

## Orwell Realized

There is a ruling cryptocracy, whether we use their own name for themselves, Bush Senior's 'New World Order' or Dr. John Coleman's 'Committee of 300.' We can read their journals, such as the reports of one of the tentacles of the global octopus, that of the Council on Foreign Relations. A researcher or ordinary citizen can learn about their work from information leaked by disgruntled members, or accidentally found, as Coleman claims he discovered a Committee report, when serving as a diplomat. Until they were sued out of existence by a group of litigants, with ties to Scientology the former American patriot journal, *Spotlight* covered meetings of the Bilderberger Group and exposed all kinds of machinations of the Trilateral Commission and other NWO organs.

With all that has been published about the ruling cryptocracy, there is very little inside knowledge available, which is to be expected for societies born entirely out of public view. As one German witness to that nation's flying disc program in the early to mid-1940's said, "Those who know do not say, and those who say do not know." Few conspirators will ever leak information and it will be very difficult to know what is valid, what is invented by authors in order to publish conspiracy-inspired books, or what is disseminated by the cryptocracy itself in order to confuse and obfuscate.

As with many complex issues examined, we encourage readers to use common sense, sharpened with critical thinking skills not to simplify the issues, but to fathom them. Before placing Orwell's descriptions of a New World Order, as he saw its potential in the late 1940's, into perspective and comparison with today's System, it is important to use critical tools to try to imagine what characteristics a global cryptocracy would need to have. The following is our attempt at working backward from today's systems of total control and consolidation toward deducing the blueprint:

1. A global cryptocracy would have to consolidate all media of exchange, including currency and language. Otherwise international coordination and control would be awkward.
2. It would remain flexible and tentative, maintaining control over generations of conspirators by trying out different systems of control, developing its expertise at intergenerational mass manipulations.
3. The conspirators would have to be concerned with efficiency and universality. What worked only in one area with one type of person and set of climatic and

resource factors could not necessarily be generalized elsewhere. In governing vast areas and throngs of different peoples, a universal conspiracy would have to use shortcuts, efficiencies, or become so unwieldy as to become unworkable.

4. It would work best if, in each society, it did not try to rule the masses directly, but rather, to simply exert control upon or coerce the top few hundred citizens in each society. That matrix of control would be efficient. Direct control would be unwieldy and unreliable. No central body of planners could know exactly how to filter its agenda through each society's culture, customs, political system and economy. It could, however, export general directives to be acted upon through the controlling few in each society, those whom, in the final analysis, it controls. Some students of power, such as remote viewer, Ingo Swann, suggest that a hidden elite need only interface with the top 700 persons in any society in order to implement an agenda item, even a society the size of China or India.

5. The central planning apparatus would be the body of the octopus and each tentacle would be different dimensions of control, always toward making life more uniform, stamping out locality, individuality, and self-determination. One dimension must be educational, another financial, yet another tentacle must assure that all political systems move toward particular set of goals. A universal religion, such as the one created at Nicea by the judeo-masonic elite of its day to shore up a crumbling Roman Empire would be useful also. Uniformity of values and eschatology can precondition a populace to be of greater usefulness to its masters. That is why, the more overt the Republican New Right is in the U.S. in consolidating police state measures, such as the first and now supplemented "Patriot Acts," the more that tyranny pushes Israel-serving Christian fundamentalism as a state-sanctioned creed.

Anyone studying the functions of the United Nations might decide that it does fulfill most of these requirements. That would be a natural conclusion, but let us modify this to say that the UN *tries* to operate this way, as a world governing body. In organizational effectiveness, however it is a sham, an organization that cannot halt population growth, feed the hungry, uplift the poor, or even stop most wars. The U.N. is a shadow-self of how global control might manifest. It may have been coined to fulfill that role, and was in operation at the time of Orwell's writing, although, notably, his novel does not even mention it. That he does not project forward the early work of the League of Nations or the U.N. as turning into his "Party" apparatus or being a mechanism, used to maintain the Party's system implies that he had a deeper understanding.

