

## Winds of Change

Commentary by Gary Kah

The winds of change are blowing. What seemed like a mild breeze only a few months ago has become a significant storm. Financial markets have been trying to recover ever since a run on cash precipitated a liquidity crisis at Bear Stearns, one of the nation's leading investment banks. In just five days – from March 13 to 17 – the firm's stock plummeted from \$70 to \$2 a share, before bouncing back slightly. In January 2007 the firm's net worth had been over \$20 billion. Today, this once prestigious banking giant is worth a little over \$1 billion – only 5% of its peak value.

The Fed responded swiftly by lowering its discount rate from 3.50% to 3.25% to assist other troubled investment banks. It also helped put together a deal enabling JPMorgan Chase to buy out Bear Stearns for pennies on the dollar. On March 17<sup>th</sup>, when news of this bailout became public, the stock of JPMorgan Chase (a long-time Rockefeller bank) jumped by almost \$4 a share – to the dismay of Bear Stearns investors who had just lost their shirts. The US banking system had taken another big step toward complete centralization – i.e. monopoly.

In the name of crisis management, the Fed has also announced it will begin making its funds available directly to investment banks, like it is already doing with its regional Federal Reserve banks. However, with this new direct funding mechanism will come tighter Fed regulation and control over these same investment banks and their clients. This will give the Federal Reserve, a privately held banking cartel, even more influence over our economy and personal lives – all in the name of maintaining order. Other measures leading to additional control are sure to follow.

Where will things go from here? I believe this is just the beginning. As the economy continues to gradually deteriorate during the next 18 months, there will likely be several more ups and downs similar to the events of recent weeks. But overall, the general trend will be downward.

If the Federal Reserve continues to lower its discount and prime lending rates, the US dollar will weaken further against other major currencies. The lower the interest rates, the more dollars are released into the system – resulting in less demand for, and therefore less value of, the dollar. This has the affect of making imports into the US more expensive. The impact is being felt most in the area of imported energy – especially oil.

Higher energy prices push up the prices of most other products as increases in production and shipping costs are passed on to consumers. This in turn has a dampening affect on the national economy as consumers have less money to spend – which leads to more unemployment, more home foreclosures, and more troubled lending institutions; prompting the Fed to intervene by lowering interest rates once again, which will lead to an even weaker dollar. And so the downward spiral will continue. But where will it stop?

We know that the Fed can only lower its rates a few more times. Unless the Fed's interest rate cuts somehow stimulate the economy enough to cause a substantial rebound, the dollar will eventually crash. I personally believe we are headed for a major dollar crisis. If (when) this happens, the central bankers of North America will argue that we need to start from scratch with a new unified North American currency that can effectively compete with the Euro. Such a regional currency shared by the United States,

Mexico, and Canada is being discussed even now by our countries' leaders. The proposed name for this new currency is the "Amero." However, if US citizens feel uneasy about such a giant step, the currency could be given a different name that might sound less radical, such as the North American Dollar (NAD), or something similar.

This push for a North American currency is part of a much bigger agenda. Based on a 1973 report published by the Club of Rome, the goal of this powerful group of world leaders is to consolidate the world's nations into 10 economic/political regions – similar to the current European Union. Once this has been accomplished these 10 regions would then be brought under a global governing authority (such as a restructured and empowered United Nations) to which they would be accountable.

This highly controversial and possibly prophetic Club of Rome plan is called the "Regionalized and Adaptive Model of the Global World System" and is detailed on pages 40-44 of my book *En Route to Global Occupation*. In its original report the Club interestingly referred to its proposed regions as "kingdoms."

The North American Union, complete with its own currency and economic/political bureaucracy, is to be one of the key regions in this emerging world government. However, globalists pursuing this agenda are facing a major hurdle. According to a report by CNBC (March 24, 2008) 58 percent of Americans currently oppose globalization based on their assessment of economic globalization efforts thus far (via NAFTA, GATT, etc.). Only 25 percent of Americans favor globalization.

With such resistance it could take the Club of Rome and its affiliated organizations – like the Bilderbergers, the Council on Foreign Relations, and the Trilateral Commission – several more decades to accomplish their goals. However, if the US dollar were thrown into sudden chaos and were to lose most of its value, this scenario could be manipulated to engineer a new currency and regional government. If the American people would have to decide between perceived poverty and a new system that promises a reasonable standard of living, which do you suppose they would choose? Historically speaking, major shifts occur more quickly and easily in times of crisis when forced change seems to become acceptable.

### **The US Political Scene**

The winds of change are already blowing in American politics. With Mike Huckabee out of the race and Ron Paul running in the far distance, we are left with three less-than-desirable presidential candidates.

Hillary Clinton is polarizing and historically very liberal. She rates a mere 12 (out of 100) on The American Conservative Union index. Although she has publicly moved toward the center on a number of issues and has consistently expressed pro-Israel sentiments over the last few years, she is still a globalist at heart. Remember, her husband is the founder of the Clinton Global Initiative (CGI), one of the strongest world government advocacy groups in existence.

Barack Obama, based on his voting record, is the most liberal senator in Washington, making even Hillary look conservative by comparison. His smooth style has seduced many Americans; but beneath his likable outward persona is an individual of deep contradictions. While he talks a good talk about the need for unity and change, his controversial private associations reveal he has an agenda that most Americans would oppose – if they really understood his worldview. Close ties to racists, outspoken Muslim

leaders, anti-American terrorists and convicted criminals show that, at the very least, he has extremely poor judgment and is not fit to be commander-in-chief. (See the two articles on Obama in our Spring issue of *Hope for the World Update*.)

