself, through radio, television programming and the Internet, and other media, has altered our perception of the world, of ourselves, and our fundamental beliefs. And technology is used to alter our environment and life itself. And this seems to be intentionally planned and directed by a managerial class. Human beings are the bread in the toaster. We're the stew in the pot, slowly altered by the heat. We're the fruit in the blender.

We are ruled over by those who plan the future. The borrower is servant to the lender. Our governments borrow from private lenders. Therefore governments don't serve us. We serve them. Governments funnel our wealth into the science, technology, wars and propaganda that serve the interests of the globalist agenda.

Right off the bat, Brzezinski tells you something fundamental about global politics:

"While the formal rules of the game **maintain the illusion that it is played only by those players called "states"** ... Some states possess overwhelming power; others, the "mini-states," are **overshadowed by multimillion-dollar international corporations, major banks and financial interests, transnational organizations of religious or ideological character, and the emerging international institutions ...**" (p. 5).

Brzezinski is very interesting to read most of the time, because despite being at the center of power, it seems to me that he is driven to explain otherwise unspoken truths, from the elite's point of view:

"Organized mechanisms, in the form of uniformed, salaried personnel, are established to confine violence to socially tolerable limits. A certain measure of crime is accepted as unavoidable; **for the sake of order, therefore, organized crime is generally preferable to anarchic violence, thus indirectly and informally becoming an extension of order**" (p. 6).

His focus is on the globalist agenda, which he promotes:

“global politics are similarly characterized by the confusing pattern of involvement, congestion, and interaction, which cumulatively, though gradually, **undermines the exclusiveness and the primacy of those hitherto relatively watertight compartments, the nation-states**” (p.8).

The post-industrial society

“is becoming a “technetronic” society: a society that is **shaped culturally, psychologically, socially, and economically by the impact of technology and electronics** – particularly in the area of computers and communications” (p. 9).

Just like Bertrand Russell and Aldous Huxley, Brzezinski writes about the capacity for CONTROL through technology:

“...both the growing capacity for the instant calculation of the most complex interactions and the **increasing availability of biochemical means of human control** augment the potential scope of **consciously chosen direction**, and thereby also the **pressures to direct, to choose, and to change**” (p. 10).

The university becomes a

““think tank,” the source of much sustained **political planning and social innovation**” (p. 12).

Audio-visual communications

“prompt more **changeable, disparate views of reality...**” (p. 12).

Other topics discussed: Pragmatism, sexual equality, automation.

In the technetronic society,

“the trend seems to be toward aggregating the **individual support of millions of unorganized citizens, who are easily within the reach of magnetic and attractive personalities, and effectively exploiting the latest communication techniques to manipulate emotions and control reason. *Reliance on television – and hence the tendency to replace language with imagery, which is international rather than national*, and to include war coverage or scenes of hunger in**

places as distant as, for example, India – creates a somewhat more **cosmopolitan**, though **highly impressionistic, involvement in global affairs**” (p. 13).

This is a major part of our indoctrination. Tragedies and disasters are milked just for this purpose. Big Daddy U.S. or UN, or Canada, etc. reaches down out of the clouds to supposedly help some particular country like Haiti, who we are made to believe is completely helpless. It’s all lies. We are supposed to believe we are advanced and superior while this other country is undeveloped because of some fault of theirs rather than suffering because of constant military invasion and imperialism. The media leave that part out.

Television globalizes us by making us feel part of “one world.” It’s more feeling than reality. Just because we can see and hear, it doesn’t make it real that we are connected to some event on the other side of the world. We are better off reading a book, and thinking things through, and taking our time, rather than falling for “*we are the world.*” We are limited individually in time and space. We have images that delude us into going along with huge agendas that we do not direct. We are urged to supposedly help people far away that we don’t actually help directly, via machine-like institutions that are not accountable to us. Living in reality means facing up to the fact that we are not involved enough in the things that will make us more independent where we are, more able to support each other locally in tough times, without government direction. We are being dragged into a system of total helpless dependency.

Economic power:

“The tendency towards **depersonalization of economic power** is stimulated in the next stage by the appearance of a highly complex interdependence between governmental institutions (including the military), scientific establishments, and industrial organizations. As economic power becomes inseparably linked with political power, it becomes more invisible and the **sense of individual futility increases**” (p. 13).

Eventually,

“these changes and many others, including some that more directly affect the **personality and quality of the human being himself**, will make the technetronic society as different from the industrial as the industrial was from the agrarian” (p. 14).

Life

“seems to lack cohesion as environment rapidly alters and **human beings become increasingly manipulable and malleable**. Everything seems more transitory and temporary: **external reality more fluid than solid, the human being more synthetic than authentic. Even our senses perceive an entirely novel “reality”** – one of our own making but nevertheless, in terms of our sensations, quite “real”” (pp. 14-15).

In the footnote, he presents the idea of holography being used to create a sensation of a living presence as well as actual conversation (p. 15). So he seems to be describing the idea of virtual reality before it existed, being used for communication.

Without using the actual word, eugenics is part of the picture. There is

“already widespread concern about the possibility of **biological and chemical tampering with what has until now been considered the immutable essence of man**. Human conduct, some argue, can be **predetermined and subjected to deliberate control**. Man is increasingly acquiring the capacity to **determine the sex of his children, to affect through drugs the extent of their intelligence, and to modify and control their personalities**. Speaking of a future at most only decades away, an experimenter in **intelligence control** asserted, **“I foresee the time when we shall have the means and therefore, inevitably, the temptation to manipulate the behavior and intellectual functioning of all the people through environmental and biochemical manipulation of the brain”** (p. 15).

He expresses the doubt that technology will give us more choices and freedom, implying that it may do the opposite (p. 15).

***** III *****

Brzezinski writes about man becoming obsessed with self-analysis according to external criteria such as aptitudes, IQ and physical features, rather than accepting himself as a given. So the spontaneous internal man is in conflict with the post-industrial obsessive external man, always concerned with his self-conscious image (p. 16).

He mentions again the possibility of “chemical mind control,” and the loss of individuality through transplantation and genetic manipulation. He claims there

will be problems “determining the legitimate scope of social control” (p. 16).

He writes about how two-thirds of the population of advanced countries live in cities which contribute to the “depersonalization of individual life” (p. 17). He cites Julian Huxley’s warning that just as overcrowding in animals “leads to distorted neurotic and downright pathological behavior,” in the same way, “city life today is definitely leading to mass mental disease...” (p. 17).

Brzezinski notes the “breakdown in communication between the generations.” Debate “implies the acceptance of a common frame of reference,” so more and more it becomes impossible (p. 17).

He mentions how our lives are being fragmented, but “global reality increasingly absorbs the individual,” and we experience the world “vicariously” through radio and television (p. 18).

“Instant communications” are already creating a type of “global nervous system.” But the so-called “global village” will lack the traditions, values and stability of an actual village (p. 19).

***** IV *****

Brzezinski writes about a growing awareness of “global interdependence” and how global events intrude into our homes. He says this “evokes uncertainty” instead of making for a better comprehension of events (p. 22).

Feelings of insecurity are intensified by the explosion in scientific knowledge. The “sharing of new common perspectives” becomes more difficult as knowledge increases (p. 23).

He claims that we can no longer sustain traditional perspectives such as “primitive myths” or “historically conditioned ideologies” (p. 23).

In other words, even back then, he was observing that ordinary people are having their frameworks and ability to communicate with each other shredded.

I think Brzezinski disarms readers by writing in a way that appears to be objective and often critical about the changes he discusses. The impression is still conveyed to the reader that concepts such as “post-industrial” society, “global interdependence,” and enormous government subsidies to science are just natural stages in human development.

When commenting on H. G. Wells’ *Imperialism and The Open Conspiracy*, I compared the cultural and military imperialism of the globalist “cosmopolitan”

revolution to a [blender](#) [66] that grinds resistant (otherwise indigestible) cultures and traditions into mush.

In the same vein, Brzezinski discusses how America has the biggest effect on “all other societies,” prompting a change in their “outlook and mores”. The United States is the innovator, and is a “major disruptive influence” (p. 24). This contradicts the one-sided indoctrination that many of us received during the Cold War that the Soviet Union was the main source of societal revolution.

Brzezinski later became Carter’s national security advisor [17]. The overall impression I get is that Brzezinski believed the U.S. was much more effective in pushing the world towards a collectivized global order than the Soviet Union.

He describes America’s impact historically, at first, as *idealistic* because America was all about *freedom*. Later, the influence changed to being more materialistic (p. 25). I can’t be sure what he thinks about freedom or materialism, but that assessment sounds correct to me. He discusses how America’s association with ideals was tarnished by Vietnam, racial tensions and assassinations. Now, America’s main influence is scientific and technological (p. 25), which is in line with Francis Bacon’s descriptions in his utopian [New Atlantis](#) [18].

America spends “more on science and devotes greater resources to research than any other society.” A footnote mentions that, according to a 1968 congressional report, “current spending on research and development in the United States amounts to some \$24 billion annually – about **two-thirds financed by the Federal Government**” (p. 25).

Huge transfers of tax money from the people towards research and development obviously contradicts the idea many of us have that the U.S. Founding Fathers established a limited federal government with their constitution. But America is, in reality, at least since World War II, this enormous tax-collecting and tax-redirecting (redistributing) engine of science and technology, especially military technology. So how is this “limited” government? It’s not. And is it really for the “defense” of the people? Of course not.