Even if Orwell gave us the plans for a New World Order as they were laid out in 1948, this does not mean that the plans would not have changed by this time, or, indeed, several times in between. Like a highly adaptive retrovirus, a global secret government would have to constantly explore, invent, and, above all experiment.

Contemporary conspiracy theorists, like David Icke, mention at once NWO type hierarchies and the Third Reich, sometimes even proposing that the Reich was merely an early form of the New World Order. In the same breath, these theorists refer to 1984, calling institutions of the Bush government, like the Department of Homeland Security "Orwellian." Such writers, especially the Christian Patriot sort that are found on the [Alex Jones](#) and [Jeff Rense](#) websites, imply that the Third Reich was the classic Orwellian conspiratorial government. Even a cursory comparison of Orwell's vision of life under the Party and the original vision of National Socialism will show that 1984's Party government and society are the logical outgrowth of the Anglo-American alliance that defeated the Reich.

Before getting into some specific quotes from Orwell's small novel, consider the following chart that compares broad outlines of the book's system with the Reich and then with our present tyranny:

1984's Party cryptocracy	The Third Reich	New World Order
<p>Increasing unification; even when Oceania, Eurasia, or Eastasia appear to be at war, Winston and others never know who really fired the missiles that strike a playground full of children. There is one System in three consolidated blocks of power. Even when there is apparent conflict, wars go on indefinitely and one senses that the opposition is a sham.</p>	<p>Goal was never global conquest. Chief theoretician Karl Haushofer envisioned a world where there would be many different political systems. Indeed, Germany's allies, Fascist Italy, Bulgaria, and Hungary had quite different systems than did Germany. Uniformity was not sought, nor desired. A famous quote from Hitler: "National Socialism is not for export."</p>	<p>Increasing unification is promoted everywhere. In Europe, there is E. Union, in Africa, the OAS. Laws take effect almost simultaneously against "hate crime" in Europe and Australia, Canada, and U. S. A common currency emerges for Europe. When an event like 9/11 happens, no one knows who really ordered it. Four big power blocks emerge, Europe, China, Russia/ CIS, and America and its vassal states.</p>

<p>All material progress is suborned to military preparedness, as war is used to destroy the fruits of human labor and to keep populations poor and bound together against manufactured images of external enemies.</p>	<p>After the campaign against the French, Hitler ordered several divisions demobilized. (Read about it in <u>Hitler's War</u> by David Irving.) The last thing Reich leadership wanted was a prolonged war. Germany strained to improve living standards and infrastructure even after the demands of war made this impractical.</p>	<p>Social programs have been suborned to a great military buildup. Since WWII, the U.S. has been involved in at least 54 different military adventures all around the world. (See <u>Killing Hope</u> by H. Blum.) The Black Budget, Shadow Government expenses, and Christian-lobbied subsidies to their mythic homeland, Israel, siphon off funds that could have been used for material progress.</p>
<p>There is an Inner Party of the very well to do elites, at about 2% of the population, an Outer Party of functionaries, at about 3%, and the Proles at 85%. Only the 2% live well and really participate in any decision-making. The proles work under dirty, dangerous conditions, and cannot afford medical care or a proper diet.</p>	<p>National Socialism as an economic philosophy, promoted the peasant and worker as the most important persons in society. Rather than rank or admission to schools based on heredity, it opened society to recognition by merit, which made German nobility a fertile ground for British or American intelligence to recruit spies. In the years before the war, Germany's middle class mushroomed and new occupational safety and health laws protected workers. They took longer vacations than</p>	<p>One reads different estimates, but all agree that only 1% of Americans control between 60% and 70% of all the wealth in stocks, bonds, and securities. The middle class, created by the New Deal, is shrinking, especially since the Reagan Administration. Foreclosures, debt, and economic decay bring U.S. ever closer to Orwell's economic model. Political action committees have the only real 'votes.' The 'proles,' who once worked 40-hours now average 49-hour weeks; many work two jobs. They once could afford health coverage</p>

