

CORRESPONDENCE WITH PROFESSOR NOAM CHOMSKY

Noam Chomsky is an American linguist, computer scientist, philosopher, cognitive scientist, and activist. He is an Institute Professor and Professor Emeritus in the Department of Linguistics & Philosophy at MIT. Chomsky has been described as the "father of modern linguistics" and a major figure of analytic philosophy. His work has influenced fields such as computer science, mathematics, and psychology ... He is also the eighth most cited source of all time, and is considered the "most cited living author (from Wikipedia).

In 2009, while searching the internet for any comments on my project Café Peyote, I found the following quote:

"If Noam Chomsky and Kurt Cobain made a record it would sound something like this."

My Mentor had mentioned and quoted Chomsky on many occasions, but I had never gotten around reading any of his books. In June 2011 I remembered the above quote and decided to try to contact Professor Chomsky to invite him to listen to my music and read my blog to get his opinion on both the music and my thoughts on world events. I was able to contact him and we corresponded by email for about a month. In some cases he would write a reply and in others he would interject his thoughts within the text of my emails.

After reading his background and then listening to many of his speeches on YouTube (which I highly encourage you to do) I thought that Chomsky and I would agree on many of my beliefs on world affairs. To my surprise, not only did we disagree in many fundamental issues, but I came out with the impression that while he is a historian that openly speaks about the powerful global elite and the atrocities committed by them and the U.S. government (the elite's tool of choice, under the flag of democracy and equality) in the form of world domination (direct or covert), he is not necessarily against it and may even directly or indirectly play a part in it.

Regardless of anything else, nothing takes away from the fact that he is an incredibly brilliant individual. I invite you to reach your own conclusion, as he may be right, I may be the one that has it all wrong. After all, they say that his IQ goes off the charts and mine is probably just close to average.

Due to the way he replied to my emails, I will be dividing them by my individual emails, noting all his comments in bold. I will add some notes to clarify where necessary. I also corrected some typos I made. Some final comments at the end. Enjoy! RB

Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011

Dear Professor,

I am a composer musician, and one fan said about my music, "If Noam Chomsky and Kurt Cobain made a record it would sound something like this..." I invite you to visit my website, with songs, videos and blog. Best wishes.

Interesting. Way beyond my experience. Afraid life is so intense I never have a chance to look at websites.

The attached is a song for you to listen to. I hope you enjoy it. If you wish, let me know if you agree. Thank you for taking the time to respond.

(RB Note: I attached my song "We Fail To See")

Don't even have the equipment for it, I'm afraid.

(RB Note: I wrote again as you will see below and he replied, "Thanks for your interesting letter. Not sure I follow. A few thoughts below.)

Thank you anyway Professor. Luckily for me the net allowed me the opportunity to listen to several of your speeches and I am quite impressed with your knowledge of events and the way you put them into a historical context to arrive at your conclusions. Although I agree with most of your facts and beliefs, I do disagree with at least one, but in particular was somewhat confused with a comment you made in one of those videos (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5OA-KgruEEg>, starting at minute 8:00).

In your speech you address Anti-Politics and noted the issues brought up by some people regarding the U.N., the Fed, CFR, etc. and you say that these people are attacking anything except what is real, and then you turn around and say that they are right, because what they fear is true and happening all around, but that the culprits are the 500 Fortune Clan. I cannot understand how you distinguish between the two.

It seems to me that there is a very significant difference between the UN/Fed/CFR/etc. and the concentration of private capital, even though they are interlinked in various ways. I don't see a problem in distinguishing them.

You do a similar thing in a speech you gave in 09 in Boston regarding Israel. You seem to distinguish between Israeli and U.S. government interests, when there is obviously a link, collusion, a conspiracy (in its legal sense) between both parties/the persons behind them. So it seems is the case of the organizations noted above and those who own/control/manipulate them, which goes back to the 500 Clan (hereinafter this will be the simply way of referring to the ones that "really" rule the world; some other people simply call them The New World Order Rulers).

Same point. The fact that there are links does not entail there are no crucial distinctions. There are, and in fact there have been many confrontations between the US and Israeli governments. I frankly don't see much merit to the concept "the New World Order".

What can these anti-politics activists do to protect their natural rights to life, freedom and property?

There are a great many things they can do, and fortunately, many people are undertaking them.

You say these activists may be arming themselves (I am against armed resistance, by they way) to fight/protect themselves against the government. When you consider that the executive branch (fed, state or local) is the enforcer of the 500 Clan's rules and regulations (not law, even less Common Law), should we say it is fruitless as they are outgunned, or should we say, at least they are willing to try?

I think that is a serious misunderstand of the nature and structure of power, and the ways of confronting power complexes.

In respect to going/acting against the government, the peaceful and correct way to try to assert your rights is through one's vote and legal action (and we know the Courts are there to protect the "State"). They cannot go to the house of David Rockefeller and demand their rights, nor outside of the offices of the CFR, as they have no legal standing. Even if the Rockefellers/CFR are calling the shots, the ones coming against the natural person are the executive agencies.

Rockefellers/CFR are not calling the shots. And there are many ways to act beyond voting and legal action. Positive changes have typically come in quite different ways.

So then, what is the solution? Where do you begin? Who do you go against to reclaim your right to a peaceful life? I would like to hear your view as to the solution to this dilemma. Below is an article I wrote that explains my views and although I too may not have the answer, I do have some ideas.

Thanks for sending. I'll try to get to it, but can't promise. Deluge of mail is so enormous that I'm compelled to put off anything that is sent.