The footnote continues: “scientists, engineers, and technicians engaged in research and development totaled 1,159,500 in the United States” (p. 26).

He refers to American education as being “intellectually deficient” in many respects, but that the “broad base of relatively trained people enables rapid adaptation” of science and technology. America was particularly strong in the “frontier industries,” such as computers, lasers and nuclear power (p. 27).

An OECD report is referenced in a footnote, which states that American society was “trying to build its future on the progress of science and technology.” The OECD report says its technological projects “**have an impact on the destiny of**

the whole nation, and it seems natural that all skills should be mobilized to cooperate. In this way industry and the universities and private organizations are associated with the Government project” (p. 29).

***** V *****

Brzezinski predicts the development of the Internet, calling it a global “information grid” (pp. 32, 59).

He says the U.S. has made the greatest effort through business and **foundations** to export its knowledge, promote new techniques in different fields, and “**to control population growth**” (p. 34). He refers to the supposed threat of overpopulation (p. 37).

So he’s admitting to certain U.S. policies even back then that are less obvious to the public. Another such policy he mentions is the promotion of regionalism in Europe and elsewhere. He acknowledges that the creation of larger political entities (such as the push to unite Europe) seems to contradict America’s interests (p. 34).

He admits that America’s push for “modernization” “disrupts existing institutions” and traditional morality, and causes resentment towards the U.S.--the “first global society” (p. 34).

The book mentions a 1969 agreement between the US and India for the creation of a satellite to provide “television programs on agriculture and birth control” for 5000 villages (footnote p. 40).

***** VI *****

The title of Part 1, Ch. 4 is “Global Fragmentation and Unification.”

Brzezinski mentions that third world countries would be stabilized through “personal dictatorships” using charisma and nationalism in order to impose “social-economic modernization from above” (p. 51).

He says the “technetronic revolution” is the start of a “global community” but at the same time it “fragments humanity” (p. 52).

He talks about how crises of identity and our “malleability” may allow what used to be “immutable” in man to be “**undermined**” (p. 53).

He mentions the regionalism policy of the U.S. and how the U.S. unifies some societies deliberately, but also through its actions causes other societies to unify

in order to resist American influence (p. 53).

In my opinion, all of these points are important in understanding globalist strategy in the past and present. Wars and other policies are not for the benefit of ordinary Americans or even for the actual benefit of America as a nation.

He refers to the ideal of "functional integration of regions and even of whole continents" (p. 55).

He quotes Myrdal (footnote, p. 56) that nationalism in South Asia was necessary to provide the "impulse for change."

He quotes A. Barber:

"International banks and multinational corporations are acting and planning in terms that are far in advance of the political concepts of the nation-state" (p. 56).

He talks about the advancement of weaponry and how space and **weather control** have become important strategically (p. 56). Developments may include "space warships" and "death rays." So he anticipates "Star Wars" development. Brzezinski also writes that "even **the weather** may be tampered with" (p. 57).

***** VII *****

On the subject of weather warfare, Brzezinski quotes geophysicist Gordon J. F. MacDonald who says that warfare "techniques of weather modification could be employed to produce prolonged periods of drought or storm..." (f.n. p. 57).

Brzezinski writes about how it may be tempting for governments to employ electronic pulsing to affect the human mind. He says that MacDonald has written that:

"accurately timed, artificially excited electronic strokes `could lead to a pattern of oscillations that produce relatively high power levels over certain regions one could develop a system that would seriously impair the brain performance of very large populations..." (p. 57).

One section is called "Toward a Planetary Consciousness." He says "a global human conscience" is "beginning to manifest itself" (p. 58).

This global sort of semi-conscious half-awareness is combined with an incredible lack of empathy for others who are suffering when their governments say *it's*

okay for those particular people to suffer. This propaganda-induced consciousness is definitely something that has been trained into us via television and other communications technologies. And it certainly is spread around through fat pay cheques to thousands of NGO groups worldwide who serve the system.

Brzezinski refers to the "emergence of transnational elites" of "businessmen, scholars, professional men, and public officials." He says these "global communities are gaining in strength" and eventually the "social elites" will be "**highly internationalist or globalist in spirit and outlook**" (p. 59).

Here we have an explanation for bizarre policies that do not serve national interests.

Preventing "overpopulation" is mentioned again on p. 59.

Problems are seen by these people as "global." He quotes Jan Tinbergen on the subject of "coordination at the world level" and efforts to create world plans by UN agencies such as the FAO, the ILO and the Center for Development Planning, Projections and Policies (CDPPP) (f.n. pp. 59-60).

On the subject of morality, he claims that social problems are not seen as the result of "deliberate evil," but are seen as the result of "complexity and ignorance." So the idea is supposedly you can't have ideological and moral doctrines formulated in advance because that involves "emotional simplifications."

"The concern with ideology is yielding to a preoccupation with ecology..." (p. 61).

Ecology replaces ideology.

He also talks about satellite technology promising "**more effective planning in regard to earth resources**" (p. 61). So that's the context of what he's writing about in terms of the elite's view of "global problems" and it sums up the agenda:

"more effective planning in regard to earth resources"

To me, it's natural for the power elites to talk like this and for decades to promote moral subjectivity via the education system and media.

They don't want to have citizens who are able to make moral judgments about the actions of those who loot resources through lies, theft and murder.

They have "sophisticated" (actually simplistic) propaganda for you to believe about their latest war or tax or power grab and they don't want you being "backward," "primitive" or "emotional" about it.

I can extrapolate from what he was writing to the context of what came later in 1992:[UN Agenda 21](#) [19].

Human-centered concerns about rights and morality are replaced by all sorts of centrally planned obsessive resource calculations about air, water and food, and how people are using these, and whether they can be beaten over the head about them in appeals to guilt about overuse or fears about scarcity and pollution.

And they obsess over finding ways to tax and fine us in such a way as to gradually impose conservation measures and rationing, and capture these resources from the control of ordinary people.

In other words, the point is to destroy land and property rights (individual or community-based) and the means people have to survive and thrive.

And the politicians and corporations can call it whatever ideology they want, and appeal to "crises" and "clean air" or "clean water" or "climate change" in order to justify what their bosses want to get away with.

So the part about replacing ideology with ecology is important I think.

You can have mercenaries running around with rifles, but you can also at the same time have mercenaries running around with thermometers and pocket calculators taking measurements (such as "energy efficiency") and counting up all the property that belongs to us, and discovering new ways to take it from us via fines and taxes.

***** VIII *****

Part II is "The Age of Volatile Belief" (p. 62).

Brzezinski acknowledges that the old system of entrenched religions and national identities "provided a stable framework and firm moorings," but the "new global unity" has not yet found its own structure (p. 62).

He refers to the "new post-industrial age" (p. 65) with its increased "differentiation in skills" leading to increased "disparities."

What makes it "post-industrial"? Why have we become "post-industrial" in the decades since he wrote this book?

Is it a coincidence that the Green agenda and [UN Agenda 21](#) [19] advocate the shutting down of the consumer society and the reduction of "carbon emissions" in the name of "climate change" (equals [population reduction](#) [20])?

Is it a coincidence that massive international “free trade” agreements have contributed to the deindustrialization of North America?

Is it a coincidence that the banking crises of recent years and the huge bail-outs to the banks have led to more calls for “austerity” policies such as increasing the age of retirement?

I think, in retrospect, it’s clear that “post-industrial” is more than a prediction. We might think of it as a natural progression only because we’re trained to see it that way. But really it looks like the result of a series of planned and forced policies.

Marxism and Beyond

Brzezinski’s historical discussions about sovereignty, religion and nationalism are very interesting (pp. 70, 71).

Brzezinski, a man at the top of the American power structure [21] (not Ron Paul) – praises Marxism:

“Marxism represents a further vital and creative stage in the maturing of man’s universal vision. Marxism is simultaneously a victory of the external, active man over the inner, passive man and a victory of reason over belief: it stresses man’s capacity to shape his material destiny ...” (p. 72).

He says Marxism appealed to “man’s ethical, rational, and PROMETHEAN instincts” (p. 73).

In reality, it’s only the “instincts” of some people who want to make man collectively into a type of “God” using science and technology.

He sounds much like [H. G. Wells](#) [22] on some points. Wells advocated humanity becoming a kind of godlike powerful collective. Wells had both praise and criticism for Marxism, but was full of enthusiasm for aspects of [big business capitalism](#) [23] in his version of scientific socialism. If you combine the writings of Brzezinski and Wells, you get a good idea of where the elites want to take us.

Brzezinski quotes Kh. Momjan that the Promethean represented

“man’s faith in **his powers**, for the notion that history is made by the people [“the people”?] and that nothing can hem in **their advance to perfection**” (p. 73).

Marxism, he writes, has served as a “mechanism of human ‘progress’” even though in practice it has “fallen short of its ideals” (p. 73).

He quotes Teilhard de Chardin:

“monstrous as it is, is not modern totalitarianism really the distortion of something magnificent, and thus quite near to the truth?” (p. 73)

The “truth” of an elitist “utopia.”

Brzezinski writes that for many outside of Christianity

“... it has been Marxism that has served to stir the mind and to **mobilize human energies purposefully**” (p. 73).

This reminds me of Ellul’s observations in [Propaganda \[24\]](#).