	<p>ever before. (Several articles in and books offered through <i>Barnes Review</i> document this economic miracle through German and foreign sources.)</p>	<p>(standard for every NS citizen), but now an estimated 45 million workers are uninsured. The 85% 'have-lesses' are quickly becoming Orwell's proles.</p>
<p>Racial lines are blurred. There are no ethnic communities in Air Ship 1 (Orwell's England). Membership in the Party or Outer Party, is not hereditary, but by loyalty and leadership.</p>	<p>Even on the eve of conflict, Transfer Agreements were arranged with East Baltic states whereby ethnic Germans would be repatriated. (See Issue 118 of <i>National Vanguard</i> for detailed discussion). Preservation of separate, strong, ethnically-distinct communities and nations was encouraged. Real diversity of peoples and cultures was encouraged.</p>	<p>By flooding every Western land with non-White immigrants and subsidizing fatherless breeding in public housing by non-Whites in the U.S., Britain, France, and Holland, Oceania's current NWO leadership is destroying White ethnicity, while encouraging all others, leading to a powerless plurality, where a majority formerly ruled.</p>
<p>The Party is an adoptive hierarchy; in which hereditary rule has been replaced by competition to become member and in which people of all races are at the top.</p>	<p>NS leaders, while often not good examples of racial purity themselves (think Goebbels or Bormann), saw the need to restore in Germany the original Nordic gene pool as it was before the invasion of Huns and migration of waves of Asians over thousands of years, (the Khazars being only the most recent.) Effort was made to promote the return of a</p>	<p>The Grand Oil Party, merely one of the organs of the NWO, presently boasts a meritocracy of loyalists, who believe in the sanctity of capital, displacement of the American worker, and use of Christianity as an official state dogma. Among these are now many Jews and Negroes. The same is true for every major party and even for the pseudo-alternative</p>

	<p>then-almost endangered species (definitely endangered now), Nordic Man. Universalists from Roman occupiers to Papal armies and Asian settlers had displaced or outbred the original inhabitants, founders of Teutonic culture.</p>	<p>parties, like that of Lyndon La Rouche. Destruction of the White majority, a <i>fait accompli</i> in Orwell's England, is high priority for all parties.</p>
<p>Mass entertainment is used to subdue the masses. They are told that they are more prosperous than before. Memory of how things really were is lost as the Party rewrites history. Cheap booze and tobacco are offered as palliatives to the workers.</p>	<p>Every effort was made by the Ahnenerbe and other organizations to provide wholesome entertainment for people, as children were encouraged to develop mind-stimulating hobbies. Through participatory worker councils, record prosperity was achieved, a technique used in post-War Japan. Academics struggled to clear the real record of the German past from the distortions of clerics. Healthy diets and lifestyles were formally promoted, especially by the Hitler Youth and Deutsche Maidschen.</p>	<p>Mass entertainment is used to placate, subdue, and condition the masses. Entertainment teaches NWO values, such as 'family life is silly and unworkable,' 'you should have sex anywhere with anyone in order to be "cool,"' and that White men are the lowest creatures on the planet, with the few surviving Nordics being maligned as idiots, schemers, or terrorists. Memory of how things were is lost as both sides of any issue, like 'segregation V integration,' are not debated, and education becomes the memorization of pre-agreed "facts." Cheap drugs, subsidized by intelligence agencies, who participate in importation, allow proles to mentally escape their conditions.</p>

The preceding table could be expanded even beyond what is discussed. A basic idea emerges, though; we are very similar to the society that Orwell described and the Third Reich, despite restrictions on civil liberties brought on by war (as existed in the U.S. and Britain, too, the latter requiring a national ID card for all U.K. residents) was *not* the prototype for Orwell's future state. His information was so detailed, even though the conspirators may have changed tactics along the way in light of new knowledge that he must have had inside knowledge of their plans. That said; let's examine how the New World Order of Orwell's book viewed race, power, patriotism, and memory from selected quotes, not necessarily in that order.

