

PROLOGUE

If You Have Nothing To Hide...

Neo: 'What is the Matrix?'

Trinity: 'The answer is out there, Neo, and it's looking for you, and it will find you if you want it to.'

– *The Matrix*

If you follow that hoary old chestnut to its oft-quoted ending, you would not fear any of what you are about to read in this book. Unfortunately, it is one of the most cunning propaganda phrases ever unleashed into the conversation of ordinary or garden variety members of the public. It is designed to imply that only the criminally guilty have any reason to hide their affairs from lawful authority. In the gaze of public and media pressure, who amongst us would not drop their trousers at the request of authority and expose our buttocks to the nice Homeland Security officer at the airport?

That's exactly what happened to American-born Shoshana Hebshi after a flight from California to Detroit:

“During her several hours in detention, Ms. Hebshi was subjected to an invasive and humiliating strip search, which required her to strip naked, bend over, and cough.”¹

It's a more modern take on the leery old doctors' motto, “please remove your top and say ‘ahhh’.”

¹ http://www.aclu.org/files/assets/01_-_complaint.pdf

Hebshi's crime, although American by birth, was to be of Middle Eastern ethnicity and seated next to a couple of likely characters from South Asia on the flight who were acting suspiciously and both went to the toilet for long periods. Hebshi didn't know the men, she was a victim of random airline seat allocation. In fact, had they bothered to ask they would have found Shoshana was the symbol of multiculturalism – daughter of a Jewish mother and Saudi Arabian father, married to a doctor, and a freelance journalist to boot. For all we know, perhaps that last fact was her real crime.

Alternatively, perhaps the security officials were suspicious that anyone would voluntarily fly to Detroit, a city now bankrupt and in large portions turned to ruin, where even cattle and chickens can be found foraging on abandoned city blocks.²

Regardless, Shoshana was dragged off the plane at gunpoint, as her lawsuit against the federal government lodged 2013 makes clear:

“Agents and employees of the FBI, the TSA, CBP, and Wayne County Airport Authority Police collaborated and put into place a plan to divert and board the aircraft, arrest Ms. Hebshi and the two men sitting next to her, and remove them to a detention facility at the airport for questioning.

“At approximately 4:25 p.m., Defendants Carmona, Bohn, Johnson and Defendant ICE Special Agent Brumley, along with other officers, boarded the plane, heavily armed, and ran down the aisle where Ms. Hebshi and the other two men in her row were seated.

“Several officers shouted at the passengers to keep their heads down and put their hands on the seat in front of them. Ms. Hebshi was stunned when the officers stopped at her row and yelled at her and the two men seated beside her to get up.”

Shoshana soon found herself in an interrogation room with an officer named Toya Parker, and was instructed to drop her tweeds for Uncle Sam:

“Defendant Parker took off Ms. Hebshi's handcuffs and told her to remove all clothing, including her underwear and bra, so that she was completely naked. Defendant Parker instructed Ms. Hebshi to stand

² “Can't solve the problems because the problems are cultural,” Washington Post columnist George Will told ABC. “You have a city, 139 square miles. You can graze cattle in vast portions of it. Dangerous herds of feral dogs roam in there. You have 3 percent of fourth graders reading at the national math standards. Forty-seven percent of Detroit residents are functionally illiterate. Seventy-nine percent of Detroit children are born to unmarried mothers. They don't have a fiscal problem, Steve. They have a cultural collapse.” <http://dailycaller.com/2013/07/28/george-will-detroit-doesnt-have-a-fiscal-problem-but-a-cultural-collapse>

facing the wall, away from the video camera, so that at least part of her body would be concealed.

“Ms. Hebshi was instructed to bend over, spread her buttocks, and cough while Officer Parker stood a couple of feet away and watched. Defendant Parker then instructed Ms. Hebshi to take her hair down from its ponytail so Defendant Parker could feel through Ms. Hebshi’s hair. Defendant Parker lifted Ms. Hebshi’s eyelids and looked in her mouth.”

Lifted her eyelids?

The long and short of the story is that despite having every orifice searched, Shoshana Hebshi ended up having nothing to hide. It also turned out she had everything to fear.

“Before Ms. Hebshi was returned to her cell, her handcuffs were removed, and she was fingerprinted and asked her date and place of birth, weight, and height. Defendant Unknown TSA Officer 2 then came into Ms. Hebshi’s cell with Ms. Hebshi’s phone and required that Ms. Hebshi show the Twitter messages she had sent out from the airplane upon landing, as well as her Facebook profile.

“At approximately 7:30 p.m., Defendant Brand authorized the release of all three suspects. Ms. Hebshi was finally allowed to call her husband and let him know that she was okay and could leave soon. As soon as she started to speak to her husband, Ms. Hebshi cried.”

One can understand, post 9/11, people and flight crews being jumpy about suspicious looking Middle Eastern passengers. But surely a handshake and a discussion over a coffee in the interrogation room is a more productive introduction than a booty-shake and a slap on the rump.