Brzezinski continues:

“Marxism ... has provoked a series of subordinate questions, all helpful in **forcing recognition of change and in compelling adjustments to it** ... Who are our present principal foes – subjectively and objectively? Who are now our allies? ...” (p. 73)

So it’s interesting. Who are the “foes” and who are the “allies” of the Marxist “liberals” (or [Marxist \[25\]](#) [neocons \[26\]](#)) who run America?

However, he criticizes (other) communists for being dogmatic and oversimplifying. They haven’t accurately perceived “**the meaning of new international phenomena**” (p. 74).

He says Marxism has a “revolutionary and broadening influence, which opened man’s mind to previously ignored perspectives,” so it wasn’t just “a phase of the painful marriage of man and technique” (p. 74). And that’s not to ignore how it was enslaving people, he says.

He says

“in the gradual evolution of man’s universal vision [as if there is any such thing] Marxism represents as important and progressive a stage as the appearance of nationalism and of the great religions.” (p. 74)

He makes an interesting observation that the three phases became perverted in practice:

Religion -> brutality.

Nationalism -> brutality.

Marxism or humanism -> brutality.

But he says man's "intellectual horizons" were "widened" in all three cases. Each helped "to enlarge man's political and social consciousness" (p. 75).

He quotes Marx:

"...The daily press and the telegraph, which in a moment spread inventions over the whole earth, fabricate more myths (and the bourgeois cattle believe and enlarge upon them) in one day than could have formerly been done in a century" (p. 76).

Brzezinski acknowledges that it's even worse with the addition of radio and television (p. 76).

He mentions the pace of "technologically induced social change."

He claims that

"institutionalized religion's concentration on the inner man has prompted social passivity and *de facto* indifference to concrete human dilemmas..." (pp. 76-77)

In contrast,

"more contemporary ideological preoccupation with mobilizing the external man has resulted in political systems whose practice refutes the moral significance of their often proclaimed humanitarian objectives."

In the one case we have "spiritual elevation" leading to "social deprivation," according to him, but the "assertion of man's social primacy" leads to his "spiritual degradation" (p. 77).

A materialistic outlook at the expense of spiritual and moral principles is going to lead to that.

He criticizes "institutional Marxism" (p. 77). He's basically saying that Marxism is not working out. Marxism is not good enough, because of "the neglect of the spiritual element." And because of "scientific developments concerning the nature of the human brain and personality," the "limitations of Marxism" have been exposed (p. 77).

The Berlin Wall came down and the Soviet and American systems were merged together as planned all along [27] according to the Reece committee's Norman Dodd.

George Bush Sr. announced a communitarian [28] New World Order [29]. And Agenda 21 was agreed to.

The individualist freedom-loving version of America has been pushed aside gradually after years of Cold War growth in government. And the old Soviet Union was phased out.

America was much more successful than Russia at taxing its people and much more successful at science and technology to be used for totalitarian surveillance.

Who is more [revolutionary](#) [30] than America? Who is more [“progressive”](#) [31]? Who is more [Trotskyite and internationalist](#) [32]?

***** IX *****

Brzezinski identifies two categories on the “left” who are unhappy with communism. One group is the “New Left” who are concerned with the communist neglect of the individual and freedom (whatever they mean by “freedom”). The other group – economists, scientists and “the new managers” – is concerned about efficiency and see institutions and dogmas as getting in the way of social change (p. 81).

He says Communist officials took “refuge in state nationalism” so they became reliant on “emotional factors” which Marxism is supposed to rise above (p. 84).

He has an interesting discussion on Vatican II, the relevance of churches in general, and how there was actually a dialogue between Christians and Communists.

He mentions the “ferment” in Christianity, how there are more individual expressions of religion and a growing interest in mysticism and ecstasy.

He quotes Jacques Ellul (*Technological Society*, p. 423), who concludes that

“it is far from accidental that ecstatic phenomena have developed to the greatest degree in the most technicized societies.”

He expects these phenomena to increase. To Ellul,

“this indicates nothing less than the subjection of mankind’s new religious life to **technique**...

“Ecstasy is subject to the world of technique and is its servant.

Technique, on the most significant level, integrates the anarchic and antisocial impulses of the human being into society. These impulses take their influence and receive their diffusion strictly by virtue of the technical means brought into play. The ecstatic phenomena of the human psyche, which without technical means would have remained completely without effect, are deployed throughout the world" (p. 91, footnote).

The word "technique" used by Ellul (see [definition \[33\]](#)) doesn't necessarily imply technology in the sense of electronics or chemicals, etc. but it does refer to a collection of methods that are scientifically effective.

Brzezinski, on the same page again, mentions Teilhard de Chardin as an example of the modern interest in mysticism and efforts to combine science with religion. He doesn't comment further about Ellul's statement other than to say that Ellul is emphasizing a relationship between science and religion.

Ellul's statement may relate to research in alternative media about establishment interference in religious states of mind. For example, see here [\[34\]](#) (about Gordon Wasson) and here [\[35\]](#) (about Aldous Huxley and others).

Continuing, Brzezinski refers to the "crisis of institutionalized beliefs" as "the last stage in the progressive secularization of life; that is, in the detachment of one's social existence from a framework of belief" (p. 92).

He also mentions the 1968 "anti-intellectual and anti-Semitic purge in communist Poland" which drove some communist intellectuals to the United States, where they found employment in institutions that studied communism (f.n. p. 92).

***** X *****

Authoritarian leadership, Marxism, Soviet Union

Brzezinski says it's probable that some liberal democratic societies will opt for "authoritarian personal leadership" (a "dominant personality"). Society's "emotional and rational needs may be fused ... in the person of an individual who is seen as both preserving and making the necessary innovations in the social order" (pg. 118). He seems to repeat the same idea later, referring to a "charismatic personality" (p. 253).

Marxism and the Soviet Union

Brzezinski praises Marxism as supplying "the best available insight into contemporary reality" (p. 123). He claimed it had strong "ethical elements," provided a basis "for attacking 'antiquated pre-industrial social institutions,' and it promoted "internationalism" (p. 123).

Communism came "too early," he says, because available communications technologies were not ready to "reinforce a universal perspective" (p. 124).

From 1930-1940, "that revolution consumed at least six and a half million lives" (p. 126). Stalin's emergence was facilitated by Lenin's elitist attitudes towards trade unions and peasants (p. 127). He asks whether **industrialization and modernization** could have been achieved without Stalin's brutal methods (p. 129). Trotsky concluded by 1930 the "physical liquidation of millions of kulaks was an immoral 'monstrosity'..." (p. 130). (The crimes of the other Bolshevik leaders, including Trotsky, are excluded from this passage).

Brzezinski criticized the the Soviet rulers as "conservative and nationalist, even when they sincerely believed themselves to be the advocates of an internationalist ideology" (p. 136).

He says that if Stalin hadn't made communism so despotic, the West "might have made communism the truly dominant and vital force of our time" (p. 138).

Also he writes that a "more relevant vision of tomorrow" is needed than the backwards Soviet system in order to deal with the "highly personal as well as the broader social concerns of the technetronic age" (p. 139).

Brzezinski observes that the Soviet political system at one point used to be in a revolutionary relationship with society. It imposed "a process of radical transformation ... by combining **modernization** (... **industrialization** and mass **education**) with **ideologically derived, novel social institutions and relationships**" (p. 139).

He says that this activity parallels the capitalist's role, as Marx saw it: 'Fanatically bent on making value expand itself, he ruthlessly forces the human race to produce for production's sake; he thus forces the development of the productive forces of society, and he creates those material conditions which alone can form the real basis for a **higher form** of society, a society in which the full and free development of every individual forms the ruling principle [Marxist fantasy].' (p. 139) Marx in this case is explaining capitalism as a necessary phase before socialism.

To me, I doubt the whole idea that there is some kind of real "progress" with this way of looking at history, even if it stopped with capitalism. And I don't think "modernization" or frantic production is necessary for a so-called "higher form" of society where freedom exists. There is either freedom, independence, private life, and respect for rights and morality, with wealth resulting from that, or else there are just varying degrees of slavery which become more and more intense as the technology is used to run over our rights. I suspect "modernization" mainly has to do with standardization in order to make totalitarian slave masters happy.

***** XI *****

Antony Sutton, Andre Sakharov, convergence theory, merger of Soviet and American systems

The Soviet Union Received Western Assistance – Brzezinski Cites Antony C. Sutton

It's significant that Brzezinski cites Antony C. Sutton's [36] research showing that the Soviet Union received Western aid. This represents some level of Establishment [37] validation of Sutton's books [38].

In a passage where he speculates about how Russia might have turned out if it had been a non-communist power, as an aside, Brzezinski mentions how "economic investment in states that subsequently became political enemies was characteristic of the capitalist era" (p. 135). In the footnote to back up this statement, he also backs up Antony C. Sutton's work:

"For impressive evidence of Western participation in the early phase of Soviet economic growth, see Antony C. Sutton's *Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development, 1917-1930* [39] (Stanford, Calif., 1968), which argues that "Soviet economic development for 1917-1930 was essentially dependent on Western technological aid" (p. 283), and that "at least 95 per cent of the industrial structure received this assistance" (p. 348)." (f.n. p. 135)

People who are serious about understanding the system need to read Sutton for themselves. The media and education system will never tell you the truth about such topics. [In fact, it's all lies 24-7, especially now with "they dumped his body in the ocean" \[40\]](#).

Also, it seems that Marxists have been living in a reality of their own all these years and most of the rest of us have been left out:

Theory of Convergence

Brzezinski says that Soviet scholars rejected the "theory of "convergence" of the Soviet and Western, particularly American, systems." Western thinkers promoted "Western theories of convergence" (p. 144).