**Page 53:**

*"He looked round the canteen again. Nearly everyone was ugly, and would have been ugly even if dressed otherwise than in the uniform blue overalls. On the far side of the room, sitting at a table alone, a small, curiously beetle-like man was drinking a cup of coffee, his little eyes darting suspicious glances from side to side. How easy it was, thought Winston, if you did not look about you, to believe that the physical type set up by the Party as an ideal— tall, muscular youths and deep-bosomed maidens, blond-haired, vital, sunburnt, carefree— existed and even predominated. Actually, so far as he could judge, the majority of people in Airstrip One were small, dark, and ill favored. It was curious how that beetle-like type proliferated in the Ministries: little dumpy men, growing stout very early in life, with short legs, swift, scuttling movements, and fat inscrutable faces with very small eyes. It was the type that seemed to flourish best under the domination of the Party."*

The Nordic in this Party-dominated world, with the Nordic sense of self-responsibility, personal liberty, and a tradition of self-sufficiency, would be completely out of place. Those best adapted in terms of physical/mental tendencies, i.e., racial proclivities, are the English that resulted from centuries of refugee settlement, non-White immigration, interbreeding with the Jews, who accompanied the Roman occupiers everywhere, Phoenicians, another Semitic tribe that settled various areas of England long ago, and the like. The part-Nordic hybrid, what is left of the Anglo-Saxon and Celt, mixed in with all the flotsam of later immigrations and early non-Aryan settlement, became the brown, beetle-like person, a nominal 'white,' like Dudley Moore, Michael Meyers, Ringo Starr, or Elton John. It is difficult to imagine this Englishman fighting off the mixed-race occupation of Roman imperialists, but his temperament fits him into the scheme of things as a managed 'human resource' in Oceania.

Page 61-62:

*"The Party claimed, of course, to have liberated the proles from bondage. Before the Revolution they had been hideously oppressed by the capitalists, they had been starved and flogged, women had been forced to work in the coal mines (women still did work in the coal mines, as a matter of fact), children had been sold into the factories at the age of six. But simultaneously, true to the principles of doublethink, the Party taught that the proles were natural inferiors who must be kept in subjugation, like animals, by the application of a few simple rules. In reality very little was known about the proles. It was not necessary to know much. So long as they continued to work and breed, their other activities were without importance. Left to themselves, like cattle turned loose upon the plains of Argentina, they had reverted to a style of life that appeared natural to them, a sort of ancestral pattern. They were born, they grew up in the gutters, they went to work at twelve, they passed through a brief blossoming period of beauty and sexual desire, they married at twenty, they were middle-aged at thirty, they died, for the most part, at sixty. Heavy physical work, the care of home and children, petty quarrels with neighbors, films, football, beer, and, above all, gambling filled up the horizon of their minds. To keep them in control was not difficult. A few agents of the Thought Police moved always among them, spreading false rumors and marking down and eliminating the few individuals who were judged capable of becoming dangerous; but no attempt was made to indoctrinate them with the ideology of the Party. It was not desirable that the proles should have strong political feelings. All that was required of them was a primitive patriotism which could be appealed to whenever necessary to make them accept longer working hours or shorter rations. And even when they became discontented, as they sometimes did, their discontent led nowhere, because, being without general ideas, they could only focus it on petty specific grievances. The larger evils invariably escaped their notice. The great majority of proles did not even have telescreens in their homes. Even the civil police interfered with them very little. There was a vast amount of criminality in London, a whole world-within-a-world of thieves, bandits, prostitutes, drug peddlers, and racketeers of every description; but since it all happened among the proles themselves, it was of no importance."*

