

sis” was solicited and has been exploited by that same Carter administration (“crisis management”). Ponder also that on May 6, for the second day in a row, Radio Moscow angrily reported that a new U.S. military intervention is being prepared for Iran, with as many as 12,000 troops now assembled on the West Coast for the operation. Ponder that three different European sources described the first Iran “rescue mission” as something that came “as close to World War III as one can come without actually fighting it.” Now ponder again: at the helm of U.S. foreign policy and military posture, just behind a “born again” puppet president, is Zbigniew Brzezinski, the Aquarian kook.

The following section, which elaborates upon Zbigniew Brzezinski’s fantasy world and his 15-year history in the Aquarian Conspiracy, is excerpted from a book on the Aquarians soon to be published by the New Benjamin Franklin House in New York.

# NATO and the Club of Rome: The Aquarian command

by Criton Zoakos and Mark Burdman

The Aquarian Conspiracy emerged as a major NATO program first made operational during the 1966-68 period. During that time, NATO formed and promoted a major, new international organization, the *Club of Rome*, for the purpose of inventing, disseminating and cultivating various “post-industrial era” countercultural movements in every nation of the Atlantic alliance, i.e. the member states of NATO and the OECD (Organization of Economic Development and Cooperation). The founders and principal officers of the Club of Rome are all senior NATO functionaries.

1. Aurelio Peccei, the chairman and founder, a part owner of FIAT, chairman of the Economic Committee of the Atlantic Institute.

2. Alexander King, the co-founder, Director General of Scientific Affairs of the OECD.

3. Harlan Cleveland, of the Aspen Institute, Ambassador to NATO.

4. Senator Claiborne Pell, former Ambassador to NATO.

5. George McGhee, former Ambassador to NATO.

6. Joseph Slate, the director of the Aspen Institute, member of the U.S. delegation to NATO.

7. William Watts, director of Potomac Associates, a NATO think-tank, and a director of the Atlantic Council.

8. Donald Lesh, an associate of Potomac Associates and a staff member of Henry Kissinger’s National Security Council.

9. Walter J. Levy, a director of the Atlantic Council, member of the Bilderberg Society, and the Council on Foreign Relations; a theoretical advocate of the doctrine of extending NATO into the Third World.

10. Sol Linowitz, the Xerox magnate with extensive history of involvement in NATO.

Tavistock Institute, the Stanford Research Institute, the Institute for Social Relations and other centers of applied social psychiatry, all of which are represented on the board of the Club of Rome, played a pivotal role in guiding NATO into adopting the long-term strategy of the Aquarian Age, in the following way:

Immediately after the Cuban Missile Crisis of October 1962, President Kennedy took the important step of rejecting the counsel of Tavistock, Rand and others who were then prompting him to adopt a NATO defense strategy based on psychological “flexible response” gameplans and large-scale psychological manipulations of the domestic NATO populations by means of “Civil Defense” programs. The President, at that time, opted for shutting down the Civil Defense Program and pressing forward with the massive expansion of NASA, the space program and the general scientific-technological upgrading of American industry.

In 1963, the year of President Kennedy’s assassination, a certain bureau within NASA signed a large contract with the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations. NASA in fact asked Tavistock to evaluate the effects of the space program on American society, its morale, its values and so forth. Tavistock, accepting the contract, farmed out various portions of the work to its various U.S. subsidiaries such as the Institute of Social Relations, Stanford Research, Rand and others. Tavistock then produced the studies which led to the formation of the Club of Rome and the adoption, by NATO, of the “Aquarian Conspiracy” strategy.

Only a certain portion of the Tavistock reports to NASA and to other clients on this subject have been declassified—to this date, most of the produced material remains classified.

Sometime during 1966, however, Dr. Anatol Rapoport, the Editor-in-Chief of Tavistock’s magazine, *Human Relations*, reported that the space program was producing an extraordinary number of “redundant” and

“supernumerary” scientists and engineers; that these new scientists and engineers had the nasty propensity of reproducing themselves at a rate much faster than any other segment of society; that their very presence and rate of expansion had a profound impact on the values of the entire American population from skilled workers and office clerks down to grammar school children eager to explain to anyone who would listen all the secrets of rocket propulsion, from construction to fueling to liftoff, all the way to re-entry and retrieval procedures. Tavistock was shocked!