This sounds like the same basic idea that [Norman Dodd](#) [41] recounted concerning the eventual merger of the Soviet and American systems being carried out by the big foundations. He was talking about a deliberate project that

required effort and planning and not something that was supposed to happen on its own.

“In the Soviet view, both the Marxist revisionists and Western theorists of ideological evolution, erosion, or deideologization of Soviet Marxism have essentially been engaged in a political stratagem designed to undermine the ideological foundations of Soviet power. The present author [Brzezinski] was particularly singled out for criticism in this connection” (f.n. p. 144).

He quotes Professor E. Modrzhinskaya’s “Anti-Communism Disguised as Evolutionism,” in which she lists what she saw as attacks on Socialism, including various theories, including:

“the convergence doctrine, and – the capstone of them all – the theory of evolution, which has been elaborated in greatest detail by Zbigniew Brzezinski, Director of the Research Institute on Communist Affairs at Columbia University...” (f.n. 144)

Andre Sakharov

Brzezinski describes the political manifesto of Soviet nuclear physicist Andre Sakharov (p. 162). Sakharov asserts “any preaching of the incompatibility of world ideologies and nations is a madness and a crime.” He condemns restraints on intellectual freedom (pp. 162, 163). Sakharov refers to social inequality in the Soviet Union:

“the 5 per cent of the Soviet population that belongs to the managerial group is as privileged as its counterpart in the United States” (f.n. p. 163).

His thesis is

“that our age requires and compels increasing international cooperation – both to avoid a nuclear war and to overcome the dangers to mankind posed by hunger, overpopulation, and pollution – and this cooperation will eventually come from the increasing convergence of the currently distinctive political and social systems” (p. 163).

Please note also that one of the stages Sakharov predicted was

“the transformation of the United States and other “capitalist” countries by reformers who will effect internal changes ...” (p. 164).

He's talking about internal changes in *Western* countries like the United States. Charlotte Iserbyt has referred to "change agents." For more information on the merger between the U.S. and Soviet Union in terms of education systems, see Charlotte Iserbyt [[42](#)].

So these anti-Soviet Marxists and dissidents were promoting ideas about merger and convergence (or "evolution") that anticipated the collapse of the Soviet Union, the fall of the Berlin Wall, and the New World Order announced by George H. W. Bush, a defining part of which is Agenda 21, which is rule by NGOs or councils under the cloak of environmentalism.

***** XII *****

East-West scientific cooperation, political implications of technology, cybernetics, technocracy, social control, East German example

Contact between East and West: Discussion of the "Future"

He mentions how Soviet academics established contact with study groups in the US and other Western countries, who studied "the future" and the "**political implications of technology**" (p. 150).

This is an example of how West and East, supposed enemies during the Cold War, cooperated – through contact between scientists. And what did they talk about? Did they talk about the advantages of allowing people to control their own lives and the advantages of independence, individual freedom, and restraining government power? No, they talked about controlling people with technology and systems of different kinds. This is what we live with now. In retrospect, it's in your face. But back then, I'm sure it was portrayed as "peaceful" whenever the public was aware of it. How "wonderful" that the two "sides" were talking to each other about their totalitarian research. Oh, isn't it so "wonderful" how they could talk about how to plan the entire world's future together! But this discussion is in the context of Brzezinski not being impressed with what he thought of as narrow Soviet attitudes.

The Soviet middle class, he writes, are "conservative in their political and social mores and are only one generation removed from their proletarian or peasant origins" (p. 169). I remember how the media during the Bush Senior era referred to the Russian communists as "conservative."

A New Level of Radical Change

He quotes a Soviet scientist and novelist, Daniil Granin from 1967, who said that the future "is fraught with crises ... connected not only with a **different**

conception of freedom, but also a different idea of individuality” (f.n. p. 151).

Brzezinski quotes from his earlier article “America in the Technetronic Age” – which he claims had angered Soviet observers:

“the world is on the eve of a transformation more dramatic in its historic and human consequences than that wrought either by the French or the Bolshevik revolutions. ...these famous revolutions merely scratched the surface of the human condition. ... they **did not affect the essence of individual and social existence**” (f.n. pp. 151-152).

He said Lenin and Robespierre will be seen as “**mild reformers**” (f.n. p. 152).

Brzezinski’s Criticism of Soviets

Instead of Lenin’s and Stalin’s more Oriental version of Marxism, Brzezinski says that the peace of the world depends on “the Soviet Union’s return to the occidental Marxist tradition ...” (p. 154).

He predicted the gap between the U.S. and Soviet Union would widen economically and technologically (p. 155).

He talks about the unlikelihood that a leader would emerge to democratize Soviet society in the near future (p. 167) (but we now know about Gorbachev).

Technocracy and Cybernetics: East Germany, Social Control

Brzezinski (p. 165) discusses possible paths for Soviet political development, including the alternative of “political disintegration” (which may describe what actually happened).

One of the alternatives he discussed is the “transformation” of the Soviet rulers into “technocrats” where the emphasis is on “scientific expertise, efficiency, and discipline” (p. 165). As in East Germany, “the party would be composed of scientific experts, **trained in the latest techniques, capable of relying on cybernetics** [43] and **computers for social control...**” (p. 165).

He talks about [Ulbricht’s](#) [44] East Germany and how it may become very relevant. Ulbricht emphasized that “the development of the socialist system ... is to a growing extent a matter of scientific leadership. . . . We orient ourselves on the **conscious scientific control of complex processes and systems by the people and for the people. We make use of cybernetics....**” (p. 170).

East Germany used “cybernetics, operational research, and electronic data

processing..." (p. 171).

In 1969, Politburo member [Kurt Hager](#) [45] reported that East Germany was "correctly programmed" (p. 171).

And he refers to a speech by East German official [Erich Honecker](#) [46] which emphasized "the technetronic features of a modern society ... " (f.n. p. 171)

***** XIII *****

Soviet Union, China, communism, global cooperation, trade, global tax

The Soviet Union

Brzezinski predicts the "early 1980s" for when the Soviet leadership would be fully "post-Stalin" (p. 173). He said they would need to reduce the party's control over ideas and allow each Soviet citizen to read whatever he wants (p. 174). This reminds me of Gorbachev's later [Glasnost or "openness"](#) [47] policy.

He discussed the circumstances in which it could be possible for the Soviet Union to rejoin "the Western Marxist tradition" (p. 175). Note that he didn't say they would become constitutionalists and celebrate property rights and freedom. The point is they would join with the other types of Marxists in the West (who have positions of power but they don't tell anyone they're "Marxists").

He wrote (decades before it happened) that it is certain that Eastern Europeans would move closer to Western Europe despite the pull from the Soviet Union (p. 301). Brzezinski complains that the building of international cooperation "is getting little help from the Soviet Union..." (p. 283).

He expected the Soviets would have to cooperate internationally or suffer economically (p. 303).

Bolshevik vs. French Revolution

He compares the Bolshevik Revolution to the French Revolution, claiming that the Bolsheviks caused more fundamental changes. They were a "**professional** [someone was funding them as per Sutton], ideological, and disciplined party" that "ripped apart and reweave the entire social fabric," causing an extensive "industrial and urban revolution" (f.n. p. 175).

Czechoslovakia

He claims that if the Soviets had let Czechoslovakia develop a more democratic

form of communism, Western communists would have copied it and would have become more appealing to Western electorates. He says this version of communism would have worked at harnessing the “technetronic challenge” “humanistically” (p. 180). I guess that means the friendly version of technetronics! But I think many people look at Western forms of socialism through rose-colored glasses [[48](#)].

More on Communism

He did not think that only communism was the “key to effective modernization” (p. 190). Throughout the book, communism is portrayed as a tool of rapid modernization. Tool for what and for whom? For “history”? For “evolution” or “progress”? What’s the rush if it’s all inevitable “progress”? Did the Bolsheviks act alone without backing? It’s clear to me that communism was a tool of the Western banking elites, based on Antony C. Sutton’s research [[49](#)]- for example, *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution* [[50](#)], and based on the findings of the Reece Committee and Norman Dodd [[51](#)] on the activities of the big foundations [[52](#)].

But it’s also clear that other ideologies and other methods are used to achieve “modernization” globally - e.g., the United States and other Western governments use war, unlimited CIA growth (see Fletcher Prouty’s *The Secret Team* [[53](#)]), monopoly capitalism, corporate subsidies, public-private partnership, bail-outs, fractional reserve banking (money out of nothing), propaganda and foreign aid to carry out their policies.

As far as I can tell, based on Brzezinski’s book and the writings of H. G. Wells and others, “modernization” means standardizing the world for total control, for interfering in our lives, regulating our property rights through excuses about the environment and endangered species, interfering in our cultures, our education, our family life, and also with population and reproduction (see [here](#) [[54](#)] and [here](#) [[55](#)] for example). It goes beyond just technology, infrastructure, resources, and military and political domination.

The word “modernization” doesn’t belong to ordinary people concerned about rights and doing the right thing. It belongs to various types of Marxists and fascists, and those who are involved in Agenda 21, and the bankers who fund them. It’s their game and they’re the only ones in the game to define “modernization” or any other destabilizing and subversive idea they promote (which we think we understand or which we think are appealing because of the way they're portrayed in science fiction). They have spent years planning, studying and promoting their [political and cultural propaganda](#) [[56](#)] - whether at Western universities or at Soviet universities - and now they carry out their policies, after all these years receiving funds from Western governments and private foundations.