The similarities of this class with the rising underclass in America are many. Here, of course, whenever the working classes begin to advance economically, especially working class Whites, modern capitalists are cleverer than the previous Dickensian ones described at the beginning of Orwell's extensive paragraph. The elites simply import illegal aliens, institute "affirmative action,"



or convince, through mass-mind management a whole generation of women to leave the home and return to work. The resulting labor glut lowers wages so much that an American worker in 1960 bought his home with 180 paychecks. By 1996, it had risen to over 800 of his paychecks, and, despite recently falling interest rates in 2000-2003, the real cost of housing has worsened, as it outstrips salaries.

Primitive patriotism is still encouraged. The World Trade Center events were used to consolidate public opinion and create a mindless, flag-waving reverence for an idea of America, while the System used the pretext of an external and amorphous enemy not to restrict access to the country through closing open borders and limiting immigration, but through restricting freedoms of Americans themselves.

Rather than restricting the number of "telesccreens," the System has learned over the years since Orwell's publication in 1948 that control of mass consciousness could best be achieved through proliferation of televisions such that entertainment became the primary vehicle for indoctrination.

Criminality is subtly encouraged. In Orwell's society, Thought Police moved with a heavy hand through all strata. This was the Soviet model as well. The American model of tyranny is far more efficient: get the proles to pay for their own enslavement and privatize the thought police function.

An oligarchy of a few corporations owns all the electronic and print entertainment and news media. They are, in turn, owned by the same conglomerates that operate the think tanks, such as the Heritage Foundation, Hudson Instituted, and Institute of Advanced Studies that advise government on the fine points of enacting and administering policies put forth by the Trilateral Commission, CFR, Bilderbergers, Fabian Society, Skull & Bones and other overt or submerged power groups. The prole watches dramas and comedies in which the actors and actresses teach her how to react. If you listen carefully to conversations, you will find that they mirror stock phrases introduced on talk shows and soap operas. Maintaining a heavy-handed state bureaucracy, as did the Soviet Union, is costly, and will eventually bankrupt a cryptocracy. Getting the masses to pay for their own enslavement, the elites profit while controlling them.

On this latter note, shows such as *Jerry Springer* and *Maury* are calculated to make social dysfunction and aberration seem entertaining or chic, i.e., "meet Tyrone, who has fathered 8 children by 7 different mothers...." (Applause for

Tyrone.) Not only is alcohol use promoted for escapism, rap, rock, hip-hop, and many other forms of popular music encourage drug use; again, make the slave pay for his slavery- it's a new twist and a damned effective one. Then pass more and more draconian legislation (the Orrin Hatch type of New World Order representative sells large doses of repression for every social ill, especially contrived ones) with the goal of incarcerating a whole new caste of slave "prisoner" labor. They learned as they went along, the Party did; Stalin's system was primitive and ineffective by comparison.

Remember another cardinal rule: if the proles ever start to emerge as an economic power, ruin them economically through deregulation and the predations of speculators; export their jobs; drown their neighborhoods and schools with aliens from different cultures, languages, and temperamental-genetic streams (races). That will cause a panic-run for real estate in communities where English is still spoken, schools which have not been slowed down to remediate fatherless "Saturday night specials," and lower their wages against foreign labor contractors. Above all, the elites profit from this every step of the way, unlike Orwell's Inner Party, who kept the proles in slums, but did not learn how to squeeze every nickel out of them in a futile effort to escape their conditions.

**Page 123:**

*"A new poster had suddenly appeared all over London. It had no caption, and represented simply the monstrous figure of a Eurasian soldier, three or four meters high, striding forward with expressionless Mongolian face and enormous boots, a submachine gun pointed from his hip. From whatever angle you looked at the poster, the muzzle of the gun, magnified by the foreshortening, seemed to be pointed straight at you. The thing had been plastered on every blank space on every wall, even outnumbering the portraits of Big Brother. The proles, normally apathetic about the war, were being lashed into one of their periodical frenzies of patriotism."*

Their Bogey Man was Mongolian; the NWO's is an Arab figure of terror.