So were the corporate-financial interests in control of the NATO organization.

### **Brzezinski and Peccei**

When the first results of Tavistock’s profiling of NASA were turned in, an alarmed mobilization took place. In May 1967, the Scientific and Technological Committee of the North Atlantic Assembly and the Pennsylvania-based Foreign Policy Research Institute (headed by NATO Ambassador Robert Strausz-Hupé) organized the *Conference on Transatlantic Technological Imbalance and Collaboration* in Deauville, France. Among the participants were Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, then on the staff of the State Department Policy Planning Council, and Dr. Aurelio Peccei, the current head of the Club of Rome and during that time, the chairman of NATO’s leading thinktank, the Economic Committee of the Atlantic Institute in Paris.

That conference was one of many in that period in which the decision was shaped to put an end to the scientific-technological advances of the United States. Two books were produced out of those deliberations, Brzezinski’s *Technetronic Era* and Peccei’s *The Chasm Ahead*. From the ideas presented in these books, the Club of Rome was later formed.

### **The technetronic era**

In his piece, Brzezinski wrote that America was moving into a society “increasingly unlike its industrial predecessor,” a “technetronic” society that could easily become a “technocratic dictatorship.” The society would be characterized by an “information revolution,” “cybernetics,” and the replacement of “achievement-orientation” by “amusement-focus,” based on “spectator spectacles (mass sports and TV) providing an opiate for increasingly purposeless masses.”

“In the technetronic society,” the manic Brzezinski went on, “industrial employment yields to services, with automation and cybernetics replacing individual operation of machines.” This will occur simultaneously with “the increasing availability of bio-chemical means of human control.” Also, “new forms of social control may be needed to limit the indiscriminate exercise by individuals of their new powers. “The possibility of extensive

chemical mind control ... will call for a social definition of common criteria of restraint as well as of utilization.”

A brave new world? In a critical passage further on in the text, Brzezinski laid out the following chilling description of what the “technetronic society” would entail. It is even more chilling from the retrospective vista of Brzezinski now being the head of the U.S. National Security Council.

The challenge in its essence involves the twin dangers of fragmentation and social control. ... The next phase may be one of sullen withdrawal from social and political involvement, a flight from social and political responsibility through inner emigration. Political frustration could increase the difficulty of absorbing and internalizing rapid environmental changes, thereby prompting increasing psychic instability.

At the same time, the capacity to assert social and political control over the individual will vastly increase. ... 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 behavior of the citizen, in addition to more customary data. These files will be subject to instantaneous retrieval by the authorities

Moreover, the rapid pace of change will put a premium on anticipating events and planning for them. Power will gravitate into the hands of those who control the information, and can correlate it most rapidly. Our existing post-crisis management institutions will probably be increasingly supplanted by pre-crisis management institutions, the task of which will be to identify in advance likely social crises and to develop programs to cope with them. This could encourage tendencies during the next several decades towards a technocratic dictatorship, leaving less and less room for political procedures as we now know them.

Finally, looking ahead to the end of this century, the possibility of bio-chemical mind-control and the genetic tinkering with man, including eventually the creation of beings that will function like men—and reason like them as well— could give rise to the most difficult questions.

Brzezinski penned this forecast of “a technocratic dictatorship” for “crisis management” 12 years ago. Today, Brzezinski sits at the center of the directorate of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, which has been provided with authority above the President and the Constitution to rule the nation in times of “crisis.” FEMA’s modus operandi is summed up in the phrase “Reichstag Fire”—prepare a dictatorship, and then prepare the crises that will trigger it. FEMA’s “contingency

plans" for its dictatorship include reorganizing government and the economy according to all the fascist features Brzezinski otherwise attributes to the "new age."

