

Are We Ready for Freedom?

I have a confession to make. My voting record over the years shows that I have voted for both extremes of the political spectrum. I have voted for a party that works to establish a Socialist or left-wing government and I have voted for parties that work for a Capitalist or right-wing government. At the time, I thought I was voting for two very different ideologies that would result in two very different forms of government. I now realize that both Right and Left lead to the same form of government. What strange bedfellows these two belief systems make—Socialism and Capitalism—and the governments they create.

Historically, political parties on the right believed in Capitalism. They established policies to allow economic freedom. They saw economic freedom as the best approach to reduce poverty. Right-wing parties also, however, established policies that restricted social freedoms. They often reflected religious views equating specific behavior as sins so they were less tolerant of social freedoms such as gay rights and the right of choice on other controversial issues. Historically, a Capitalist government resulted in smaller government, lower taxes, greater rewards for initiative and less personal freedoms with regards to religion and personal beliefs.

Historically, political parties on the left believed in Socialism. They established policies to allow social freedoms. They were more tolerant of social issues such as gay rights and the right of choice on other controversial beliefs. Left-wing parties also, however, established policies that restricted economic freedom. They saw government redistribution of wealth as the best approach to reduce poverty. Historically, a Socialist government meant bigger government with higher taxes in order to redistribute wealth and more personal freedoms with regards to religion and personal beliefs.

How do Capitalism and Socialism Lead to the Same Type of Government?

Today, both right-wing and left-wing parties continue to state their platforms as though they are different. Are they different? Do they walk their talk? Conservatives or Republicans may say they adhere to economic freedoms, but do they? Democrats, Liberals or Socialists may say they adhere to social freedoms, but do they? It appears that mainstream political parties all offer essentially the same policies. It seems they all stand for the same type of government—government that limits both economic and social freedoms.¹

Both believe government should have the right to pass laws or regulations to force their beliefs on others. Both have led to ever-bigger government and ever-bigger taxes in order to implement and then enforce ever-more laws and regulations. So, why have both Capitalism and Socialism led to the same government? Could it be that both groups want the power of government to give them control over others?

When many of us adhere to the beliefs of a political party, we believe our ideas are right. We believe this so strongly we are willing to force those ideas on others. Remember, those we elect and those who work for government are people like you and me. Don't we all have family and neighbors we don't agree with? Would you like a family member or a neighbor that doesn't agree with you to have the right to impose their ideas on you? If not, why do we allow those who form our governments (even if they do have a clear majority) to force their beliefs on us by restricting our freedoms—either economically or socially?

If you believe a political party that gets the most votes and forms the government should have the right to impose their beliefs, how would you feel if you had been Jewish during the reign of Nazism in Germany? Or, how do you feel today with governments supporting the Medical Health Model and suppressing the Natural Health Model?

“
The ingrained idea that, because there is no king and they despise titles, the Americans are a free people is pathetically untrue. ... There is a perpetual interference with personal liberty over there that would not be tolerated in England for a week.”

Margot Asquith
Author & wife of Herbert Asquith,
England's Prime Minister 1908–1916

Two Common Laws

Shouldn't our laws be used only to protect our God-given rights of life, liberty and property? These three rights existed before man's law existed. In allowing governments to create laws beyond those that protect these freedoms, haven't we allowed the law to destroy our rights and freedoms? Isn't it more important that we each have the freedom to make full use of our talents and creativity so long as we do not limit the freedom of another? Author, Richard Maybury, discovered two laws that are common to all major religions and philosophies:

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

Shouldn't government, as well as each of us, obey these two basic laws? If not, what kind of society are we creating?

So, what kind of government should we create? Maybury suggests we take the best from both right- and left-wing beliefs—both economic and social freedom. Today most of us vote

for a political party rather than base our vote on who will best represent us at the local level. This has created a system that divides us. We're encouraged to vote for a mainstream party so we won't 'waste' our vote. We may vote for one party over another simply because it is the lesser of two evils. This type of voting does not produce change. We need to realize our vote is worth something. We need to ask ourselves, "Is the person I'm voting for worthy of my vote?" If not, why would we throw away our vote? Wouldn't it be better to encourage and support individuals to run who we feel will do the best job, have the most common sense, and give the greatest freedom ... even if we know the likelihood of them being elected is slim? By realizing our vote counts, we act as a beacon for others to make a change.

Who Benefits?