**Pages 127-128:**

*"In some ways she was far more acute than Winston, and far less susceptible to Party propaganda. Once when he happened in some connection to mention the war against Eurasia, she startled him by saying casually that in her opinion the war was not happening. The rocket bombs which fell daily on London were probably fired by the Government of Oceania itself, 'just to keep the people*

*frightened.' This was an idea that had literally never occurred to him. She also stirred a sort of envy in him by telling him that during the Two Minutes Hate her great difficulty was to avoid bursting out laughing. But she only questioned the teachings of the Party when it in some way touched upon her own life. Often she was ready to accept the official mythology, simply because the difference between truth and falsehood did not seem important to her. She believed, for instance, having learnt it at school, that the Party had invented airplanes. (In his own schooldays, Winston remembered, in the late Fifties, it was only the helicopter that the Party claimed to have invented; a dozen years later, when Julia was at school, it was already claiming the airplane; one generation more, and it would be claiming the steam engine.) And when he told her that airplanes had been in existence before he was born, and long before the Revolution, the fact struck her as totally uninteresting. After all, what did it matter who had invented airplanes? It was rather more of a shock to him when he discovered from some chance remark that she did not remember that Oceania, four years ago, had been at war with Eastasia and at peace with Eurasia. It was true that she regarded the whole war as a sham; but apparently she had not even noticed that the name of the enemy had changed. 'I thought we'd always been at war with Eurasia,' she said vaguely. It frightened him a little. The invention of the airplane dated from long before her birth, but the switch-over in the war had happened only four years ago, well after she was grown up. He argued with her about it for perhaps a quarter of an hour. In the end he succeeded in forcing her memory back until she did recall that at one time Eastasia and not Eurasia had been the enemy. But the issue still struck her as unimportant. 'Who cares?' she said impatiently. 'It's always one bloody war after another, and one knows the news is all lies anyway.'"*

Julia wills away, out of mind any memory that might conflict with her superficial obedience to the Party. When a fact is inconvenient, she disregards it by forgetting. When Winston tries to awaken her memory or questions the Party's tampering with history, even privately to her, she begins to distance herself from him to avoid the cognitive dissonance. Part of the meta-conditioning to which we are all subjugated is anti-intellectualism; we are taught a visceral dislike of persons who are analytical, who ask too many questions, who are not happy with things as they are. In all kinds of staging, scripts are played out on our 'telesccreens' that show persons of high intellectual vigor and curiosity as social pariahs. Even cartoon shows teach this perspective. The ideal 'prole' citizen is Homer Simpson or Beavis & Butthead, the mindless consumer and 'party dude.'

In our own social issues, we can see the obliteration of history. Why did the U.S.

side with Britain in both world wars? "Because that nation stood against aggression and German occupation of other people's territory" is the official answer. In fact, anyone with memory would recollect that at the time, Great Britain and Russia had more people subjugated under colonial status than any other nations. The memory falters in comparison of U.S. behavior. America is an empire, forged from crumbling Spanish, French, and British possessions, denying states their Constitutional right to secede through a war of aggression and occupation. We were told that a U.S. that at the time already occupied Puerto Rico and several other "territories" (read "colonies") and had only recently granted independence to the Philippines was going to stop Germany and Japan from "taking over the world." The factual backdrop of the ersatz moral justification for war is forgotten. If the quoted reasons for aggressively pursuing entry into war before Pearl Harbor, namely upholding Roosevelt's "Four Freedoms," were proffered, this was no reason at all. It could hardly be said that America's allies, especially either Chinese government, or the U.S.S.R. upheld his Four Freedoms in any way.