Below is my article. Best wishes.

(RB Note: I included my article "[Iraq – When Will We Take Responsibility for What Our Government Did.](#)"He did not write any comments on the article.)

Professor,

It does not do any good to point to a problem if a clear way to address and counter it is not presented. By your response and your lectures I guess then that

the question should be, who are the Fortune 500 individuals you refer to that we should be fighting against? Or at least you are implying that we should be focusing our quest for freedom on an enemy you simply describe as "private tyranny," and I am not sure if by the 500 Clan, you are referring to the people that actually appear on such annual lists, or those who have even more wealth and power that do not appear on that list, which brings us back to the Rockefellers, Rothchilds, etc.

The idea that we are fighting against a particular human “enemy” is an illusion that undermines much serious activism. There is a state capitalist system, which we can analyze into its component elements: financial capital, energy corporations, the state executive, etc. And that system is what we should be seeking to improve or to dismantle, depending on our goals. The “Fortune 500” is a convenient abbreviation. The Rockefellers, Rothschilds, etc., are part of the system, but by no means an essential part. If they disappeared, the system would be not all that different.

The concept of a New World Order is not something that the anti-politics activists invented, but a term used by many powerful men for many decades, now more often and openly than before; simply refer to President George H. W. Bush's new world order speech given around 1991 (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7a9Syi12RJo>), referring to it and the United Nations' role in bringing it about.

The term is indeed used, but the source you cite is just boilerplate, which no one should take seriously. If you look more closely at Bush’s plans (National Security Strategy, budget, etc.) and actions (invading Panama, rejecting negotiations to invade and substantially demolish Iraq, etc.) then you will discover that he regarded the UN just as other presidents have: as an instrument of US power when that is possible, and to be disregarded and dismissed when it doesn’t fulfill the role of establishing US hegemony, a dominant principle of foreign policy since WWII.

As to concentration of private capital vs. the Fed (as an example), if I personally have a link to an organization/corporation and I control it, then my actions and that of such entity will be focused on the same objectives, Thus, The Feds and those who own that private corporation (appearing to be a quasi-governmental agency) are one and the same and they should not be viewed as separate entities.

That is a profound misunderstanding of what the Fed is and how it works.

As to Israel and US government confrontations, there have been apparent noticeable differences in policies, but have not the results been the same regardless? If you and I disagree on how to proceed in certain things, but our actions always follow a certain path and neither of us stops such course of action, would it be incorrect to assume that we both allowed things to follow such course, maybe by in apparent agreement?

On the contrary, there have been very serious confrontations, and when the US put its foot down, Israel of course had to obey. I've cited many cases in print.

You talk about domination and control of energy resources (presently the most valuable industrial commodity) as the focus of U.S. foreign policy for at least the last century, which has resulted in all the actions taking against oil producing Middle Eastern nations/regions. Are all these not acts intended to control the world? Isn't there an attempt globally to centralize control? Is not the U.N. that tool? So, who is behind the U.N., who pulls the strings? Or as you state, who is calling the shots then?

Of course the US has sought to control as much of the world as possible since WWII, and still does (with diminishing ability). No need to bring this to my attention; I've written probably thousands of pages documenting it in details. But you misunderstand the UN. True, the US will use the UN as an instrument when it can, but when the UN does not adapt to US goals it is simply dismissed, in fact often even defunded. The UN can do virtually nothing on its own. It can act insofar as its members – mainly the great powers, primarily but not only the US – permit. And the US is alone in the extent to which it dismisses the UN when it doesn't accord with US demands, from its very inception, and very dramatically so under the more lawless administrations, like Reagan. I've discussed many cases in print (and in talks, much less detail of course).

Many years after signing the Federal Reserve Act into law, president Woodrow Wilson noted how the nation's money supply was thereafter in the control of private banking interests (500 Clan?) and therefore so was our nation, yet he not only allowed it to become law, but he did not become an outspoken critic of such injustice. It's good to note a wrong, but it is not OK to not do anything to correct it, unless he only did it to justify himself, as if it was out of his control, to attempt to wash his hands of fault of the event.

Again, I'd urge you to look into the history of the Fed. You'll find that these conceptions are very far from the mark.

To my final questions of what we should do, you say that you will try to get to that? To be honest, I think that you should make that clear at the end of your speeches, not only of the bad things that are now happening in the world, but specifically noting who those bringing it about are and what we should specifically do to counter their aims.

That's exactly what I do. I can't think of a case where I haven't identified the institutional factors and individual actors, and discussed what we can and should do about it. Perhaps you don't like the analyses and answers. That's fine. But they are there.

And since 9/11 things seem to be accelerating in a tremendous pace, all to the world's detriment, under the banner of fighting terrorism.

These are topics I've written and spoken about extensively since 1981, when Reagan declared the "war on terror," with horrendous consequences.

Jumping from a historian to an anti-politics activist that has an answer to share to help guide us in the right course would be greatly appreciated, in particular from a brilliant mind like yours. How can we confront power complexes, especially if they are consolidating power?

I don't know of ways other than those I've discussed at length (as have many others) and tried to act on myself.

I guess what I am saying is that you and your influence is needed now more than ever. Respectfully,

Thank you for taking the time to respond to my comments. One thing I thought about after sending my last email was clarifying that I have never read any of your writings and only heard the videos I mentioned in my emails, and I thought that I should have added "and professor, if you have already address these issues in previous works and given suggestions as to how to proceed, then I apologize,"

And by your reply it appears that I must: I apologize!