He isn't necessarily happy that communism failed to link "humanism with internationalism" (p. 193). He praises communism for helping to grow the "collective consciousness" of humanity and to "mobilize the masses for social progress" (p. 193).

He corrects those who think that American foreign policy was conducted based on the idea of a "monolithic world communist conspiracy" (f.n. p. 285). In fact, the United States "pioneered in aid to Yugoslavia in the late 1940s" and it was "the first to initiate American-Soviet cultural exchanges, visits between heads of state, and so on" (f.n. p. 285).

China

Brzezinski actually refers to the lack of unity in Chinese communism, tarnishing their "undeniably impressive achievements in the struggle to overcome China's backwardness" (p. 187). So he is full of praise for the Chinese communists.

He predicted the growth of Chinese power (p. 188).

He suggests "Africa, rather than Asia, may be a more promising long-range Chinese target" (p. 188). He mentions how they have already made "political inroads into East Africa (p. 280)."

In 2012, you can find plenty of articles on the present day [Chinese colonization of Africa](#) [57].

Did he want China to expand their influence?

Brzezinski writes that the U.S. should encourage other nations to "seek ties" with China. It should also start its own "initiatives" regarding China and avoid "anti-Chinese" arrangements (p. 289).

Do Marxists – or whatever we call the people who govern us and pretend to be "liberal" or "conservative" – really work to serve a particular nation such as America or Canada? Do they not have a particular internationalist view of the world that excludes national sovereignty, tribalism and older traditions that aren't humanist? It's so obvious since Brzezinski spells it out.

What has gone on all these years? We should investigate the relationship between the United States and China over the decades since this book was written (and prior), for example: [Cambodia and Pol Pot \(Brzezinski involved\)](#) [58], George Bush Sr. ([Ambassador to China](#) [59]), [Nixon](#) [60], [Carter and Brzezinski](#) [61], [Panama Canal vs. ports question of control](#) [62], [Ron Brown incident](#) [63], major trade agreements with China, [nuclear technology transferred to North Korea](#) [64], the [downed aircraft incident under Bush Jr](#) [65].

Big Business

Like socialist [H. G. Wells](#) [66], Brzezinski also praised big business, for example in the context of praising the foreign operations of international corporations in terms of their efficiency and use of technology, and the need to reform the US foreign service and policy-making along those lines (pp. 292, 293).

He describes the capacity of American big business for "collective organizational efforts" and their ability to adapt new methods and pool resources. The methods developed by American business include "linear programming," a "systems" approach and "coordinated teamwork" (pp. 202-203).

He quotes Max Ways "The Road to 1977," *Fortune magazine*, January 1967, who lists the techniques of "systems analysis" or "systems planning" (f.n. p. 203). Also: "An emphasis on information, prediction, and persuasion, rather than on coercive or authoritarian power, as the main agents of coordinating the separate elements of an effort" (f.n. p. 203).

Information Grid / Internet

He said they were already developing a "national information grid that will integrate existing electronic data banks" in order to collect knowledge together (p. 202).

And he also expected a "world information grid" (p. 299) that would act as the "basis for a common educational program" and for "common academic standards" (p. 299).

Foreign Aid, Trade & Global Cooperation

He talks about how the idea of foreign aid was already seen back then as an "imperative," as part of "global consciousness" (pp. 275, 276).

He talks about cooperation leading to a "long-range strategy for international development based on the emerging global consciousness (p. 303)". He hoped for "more internationalized, multilateral foreign aid" (p. 304). This sounds like the Millenium Development Goals (or Sustainable Development Goals) and Agenda 21.

He worries about what he calls "chaos" because of so-called "outmoded ideological concepts" (p. 293) and he's scared to death of a revival of "nationalism" and those who object to "aid to the Third World," which is the center-piece and crowning imperialist scam of globalism. And they dare not surrender it to those who want old-fashioned independence and who want their money spent on their own needs, their family's needs and their country's needs

rather than sending it off to international corporations who beat up on the Third World if necessary, take their resources and call it "aid." This method of imperialism is described by John Perkins in *Confessions of an Economic Hit Man*.

To me, it's clear that foreign aid is a means of control over those of us who pay taxes in the so-called First World. It amounts to redistribution of our wealth (as tax cows) to international corporations, UN bureaucracies and governments. One of the major uses is population policies and this is disguised under all sorts of cover stories which are just firmly embedded indoctrination to allow for the aborting of babies and sterilization ("women's rights," "women's health," "poverty," "climate change," etc.). Population reduction is necessary for a controlled global society, it's a consistent theme in Fabian writings (see [H. G. Wells "Open Conspiracy" \[67\]](#)), and it's more and more in the media, barely disguised.

We're never asked whether we agree with our government loaning money overseas. Foreign Aid is never an election issue. It's just the done thing and if you object, you're just *mean*. We don't question the legitimacy of these transactions – with our money – and the legitimacy or constitutionality of international organizations such as the United Nations and G20. The people have no say.

I suspect that exposing the truth about foreign aid and asking governments (like the Canadian government) to justify their policies to the people they supposedly represent would expose a whole lot of basic issues, and would be sensitive point with the globalists. They'll throw the word "nationalist" at us immediately (in between their hypocritical flag-waving). But people should be careful about what groups and parties they sign up with in case they're just playing the role of opposition and act as a sink for our energy, money and time. We should investigate independently and shine a light on foreign aid as well as war policies and new trade agreements. We should start asking fundamental questions about why politicians are so motivated to sign all of these international agreements. When does it stop?

There are fake dialectics and fake oppositions and made-up enemies at all levels: like the Conservative Party in Canada or the Republican Party, like the US vs. China, like the Cold War. The opposition is real at one level even to the point of war. But at a deeper level, the different sides are working for the same powerful people.

He talks about how it would be good to give "international bodies a larger role in economic development and to start eliminating restrictions on trade..." (p. 289). So the elites have pushed many "free trade" agreements since he wrote this and are still pushing new ones.

He thought that "international security arrangements" should "replace" Cold War alliances. There should be an "association based on a concept of cooperative nations..." and its security arrangements are to be directed against "those who depart from established norms" (p. 289). This sounds like the mode they've operated under since the end of the Cold War and especially since after 9/11. The United States government uses a policy of preemptive war and attacks countries (directly([Libya \[68\]](#)) or indirectly ([Syrian rebels \[69\]](#))) that haven't attacked it when the government of that country stands in their way. This goes against traditional doctrine on respecting the internal affairs of nations. They don't believe in that and aren't pretending to follow it any longer.

He says the "technetronic revolution" has somehow sped up the idea of "European consciousness" and the "autarkic ideas of the industrial age have little or no hold on it today" (p. 294). So regionalism and the erosion of national identity is equated with the post-industrial age. Why should there be a post-industrial age anyway and why should it mean giving up sovereignty and independence? How is supposed willingness to become part of a united Europe or "European government" (f.n. p. 294) relate to "technetronic" other than the fact that globalist and "European consciousness" and "free trade" (shut down factories, eliminate jobs) propaganda is spread through television and radio broadcasting? Everything in the post-industrial technetronic age is built on bits and bytes of data and propaganda fluff.

Also, during the "industrial age," governments left us alone to a large degree in Western countries like Canada. Now, with the "post-industrial age," the technology is used to harass you, surveil you, violate your privacy and make up endless rules for your life. Is this a coincidence?

And everyone is provided with politically correct ideas to accept new – and strange (because they come from "Marxists") – priorities and legislated changes (pushed by foundations) via the media, and these changes are pushed on us (through peer pressure also) as if we are a huge flock of sheep. These changes do not come from us. They are paid for by corporate think-tanks, NGOs and foundation heads ("philanthropists") we are taught to admire and obey.

He also writes about the goal of creating a "community of the developed nations that would embrace the Atlantic states, the more advanced European communist states, and Japan" (p. 295).

He says this is more "attainable" than the goal of a "world government" (p. 308).

This reminds me of the G7, G8 and G20 at present. The G20 includes nations such as the US, Canada and Japan, with the [European Union \[70\]](#) in attendance, which now [includes \[71\]](#) formerly European communist states such as Poland, Hungary, etc.

Mankind is "moving steadily toward large-scale cooperation" (p. 296). He claims that despite set-backs, "all human history clearly indicates progress in that direction" (p. 296). But I don't agree at all. Only those who seek to dominate others want to see everyone "cooperate" on a large scale, because how would that happen except through coercion? Doesn't it require constant harassment and hectoring, and the offering of "solutions" for supposed crises and scams such as climate change (even though, as of 2012, the earth hasn't warmed in 16 years according to a report [109]). He even says there need to be "deliberate efforts to accelerate the process ..." (p. 296). So it's not natural. Natural cooperation happens without coercion or it doesn't happen at all.

He doesn't see it in terms of creating one large formal world state. He wants to "associate existing states" through "indirect ties" and "limitations on national sovereignty" (p. 296) that are already in development.

He mentions the idea of a "council for global cooperation..." (more than the OECD) that brings together "the political leaders of states." This body would be "more effective in developing common programs than is the United Nations" (p. 298). He says that advanced nations are becoming "post-industrial" and are "moving into the post-national age" (p. 299)

He talks about creating an international convention that would make it possible to "outlaw the use of chemicals to **limit and manipulate man** and to prevent other scientific abuses ..." (p. 300). He was concerned about that, but I think people are being prescribed [72] these chemicals now unfortunately, and they are eating and drinking them (see [here](#) [73], [here](#) [74], and [here](#) [75] for example).