In the same mechanism, students in college are allowed to debate how to better achieve racial integration. The very policy, itself, of desegregating schools is never discussed. The fact that Black schools did a much better job of graduating functional, responsible, better educated students under the regime of segregation is not examined. A veil of erased memory falls over areas that should stir debate. No one checks the record of pregnancies in high school, the dropout rate, or percentage of graduates who went on to college or technical schools. Even a cursory review in areas where such records are still extant will show that both Black and White high schools functioned far better *before* desegregation than do today's schools-as-engines-of-social-policy. When the context is shoveled into a memory-hole, the ability to debate, to review, or for a 'represented' public to make decisions is lost and policy is set, irrevocably, by those who frame or deny the debate.

Memory is also destroyed by manufactured context. We hear the terms, 'minorities and women' used as if it were an integral phrase. Two appalling facts overturn the assumption that this phrase on the lips of newscasters is supposed to summon.

Firstly, non-Whites are a vast majority of the world's population. **We**, Caucasians, Whites, are but a small pocket of foam atop the sewer of humanity, a mere 8% at best. Of that, the original inhabitants of Europe are only about 15% of this 8%. The rest evidence waves of Mongols, Turks, Tatars, Khazars, the

invading partly-Negroid, mostly Hamitic Carthaginians of the Punic Wars, and waves of non-White Allied troops, who were stationed in Europe, especially Germany, after both World Wars. Even if White enclaves were created tomorrow, they would be no more than a bulwark against further admixture. Within our walls, the descendants of all manner of invaders or settlers, some even incidental, like the estimated half million African servants or slaves imported into Europe by Portuguese slave merchants to serve its nobility and wealthy castes over a three hundred year period, all of these descendants are accounted in every dark or almond-shaped eye, wavy hair, olive skin, thick lip, or widened or hooked nose. No one could accuse this "White" world minority of striving for racial purity, because even so-called White movements lack the political will to remember how our imagined "sub-races" came about.

Secondly, to link the conditions and fates of women and non-whites (the supposed 'minorities') is the height of absurdity. Women's rights, the rights of women to do other than perform sex, home-labor, to birth and raise children, the rights of women to participate economically as equals, and to vote or hold office are an *exclusively* Western idea. It is a White notion that has only recently caught on to a limited extent in Third World nations.

Return to the notion of loaded phrases, such as the foregoing, 'women and minorities': what is at work here is manufactured context. By linking two illogical and basically unconnected constructs, a context is created, which links, in turn to the manufactured assumption that there is a "white male hierarchy" running the country. White males are the least protected by laws and the most vilified by entertainment media. Only the few White males that evince a reptilian spirit of cooperation with the agenda of the NWO and aggressively promote it with great wealth belong to a controlling hierarchy, but Jews, Blacks, Latinos, or any one else can also belong, for, as the next quotation will prove, Orwell correctly predicted that the totalitarianism of his future / our present would not be based upon hereditary power or on race.

**Pages 172-173:**

*"In principle, membership in the three groups [ed. Inner Party, Outer Party, and proles] is not hereditary. The child of Inner Party parents is in theory not born into the Inner Party. Admission to either branch of the party is by examination, taken at the age of sixteen. Nor is there any racial discrimination, or any marked domination of one province by another. Jews, Negroes, South Americans of pure Indian blood are to be found in the highest ranks of the Party, and the administrators of any area are always drawn from the inhabitants of that area [ed.: there's 'representative government' for you rather than direct democracy].*