Just one thing then, how do we, as a nation, benefit from having the Fed/Private Bank control the money supply? Best wishes.

It's hard to imagine how a complex state capitalist country could function without a central bank.

By the way, let me add that in my most basic understanding of the Fed, it works like this:

The government needs one billion dollars. It calls the Fed and tells it what it needs. The Fed says it will provide it: I will loan it to you at a certain percentage rate of interest. The Fed calls the Treasury Dept and says, print one billion dollars and give it to the government.

Is this a correct summation of what happens in such a case?

Thank you for clarifying. I am now blessed with two superb teachers that help me find the truth.

One thing my other mentor taught me was this:

In life you must apply critical thinking
There are two rules in critical thinking

The First Rule is: Question Authority

The Second First Rule is: Question yourself, as you are your biggest authority

That's part of what the Fed does. There's a lot more. Good advice.

Dear Professor,

I highly enjoy communicating with you through this medium and thank you for your valuable time and comments. In all fairness to you I am viewing more of your speeches, including the one on the 50th anniversary of the UN, and will be responding shortly to your last comments.

However, I want to separately address something else. We started our exchange around father's day and I search to see if you had any children so I could congratulate you, but I did not find the answer when I searched. What I did find was a note that your wife had passed away of cancer several years ago and of course my condolence go to you. I want to share with you another article I wrote pertaining to the issue of cancer. And professor, the bad guys here are the same ones we have been talking about, Best wishes.

CANCER, THE FDA, THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION AND YOU

(RB Note: he did not write any comments on the article)

Three children and five grandchildren. Thanks for the condolences, appreciated.

Thanks for sending me the article. I'm not persuaded. I've been very close to the scientific establishment for most of my life, and some of my closest friends happen to have been cancer researchers, one a Nobel laureate (and left activist). I don't think science works like this.

To me, no mater what the Novel laureates may say, not only the story of Rife's life, but his video (provided as a link in the article) showing the living cancer cell and how it explodes at the time of treatment is irrefutable proof of Rife's observations and results and confirmation of the theory/reality of pleomorphism. But anyway, just wanted to share. I will respond to the our prior comments shortly.

And by the way then, Happy Father's Day. I am also the father of five. Have a great weekend.

Thanks for the good wishes.

Greetings Professor,

I continue here our prior correspondence. As to the Fed, I disagree. Regardless of the complexity of our system, why should a private bank get involved as a middle man between the same government (the requestor and printer of the money) when constitutionally it is not required, nor authorized to do so? The government can create its own money (1) without having to pay any interest, (2) maintaining its interest rate for lending purposes stable, and (3) having something to back and guarantee it, as gold and silver historically have done. The Fed's involvement in the money supply is a complete conflict of interest with our national interests. As Mater Amschel Rothschild stated, "*Give me control of a nations money supply, and I care not who makes its laws.*"

The consequences of the Fed's actions to the economy, personal wealth, past vs. present value of commodities (inflation: you now pay a dollar for what you probably paid for with a penny when you were young), creation of very wealthy individuals, control of the markets, creating ups and down in Wall Street and other similar institutions, and buying up everything to consolidate power -- are not a welcome relief for human beings that are falsely believing they are free.

Our present economic troubles are much the fault of the Fed. It reduced interests rate significantly for a prolong period of time causing the home bubble (making many very happy at home while we proceed to the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq). Greenspan was also told of all the problems being created (money out of thin air) in the derivatives/etc. markets and he acted immediately to silence dissent. And you can't say that this is just one man making several honest mistakes. If the mistakes always go in the same direction, then they are not mistakes, they are simply helping create a Utopia for the Masters, as you mentioned in a speech. Or is Greenspan an "impeccable source" of knowledge as you claimed Paul Volker is?

By they way Professor, being that you are an academia insider and are given access to the deep vaults of information, just like professor Carroll Quigley, and you can speak out and say the truth (for as you say, you are white, privileged, rich and part of the wealthy classes), can you please tell me who are the original (and probably still) owners of all the shares of the U.S. Federal (sic) Reserve corporation?

As to the Rothschilds, I also agree that if one powerful individual/family disappears things will remain somewhat the same, as the machine of global control is running on the same fuel that all these shadowy persons are contributing to it and expecting to gain from. They may not be having meetings to discuss their plans for the New World Order (you may not like this term because you seem to see it as if there have been different New World Orders emerging at different times, like after WW1 and WW2, although you forecast a "coming world order" in your 1995 speech). But by acquiescence they are moving thing in a direction that guarantees them total control of our world's resources (tangible and intangible). But let me add that some meetings of sorts do seem to happen, with the Bilderbergs and the Council on Foreign Relations coming to mind. This brings up another question that I need to ask that will help me understand your neutrality/objectivity in this particular subject. Are you or have you ever been a part or member of the Council on Foreign Relations and are you a Freemason?

Related to this, in your U.N. 50th Anniversary speech you speak of John F. Kennedy's reference to a "monolithic ruthless conspiracy" and state in general terms that he was referring to the Soviet Empire. The only place I have heard or found that he speaks about this is in his 1961 (?) speech before the American Newspaper Publishers Association and I have heard the speech several times. There are no words there about foreign governments, their spies or plans of attacks via military intervention; instead, it specifically talks about secret societies, secret oaths and proceedings, a tightly net efficient machine, whose preparations are concealed and mistakes buried.