"In the economic-technological field some international cooperation has already been achieved, but further progress will require greater American sacrifices" (p. 300). Why are more "sacrifices" required by Americans? Does this refer to Western technology and factories (see [Jack Layton's comments here](#) [76]) going to China and other Asian nations in order to build a global system?

He talks about efforts to create a new "world monetary structure" "with some consequent risk to the present relatively favorable American position" (p. 300). Was he talking about the same idea as the Nixon change, ending Bretton Woods, or was he talking about something further off?

Why should Americans be made to suffer such risks and economic sacrifices because of their own government's policies? A government run by globalists cares about their ambition of "international cooperation," which means world government. Their wars also and the sacrifices involved in those wars are for building a system of international "cooperation" also where everybody does what

they're told. I'm sure "international cooperation" will mean censoring inconvenient opinions ([UN attempts to regulate Internet \[77\]](#)), because you can have more "cooperation" that way by shutting people up.

He said progress would likely require getting rid of restrictions (from 1949 and 1954) put on American corporations abroad (p. 300).

He mentions the need for a "new theory of international production" (p. 300).

He also mentions the creation of a "free-trade area, which could be targeted in progressive stages" (p. 300).

He says the world is "still unstructured politically..." (p. 305).

He talks about the possibility of a "global taxation system" (p. 304). His reference is the "Bulletin of Peace Proposals" prepared "by the International Peace research Institute, Oslo, in the autumn of 1969" (f.n. 304).

He talks about "the problems confronting man's life on this planet..." (p. 305) but the biggest problem of all are the wars funded by the US government. But he doesn't seem to include that as a problem. Can we stop the wars first please before talking about made-up "problems" or problems that aren't any of our business? Can we write a few books about how we can get governments to stop unleashing bombs and drones on people all over the world? But I suppose the elites see the real "problem" in terms of power and control over people, so their solutions are: standardization, population, taxation, surveillance, loaning out our money, burdening us with debt in the name of "foreign aid," etc.

"This country's commitment to international affairs on a global scale has been decided by history. It cannot be undone..." (p. 306)

He talks about "educational reforms" to "promote rational humanist values" (p. 308), and a "more functional approach to man's problems, emphasizing ecology rather than ideology..." (p. 308). The spread of "a more personalized rational humanist world outlook" would gradually "replace the institutionalized religions, ideological, and intensely national perspectives that have dominated modern history" (p. 309).

Articles of Interest

One of the end notes on p. 314 (about p. 65) II. 3. "... see Jacques Soustelle, *Les Quatre Soleils*, Paris, 1967. ... Soustelle attacks the progressive theory of history as expressed by Marx, Spengler, Toynbee, and Teilhard de Chardin. For a more complex analysis, see Michel Foucault, *Folie et deraison*, Paris, 1961; American edition, *Madness and Civilization*, New York, 1965."

Another article by Brzezinski is mentioned on p. 324 (Note V 13) "Global Political Planning," *Public Interest*, Winter 1969.

***** XIV *****

Threat of a controlled society, use of technology, planning vs. freedom

America's Post-industrial Transition

He says that modern America is a "social laboratory" (p. 196).

He wonders whether technology can be beneficial and not induce "excessive social control" (p. 196).

He explains that America is "in transition from the industrial to the technetronic age" (p. 197) and is the "first post-industrial society" (p. 197).

He explains that this change is producing a "crisis of established American values and institutions" (p. 197).

To get Americans to accept the earlier changes of government intervention and social welfare, he says it took the Civil War, the industrialization of the country and the New Deal (p. 199).

The statistics for rural vs. urban U.S. population changes are recounted from *Time* magazine: In 1800, the rural population was 94% of the total. In 1900, it was 60%. In 1950, it was only 35%. The predicted estimate given for the year 2000 for the rural population is 17%. (f.n. p. 199)

If you follow up on those statistics 40 years later, for the year 2010, the World Bank states the rural population of the United States is [17.7%](#) [78]. So the globalist (Agenda 21) operation of clearing the human beings off the land is at least 10 years behind that estimate. Those last 17-20% must be a cause of [severe frustration for them](#) [79]! Don't those people know they're not supposed to live in the country? This is "progress."

But overall you can see how Americans have given up their rural roots and means of independence. Just as [Esau sold his birthright for a bowl of pottage](#) [80], most Americans seem to have surrendered their property rights, freedoms and rural independence skills – and civil liberties also since 9/11 – in order to worship government. And no doubt they'll find it wasn't worth it.

He mentions the loss of industrial employment (p. 200).

He categorizes Americans into three segments, each "age" still having its representative groups of people – in 1970: "post-industrial" (high-tech employment), "industrial" and "pre-industrial" (p. 201).

"The current transformation also poses profound philosophical issues concerning the very essence of social existence, since it is largely derived from an **unprecedented expansion of scientific power over both man's environment and man himself**" (p. 201).

The Elite

"This feeling of uncertainty about national purpose is also magnified by the fading of the **established political elite that has guided the nation since World War II. Primarily composed of men coming from the eastern seaboard and connected with legal, corporate, and high financial circles, the political elite provided a sense of continuity** within the framework of a pragmatic liberal consensus on the nature and character of modern industrial society" (p. 215).

I'm not sure exactly how they're "fading" or how there's a "breakup" (p. 215). On the face of it, it can't be correct. The Rockefellers for example, and the institutions they founded have dominated society all these years including the Council on Foreign Relations (not so publicly) and the United Nations. The principal founder of Brzezinski's Trilateral Commission [81] is David Rockefeller who is also a key member of Bilderberg [82]. JP Morgan Chase & Co. and other big banks are represented in [President Obama's cabinet](#) [83]. The same big foundations [84] still dominate [in addition to the newer ones](#) [85].

He says this elite was being challenged from more dispersed interests connected with new "scientific-defense and frontier industries" (p. 215), and also by more "ideologically inclined intellectual forces" (p. 215).

I remember reading a similar analysis by Carroll Quigley in *Tragedy and Hope* about the conservative "new money" classes. So I think Brzezinski, who may be referring to groups on the left also, is also mainly referring to the conservative and neoconservative movements (two different things in my view, with the [former being subverted by the latter](#) [86]).

My point is that the same elites are still in power, regardless of ideological stripe or faction:

The CFR (Council on Foreign Relations) is one of their main semi-public organizations. [Here is "left-wing" Democrat Hilary Clinton at the CFR literally asking for orders](#) [87].

[Here is "right-wing" neoconservative Dick Cheney at the CFR explaining his key role as DIRECTOR of the CFR and how he hid that from his constituents \[88\]](#) David Rockefeller also talks to Cheney about his support of FTAA ("free trade" for the Americas).

The same [article \[89\]](#) mentions other CFR neocons and explains the left-wing ex-Trotskyite background of Reagan neocons. The point is that the neocons also work for the CFR and not just the Democrats.

Also, Bush Sr. (CIA), Reagan's VP – neither a neoconservative nor a conservative – was [tied to the elites \[90\]](#), and must have affected the direction of Reagan's presidency. Reagan had been [running against Bush \[91\]](#).

In any case, just like the neocons were former "Cold War liberals," Reagan himself and also various factions in the conservative movement were clearly dominated by militarism and by the military industrial complex. See [this article again \[92\]](#) about anti-war, anti-imperialist and anti-militarist attitudes among traditional conservatives like Russell Kirk and Pat Buchanan. Despite the personal beliefs of members of different factions – and maybe there is no end to factions who are taken over by [billionaires \[93\]](#) and secret societies – most politicians and activists end up working for the elite international corporations and bankers.

The New Left

Brzezinski calls the New Left an "infantile ideology" (p. 222). He doesn't like their protests and militancy (p. 224).

Brzezinski complained that they "have jeopardized American social progress by providing a convenient rationalization for the more conservative social attitudes" (p. 236).

For me, I think people were right to protest the Vietnam war and to be skeptical of government and corporations. However, he argues that the New Left had a strong "totalitarian predisposition" (p. 234) and not just an anarchistic tendency (p. 236).

“...leading New left spokesmen have been contemptuous of free speech, democratic procedures, and majority rule. They have left little room for doubt as to how they would handle their critics if the New Left were ever to gain power (p. 235).”

I think there is reason for concern because [Obama's Democratic Party has been identified with the New Left \[94\]](#).

Co-opting protest movements?

He writes that the

“American tradition of free dialogue ... has been an important factor in developing this responsiveness to change; it has made it possible to exploit protest movements (and thereby render them historically superfluous) by adapting and adopting their programs” (p. 257).

If I am interpreting this comment correctly, it could also apply to the “[color revolutions](#)” [95] that American globalists seem to be covertly running overseas.

Planning vs. Freedom: Anticipating Agenda 21

“Technological developments make it certain that modern society will require more and more **planning**. Deliberate management of the American future will become widespread, with the planner eventually displacing the lawyer as the key social legislator and manipulator How to combine **social planning with personal freedom** is already emerging as the key **dilemma** of technetronic America...” (p. 260)

“Dilemma” just means it’s impossible. What he describe is also non-democratic.

He says one of America’s domestic priorities is the need to “blur traditional distinctions between governmental and nongovernmental social processes...” (p. 308). NGOs – private groups working with government – are a major aspect of the [Agenda 21](#) [96] system we live under now.

