"Why of course the people don’t want war. Why should some poor slob on a farm want to risk his life in a war when the best he can get out of it is to come back to his farm in one piece? Naturally the common people don’t want war neither in Russia, nor in England, nor for that matter in Germany. That is understood. But, after all, it is the leaders of the country who determine the policy and it is always a simple matter to drag the people along, whether it is a democracy, or a fascist dictatorship, or a parliament, or a communist dictatorship. Voice or no voice, the people can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked, and denounce the peacemakers for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same in any country."1

Who made this statement? Could it be one of our government leaders today? … It was Hermann Goering, second in command to Hitler, who spoke those words. History repeats … people are people no matter what nationality. The Germans of yesterday supported Hitler as their leader—even *Time* magazine heralded him. The Russians of yesterday supported Lenin and Stalin as their leaders. The Americans of today support leaders who call for war and support torture. Why do we support leaders who call for war and restrict freedoms, under the guise of protecting freedoms?

We live in a time where leaders of large corporations, the media, government bureaucrats and politicians seem to speak with one voice. All too often that voice isn’t about truth but rather to manipulate our thoughts and beliefs. This voice knows that a threat to our freedom is a reason we will accept war. Is it also the reason the “enemy” is willing to go to war?

**Earning Freedom**

The world we live in today speaks of freedom without knowing what freedom really means. There is a wide gap between the truth of freedom and what we think is freedom. If we truly value freedom, then we are willing to give it to another—we do not impose our ideas of freedom on others. When we enter a war to oust one ruling group to replace it with another, do the people of that country want the change? Will the new ruling group operate without corruption and cruelty to maintain the power given to them? Does the country that intervenes
Who Foments and Funds Wars?

Wars are about differences of beliefs, religion, and cultures. To escalate those differences to the level of war between countries, a great deal of money is required. To prepare for a new government, we need to be aware—both as voters and as elected officials—who enables and funds war.

“Follow the money,” is a phrase often used to discover the powerful people or special interest groups behind government actions and restrictive regulations. It can be a shock to learn that a war fought in the trenches for an ideal has been fomented and funded by foreign interests. Hitler for example was funded by corporate leaders on both sides of the Atlantic.2

It was surprising to learn that the Russian revolution in 1917 that overthrew the Czar and paved the way for the Soviet Union had been funded by powerful corporate leaders in the US. Why? Why would corporate leaders want a communist government? The answer is to consolidate power. In order to expand their power and wealth, it is necessary to consolidate control in the hands of a few. One effective way to do that is through government regulations. This is accomplished by:

1) Control of the media to generate fear, to influence how we vote, and to encourage us to rely on government to protect us.

2) Control of political systems by funding candidates, manipulating elections, lobbying, and maintaining the illusion that we elect our government.

3) Control of the people by dumbing down the education system, by generating constant fear of attack so we open the door to spying on our neighbors, to police brutality, military intervention, and eventually a police state.

The actions leading to 1917 have implications for us today as our governments continue to lead us to war and work to erode more of our freedoms. Antony Sutton was a respected academic and author of several books. He shares what his research uncovered about US corporate leaders funding and fomenting revolution in Russia.

Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution
Watch Video

And for an insight as to how the media controls our views, here are the words by Judge Napolitano as he questions our political systems on his show “Freedom Watch.”

Judge Napolitano
Watch Video
benefit with access to the resources of the conquered country? The media continuously portrayed the plight of women in Afghanistan as a reason to eliminate the governing Taliban. Have we removed one regime only to replace it with another regime ... where the drug and child sex trade are reported to thrive?³ We impose our ideas of freedom on others without respecting their culture, their beliefs, their way of life. The result is never as we imagine.

If we truly value freedom, then the result is not what counts but the process. For example, the 2000 US presidential election, the use of electronic voting machines without any paper records, made a mockery of the freedom to vote. The election was settled in a state where the winner’s brother was governor, yet this fact was not questioned in the major media. It was interesting that both Republicans and Democrats did not stand together to defend freedom. Instead, most Republicans were happy with the outcome. They did not view the election as an opportunity to stand for freedom. The use of voting machines without a paper record continues to be a ripe opportunity for fraud.

Uncounted, a powerful documentary by Emmy award-winning director David Earnhardt reveals a fascinating yet shocking story of how easy it was, and still is, to change election outcomes using electronic voting machines. This film airs the stories of several credible people—noted computer programmers, statisticians, journalists, and experienced election officials. Their voices have not been given attention in the major media. Computer programmer Clint Curtis, from Florida, was directed by his boss to create software that will “flip” votes from one candidate to another; County Clerk Bruce Funk, from Utah, was locked out of his
office for raising questions about security flaws in electronic voting machines; Steve Heller, from California, was convicted of a felony after he leaked secret documents from a corporate office detailing illegal activities committed by a major voting machine company; entrepreneur, Athan Gibbs from Tennessee, was ignored when he approached election officials to show them his voting machine that produced a verifiable paper record.

*Uncounted* gives a graphic message that future elections can readily be manipulated as long as the electronic voting machines continue to be used.