Your point on the U.N. is well taken, and it may make declarations denouncing U.S. actions, but I would say that in the face of obvious human/national rights violations, the U.N. cannot agree in public to such actions, as its credibility with the other "non-controlling members" would be completely lost. Your reply notes how the U.N. cannot do anything unless the great powers want to do it, is that not the same as saying that the great powers then control/own the U.N.? And who controls those great powers, the presidents of those countries or the visible and invisible Fortune 500 Clan? (in one of your speeches you state that to say "Israel and the United States" is the same as to say "The United States" as if they were one entity, but they are in fact two separate governments, then I can only conclude that you did not mean that the governments of Israel and the U.S. are one, but instead that the persons that control both governments are one and the same. You also note that the President, like the Queen of England, just play a ceremonial role, so you are saying that someone is pulling the strings, although I have not heard you specifically state who the puppeteers at the highest levels of global power are).

Pretty smart move, create the U.N., then in 1946 make clear that the U.S. is not subject to international treaties so it can do as it pleases around the world. Sometimes basic things answer complex questions. For example John D. Rockefeller Sr. said that monopolies should be legal (in general terms) and then his son John D. Rockefeller Jr. with his son Nelson bought and donated the property upon which the U.N. was constructed. Is the U.N. then a tool for monopoly? The way I see it, one of the main purposes for creating WW1 was to create the "League of Nations" and when that did not fly, they (whatever you want to call them) unleashed WW2 to justify the creation of the U.N. As a note, according to Wikipedia, John D. Rockefeller Jr. was "a committed internationalist, he financially supported programs of the League of Nations and crucially funded the formation and ongoing expenses of the Council on Foreign Relations and its initial headquarters building, in New York in 1921").

Just some thoughts. By the way Professor, how is your health? Best wishes.

I'm afraid we disagree so radically about matters of fact and principle that discussion would be hopeless unless it was quite extensive, and for that I simply don't have time as you would easily understand if you looked at commitments, obligations, or even just the deluge of mail, which restricts me to brief responses.

Health is OK for my age. Thanks for the concern.

Well, at least we seem to agree on the most important and basic fact, as I agree with you that, as you noted in a 90' Massachusetts Institute of Technology speech, "We have a de facto world government ... that it operates in secret ... that they determine the basic things that happen in life ... that it has its own institutions such as the IMF, the World Bank, the World Trade Organization, as well as the executive branches of the seven rich countries ... that the major institutions are under totalitarian control ... and that the people who count own the oil stocks."

I'd be interested in seeing the source. I don't recognize this, though there are elements of truth in it.

Our main disagreement is that you think (or claim) that the FED and the U.N. are not under the control of the above and therefore are not part of the problem. This is my main problem in trying to understand your position, as it seems contradictory.

It's not at all contradictory. The UN can act insofar as the great powers, primarily the US, permit it to. The evidence on that is overwhelming. The Fed is an instrument primarily of the government, in cooperation with the private sector, and I think your interpretation of what it does is quite incorrect.

I want to make one final observation (and thank you for your patience with this ignorant mind that is trying to understand what goes around him) and that is related to a comment that you made regarding using fossil fuels. You stated that it is not a moral question, but a technical one and that we need to compare the different alternatives and then decide which one we want to use. Please, fuel made of alcohol, motors running on unlimited magnetic power, natural gas produced using organic waste from our kitchens; there are many alternatives that are inexpensive, less or none toxic, and cost cents compare to fossil fuels, but like with medicine, any person or enterprise that presents these natural sources of energy, which compete with or threaten the petroleum and nuclear industries, those persons are ridiculed, products and technical data confiscated, threatened, imprisoned and/or murdered.

So you agree that it is a technical question, not a moral one. The consequences you describe are vastly exaggerated. There's a lot wrong with this country, but it's not the way you describe.

So here is something else you and I might agree on, and that is that murder is a moral question - making all of the above persons which are part of the de facto world government immoral in nature. The same applies for all those that knowing of the facts defends or justifies them.

So?

I'm glad to hear that you are in good health. If you suffer from any joint, muscle or back pain, there is a product that me and many friends have tried and in every

single case the results were incredible. The product is DMSO. "60 Minutes" made a documentary on it in the 60's. The FDA is yet to authorize it for medical use. You can buy it over the internet. Here are the links, in three parts:

Part 1 <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u0i7jARfKel>

Part 2 <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=icfh4x2vxbA&NR=1>

Part 3 <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gvHNN2XbkqU&NR=1>

Thanks for the suggestions. I'm afraid I very rarely access YouTube, and don't regard it as a credible source.

Best wishes to you and your loved ones Professor. I hope to meet you some day.

Just elements? The source of my first comment is you, in a live video, in YouTube speaking live. I saw so many that neither do I remember which one had this words (and I checked right now and could not identify it) nor do I want to view whole videos again to tell you at what minute you will find it. There are many many videos of you there. But if it is that important to you let me know and I will search and get it for you.

Your "SO?" is too profound to respond to. I can only say that I am saddened by that observation. But it does help me reach my conclusions after corresponding with you.

As to DMSO, if you want to try it I would be glad to buy and send you a bottle. Just give me a mailing address.

If you check you'll probably find that the phrase "de facto world government" is not mine but is quoted, possibly from the Financial Times, and the same with the rest of the description you cite here. Not all the institutions are under totalitarian control, and I doubt that I said anything about oil stocks. Nothing special about them.

On your reaction to "So?," I don't follow.