This transformation, Brzezinski went on, means that "America, having left the industrial phase, is today entering a distinct historical era, a different one from that of Western Europe and Japan. This is prompting subtle and still indefinable changes in the American psyche, providing the psycho-cultural underpinnings for the more evident political disagreements between the two sides of the Atlantic. ... Europe and America are no longer in the same historical era. What makes America unique in our time is that it is the first society to experience the future ... be it pop art or LSD. ... Today, America is *the* creative society; the others, consciously and unconsciously, are emulative."

This fact, Brzezinski continued, will have enormous international repercussions. "The instantaneous electronic intermeshing of mankind will make for an intense confrontation, straining social and international peace." There could well be a "three-way split into rural-backward, urban-industrial and technetronic ways of life" that will "only further divide man."

The "implications of a truly new era" will require a "universal intellectual elite" and a "world superculture" produced "inevitably" by "the network of electronic communication." This will also entail "creative interpreters of the new age" who will develop a concept of "regionalism with due deference to the symbolic meaning of national sovereignty." This could all be best thrashed out at "a special world congress, devoted to the technetronic and philosophical problems of the coming age."

### **Enter Aurelio Peccei and The Club of Rome**

This line was echoed in various NATO conferences of the period, and was straightforward: America was becoming a super-sophisticated "information society," while Europe was still an "industrial society." In Peccei's words, America is entering the "IBM age," while Europe is still in the "GM age." In his book of this period, *The Chasm Ahead*, Peccei fully endorsed Brzezinski's "technetronic age" perspective, and laid out the following argument:

Chaos would ensue unless the Atlantic alliance ruled the policy of the world. But that alliance was threatened by this industrial vs. information "gap." Therefore, what was needed was for Europe to end its resistance to aligning itself with "post-industrial" America, to redirect its policies toward the "informational society" direction, and thereby re-create the Atlantic Alliance.

As this was being accomplished, it would mean Malthusian triaging of industrial capital on a global scale. This would of course mean a collision, at some point, with the scientific-technological-military apparatus of

the Soviet Union

Peccei, again citing Brzezinski as his source, the Warsaw Pact would be offered "convergence" with the Atlantic Alliance as the alternative to "explosion." This "convergence" would lay the basis for what Peccei labelled "One World" government that could run global affairs on the twin foundations of "crisis management" and "global planning."

### **A visit to Tavistock**

While this new world strategy was being prepared within NATO, Peccei had a series of consultations with key officials. One was McGeorge Bundy, former National Security Council chief during the Cuba missile crisis; another was the then chief Scientific Administrator for NATO, Dr. Alexander King, the Director General of Scientific Affairs for the OECD, and a third was Dr. Homer Perlmutter, editor of Tavistock's magazine *Human Relations*. Peccei also met extensively with White House officials and with the State Department Policy Planning Council.

Finally, Peccei traveled to the headquarters of the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations in Sussex, England, where the decisions on how to proceed transforming NATO policy were finalized. The strategic attempt would be made to induce the Soviets into "convergence" by means of "disarmament" and similar efforts and through ideological/psychological manipulations centered around the offer of "Systems Analysis" cooperation. McGeorge Bundy and Alexander King would offer the Soviets an "entry point" through the International Institute of Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) and the International Federation of Institutes of Advanced Studies (IFIAS).

The domestic job of brainwashing the populations of NATO countries, with special emphasis on the American population, would be coordinated by a "Club of Rome" to be founded by Aurelio Peccei and Alexander King, with the Tavistock Institute functioning as the evaluator/controller of the process.

### **The Club of Rome and NATO**

The Club of Rome itself was founded in late 1968 at a meeting called on the basis of Peccei's call for a new one-world government. The attendees at the meeting were to form the core of a to-be-created "World Forum" that would coordinate "global planning" and "crisis management," with the goal of an international "technocratic dictatorship" overseeing "post-industrial, information societies," as outlined by Brzezinski in his 1967 document. The key was to make sure that this global transformation was managed by the NATO alliance; NATO would be the motivators and controllers of the 1984 world outlined in respective writings by Brzezinski and Peccei.