After that experience, you might be thinking, ‘who in their right mind would book a flight to Detroit these days?’, but on a more serious note Shoshana’s story encapsulates the risk of assuming that just because you are innocent, your day won’t turn to custard at the hands of the Government.

I began this chapter with the infamous quote, if you have nothing to hide you have nothing to fear. A more accurate restatement of the proposition is:

“If you have reason to fear, you have reason to hide.”

The essential question this book asks is a simple one: do you have reason to fear? Have we reached a point where the power of the State, worldwide, has become overbearing and unreasonable? Have we given our respective bureaucracies too much power in the name of creating a protective nanny state?

This is not a book about shadowy conspiracy theories. Everything in this book happened, as is described. The details are meticulously footnoted and cited, where possible with a web address as well so you can check it for yourself.

As you will discover, the agenda is actually “hidden in plain sight” for the most part and there’s nothing shadowy about it. What this book aims to do is bring together different parts of the jigsaw and reassemble them to make it easier to see the big picture.

Only then can you truly make an informed decision as to whether the powers of governments, aided by modern technology, have tipped the balance too far in favour of the State and its lobbyists.

This, also, is where the “slippery slope” argument kicks in. Prick your ears up and sit up straight, because based on the evidence now emerging we are on the brink of a powershift tipping point, or a point of no return.

The danger is that, for the first time ever, the State is morphing into a global entity which will be too large for any individual, or indeed any individual nation, to challenge. It is, in a sense, a political arms race in which the outcome is a kind of ‘superstate’ capable of legislating and enforcing to protect its own existence, even against the protests of the people.

If you don’t take my word for it about the implications, then perhaps you will listen to the words of David Rockefeller, the 98 year old patriarch of his family who, perhaps more than anyone else over the past century, has done more to push globalisation as the endgame:

“Global interdependence is not a poetic fantasy but a concrete reality that this century’s revolutions in technology, communications and geopolitics have made irreversible. The free flow of investment capital, goods and people across borders will remain the fundamental factor in world economic growth and in the strengthening of democratic institutions everywhere,” says Rockefeller in his 2002 *Memoirs*.

Americans watching hundreds of thousands of illegal aliens crossing their borders every year have more reason than most to wonder about Rockefeller’s vision, but Europe and Australasia are equally destinations for immigrants both legal and illegal. The removal of national borders was, ironically, a key foundation for the founder of communism, Karl Marx, as well because, like Rockefeller, he knew it would create the social mood for a new world.³

³ “On the Question of Free Trade” by Karl Marx 1848, <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1848/01/09ft.htm#marx>

“In general, the protective system of our day is conservative, while the free trade system is destructive. It breaks up old nationalities and pushes the antagonism of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie to the extreme point. In a word, the free trade system hastens the social revolution. It is in this revolutionary sense alone, gentlemen, that I vote in favour of free trade.”

With free trade eventually comes freedom of movement, although it is not yet fully operational as US theologian Daniel Groody noted in a paper on migration:

“The fact that in our current global economy it is easier for a coffee bean to cross borders than those who cultivate it raises serious questions about how our economy is structured and ordered.”⁴

However, these men – including Rockefeller for all his sins – are only saying exactly what the premise of this book is: that new technology and political aspirations have made a single command post for the entire planet not only possible, but almost unavoidable. For the first time in human history those with ambition who nurse a genuine desire to control the world might actually achieve it. The questions you should be asking are no longer ‘if’ this will happen but ‘when’, and who are those ambitious people? What do they stand for? What do they believe?

To one extent, the title of this chapter is correct: if you don’t buck the status quo, if you accept the limitations on freedoms your ancestors fought hard to gain, if you don’t stand out from the crowd and just go about your own business, doing what you are told, then you probably do have nothing to fear. But if, one day, you decide the State has gone too far and you begin to challenge those limits politically, you may well have something to fear. Just look at the IRS monitoring of conservatives revealed recently.

What we need to be publicly debating, in bars, on talk radio, around dinner tables, in newspapers, is whether we want that future, because by my reckoning we have about five years to prevent it.

You might be a left-wing voter. You might hate conservatives. You might think it’s a good thing that the IRS and other government agencies are spying on and harassing your political opponents. But think about something else for a moment: an infrastructure and political system that allows such outrages on one side, can equally be used against you when the time comes. Who, then, will you run to?

⁴ <http://kellogg.nd.edu/faculty/fellows/dgroody/articles/TSSeptember09Groody.pdf>

As German pastor Martin Niemoeller said:

*First they came for the communists, and I did not speak out--
because I was not a communist;
Then they came for the socialists, and I did not speak out--
because I was not a socialist;
Then they came for the trade unionists, and I did not speak out--
because I was not a trade unionist;
Then they came for the Jews, and I did not speak out--
because I was not a Jew;
Then they came for me--
and there was no one left to speak out for me.*

The whole “nothing to fear if you have nothing to hide” argument is presumptive. That is, it is made from a presumption that the State has the right to know your innermost thoughts or private dealings. It also presumes that you truly know the motives of the State, because if you actually don’t know the motives, how can you possibly truly know if you have something to fear or not?