Thanks for the offer to send DMSO. I'm pretty conservative about such matters, and keep to doctors' recommendations. Thanks for the offer to send the CD. Afraid I almost never have time to listen to music, and when I do, I keep to my old-fashioned conservative tastes.

Found it. I was fortunate. Send it to a friend to view, or view it with him:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W9Nf7FYnrx8>

"A de facto world government is mentioned around minute 3:10

"You are allowed to rent yourself to it. That's called getting a job." Another interesting quote from the video.

Please don't ask that it be removed. Best wishes.

Why on earth should I ask that it be removed?

It's as I thought. The phrase "de facto world government" is quoted from the Financial Times, and it's the corporations that are described accurately as absolutist institutions. The little I listened to of the rest seems innocuous enough.

Yes, very innocuous, to the privileged: yet another lecture on how to understand things that don't impact them negatively. Yet, you did not mention that it was a quote, it was clear to me that it represented your views and not critical, by the way, just as an academic "matter of fact."

I'm glad you now know how to surf the web.

I'm sorry. It says it's quoted from the FT. And yes, it's a matter of fact. Don't follow the rest.

You are right as to the quote, I missed that as I tried to navigate through several videos to find you the quote, but like you state, it's a matter of fact and that is what needs to be understood.

Professor, what are your views on the Common Law and how a natural human being (as opposed to a fictitious entity) can present it in the courts (before or after being prosecuted) to protect one's self of things such as the Health Care requirement for mandatory medical insurance?

Can't respond on common law at this level of abstraction. On the specific question at issue, about mandatory medical insurance, it's like refusing to have automobile insurance – that is, placing a burden on others. There's a way to refuse to have automobile insurance: namely, not to drive. And I suppose one could imagine a way to allow refusal of mandatory medical insurance, perhaps a firm pledge never to accept any public medical care, like an ER if you have a heart attack.

Thank you for your candid response Professor.

As I was doing my research as we corresponded I came across a film called Psywar, regarding the U.S. government's (those behind it) Propaganda machine. There were several clips of you in a personal interview, although I am not sure if it was your contributions to the film or if they used existing footage. You and your

views are the first thing presented in the Epilogue
(<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eYUJ-m-kLVk>).

The movie concludes that we, as human beings, have to force the players to the surface and make this information public. It notes that those behind our problems have real names, not just corporate names and that we need more info on who is manipulating public opinion and the public mind. And of course, that we must apply critical thinking to our analysis.

Howard Zinn is also featured in this movie. I had the honor of corresponding with him starting around 2006. My son gave me his book "A People's History of the United States" and I was so impressed by it that I wrote a song about it, trying to summarize the book. I named it "Howard's Song To The People." I sent it to him and asked that he tell me if it reflected correctly his thoughts. He wrote back, "Thank you so much for the song. My wife and I listened with pleasure. The lyrics are certainly appropriate." These are the lyrics (and the song is attached - it has not been produced):

Blacks were enslaved, Indians betrayed
And Mexico was cut in half
The May came in and so did rule
But most were in seven-year servitude

All of them were screwed
Except the Governor

He had the land
Millions of fields
And had poor men fighting to death
For promises of food
It didn't matter North or South
The profits kept on pouring in
To feed his greed

He wanted it all
So the masses were Corporized

Wall Street devours, it's all a plan
To take it all away from me
Once they have you
They'll close the door
So everything will be in their control

And history repeats itself
Year after year
He who has the gold is the one that rules

Don't ask me what their names are
Just read the proper literature
And dig in history
"A Peoples History"

I guess that at the end of the day we all have our purpose in life and a personal way in which we proceed based on our beliefs as to what that purpose is. You do it through lectures and books presenting facts. Mr. Zinn did it through activism. I do it through my music and webpage, just a voice in the desert. May we all be working for the same goal.
Best wishes.

Don't know the film, but as I probably told you, I rarely see films. Advice sounds good. Glad to hear that it featured Howard Zinn, a marvelous person (and close friend for many years). I certainly agree with him about the song.

Dear Professor,

Hope all is well. I just want to ask you a couple of more things for my research. I recently asked you about using the Common Law to defend one's rights and you stated that you could not answer at that level of abstraction. I later sent you an email with my song The Common Law (reproduced below) hoping that my lyrics would clarify my view and make my prior question more specific. I would really appreciate it if you can give me your opinion on the lyrics so that, if you disagree, I can apply the second first rule of critical thinking. THX

THE COMMON LAW

This is not a dream that you will wake up from
Everything you see is really happening
Read the news, piece together everything
And you'll see
Common sense is telling you that all their words
Are lies

They take away our freedom through the Patriot Act
They make it sound like its really good for us
But simply read the document
They got us by the balls
And nothing you can say will change anything
Unless you stand up for your rights
Forget the Constitution
The Common Law is the way to fight

We have been conditioned to believe
That government can regulate our behavior
But do you remember free will?
That is reflected in the Common Law
The right to proceed as you wish
So long as your actions don't harm others
So find out what it is
Invoke it in your filings in court

Government can only regulate that which it creates
Like corporations; don't be deceived
Let's win our freedom back
Oh, and I wrote this song on the 4th of July

The law did not begin simply yesterday
Precedence takes it back centuries
And your Natural Rights
Existed then as well as now
It's not only Habeas Corpus
The Magna Carta comes to mind

I wish I could respond. My own personal limitations, I'm sure, but I just don't resonate to this style of argument.

Professor,

As I was cleaning my inbox I read your last email again and decided that your response really has no impact on whether you would agree to answer my last question, so let me present it here.