Today there is an assumption that large corporations and very wealthy people represent Capitalism. Do they? Many multinational corporations have set up charitable foundations. These foundations often not only support Socialist causes but their primary goal is to foster Socialism. Why would Capitalists want Socialism?

Why would multi-national, right-wing corporate leaders want left-wing Socialism? In order to maintain their position of power, wealth and control they need to eliminate competition by building monopolies and cartels. In order to manipulate and control us, they need to influence and control government, media and education. One way to gain control over us is to encourage us to rely on government. This is the foundation of Socialism. From there, it is easy to get government to react and pass more and more laws under the guise of protecting us and keeping us safe. In truth, such laws erode our freedoms.

Big government is used as a vehicle for those wanting to maintain their position of power, wealth and control. Once we have accepted government as our protector, those in power manipulate us to react emotionally so we will support more and more regulations and laws. Regulations and laws that we believe make us safer ... do they? The regulations and laws benefit multi-national corporations. Remember ... someone owns and controls the media, someone finances politicians and someone always benefits.



Health care today is one example. Major media, supported by multi-national pharmaceutical advertising, edits coverage of natural treatments to put them in a poor light. Natural health practitioners are often portrayed as simply quacks that are harming people. What happens when a natural health practitioner is unable to help a child? News coverage has a field day with it, people scream for children to be protected, and government passes laws limiting the ability of natural health care practitioners. Those of us who believe in natural health have our freedoms eroded. The media does not spotlight the number of children who are harmed or die as a result of the care of the medical health system. We need to ask ... who benefits from slanted news coverage?

Beyond Belief?

Many of us find it hard to believe that certain individuals could influence the direction of a country. The fact that we find this so hard to believe may be what allows such a scenario to happen. In 1954, the Congressional Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations was formed for the purpose of investigating "... the activities of Foundations as to whether or not these activities could be labeled un-American." The Committee defined 'un-American' to mean: "To make changes in the country by unconstitutional means." There was concern that corporations were avoiding taxes by setting up Foundations and then using the Foundations to influence the country to the benefit of the corporations.

Early in the investigation, Norman Dodds, the Research Director for the committee, was invited to the Ford Foundation to meet with their President, H. Rowan Gaither Jr. He astounded Dodds as he was so forthcoming. He declared the Foundation gave grants designed to ensure the governing principles of the United States would eventually harmonize with those of the Soviet Union. Dodds told him if he would make public what he just said, there would be no need for the Committee to continue. Gaither replied that they would definitely not make their agenda public.

Dr. Joseph Johnson, President of the Carnegie Foundation, invited Dodds to send a staff member to review their Minute Books. Dodds sent Kathryn Casey, a practicing attorney in Washington who was on the Committee staff. Casey was not sympathetic to the Committee's investigation as she felt foundations did so much good there couldn't possibly be anything wrong with them.

Casey was stunned by what she discovered. A Minute Book entry at the trustees first meeting in 1908 revealed the focus for the year, "Is there any means known more effective than war assuming you wish to order the life of an entire people?" In 1909 the Minute Book entry indicated the trustees had concluded that war was the most effective way to influence people's lives. Their next focus was "How do we involve the United States in a war?" The conclusion reached was that they must control the State Department.

In 1914, World War 1 started. Casey reported a Minute Book entry at that time authorizing a telegram be dispatched to President Wilson cautioning him to see that the war did not end too quickly. When the war was over the Minute Book entry indicated a concern about people returning to the values held prior to 1914. It seems war was seen as a way to condition people to rely more on government.

Watching the program, Canada: A People's History on CBC television, featuring the years 1940 to 1946, I was surprised to hear the narrator sum up the prosperity that World War 2 brought to the country by saying the Canadian people were no longer afraid of the left-wing. These words made me wonder if in fact war accomplished what was intended by the major charitable foundations and their giant, seemingly Capitalist, corporations. The people now accepted what government could do for them.

Casey also reported that the Carnegie Foundation minutes stated they must find a way to control education in the United States.

“
Let us be specific. Collectivists advocate controlled elections, controlled media, controlled education, the elimination of free speech, disarmament of the population, fiat money, a cartelized health-care system, military imperialism, and global government.

The ideology of Freedom Force is individualism, the opposite of collectivism at every point. Individualists advocate honest elections, a competitive media, an educational system responsive to parents, encouragement of free speech, a well-armed citizenry, sound money, freedom-of-choice in health care, a non-interventionist foreign policy, and national sovereignty.