John McCain is a moderate Republican. However, his rating of 82 on the ACU index makes him the most conservative of the three leading candidates. There is little doubt he loves his country; yet he has also supported trends toward globalization and has been a member of the pro-UN Council on Foreign Relations since 1997. He is what I call a “patriotic globalist.” I believe he has resigned himself to the idea that global government is inevitable – so let’s make certain the United States has as much influence as possible in shaping this new world order. This position is probably not too different from that of Hillary Clinton.

It is worth noting that Clinton, Obama, and McCain are each surrounded by advisors who are prominent members of the Council on Foreign Relations and generally support globalization efforts. They include:

**CLINTON:** Madeleine Albright, Richard Holbrooke, Samuel Richard “Sandy” Berger, General Wesley Kanne Clark, Nelson Strobridge “Strobe” Talbott III, John M. (Jack) Keane, Kenneth Pollack, and Michael O’Hanlon.

**OBAMA:** Zbigniew Brzezinski (also a Bilderberger and Trilateral Commission member), Sarah Sewall, Susan Rice, Joseph Cirincione, Lawrence Korb, General Merrill McPaek, Dennis Ross, and Jay Rockefeller (also TC). Rockefeller is the current chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee.

**McCain:** Henry Kissinger (also Bilderberger and TC), Colin Powell, Alexander Haig, James Woolsey, and Brent Scowcroft.

Given this information it is highly unlikely that our next president will steer us away from world government.

Ron Paul, who is receiving about 5 percent of the Republican vote, is the only candidate left who I believe would strongly defend our national sovereignty and constitutional freedoms across the board. Like Huckabee, however, he has been unable to turn his votes into a majority.

Whether we like to admit it or not, the hard reality is that while a significant number of Americans currently oppose efforts toward globalization, morally speaking our nation has moved strongly toward the left in recent years. Young voters are generally much more liberal than the WWII or Baby Boomer generations. They also tend to view globalization more favorably. The Obama campaign has succeeded at registering unprecedented numbers of these young voters. In all probability, 3 to 4 times as many individuals in the 20 – 45 age group will vote in November’s national election, as compared to 2004. They will be voting not only for our next president, but also for members of the House and Senate. If they show up in the numbers expected, it will represent a quantum shift in American politics.

Unlike the conservative pundits on television and radio who are boasting about the huge conservative backlash that will follow in 2012, I believe the ideological shift already underway could be permanent. Here’s why.

Members of the so-called Generation X (ages 20 – 45) are far less prone to embrace the Christian faith than are their more senior counterparts; only 18 percent of Generation X members are Bible-based believers. Unfortunately, it gets worse. Among our youth, ages 20 and under, less than 5 percent are Bible-based believers – compared to 33 percent of Baby Boomers and 67 percent of the WWII generation. (Source: Bob Sprunger, youth pastor, First Mennonite Church of Berne, Indiana, December 31, 2006, quoting a public survey in his sermon.) As these young voters who are increasingly hostile toward Christianity come of age and begin to flex their muscles at the polls, more liberal politicians will become entrenched in our political system.

In the past, political trends toward the acceptance of anti-Christian positions could be tempered somewhat by the fact that the turn-out rate among conservative Christian voters was much higher than that of liberal voters, who tended to be more apathetic. In some elections Christians turned out at more than twice the rate of their liberal counterparts. This had the affect of giving Christians a disproportionate voice at the polls.

For example, if conservative Christians represented 20 percent of all registered voters, by voting at twice the rate of others this gave them the equivalent of 40 percent of the vote – enough to sway the outcome of many elections. However, with the percentage of young liberal voters increasing at a rapid pace, and with their likelihood of voting tripling or quadrupling, this will serve to offset any previous Christian advantage at the polls. We have already seen this at work in recent primaries where, in some instances, conservative Christians accounted for less than 30 percent of the Republican vote and less than 10 percent of the overall vote.

The poor showing of conservative candidates this year has also been affected by one other factor – disunity among Christian voters. The evangelical vote was largely divided between Fred Thompson, Mitt Romney, Tom Tancredo, Duncan Hunter, Mike Huckabee and Ron Paul. By the time Huckabee emerged from the pack, it was too little too late. The South Carolina primary was particularly damaging. In that state the conservatives were so divided, it resulted in a McCain victory even though he received fewer votes than when he ran against George W. Bush in the state’s 2000 primary.

One reason for such unusual disharmony among Christian voters was the fact that two of their strongest voices – Jerry Falwell and D. James Kennedy – both died a few months before the primaries began. This left a huge void. Perhaps if James Dobson and a few other Christians of influence had gotten behind Huckabee earlier, the results might have been different. But now, for better or worse, Republicans are left with John McCain.

Here is the dilemma. If conservatives protest by failing to show up in November, it will easily give the victory to Obama or Clinton. If that were to happen, as mentioned, it could produce a permanent shift to the left. Let’s hope and pray that McCain chooses a pro-Constitution, conservative running mate who will rally Christian voters. But even if he chooses well, he will still face an uphill battle to become president. The momentum is with Democrats and their young voters.

Some may wonder, does it even matter whom we vote for? If McCain does win, will he live up to his promises to conservatives? Will he govern wisely and defend our freedoms honorably? Only time will tell. Regardless of the outcome of this fall’s election, one thing is almost certain – there will be **major** changes in the next four years. Christians get ready!!

Gary Kah is the former Europe & Middle East Trade Specialist for the Indiana government. While in that position he traveled extensively overseas working closely with the economic staff at American Embassies. His books, *En Route to Global Occupation* and *The New World Religion*, along with his timely research newsletter, *Hope for the World Update*, may be obtained by dialing 317.290.4673 or by visiting his website at [www.garykah.org](http://www.garykah.org).