In *Power vs. Force*, David Hawkins reminds us that force “exploits life for the gain of an individual or an organization.” Hawkins writes, “We may observe how throughout history, society has tried to “treat” social problems by legislative action, warfare, market manipulation, laws, and prohibition—all manifestations of force—only to see these problems persist or recur despite the treatment.” The power, on the other hand, that Hawkins is writing about is based on the power of love as reflected in principles such as respect for human dignity, freedom, and acting for the betterment of the whole.

For freedom to thrive we must live and govern our lives with a view to act according to what is best for all. Today, it is becoming more evident that corporations, media, government personnel, and we as individuals only care about our own interests. And so, our freedom suffers.

**Why have we become complacent about freedom? Is it because money has become God? Do we value money more than we do freedom?**

**Government Based on Freedom**

When we are ready to give freedom, how would a government truly based on freedom work? A constitution should include two laws that were discovered by author Richard Maybury as being common to all the world’s religions. They are:

1. *Do all you have agreed to do and*
2. *Do not encroach on other persons or their property.*

Both governments and individuals must respect these two laws. A group of individuals, including government, should not be given any rights that are not extended to the individual.

In addition, a government constitution should protect personal freedoms—the right to own property, the right to free speech, the right to trade freely, and the right to religious freedom. Taxation on income needs to be curbed. This would mean abolishing Federal income tax. It seems we’ve forgotten the example set by the founding fathers of the United States. The citizens of the US fought a war to establish their independence from England because of onerous taxes and the fact they did not have representation to decide what taxes were
necessary or fair.

The founding fathers deliberated long and hard to come up with what they felt would establish a tax system that would not become a burden to the people. They wanted to limit the size of the Federal government as much as possible. With that in mind, the constitution of the US allowed the central government to levy “indirect” taxes with the assumption such taxes would only be levied on nonessential items. The State governments were given the right to levy direct taxes with the idea they are closer to the voters so State governments can more readily be controlled and held accountable by the people. If for emergency purposes, the Federal government needed extra funds, the constitution allowed them to go through State governments to request a specific amount, for a specific purpose, for a specific time. This system was designed to limit the size of, and therefore control by, the Federal government.7

Government can be supported through a tax on the sale of products without the need for income taxes. While a sales tax system would keep us more aware of the amount of money we pay to support government, any such legislation should include limits to the levy of taxes and to government spending.8

A constitution should also include provisions to ensure government is accountable to the people. Both government employees as well as politicians should be personally accountable to uphold the constitution.

George Washington, before he became the first US President, provides an example of the integrity required for us, and our governments, to uphold a constitution:

In 1783, many people wanted a new government, and the army officers wanted to set up a dictatorship and make Washington the dictator. Washington not only turned the offer down, he said any soldier who followed the orders of this new government was wrong. The soldiers’ job was to protect liberty, not necessarily to obey orders. Under Washington’s encouragement, the troops mutinied and deserted—and that kept America from becoming a dictatorship.

But no one teaches about that in the schools. Why? I don’t know. I suppose they don’t want the children to learn that Washington encouraged the troops to disobey orders, he wanted the troops to be dedicated to a higher law than any government’s law.9

A government constitution should also place limits on government decisions that entail future spending. No government should be able to bind generations of citizens. Right now, our governments are signing international agreements, passing countless regulations put forward by the bureaucracy, and making laws that are not in our best interests. We are not being informed. The results of these decisions can spring up to surprise us by limiting our freedoms at any point in time.
Do we have a part to play? What is our role to earn a government truly based on freedom? It is easy to point the finger of blame but government simply reflects who we are.

**Giving Freedom**

If we want to create a government, a country, that is truly based on freedom, then we have to change our priorities. Instead of making decisions based only on what is best for me, we need to make decisions that won’t harm others. We have to come to the realization that we are all here together. There is always a creative solution for every problem ... one that will benefit all.

In order to earn a government based on freedom, we need to be tolerant of differing beliefs and cultures. Three pivotal and controversial issues for testing tolerance today are abortion, gay rights, and socialism or the belief that we have the right to take from some to give to others.

Some believe that life begins at conception and abortion, therefore, is murder. Others believe that life begins at birth—with breath. Until the fetus can survive outside of the woman’s womb it is considered part of the woman’s body so abortion is acceptable until this stage in fetal development. Are you ready to give others the freedom to follow their belief?

Some believe that only love shared in a heterosexual relationship is normal, and therefore, acceptable. Others believe that love shared in either heterosexual or homosexual relationships is acceptable. Are you ready to give others the freedom to follow their belief?

Some believe in socialism—that income from...
It is difficult today to find the statistical comparisons.

Here’s a few statistics for the US to illustrate the change:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average 3-bedroom house</td>
<td>$22,300.</td>
<td>$162,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Ford or Chevrolet Car</td>
<td>$2,864.</td>
<td>$18,245.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Income per person</td>
<td>$7,520.</td>
<td>$30,302.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of house &amp; car to income</td>
<td>3.35:1</td>
<td>5.98:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Income Taxes</td>
<td>16.97%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here is a comparison of household income in the US between 1961 and 2011. Keep in mind that most households in 1961 had only one person supporting the family. In 2011, the majority of households have two people supporting the family:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median household income</td>
<td>$42,075*</td>
<td>$49,777**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To maintain our standard of living, we have considerably increased our debt. Personal debt has risen from 64% of disposable income to 97%. And we have less of a cushion as our savings rate has dropped from 6.5% of disposable income to 0.5%. In addition, we are working longer hours in order to keep up our material lifestyles. The average married couple works 400 more hours a year.

