



# The Trilateral Commission's Vain Attempt At Democratizing

The elitist nature of the Trilateral Commission has not changed since its founding in 1973 by the late David Rockefeller and Zbigniew Brzezinski. As its principals and original architects, they missed the “Great Reset” of the global economy by only a few years. □ TN Editor

It was during the summer of 2019 that the Trilateral Commission published an eight page brochure called, *‘Democracies Under Stress: Recreating the Trilateral Commission to Revitalize Our Democracies to Uphold the Rules-Based International Order’*. As I mentioned in an article published back in February, the brochure spoke about how the institution was now dedicated to **‘rediscovering’** its roots, **‘sharpening’** its mission and **‘rejuvenating’** its membership.

This apparent attempt at modernising came in the wake of the deaths of the Trilateral Commission’s two founding members - David Rockefeller and Zbigniew Brzezinski - and also that of former European Chairman of

the Commission Peter Sutherland.

On reading the literature, it was plain to see that the group were working to ensure its long term survival by seeking the next generation of corporate, political and academic members, all in a bid to maintain the goals of it's founding fathers, which include the implementation of a '*New International Economic Order*'.

Ever since its inception in 1973, the policy of the Commission has been that membership is by invitation only. Third party applications have never been welcomed. That is until now.

In a July 2020 press release titled, '*Trilateral Commission Invites Applications for New American Members*', the institution confirms that for the first time ever they are '***issuing a public call for applicants for membership***'. An extract from the press release reads:

***Traditionally, the Trilateral Commission has only solicited nominations for membership from existing members. As part of the Commission's recent efforts to refocus its critical mission and rejuvenate its extraordinary activities, it is now issuing a public call for applications to its United States group.***

The North American Chair of the Commission, Meghan O'Sullivan, had this to say:

***We are excited to further strengthen and diversify the Commission's ranks. Our members include people with remarkable experience in the public and private sectors, extraordinary intellectual acumen, and energy and passion for the world. While we welcome those who have reached the pinnacle of their careers, we are also intensely interested in people who still have another chapter - or more - to come.***

We are also informed by the Commission that spanning their 47 year existence, they have secured members who share the group's '***common values and a commitment to the rule of law, open economies and societies, and democratic principles***'.

So is the decision to appeal for new members a sign that the institution genuinely wants to democratise? Does it really want to open itself up to a broader range of individuals? Is this the opportunity that the common man has been waiting for, to muscle in on a carefully selected band of elites and with it bring a much needed level of public scrutiny?

Everything was going so well in the press release until the fourth paragraph. First we are told that prospective members must be U.S. citizens, which is fine considering the invitation for applicants is for the American branch of the Commission only. The request for applicants to send in a biography or curriculum vitae is also standard. But then comes a heavy dose of reality:

***They are also required to obtain one nominating letter from a Trilateral Commission member from North America, Europe, or Asia and at least one additional letter from a member or non-member. Recommenders should send their letters to membership@trilateral.org.***

So your only hope of getting onto the Trilateral Commission is if you personally already know someone who has a seat at the table. How's that for 'rejuvenating' the membership? Clearly your application only stands a chance of progressing if you know the right people. After 47 years, the Commission is not about to compromise itself by throwing the doors wide open to the public. Yes, they will accept new applicants into the fold. But only those who have been meticulously vetted and believe unconditionally in the Commission's values. What they do not want are outsiders who risk unsettling - or even infiltrating - the institution. Whichever way you look at it this is elitism 101. What we would call in the UK Jobs for the Boys.

The objective of bringing in a new era of talent is also demonstrated by the Commission seeking applications for its David Rockefeller Fellows program. The criteria for this reads:

***The Commission seeks applicants 35 years old or younger who show keen interest in national and global issues and strong potential for future leadership. DRFs join the***

***Commission's annual meetings and have other opportunities to engage with its membership.***

This appears to be about both nurturing and grooming the next generation of the Trilateral Commission. The fact that fellows are permitted to attend annual meetings and 'engage' with the membership supports this notion. It will allow current members to sound out those who have the potential to further the cause of globalisation, and if he or she adds value then they could progress up the corporate ladder and become fully fledged members of the institution. Whether they become a CEO, an executive director of a multi national or a banker, in some manner they will hold a level of influence over a particular sector. After all, it is very common to find members of the Trilateral Commission sitting on the board of corporations, councils and think tanks. This is one of the ways that the Commission exerts power over the legislature, and why it is no coincidence that the beliefs of the group end up permeating the national conversation.