Pentagon Papers whistleblower Daniel Ellsberg says the government has ordered mainstream media to avoid reporting on 9/11.

I know of no evidence for that. Are you sure he said it? I'd like to see the source.

He further stated that some of the claims concerning government involvement in 9/11 are credible, that "very serious questions have been raised about what U.S. government officials knew beforehand and how much involvement there might have been", that engineering 9/11 would not be humanly or psychologically beyond the scope of those in office, and that there's enough evidence to justify a new, "hard-hitting" investigation into 9/11 with subpoenas and testimony taken under oath.

Perhaps you are unaware that I joined in the call for a new investigation years ago – knowing of course, as Ellsberg does, that if it is an official investigation it will go the way of all others. And also knowing – and repeatedly saying – that there is no need to call for an investigation. Activist movements don't call on the government for investigations. They set them up, like the Russell Tribunals for the past 40 years and many others.

You and I have been discussing the existence of an organization of sorts that we can correctly refer to as the De Facto World Government

Recall that the phrase is not mine. I quoted it. The reality is considerably more complex, as I've written and spoken about often. That's becoming much more true today, as global power is diversifying.

and have described (you through your eloquent and informative speeches and writings) its aims, which I don't need to describe here and our differences of opinion notwithstanding. What is now happening around the world under the flag of "fighting terrorism" together with the apparent orchestrated global financial crisis seems to be resulting in what has been described for years as the goals of the De Facto World Government, which include the control of wealth, governments and commerce as a whole, and thus directly and indirectly the masses.

I don't see any reason to believe this.

Professor, do you think, believe or know if the De Facto World Government planned, conspired, executed, manipulated or allowed all the events surrounding the 9/11 attack in New York?

Since I don't think there's a De Facto World Government in the relevant sense, I can't answer. But if the Bush administration was involved, they must have been incredibly stupid, verging on insanity. Uncontroversially, they wanted to invade Iraq. Uncontroversially, they blamed it on mostly Saudis (their closest ally). Had they blamed it on Iraqis they would have had smooth sailing, no need to discredit and undermine themselves by wild claims, quickly exposed, no sidetrack into Afghanistan, etc.

In your speech, the one I provided a link to, you described the organization that is trying to control everything I have spoken about and afterwards you simply stated that - what you described - is what the world's leading business newspaper the London Financial Times has described as the De Facto World Government -- you explicitly described it and they explicitly gave it a name. Same difference.

So your answer is, the De Facto World Government does not exist per say, because although it exists, it is presently diversifying and therefore, no such group was behind or supported the attacks of 9/11, in any way. It was that guy Bin Laden (the one involved with the CIA), who is, even in death, holding the free world/democracies captive, requiring the most powerful countries in the world to use military force against anyone they perceive as being part of, or allowing, these terrorist organizations to exist.

OK, I guess I can believe that ... !? Best wishes.

There is an organization that is *trying* to control everything, but has never succeeded, and has been weakened considerably in recent years, a major topic in international affairs discussion.

No comment on the rest.

We owe that to people that have exposed Their conspiratorial plans (They are the true conspiracists, not the people that expose Them) and have taken action. Hopefully They will not succeed, but it is difficult not to worry because of the economic/political/police power They have and I actually see Them, if not more powerful, more daring now to accelerate Their control regardless of consequences and being more in the open (like the way in which we jumped into Libya -- another atrocity in the name (excuse) of democracy -- For Profit, like any business.

Its been a pleasure discussing these matters with you, even though I disagree with some of your arguments (like, if I don't want to get car insurance, I should not drive, which sounded pretty funny coming from you, to be honest) and feel you evaded answering some things directly, but hey, you have to do what you have to do. That "Organization" can destroy anyone pretty easily.

Call me one day, even now if you wish, just to say hi and so we can formally introduce ourselves. It would be an honor.

Best wishes Professor.

Sorry you don't understand that if you don't get insurance you are imposing a burden on others.

But I think you're right that we've exhausted the possibility of discussion for now.

I almost never use the phone.

I understand your point of view, but I don't agree that one imposes a burden on others for not having car insurance and driving. Why would one conclude that I would crash and cause financial hardship on a person or society or that I would not have the means to pay for such costs? You are looking at this from a collectivist-socialist point of view.

Anyway, people have a natural right to travel in whatever means possible and you cannot stop someone that either cannot afford or chooses not to buy insurance (people believing the opposite notwithstanding, Crandall vs. Nevada line of cases).

We can take that argument to an extreme and say we will incarcerate someone "before" they do something, without a trial. Things are not as simple as the supposed legal requirement to get car insurance only, but what it represents overall.

Taking it to another extreme, if the "organization" was not so inclined to not share their wealth and also take everyone else's (Genghis Khan attitude: win - but also everyone else suffer), maybe we would all have enough money to pay for any damage, not to mention, have something to feed our children. Imagine all that wealth to benefit all (in particular through education - in the US They have

created a race of mindless consumers that are never satisfied and easily manipulated, who, like noted by one individual, have the flag wrapped around their eyes and ears -- and in the world, like in Nicaragua as you have noted, they have created misery). John Lennon must be sick to his stomach.

As to the phone call, I also did it as a courtesy. I knew you would not call and I was tempted to write, "Don't tell me you don't use the phone either?" Saludos.

Suppose you are driving and hit a pedestrian causing serious injury. If you don't have insurance, who pays?

People don't have a right to travel, or do anything else, in a way that causes harm to others.