Are we better off today? “Over the past generation, the signs of middle-class distress have continued to grow, in good times and in bad, in recession and in boom.” Even before the far-reaching US debt and housing crisis became evident in late 2007, bankruptcy had become deeply entrenched. “In just twenty years, the number of women filing petitions for bankruptcy had, in reality, increased by 662 percent. … the people who rank in the worst financial trouble are … parents with children at home.”

In addition to the struggle to maintain personal lifestyles, taxes continuously increase as government debts escalate.

* Adjusted to today’s dollars (April 15, 2011)
** Based on two wage earners per household, the median per person would be $24,889
those that have more should be more highly taxed so that those who have less will have more. Others believe that each person should be able to give when and where they choose, rather than government deciding who gives and who gets. Are you ready to give others the freedom to follow their belief?

These issues are heartfelt and emotionally explosive for many. But, can we possibly expect to reform our governments to allow basic freedoms when we personally cannot allow others the freedom of their beliefs?

When a majority of us can pass the test of tolerance we will have earned a government based on freedom. We will be able to respect others viewpoints without agreeing, and in turn live in harmony.

Our world is going into a period of great change. Perhaps it is a time of wake-up calls for all of us—to live from our hearts, to create our dreams, and to learn to listen to God, our Creator, or Life. Perhaps it is a chance to step back and rediscover what is important in life.

Perhaps we need to stop looking at government to bail us out of the hard experiences life gives us to teach us something. Instead we need to look for creative solutions. When hurricane Katrina

---

**Knowing the Problem Leads to Solutions**

Why is it important to face, rather than ignore, that our governments don’t always have our better interests at heart? One of the producers of the documentary, THRIVE, offers an answer to that question: “One especially encouraging insight that emerged in the course of making THRIVE was that the most informed people are consistently the most hopeful, because once the nature of the problem is clear, so are the solutions.”

Foster Gamble, an heir to the Gamble family fortune of the well-known Proctor & Gamble corporation, co-produced the documentary with his wife. The film reveals what he discovered behind-the-scenes of the hallowed halls of government by “following the money.”

He states:

> What is keeping us from thriving? After a lifetime journey of pursuing that question, my research revealed that a small group of financial elite have gained control over key areas of our lives – energy, food, health care, education and more - and are the single greatest threat to humanity’s ability to thrive. ...

At first, an agenda to control others was hard for me to consider. But as I spent many years getting myself educated about it, many things that hadn’t made sense began to fall into place.

His decades-long investigations led to the making of the documentary, THRIVE, and a website that outlines the problems ... and more importantly, the solutions.

THRIVE, What on Earth will it take? http://www.thrivemovement.com/the_movie
hit the New Orleans area in the US in 2005, it was expected that the government would deal efficiently with the disaster to reduce human and animal suffering as effectively as possible. Government rescue operations were delayed, failed to meet expectations, and left many bereft of help in the wake of the destruction.\textsuperscript{10} It was the efforts of countless volunteer groups from all over the US that organized quickly to provide relief—volunteers rescued those isolated by floodwaters, provided temporary shelters, and brought food.

In their book, \textit{Rescued}, Allen and Linda Anderson introduce “gutsy heroes dealing with situations as harrowing as any crime or adventure drama. These heroes didn’t leap tall buildings with a single bound. Instead, they crawled beneath teetering houses and gently coaxed frightened animals to come to them. Ordinary people, not Olympic athletes, scrambled over barbed-wire fences and fended off mold, rot, mosquitoes, snakes, and alligators. Their lives changed forever by fulfilling a commitment to rescue animals.”\textsuperscript{11} The rescue of pets and other animals was entirely orchestrated by volunteer organizations.

A dog caught in the floodwaters gives us an example of the love and courage both people and animals demonstrate in the face of disaster:

\begin{quote}
Days after the levees in New Orleans broke, Chris Cutter, communications director for International Fund for Animal Welfare, worked on a boat that maneuvered through toxic water. No one, human or animal, would have wanted to spend a minute more than necessary in it. Chris recalls, “We saw a dog swimming in the muck.” Chris’s boat steered toward the dog. Instead of allowing the rescuers to help him into the vehicle, the dog turned around and swam away from the boat. That’s when they heard barking coming from inside a house.

The rescuers steered to follow the dog. He led them to the back of his house where a female dog, his “girlfriend,” as Chris calls her, was trapped inside. Only after the rescuers freed the female dog did this big shaggy husky allow the rescuers to haul him into the boat.
\end{quote}

Together, we can always come up with solutions that benefit the whole. Neither government nor individuals can ever solve everyone’s problems, but we can help each other.

\textit{The choice is ours—do we learn to work together or do we look to government? Are we ready to prepare for a new government ... a government truly based on creating freedom for all?}
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