Let us not forget what is one of the overriding objectives of the Trilateral Commission. Soon after the Commission was formed, former member Richard N. Gardner (a former U.S. Ambassador to Spain and Italy) wrote an essay for Foreign Affairs magazine (the official publication of the Council on Foreign Relations). In *'The Hard Road to World Order'*, Gardner emphasised the objective of dismantling national sovereignty

***In short, the 'house of world order' will have to be built from the bottom up rather than from the top down. It will look like a great 'booming, buzzing confusion,' to use William James' famous description of reality, but an end run around national sovereignty, eroding it piece by piece, will accomplish much more than the old-fashioned frontal assault.***

For the Trilateral Commission, the future is now. The new applicants of today may well become the leaders of tomorrow. This is ultimately how they have maintained their significance over the best part of half a century, by having the right people positioned in the right places.

Read full story here...



# Are Technocrats The Quiet Revolutionaries In Government?

Technocracy is forcefully asserting itself throughout the world and it's no surprise that Technocrats have been laying this trap for decades. Started in the 1930s, the ideology grew as technology advanced to achieve its goal of total control over society.

In Australia, the Technocracy revolution is highly visible and citizens are feeling the pressure as they slip into scientific tyranny and dictatorship. □  
TN Editor

The familiar sight on television screens over the past few months of the prime minister and the state and territory leaders flanked by, and often deferring to, their senior health experts, suggests a comfortable, and wholly workable, relationship between those elected to govern and those with particular expertise to contribute.

There is little in what we have been watching to indicate tensions – yet, the ongoing debate about the appropriate role of experts in a democracy reveals tensions aplenty. Indeed, it might be argued that there is no more pressing problem in both public policy and democratic thought than this relationship between the rulers and the experts, and by implication, between what people want and what experts agree to.

It is not just a dry academic argument. The highly contested role of experts in government is now widely seen as a major contributing factor to the global surge in populism as populist leaders urge people to “take back their lives”. It is a significant factor in the current rise of nationalism in Europe, with populists leading the charge against the “undemocratic technocracy” of the European Union; it played a crucial role in the Brexit debate that led Britain out of the EU; and it is very much a part of Donald Trump’s America.

The parameters of the discussion are broad in the extreme. They range from zealots at one end of the spectrum arguing for the replacement of politicians by experts in a system in which leaders are chosen for their relevant skills and proven performance, as opposed to whether or not they fit the majority interests of a population, to the other end of the spectrum represented by Donald Trump who, according to Philip Rucker and Carol Leonnig in their book, *A Very Stable Genius*, repeatedly told his chief of staff John Kelly when lining up experts to brief him: “I don’t want to talk to anyone. I know more than they do. I know better than anybody else.”

The idea of technocracy began to develop in the early 20th century as a public policy concept designed to advocate the application of the scientific method to solving social problems. The term was coined by the American engineer William Henry Smyth in 1919, and adopted as a key theme by the sociologist and economist Thorstein Veblen in his influential book, *Engineers and the Price System* (1921).

It was further popularised by James Burnham in his widely read *The Managerial Revolution* (1941). The term has come to mean “government by technical decision making.” As a social movement, technocracy gained prominence, predominantly in the United States and Canada (but

also in Germany and the Soviet Union) briefly in the 1930s, advocating the replacement of elected politicians and business people with scientists, engineers and economists who had the technical expertise to manage the economy and address the problems of the Great Depression.

The movement was inspired by Howard Scott, an American engineer who regarded government and industry as wasteful and unfair and argued that an economy run by engineers would be both efficient and equitable. The movement lost momentum with the outbreak of World War II but underwent a revival later in the century, notably in France in the 1960s where it became identified with the earlier theories of Henry de Saint-Simon (1760-1825) who had predicted a society ruled by scientists and engineers. Its current revival owes much to the work of the American public policy expert Frank Fischer, who, in his 1990 book, *Technocracy and the Politics of Expertise*, argued that democracy was “simply incompatible with the realities of a complex post-industrial society.”

To Fischer, technocracy was a “system of governance in which technically trained experts rule by virtue of their specialised knowledge and position in dominant political and economic institutions”. Fischer argued that it was not so much an idea for the future but was actually already happening, describing a shift towards a “quiet” and “faceless” technocratic “revolution” as new technocrats emerged in a different guise.

No longer posing as the “new men” of the future with grand pronouncements about technological and scientific progress and blunt rejections of conventional politics, these current technocrats “modestly step forward” as organisational “servants” in a subdued and pragmatic language addressed to organisational and technical “imperatives.”

This quiet revolution, according to Fischer, was not so much a break with the past but rather served as a “striking continuity of basic technocratic ideas”, echoing the notion that technocracy was simply an “ever-recurring intellectual doctrine”.

Is growing technocratic influence on decision making necessarily

subversive of democracy? Looking back on the three decades since Fischer wrote those words, Anders Esmark of the University of Copenhagen, in a 2017 paper, substituted the idea of a quiet revolution for a more specific claim: what we have witnessed since the 1980s is a technocratic revolution carried through primarily by the governance paradigm of public policy and public sector reform.