The person that causes the injury pays. If I don't have insurance, I pay, to the extent that I can. If it turns out that I cannot pay in full, just one of those things. Like in the case of causing an injury, whether I have insurance or not, the victim will still suffer. It happens. Unfortunate, but it does.

Again assumptions: if I travel I will harm another. Do I have a right to travel without insurance if I don't harm others (now let's assume I won't)?

"Just one of those things" if you don't happen to be able to pay. Poor victim. I frankly hope you'll think through the position you are taking.

You can't be sure that when you travel you won't harm others. That's why a decent social system will have some version of insurance.

Professor,

I would like to know one thing, though, before I reply:

Without getting into the philosophical aspect of it, do you think human nature is to be good (help others, even if I have to sacrifice myself and my wishes) or be bad (I don't care about others as long as I survive). Your answer could also be in between, so let's say, from 0-10, 0 being bad. Where do you think humanity stands?

I think we know the answer. Since the whole range of behavior you describe is manifested in normal humans, and whatever is manifested is in accord with human nature, it follows that human nature allows all of these options.

What a great response. My respect to you. Talk to you next week.

Professor,

As I said, great response, but I don't feel you answered the question, just left it as a possibility either way, not your personal view of "what is the tendency" of human nature. Or maybe you are saying 50%, it can go either way. Obviously we know that environment is everything, externally and internally, even microscopically.

It's not "either way," it's both ways. As for "what is the tendency," it's unanswerable on the basis of current understanding.

Many things went through my mind as I mentally prepared to give you a dissertation of what my general views are as to your many responses, using car insurance as the introduction, but my last decision was to stop here, before I say things that might offend you, and I do respect you, not that agree with all your actions.

I will say this, you make it sound like I don't care about someone being injured, but on the contrary and the lyrics to my music express it (You Decide, Aelohim). I simply said it as a reality of everyone's destiny, luck, circumstances, in the same way as you point out the atrocities of the organization. At least in a car crash it is not intentional (who wants to crash?), but in the case of your friends and/or acquaintances, it is all deliberate, no pity, no guilt. Car insurance is the least of our worries.

That doesn't answer the question why you think it is proper for you to decide to opt out of insurance, despite the fact that it threatens serious harm to others. That was the one and only issue.

Not really, car insurance was an example you brought up when I asked about healthcare and the common law.

As to the question of human goodness/badness being answerable, I think it is and I will present it on my next blog article. I'll send you a copy.

Thank you for your insight and for sharing with me your valuable time.

Ricardo Beas
July 19, 2011

On September 11, 2011, the 10th Anniversary of 9/11, I decide to write the professor again:

Hope all is well and that you and your loved ones have not been affected by recent events in the East Coast.

I woke up this morning thinking about today's 10th anniversary of 9/11, so I turned on the TV. Since the attack, I had not been paying attention to the development of the old World Trade Center site and as I watched I remembered that you had mentioned that the organization that is trying to control everything has been weakened considerably, and then I heard that they named the new building the "One World" Trade Center. It is so sad to see everything that has happened to our world since 2001.

You had mentioned that you had joined in the call for a new investigation into the 9/11 attack. Can you please explain in a nutshell why? What is your belief as to what happened and who were the culprits? What part of the official version do you disagree on? THX

Hurricane was a nuisance. Lost power for a day, but that's familiar in our decaying society. The problem for me was that I was scheduled to fly to Mexico to visit my daughter, and that had to be cancelled. Was taking off for Europe a few days later, so had to miss it. Just back last night.

I don't see any reason to doubt what the FBI suspected in mid-2002: that the plot was hatched in Afghanistan and then implemented in the UAE and Germany, and that it traces to al-Qaeda. And have never seen any reason to doubt it. I am deluged with furious letters from the "truth movement," which I politely answer, and years ago I agreed to their request that I join in calling for a new inquiry, but I also pointed out to them two things, which none of them can understand: (1) an official inquiry will discover nothing (they incidentally agree, because everything in the world is run by the CIA, or Mossad, or both), and (2) every serious activist movement sets up its own tribunals, so they can do that if they like. No use.

If you'd like to get a sense of what it's like, have a look at the activist websites. A piece of mine on 9/11 was just run by Comondreams. Someone sent me a link to the posting and the comments, which were revealing. About 99% were bitter condemnations because I'm a secret agent for the government (or maybe Mossad), as proven by the fact that I ignored the only question that matters in the world: that Bush was the agent of 9/11.

Part of the reason why the left is so ineffectual. Enormous energy is drained off into these endeavors.

I just happen to see a video of you discussing 9/11 and your thoughts on the "Truth Movement" as well.

Professor, of the Organization you mentioned, regardless of how efficient or capable they might be at this time, who would you say are the 10 to 15 most influential or dominating individuals?

I wouldn't try to list individuals. They are not unimportant, but the important questions have to do with institutions, I believe.

I believe identifying individuals and institutions are both important and by knowing the individuals we might be in a better position to identify such institutions.

Humor me, give me the names of the two you consider most influential.

Whoever happens to be president of the US is highly influential, because the US is the richest and most powerful state in human history. But that alone should help explain why I don't think much of the effort to try to rank individuals.

Another reason is that there are many distinct dimensions, unrelated to one another. It's a hopeless endeavor, in my opinion.

OK, so you said looking at "institutions" (corporations and other profit and non-profit institutions) is more important than looking at individuals.

So tell me then, which are the 10 most powerful and influential "institutions" behind the Organization.