At the conclusion he writes about defining “social purposes” (p. 309). He asks:

“To what ends should *our power* be directed, how should *our social dialogue* be promoted, in what way should the *needed action* be taken ...” (p. 309) (emphasis mine)

He mentions these as philosophical and political issues.

But why should so much coercive power combined with advanced technology be allowed in the hands of government?

Why should there be any “social dialogue” that is promoted coercively and through propaganda? Why is that legitimate? Who determines the direction?

Who has the right to decide the “needed action” and use government to force it on others?

The Threat of a Controlled Society

Brzezinski writes:

“Another threat ... confronts liberal democracy. . . . it involves the gradual appearance of **a more controlled and directed society**. Such a society would be **dominated by an elite whose claim to political power would rest on allegedly superior scientific know-how. Unhindered by the restraints of traditional liberal values, this elite would not hesitate to achieve its political ends by using the latest modern techniques for influencing public behavior and keeping society under close surveillance and control**” (pp. 252-253).

He refers to this as “technological managerialism” (p. 253).

He says that the “technological momentum of the country would not be reversed but would actually feed on the situation it exploits” (pp. 252-253). By this, I think he means that industries related to security, surveillance, weaponry and prisons would do very well and would continue to become more advanced despite the increased oppression which would tend to slow down other sectors of the economy, but not those sectors. In other words, there may be plenty of work (for a while anyway) for everyone who is willing to participate in the oppression sector in which they help the bankers walk all over their neighbors and fellow citizens – for their paycheck. That’s how I interpret his statement. I think *everybody* needs to think about what they are participating in.

He says that social crises, a charismatic leader and mass media “would be the steppingstones in the piecemeal transformation of the United States into a **highly controlled society**” (p. 253).

End

Addendum: Misquotes concerning "Between Two Ages"

[This article \[97\]](#) explains some misquotes that people repeat concerning Brzezinski's book and how someone seems to have combined the quote on pages 252-253 (quoted above) with another quote from the original Brzezinski journal article "America in the Technetronic Age", from *Encounter* (January 1968).

The following is also a correct quote (according to the above link), but it's from his journal article, not this book:

"At the same time, the **capacity to assert social and political control over the individual will vastly increase**. As I have already noted, it will soon be possible to assert almost **continuous surveillance over every citizen and to maintain up-to-date, complete files, containing even most personal information about the health or personal behaviour of the citizen**, in addition to more customary data. These files will be subject to instantaneous retrieval by the authorities (p.21) ."

Addendum: Brzezinski at Montreal CFR in April 23, 2010

[Youtube video of one segment of his talk](#) – "Global awakening" [98].

Brzezinski talks as he writes, as if he is a calm observer rather than also a participant. More and more people are aware of the goals and manipulations of the globalist elite. That doesn't mean enough will be able to figure things out in time, because as he indicated in *Between Two Ages [see above]*, there would be chemical and other technological means of controlling populations. We need to stop going along with their lies, their wars, their financial manipulations, and their police state. Decide what you believe, but stop picking the false "left" and "right" sides that they give us.

From website (in French) for Conseil Des Relations Internationales De Montréal:

- a) <https://www.corim.qc.ca/fr/recherche?q=Brzezinski> April 23, 2010 event [99].
- b) Bio (French) https://www.corim.qc.ca/fr/biographie/148/Zbigniew_Brzezinski [100]
- c) <https://www.corim.qc.ca/fr/conference/123/2010-04-23-zbigniew-brzezinski> [101]. This features another segment of his presentation: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Xh9_7hLS0pY&feature=youtu.be [102] "Vidéo CORIM - Zbigniew Brzezinski - Les dilemmes géopolitiques des États-Unis."

Below the embedded video (also in the background when he is speaking), you will see the event was supported by RioTinto

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rio_Tinto_\(corporation\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rio_Tinto_(corporation))) [103].

The event was in association with the CIC, the Canadian International Council (Council on Foreign Relations or formerly Canadian Institute for International Affairs, the branch attended by Brzezinski being Conseil des Relations Internationales de Montréal). There is a link to a related website <https://opencanada.org/fr/a-propos-de-nous/> [104] which is an online magazine of the Canadian International Council, their website is here: <https://thecic.org/> [105]. At the bottom of the page, there are various powerful corporate and government institutions listed as partners.

Addendum: [Meet Zbigniew Brzezinski, Conspiracy Theorist](#) [106] by James Corbett, youtube.com, corbetteport.com [107]

This video contains an amazing series of clips featuring Brzezinski.

Note: According to [this researcher](#) [108], “national sovereignty is no longer a viable concept” – repeated by the otherwise brilliant activists in the confrontation scene – is a misquote and is not found in “Between Two Ages” (I didn’t come across it either). It’s better to be careful about accuracy and check quotes and facts yourself, as it can cause others to spin their wheels trying to verify them.

References and Additional Information

Links have been checked, accessed and updated as of February 27, 2021.

Original series: <http://canadianliberty.com/between-two-ages-by-zbigniew-brzezinski/>

Additional related posts: <http://canadianliberty.com/tag/zbigniew-brzezinski/>

[1] *Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technetronic Era*, by Zbigniew Brzezinski, 1970, The Viking Press, New York. Third printing October 1971.

[2] <http://canadianliberty.com/invisible-empire/>

[3] <http://www.peterdalescott.net/>

[4] <https://web.archive.org/web/20160422071757/http://csis.org:80/expert/zbigniew-brzezinski>

[5] <http://trilateral.org/>

[6] <http://www.cfr.org/>

[7] <http://www.nysun.com/national/despite-criticism-obama-stands-by-adviser/62534/>

[8] <https://web.archive.org/web/20110804232151/http://www.counterpunch.org/brzezinski.html>

[9] <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uhFleLinwEM>

[10] Note: In some YouTube videos, there is a photo of a soldier identified as Osama bin Laden, but the following article asks where is the evidence for that, and says he is more likely a Pakistani soldier:

http://www.911myths.com/index.php?title=Bin_Laden_and_Brzezinski

[11] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EVgZyMoycc0>
<https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0756324/>

[12] <http://www.amazon.com/Secret-Destiny-America-Manly-Hall/dp/089314388X>

[13] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Steppenwolf_\(novel\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Steppenwolf_(novel))

[14] <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Daniel+12%3A4&version=KJV>

[15] <http://www.cuttingthroughthematrix.com/books.html>

[16] <https://web.archive.org/web/20130312095442/http://www.ukginger.net/mystery-babylon.php>

[17] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zbigniew_Brzezinski

[18] <http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/bacon/1626/new-atlantis/index.htm>

[19] <http://canadianliberty.com/the-future-we-dont-want-the-canadian-government-should-withdraw-from-the-rio20-earth-summit-and-renounce-un-agenda-21/>

<https://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/documents/agenda21/english/Agenda21.pdf>

[20] <http://canadianliberty.com/bill-gates-population-reduction-and-zero-co2-same-thing/>

https://www.ted.com/talks/bill_gates_innovating_to_zero

[21] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zbigniew_Brzezinski

[22] <http://canadianliberty.com/h-g-wells-the-open-conspiracy-part-10/>

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

[24] <http://canadianliberty.com/notes-on-propaganda-by-jacques-ellul-6/>

[25] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jeane_Kirkpatrick

[26] <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neoconservatism>

[27] <http://canadianliberty.com/april-17-2009-soviet-and-american-systems-were-to-be-merged-where-we-are-today/>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IMVZSsPzaTc> Interview with Norman Dodd of the Reece Committee

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_House_Select_Committee_to_Investigate_Tax-Exempt_Foundations_and_Comparable_Organizations

<https://duckduckgo.com/?t=ffnt&q=reece+committe&atb=v119-1&ia=web>

[28] Discussion of communitarianism:

<http://nord.twu.net/acl/research/standfor.html>

[29] [https://www.youtube.com/results?](https://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=bush+announced+new+world+order)

[search_query=bush+announced+new+world+order](https://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=bush+announced+new+world+order)

<http://canadianliberty.com/new-world-order-speeches-of-president-george-h-w-bush/>

One of these speeches, September 11, 1990:

<https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/address-before-joint-session-the-congress-the-persian-gulf-crisis-and-the-federal-budget>

Source website: <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/>

[30] <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A7991-2003Nov6.html>

Bush: Iraq Part of 'Global Democratic Revolution'

[31] <http://canadianliberty.com/explaining-global-health-initiative-population-control-the-centrepiece-of-u-s-foreign-policy/>

[32] <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trotskyism>

[33] <http://canadianliberty.com/about-propaganda-by-jacques-ellul-more-on-his-bio-5/>

[34] https://logosmedia.com/2012/05/RGordonWasson_The-Man-the-Legend-the-Myth-secret-history-of-magic-mushrooms-by-jan-irvin-144/

[35] <https://logosmedia.com/2012/08/how-darwin-huxley-and-the-esalen-institute-launched-the-2012-and-psychedelic-revolutions-and-began-one-of-the-largest-mind-control-operations-in-history/>

[36] <http://canadianliberty.com/key-information-antony-c-sutton-interview-on-wall-street-support-for-totalitarian-regimes/>

[37] <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Zbigniew-Brzezinski>

[38] https://www.amazon.com/s?k=Antony+C.+Sutton&i=stripbooks-intl-ship&ref=nb_sb_noss_2

[39] https://www.amazon.com/s?k=Western+Technology+and+Soviet+Economic+Development+Antony+C.+Sutton&i=stripbooks-intl-ship&ref=nb_sb_noss

[40] Re. supposed death of Osama Bin Laden:
<http://www.corbetteport.com/911-a-conspiracy-theory/>

[41] <http://canadianliberty.com/april-17-2009-soviet-and-american-systems-were-to-be-merged-where-we-are-today/>

See [27] also.