The whole point of “freedoms” is that they are seen as things the government has no right to touch. In the US Constitution, such freedoms are defined as given by God to all people, not given by the State. The reason for this was not because the founding fathers of the US were rampant Bible-bashers – far from it in many cases. What they were actually doing was creating a legal framework to say that “we the people” who are writing this constitution derive certain fundamental rights that the State should never be able to touch, therefore we allocate the giver of those rights as an authority higher than the State. If the State were to become the Supreme Being in a legal sense, it could cancel those fundamental rights at will. God is in the US constitution not for spiritual reasons but for legal reasons.

If you now approach issues from the presumption that the State reserves all rights to itself in the first instance, then you have already surrendered. Yet that is what is happening.

Take a look at 9/11. Under the guise of “national security”, our daily lives have changed for the worse. Taking a flight is no longer a dream reminiscent of the TV series *Pan Am*, but a black comedy/farce.

How did it happen? A crisis presented itself and spin doctors leapt on the

opportunity to “sell” the public a solution – tough new laws and regulations. Go back and look at the public debate at the time, we practically begged for it, begged for big government to make us safe.

The same sort of crisis talk and manufactured solution is rife in the climate change debate as well, but with the added twist that they’ve been so successful on the climate issue that a massive global governance framework is a mere whisker away from being implemented on the back of that Trojan Horse.

We are entering, I argue, what you could call the “post-democratic age”, where the needs of the State are seen as trumping the needs of the citizens. The public exist, in the eyes of the elite, as a means of serving the State, not the other way around.

In a sense, this is not a new concept. It has been traditional throughout Western civilised history that the State was supreme, usually embodied in its monarch, and the people were subjects, not citizens.

The American and French revolutions in the 18th century put a spanner in that system of administration for a while, but supporters of the “supreme state” doctrine have regained the upper hand, even in the heart of America itself.

They have achieved it not through force but through propaganda and the persuasive powers of similar thinkers sprinkled as commentators and news editors in the mainstream media, they have done it with the assistance of idealists in the education systems who have ensured two generations of children have been indoctrinated into “thinking globally, acting locally”.

We have become our own civilisational executioners, without even realising. We have delivered the bullets to be used against us, we have voted for those who will ultimately sell our freedoms down the river in return for a cushy retirement fund and big campaign donations.

The system is “post-democratic” in the sense that it is no longer true to the original principles. Sure, you still get the vote, but all elections seem to do is rearrange the deck chairs on the ship, while its unseen captains continue to steer their own course. Red, blue, left, right, nothing really changes, because the system looks after itself and throws up successful candidates who know the rules and know who they owe their success to.

Why is this? Who is really steering this ship? The answer, later in this book, may stun you.

Second century Roman satirist Juvenal coined the phrase (or at least

he gets the credit for it), “give them bread and circuses”. It was a cynical analysis of how the Roman powerbrokers manipulated the public with distractions and handouts and how the crowds loved it. Two thousand years later, have we really changed?

Intriguingly, Juvenal’s *Satires* also gave us another phrase worth remembering: *quis custodiet ipsos custodies?* In English, “who watches the watchers?” An early forerunner of “power corrupts”.

To understand where we’ve come from, and why powerbrokers want to take us back there, we will have to reacquaint ourselves with a little history. Above all, *Totalitaria* is a story about the drive to hold power over others. Do not assume for a moment that just because we drive flash cars and use smartphones, that the age old lusts and ambitions that have always driven human affairs are not still there, lurking just under the surface.

The essence of this book, then, is not conspiracy theory but “convergence theory” – the idea that sometimes a tipping point is reached because a range of different social threads begin to interweave amid a convergence of opportunities. The phenomenon is similar to a shark attack. The smell of the prey lures otherwise independent sharks in for a feeding frenzy. None are acting in concert, each has their own personal agenda, but they share a target: you.

As we shall discover, some groups in this story are motivated by economic power, some by political power, some by religious power and some by idealism. Some are motivated by a combination of these factors. To understand, we have to find out what drives them.

This book is split into two main sections. Firstly, an analysis of just how totalitarian-like our modern civilisation has become. What are the technological and social changes that encroach on our basic freedoms? What are the systems that might be acceptable to us today for one purpose, but which can be used against us by a future administration?

The second part of the book is devoted to finding out what drove our civilisation to this precipice, and meeting some of the people and groups behind it. Whereas part one is illuminating, I suspect you will find part two explosive as the book moves into top gear and accelerates to its conclusion.

Let’s begin.