I don't know what "organization" you have in mind. I've already mentioned the most powerful institution along many dimensions "the US government" while adding that there are many dimensions. This does not seem to me a useful endeavor.

What organization I have in mind? That is how I started this recent correspondence, noting that I was referring to the organization that you had mentioned in a previous correspondence, the "organization that is trying to control everything" according to you. And I think it is proper to call it the De Facto World Government as named by the FT.

With your type of answers and comments to such important questions it is no wonder why some in the "Truth Movement" think you are a part of the conspiracy. You say people should take action, and in one of our emails you agreed with a person I quoted that it was important not only to find the corporations that are part of the conspiracy, but more important that we identify the individuals behind them, I don't know, maybe for prosecution or simply to make them visible to the people that don't know who really controls everything, and yet, you avoid giving specific names of the individuals and institutions when I ask you. Your answer about the president being influential is

just a way of you going around the question, as you have already mentioned that the President is just a ceremonial figure, like the Queen.

You stated in an email that we discussed that what the Financial Times calls the De Facto World Government (DWG) operates in secret ... that they determine the basic things that happen in life ... that it has its own institutions such as the IMF, the World Bank, the World Trade Organization, as well as the executive branches of the seven rich countries ... that the major institutions are under totalitarian control ...

and yet even though you know perfectly well that the Truth Movement firmly believes in such a DWG and that they were behind 9/11, in a video (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LoDqDvbqeXM>) you state that "even if this were true," that 9/11 was an inside job, "who cares ... it does not have any significance" and you stretch your logic for that answer by comparing it to the JFK conspiracy and saying, "who cares about JFK (his assassination), who knows and who cares? Plenty of people get killed all the time... what does it matter if one of them happens to be JFK" (and to think that you seemed concerned because I might drive without insurance and injure someone).

Who cares - you say that they determine the basic things that happen in life and that they control the executive branches of the seven rich countries - and who cares? What type of logic are you using? Even a person with a below average IQ can see the importance.

In a video David Ray Griffin (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FQPG3QxXy98>) tries to answer why you might deny a 9/11 inside job, and he clearly states how much he admires you, that you are his hero and that he is hopeful that you will wake up on this issue. But it is obvious to me that because of his respect for you he does not want to clearly say that you must know, there is no way around it due to your intelligence and access to persons and data, which I guess would make you an apologist for the DWG; or to put in simpler terms, a liar. That is also the reason why I had stopped my correspondence before and even told you that I did it before I said something to offend you. And then I read your email painting yourself as a victim of hatred of the Truthers.

You being CIA, Mossad, I doubt it, although I guess it could be true. What do I believe? I believe you described yourself in a video very well, when you said, "You are allowed to rent yourself to it. That's called getting a job."

I guess in a sense, and as noted by Griffin in so many words, the only question that matters may be if Bush was the agent of 9/11, because establishing that as a fact publicly, and everything behind that revelation, including discovering everyone behind it, maybe, just maybe the DWG could be neutralized or destroyed, like any other criminal conspiracy. Professor, many people look at you for solutions to our world problems, to government abuse. Professor, you can be the Agent for Freedom. Who cares now, you are older, you have lived your life, your wife is waiting for you, you have travelled the world, people bow at you, do this final Good Samaritan gesture for all of mankind. Who care if the DWG thinks you betrayed them because maybe they created and allowed you to live out the prestigious reputation that you enjoy and all benefits that come with it.

On the other hand, maybe you agree with the people behind the DWG, maybe all of us inferior humans are like dogs that will destroy everything if you let us (thus my question if you believed that man had a tendency to be good or bad, because if it is bad, it might justify the need for ruthless control of the masses).

So professor, will you be the agent for truth? It's so sad professor, what a loss for humanity if you don't.

Best wishes to you.

Professor Chomsky did not respond.

As a final note on this correspondence, the question of whether man is good or bad is a very important question in this discussion and context, but very difficult to answer as pointed out by Professor Chomsky. Simply trying to define what is good vs. bad is a challenge. The question is important because if indeed man's tendency is to be bad (as most of us might define it, maybe using the logic behind the Ten Commandments), then it would justify those in power (kings, presidents, Wall Street) in trying to maintain the masses depressed and highly regulated - controlled, as opposed to allowing them to be free and to prosper. That is the social experiment that those in power have refused to try or allow to happen because of the possible consequences – being dethroned or maybe beheaded. Fear is a powerful deterrent in changing the status quo.

By the way, by Chomsky saying that the question of whether man tends to be good or bad was unanswerable he is actually answering the question, as if it is unanswerable, then it means that it can go either way, and if it can go either way, then it is by definition a 50/50% chance, as opposed to 51/49.

I have been working on this questions in my head for a couple of months, and to be honest, I am not sure what the answer is, yet, but soon will come out with my theory.

Here are the questions that Chomsky did not consider important, decided to ignore or refused to answer:

- 1. Has he ever been associated with the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR)*
- 2. Has he ever been a Freemason*
- 3. Who are the main figures behind the “corporation” (Fortune 500 figures he refers to in various ways, the people propagating and financing the New World Order)*
- 4. Who are the original and present owners of the Federal Reserve*
- 5. Who really controls the U.N.*

Noam Chomsky on De Facto World Government

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W9Nf7FYnrx8>

Noam Chomsky on 9/11 Conspiracy

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LoDqDvbgeXM>

- If 9/11 conspiracy were true, who cares!

Comments on Chomsky's claims on 9/11 by David Ray Griffin.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FQPG3QxXy98>