[42] <http://canadianliberty.com/charlotte-iserbyt-secret-history-western-education/>

<http://deliberatedumbingdown.com/ddd/>

[43] <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cybernetics>

[44] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Walter_Ulbricht

[45] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kurt_Hager

[46] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Erich_Honecker

[47] <http://www.historyorb.com/russia/glasnost.php>

[48] <http://canadianliberty.com/swedens-utopia-unmasked/>

[49] <http://antonymsutton.com/>

<https://duckduckgo.com/?q=Antony+C.+Sutton&t=ffnt&atb=v119-1&ia=web>

[50] <https://duckduckgo.com/?q=Antony+C.+Sutton+Wall+Street+and+the+Bolshevik+Revolution&t=ffnt&atb=v119-1&ia=web>

[51] See [27].

[https://duckduckgo.com/?](https://duckduckgo.com/?q=norman+dodd+rene+wormser+foundations+their+power+and+influence&t=ffnt&atb=v119-1&ia=web)

[q=norman+dodd+rene+wormser+foundations+their+power+and+influence&t=ffnt&atb=v119-1&ia=web](https://duckduckgo.com/?q=norman+dodd+rene+wormser+foundations+their+power+and+influence&t=ffnt&atb=v119-1&ia=web)

[52] *Foundations: Their Power and Influence* by Rene Wormser:

[https://duckduckgo.com/?](https://duckduckgo.com/?q=foundations+their+power+and+influence+rene+wormser&t=ffnt&atb=v119-1&ia=web)

[q=foundations+their+power+and+influence+rene+wormser&t=ffnt&atb=v119-1&ia=web](https://duckduckgo.com/?q=foundations+their+power+and+influence+rene+wormser&t=ffnt&atb=v119-1&ia=web)

[53] https://www.amazon.com/s?k=The+Secret+Team+L.+Fletcher+Prouty&i=stripbooks-intl-ship&ref=nb_sb_noss

[54] http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PCAAB500.pdf

[55] <http://canadianliberty.com/population-control/>

[56] <http://canadianliberty.com/kgb-agent-bezmenov-interview-on-the-subversion-process/>

[57] <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1036105/How-Chinas-taking-Africa-West-VERY-worried.html>

[58] <http://www.nytimes.com/1998/04/17/world/death-of-pol-pot-the-diplomacy-pol-pot-s-end-won-t-stop-us-pursuit-of-his-circle.html>

[59] <http://www.nndb.com/people/362/000022296/>

[60] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Richard_Nixon

[61] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zbigniew_Brzezinski

[62] <https://web.archive.org/web/20120909185912/http://archive.newsmax.com:80/archives/ic/2006/3/14/95754.shtml>

[63] <http://www.wnd.com/2004/09/26786/>

[64] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Donald_Rumsfeld "He also sat on European engineering giant Asea Brown Boveri's board from 1990 to 2001, a company that sold two light-water nuclear reactors to the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization for installation in North Korea, as part of the 1994 agreed framework reached under President Bill Clinton."

[65] <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1349906/Chengdu-J-20-China-used-downed-US-fighter-develop-stealth-jet.html>

[66] <http://canadianliberty.com/h-g-wells-imperialism-and-the-open-conspiracy/>
<http://canadianliberty.com/h-g-wells-imperialism-and-the-open-conspiracy-part-2/>

[67] <http://canadianliberty.com/h-g-wells-the-open-conspiracy/>

[68] <http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/datablog/interactive/2011/may/23/libya-nato-bombing-no-fly-zone>

[69] <https://web.archive.org/web/20120701151412/http://www.informationclearinghouse.info:80/article30860.htm> *Syrian Rebels are Foreign-backed Terrorists* by Tony Cartalucci, March 19, 2012

[70]

<https://web.archive.org/web/20131112210709/http://www.g20.org:80/docs/links/faq.html>

[71] http://europa.eu/about-eu/countries/index_en.htm

[72] <http://canadianliberty.com/your-drug-may-be-your-problem-by-peter-breggin-and-david-cohen-1/>

[https://duckduckgo.com/?](https://duckduckgo.com/?q=Peter+Breggin+Your+Drug+May+Be+Your+Problem&atb=v119-1&ia=web)

[q=Peter+Breggin+Your+Drug+May+Be+Your+Problem&atb=v119-1&ia=web](https://duckduckgo.com/?q=Peter+Breggin+Your+Drug+May+Be+Your+Problem&atb=v119-1&ia=web)

[73] <http://canadianliberty.com/bpa-free-products-still-contain-bisphenols-of-equal-toxicity/>

[74] <http://canadianliberty.com/gmos-glyphosate-levels-in-urine-also-bt-toxin-found-in-people-pass-prop-37-in-california-to-require-labeling/>

[75] <http://canadianliberty.com/harvard-study-2012-finds-fluoride-lowers-iq/>

[76] <http://canadianliberty.com/jack-laytons-passing-points-of-agreement-2/>

[77]

<https://web.archive.org/web/20190211154846/https://www.infowars.com/internet-remains-unregulated-after-un-treaty-blocked/>

[78] <http://www.tradingeconomics.com/united-states/rural-population-percent-of-total-population-wb-data.html>

[79] <http://canadianliberty.com/we-certainly-dont-want-them-strolling-about-the-countryside-pack-people-into-cities-overpopulation-propaganda-in-lead-up-to-rio20/>

[80] <http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Genesis+25%3A34&version=KJV>

[81] <http://www.trilateral.org/>

Memorial Remarks for David A. Rockefeller by Henry A. Kissinger (May 2, 2017)

<https://www.trilateral.org/download/files/membership/HK%20-%20DR%20Memorial%20remarks-5-2-17-AS%20DELIV.pdf>

Special Address by Founding Director Zbigniew Brzezinski in the Palace of Culture on 9th May 2004: <https://www.trilateral.org/download/files/ZBIGNIEW%20BRZEZINSKI.pdf>

[82]

<https://web.archive.org/web/20140509003323/http://www.bilderbergmeetings.org:80/governance.html>

[83] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_M._Daley

[84] <http://canadianliberty.com/april-17-2009-soviet-and-american-systems-were-to-be-merged-where-we-are-today/>

See [27] and [52]

[85] <http://canadianliberty.com/bill-gates-population-reduction-and-zero-co2-same-thing/>

https://www.ted.com/talks/bill_gates_innovating_to_zero

[86] <http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/politics/item/2488-is-conservatism-dead>

[87] <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Kfppl6NqF0I> Hilary Clinton at the CFR.

[88] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BbnpN07J_zg&feature=emb_title Dick Cheney speaking at the CFR, also speaking from the audience is David Rockefeller.

[89] <http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/politics/item/2488-is-conservatism-dead>

[90]

https://web.archive.org/web/20150425155800/http://thecounterpunch.hubpages.com:80/hub/The_Bush-Nazi_scandal_by_John_Loftus_former_Federal_Prosecutor

[91] <http://blog.chron.com/txpotomac/2009/10/new-book-tells-inside-story-of-pivotal-bush-reagan-debate-in-nashua/>

[92] <http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/politics/item/2488-is-conservatism-dead>

[93] <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0612/77809.html>

[94] <http://www.theblaze.com/contributions/why-the-new-left-is-now-the-democratic-party/>

[95] <http://original.antiwar.com/justin/2010/02/07/the-orange-revolution-peeled/>

[96] <http://canadianliberty.com/the-future-we-dont-want-the-canadian-government-should-withdraw-from-the-rio20-earth-summit-and-renounce-un-agenda-21/>

<http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/documents/agenda21/english/Agenda21.pdf>

[97] https://web.archive.org/web/20140701075721/http://martinfrost.ws/htmlfiles/third_section/check-your-sources.html

[98] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xI_rYUGbn74 In this segment, you can see it's the same event (see below). "For the first time in all of human history, mankind is politically awakened . . . "

[99] <https://www.corim.qc.ca/fr/recherche?q=Brzezinski>

[100] https://www.corim.qc.ca/fr/biographie/148/Zbigniew_Brzezinski

[101] <https://www.corim.qc.ca/fr/conference/123/2010-04-23-zbigniew-brzezinski>

[102] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Xh9_7hLS0pY&feature=youtu.be This segment is about success in Afghanistan, and it is very interesting that he is

talking about "new cultural patterns of behavior, including men and women" in Afghanistan. He strategizes about how to succeed in imposing "modernity" etc. on Afghanistan.

[103] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rio_Tinto_\(corporation\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rio_Tinto_(corporation))

[104] <https://opencanada.org/fr/a-propos-de-nous/>

[105] <https://thecic.org/>

[106] <https://youtu.be/pBo134nnIlc>

<https://www.corbettreport.com/episode-252-meet-zbigniew-brzezinski-conspiracy-theorist/>

[107] <http://www.corbettreport.com/>

[108]

https://web.archive.org/web/20140701075721/http://martinfrost.ws/htmlfiles/third_section/check-your-sources.html

[109] Report from 2012:

<http://canadianliberty.com/monckton-states-the-truth-about-global-warming-before-being-kicked-out-of-un-climate-summit-no-warming-in-16-years/>