*In no part of Oceania do the inhabitants have the feeling that they are a colonial population ruled from a distant capital. Oceania has no capital, and its titular head is a person whose whereabouts nobody knows. Except that English is its lingua franca and Newspeak [ed.: "minorities and women." "Homeland security."] Its official language, it is not centralized in any way. Its rulers are not held together by blood ties but by adherence to a common doctrine. It is true that our society is stratified, and very rigidly stratified, on what at first sight appear to be hereditary lines. There is far less to-and-fro movement between the different groups than happened under capitalism or even in the pre-industrial ages. Between the two branches of the Party there is a certain amount of interchange, but only so much as will ensure that weaklings are excluded from the Inner Part and that ambitious members of the Outer Party are made harmless by allowing them to rise. Proletarians, in practice, are not allowed to graduate into the Party. The most gifted among them, who might possibly become nuclei of discontent, are simply marked down by the Thought Police and eliminated. But this state of affairs is not necessarily permanent, nor is it a matter of principle. The Party is not a class in the old sense of the word. It does not aim at transmitting power to its own children, as such; and if there were no other way of keeping the ablest people at the top, it would be perfectly prepared to recruit an entire new generation from the ranks of the proletariat."*

Two other excerpts are worth your reading, even if you don't have time to read the whole work. In 1984 pages 220 to 221 the need to set up and then destroy enemies is discussed. This is remarkably similar to how the U.S. funded and trained Al Qaeda personnel so thoroughly that it can't seem to find most of them and now seeks them as enemies. It is also the pattern of backing the Baathist leadership of Iraq, arming it under Saddam Hussein, and then demanding that the nation completely divest itself of the weapons which the U.S. either gave it or helped it build in order to fight against the (then) Islamic-led Iran in the 1980's.

Despite occurring a few pages earlier than the above, page 217 has a brilliant discussion of how power becomes an end in itself. Winston is told that even if life spans are shortened by the same policies that guarantee the Party's unlimited power, even if poverty continues to worsen and life becomes ever more precarious, preserving its grip on power is actually the sole objective. To the reader's surprise, there is no more ideology to it: just as for a neo-conservative the only objective is holding onto the loot, for the Inner Party, the garage is empty- it is not a vehicle for stamping history with some great thought, but rather a mechanism of domination without the backing of a Great Idea.

On page 164, Winston Smith, the protagonist, hears from a member of the Inner Party the whole usefulness of war, per se, to the ruling elite. It serves, to paraphrase, the function of keeping most of the population poor by destroying the fruits of human labor, wrecking material civilization. Although not articulated as such, it is shown throughout the book how war serves Oceania as it serves the U.S. by creating the pretext for a disciplined society. War is used to threaten social order, in a classical Hegelian dialectic, and repression is then used to maintain that order. Repression can be increased precisely to the extent that the consensual reality is threatened with change.

A code name in today's "newspeak" is "security." National Security is one of the most common pretexts for launching wars. The only people really concerned with securing what they have are the elitists. They use the term as a coined condition-statement. By saying that such-and-such a legal measure is 'needed' by the police or military, a case is made that it improves "security." With an invented context, you are never supposed to ask, "*Whose* security is at issue?" The term simply has an association with stability and prosperity and other positive-context nouns, so the herd accepts it, not realizing that, all the while, new police powers make us ever less secure, for the threat to security and liberty is not external, save by contrivance.

Orwell must have had access to people who were planning today's society. If the blueprint they created was what 1984 exposes, the architects revised several times during the construction. They found, perhaps, that, while there could be a decentralized Party in charge of Oceania, part of mass mind control was to go through the charade of "freedom" and "representative government," while, in fact, the real decisions are made elsewhere. They may have found it useful to overlay the real and secretive decision-making matrix with the preserved remains of national governments, buildings, capitals, legislative bodies and all. The best slaves would, naturally, be those who think themselves free, and are unlikely therefore to rebel.

Note: The edition of 1984 used in this article was the Signet Classic, first published by New American Library, div. of Putnam, Inc., NYC, NY, first printed 1950.

A Production of the [Gambanreidi Statement](http://www.geocities.com/gambanreidi),  
an Odinist/National Socialist Perspective on Life, History, Faith, and Events.  
Visit us on the Web @ <http://www.geocities.com/gambanreidi.geo/>