Read full story here...

---



## **Fusion Centers: National Spying Operation On Citizens**

The national network of local Fusion Centers was created as a data gathering network to normalize state and local data to Federal databases. Instead of fighting terrorism, they have become a spy

network on ordinary citizens. □ TN Editor

What has the public learned about Fusion Centers since the recent BlueLeaks hack was released over a month ago? Not a lot.

The Feds have done a great job of keeping the public from finding out what DHS Fusion/Intelligence Centers are really doing. In a country founded on freedom, we find federal and local law enforcement scrambling to keep the true function of Fusion Centers hidden from the public.

By piecing together articles from Maine and Texas newspapers, a disturbing picture begins to unfold of warrantless surveillance of Americans.

The first proof that Fusion Centers were being used to spy on everyday citizens and activists can be found in a *Maine Press Herald* article from mid-July.

*“A cache of internal police documents stolen from a secretive Maine State Police intelligence unit has provided the first substantial glimpse into how it collects and shares information about crime suspects and political activists and, in rare cases, keep tabs on domestic extremists, gang members and anti-government groups.”*

The article goes into greater detail describing how local police use Fusion Centers to track down low-level offenders and ID people from social media or video footage.

*“Police agencies commonly contact the Maine center with requests for help identifying a person depicted in a photo, sometimes captured from a surveillance camera. Other pictures are taken directly by law enforcement, or appear to be pulled from Facebook or other social media sites.”*

Maine police even went so far as to ask the Fusion Center to identify a passenger in a car who refused to identify himself, and did not consent to having his photograph taken or his fingerprints scanned.

Another article in the *Maine Press Herald* which predated BlueLeaks,

revealed that Fusion Centers refuse to acknowledge that they are secretly scanning everyone's faces and spying on their cellphones.

*"Despite evidence that the Maine State Police has worked for years with federal agencies to develop its use of digital surveillance technology, the agency now uses that law to refuse to answer any questions about such efforts, or even acknowledge that they exist."*

A third *Maine Press Herald* article revealed that Fusion Centers are secretly collecting a massive database of license plate numbers, the names and addresses of legal gun owners, and monitoring political activist groups and collecting members names and addresses.

## **Fusion Centers created a national citizen spy program**

*The Austin Chronicle* revealed that Fusion Centers have used secret informants to create a national "Suspicious Activity" network.

*"In early June, an intelligence center operated by the Austin Police Department was hacked, along with many others like it across the country. Known as BlueLeaks, the collection of leaked documents from the hack contains over 10 gigs of material taken from the Austin center. They reveal a secret citizen spying program that's active in the Austin area and across the country."*

The article reveals how Fusion Centers have created a vast network of secret "Threat Liaison Officers" (TLOs).

*"Documents examined by the Chronicle show that each TLO must sign a nondisclosure agreement with ARIC, including those not working in law enforcement, essentially creating secret citizen officers."*

Secret citizen spies or TLOs could be someone you least expect. TLOs could be anyone: "private security officers with local hotels, malls, large venues, and local semiconductor companies. Government employees in "education," "code enforcement," and "public works" also contribute to ARIC as FOUO TLOs.

According to the article, TLOs could be teachers, trash collectors, ministers, priests, rabbi's or even counselors.

Basically DHS has succeeded in creating a network of secret government spies masquerading as everyday people.

A TLOs job is to report people for doing mundane things like asking questions, taking pictures or being observant of one's surroundings. TLOs are also reporting people for "suspicious" social media posts, whatever that means.

*"According to one FOUO TLO's report, an individual was seen taking photos of Zach Scott's Topfer Theatre on Sept. 22, 2016. The report includes five different pictures of a young person using a camera on a tripod to photograph the theatre from across the street."*

To make it easier to report Americans for doing mundane things, Fusion Centers have provided TLOs with a checklist.

***"The leaked documents include submission forms TLOs use to make their reports. At the top of the forms are boxes to check indicating the type of activity being reported. These include the aforementioned "School Threat," but also Eliciting Information, Observation/Surveillance, and Suspicious/Odd Facebook Post. The TLO report spreadsheet contains 128 reports of school threats. But the category most reported by far was Expressed or Implied Threat, with more than a thousand entries."***

To say that this is reminiscent of China, the USSR or East Germany is an understatement. As the *Chronicle* warned, 'worrisome examples of suspicious activity have led to increased scrutiny' which means the Feds and local police could be secretly monitoring innocent Americans without out any public scrutiny.

If you thought DHS's "If You See Something, Say Something" was a failure guess again. DHS has managed to justify creating 78 Fusion Centers whose sole purpose, it seems, is to spy on innocent Americans

and track their daily movements.

[Read full story here...](#)