”

www.freedomforceinternational.org

This would be needed to accomplish their mission of creating a Socialist or Collectivist State. The minutes indicated the key to success lay in altering the teaching of American history. With the help of the Rockefeller and Guggenheim Foundations, they started with 20 history teachers who were groomed in a new approach to history. “Near the end of the 1920’s the Endowment granted \$400,000 to The American Historical Association for a study of American history in a manner that points to what our country can look forward to in the future. ... The last of the seven volume report summarizes that this country belongs to Collectivism administered with characteristic American efficiency.” At that point in time, most Americans supported the founding fathers belief that individual rights and freedoms

took precedence over the state or collective rights and freedoms. The new approach to history taught that Collectivism took precedence over individual rights and freedoms.^{3,4,5}

How successful have they been? In our media do we hear the principles of the Declaration of Independence discussed in connection with current events? Are children taught in schools the values on which the U.S. was founded, and how to apply those values today?

Activist and one-time leader of the Black Panthers, Eldrige Cleaver, was originally a Socialist. He noticed, however, that the major foundations that he considered icons of Capitalism were eagerly providing funds for socialist causes. This opened his eyes to their hidden agenda and his unknowing support of their agenda.⁶

Letting Go of Labels

Hanging on to labels of being either Right or Left, Capitalist or Socialist, keeps us divided and distracted. Isn't it closer to the truth that most of us are a mixture of beliefs from both the Right and the Left? For example, some people believe in the right to have an abortion (left), smaller government (right), and that less taxes (right) will create more prosperity for all. Some people believe government should take responsibility for our environment (left), a military presence with an eye on countries with oil (right), and that government regulations are needed to protect society (left).

Isn't it time to let go of old labels and work together to improve our world and allow individuals the freedom to express their full potential? The early settlers and founding fathers of the United States established a government and economy based on individual freedoms. This system made the United States the most prosperous country, with the greatest amount of freedoms, of any country in modern history. In fighting for independence from England, the founding fathers of the US well recognized the corrupting influence of power. John Adams, a key member of the Congress that signed the Declaration of Independence, stated: "There is danger from all men. The only maxim of a free government ought to be to trust no man living with power to endanger the public liberty."⁷ We have neglected his warning to be ever vigilant to monitor those who govern.

The Three Commandments of Freedom as expressed by Freedom Force International

INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

Only individuals have rights, not groups. Therefore, do not sacrifice the rights of any individual or minority for the alleged rights of groups.

EQUALITY UNDER LAW

To favor one class of citizens over others is not equality under law. Therefore, do not endorse any law that does not apply to all citizens equally.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE

The proper function of the state is to protect, not to provide. Therefore, do not approve coercion for any purpose except to protect human life, liberty, or property.

<http://www.freedomforceinternational.org/freedom.cfm?fuseaction=creed>

The economic and social prosperity of the US, as well as other countries, continues to decline as both Capitalists and Socialists work to promote Collectivism and give government ever more control over us. The result is that both personal and government debt are growing while poverty and violence are increasing.

Each of us must be ready to walk the talk for personal freedoms. Think of something you have a very strong opinion about—abortion, gay rights, distribution of wealth, protection of the environment, pornography, prostitution, prayer in schools, vaccinations, etc. Ask yourself, “Even though I believe as I do, am I willing to give others the freedom and the right to their beliefs no matter how different they are from mine ... as long as their belief does not encroach on my freedom and that of others?” This is an acid test as to whether or not we as individuals are ready for freedom.

We have been asking government to protect us. Would it not, instead, be wiser to ask government to protect our freedoms?

References

1. *Are you Liberal? Conservative? Or Confused?* Richard J. Maybury, 1995. ISBN#0-942617-23-1
2. *Whatever Happened to Justice?* Richard J. Maybury, 1993. ISBN#0-942617-10-X
3. “The Hidden Agenda, The Testimony of Norman Dodd,” *Audio Archives* of the Reality Zone, Volume 2, <https://realityzone.com/product-category/audio-archives/>
4. *Tragedy & Hope*, Carroll Quigley, 1966. ISBN#65-13589
5. *Foundations: Their Power and Influence*, by Renee Wormser, 1958. www.radioliberty.com/bfound.htm
6. Eldridge Cleaver information from a private conversation
7. *John Adams*, David McCullough, 2001. ISBN #0-684-81363-7