

Stanford 'thought control' engineers manipulate farm-state decline

by Marcia Merry

Now under way in North Dakota is a series of 39 "town hall meetings" on the economic and social future of the state. No friendly citizen effort, these meetings are part of a stage-managed campaign, designed in large part by SRI International (formerly the Stanford Research Institute, a California-based think-tank), to manipulate public opinion in a way to accept the current economic decline of the state, and to make way for worse to come.

The North Dakota operation goes by the name of "Vision 2000." Similar campaigns are in various stages of implementation in Iowa, Nebraska, Wyoming, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, and Florida. The Iowa program is called "The Iowa Futures Project." There is also a Wyoming "Futures Project." The activities involved in these projects are so cynical that if you run up against any "public interest" project on the economy in your area—in whatever part of the country you may live, and it uses "2000," or "Vision," or "Futures," or "Global," in its name, you are well advised to investigate whether it isn't run by the "thought control" engineers at SRI International.

The gist of the SRI projects is to set up statewide committees of business, government, and other active people, who then are the official sponsors of activities to assemble funds, hire SRI International staff, court media attention, and schedule "town meetings" to orchestrate public confusion and acceptance of pre-planned conditions of economic decline.

Of course, this agenda is never discussed in these terms. Instead, New Age lingo is used about "seeking a new direction," "taking control of our state's destiny," "enhancing the quality of life," and so forth.

Behind the rhetoric, the SRI International staff produces an economic development program that, in each state, would spell disaster for the residents. These manipulation experts then conduct operations to give their rotten programs an aura of public approbation.

'Is North Dakota dying?'

Look at the process now under way in North Dakota. In recent months, a group called the North Dakota 2000 Committee was formed, with 28 members. The committee staff includes three associates of the Center for Economic Competitiveness, SRI International, Menlo Park, California. The

committee's goal is to conduct activities in the name of "Vision 2000" for the state. On Sept. 9, a one-hour "special report" on "Vision 2000" was broadcast on all commercial and public television stations in North Dakota.

Within a short time after its formation, the North Dakota 2000 Committee produced a summary report printed as a mass-circulation 12-page publication, which was designed to express concern for the state, convey legitimacy for the actions of the "Vision 2000 Committee," and to justify the SRI International involvement is what is to be an eventual "strategic action plan" prepared for the state this fall.

The paper is entitled, "Is North Dakota Dying? Will We Stand By and Watch?" and features a dismal, full-color painting of a family staring into a dark, fenced-in field. Three questions appear under the painting: "What kind of future will our children have to look forward to in North Dakota? How can we continue our quality way of life? What opportunities are available to you?"

The paper has low-level commentary on the state's economic condition, a few proposals, photos and innocuous comments of 17 members of the Vision 2000 Committee, and a saccharine-sweet section headlined: "Who is SRI and why are they qualified to help us develop North Dakota's economy?" The paper ends with the time and place listings for the 39 town meetings sponsored by the Vision 2000 Committee for September and October.

Who is SRI? Good question! First, look at their economic proposals and analysis of the state of North Dakota. Then look at their pedigree.

The SRI evaluation of North Dakota is that the state is in trouble because it has relied on production of raw agricultural commodities and energy, whose prices can be expected to be low. Additionally, the SRI/2000 Committee notes that the federal budget deficit jeopardizes the income to the state that currently comes from agricultural subsidies and defense expenditures.

The committee concludes, "The challenge will be to identify where we have a competitive edge—or where we can create an edge—and pursue the development of unique products to fill a specialized niche. This, then, is our vision for North Dakota's place in the world economic marketplace. . . .

"To accomplish this vision, North Dakota must develop

several key elements.”

Then follows a list of recommendations: 1) a cluster of technology-intensive research firms; 2) programs to train workers; 3) a “climate” to encourage risk-takers; 4) a commitment to quality-of-life institutions such as schools; and 5) new investment sources.

Sound nice and nebulous? That’s the idea. You are supposed to think you have nothing to disagree with, and you are to attend the town meetings. But in fact, the thoughts you are supposed to have about the economic crisis in North Dakota are already pre-programmed by SRI International. The overall concept is that deindustrialization of traditional manufacturing and energy production will take place, traditional high-technology farming will disintegrate, and quality education and social services will give way to occupational re-training.

The core of the SRI proposals is warmed-over “cottage industry,” but with the twist that the orientation should be for the “global marketplace.” By this is meant that there should be no expectation of federal, state, or local statutes to protect chosen industries, occupations, or labor standards. All is to yield to the needs of the “international marketplace.” According to John Melville, one of the SRI functionaries, “We give recommendations on how to get geared up for a global economy.”

Concretely, the SRI-approved “new” industries are ridiculous. When Vision 2000 talks of “new aerospace-related, energy processing-related, and food processing-related clusters” of research centers for new products, they have in mind such new items as North Dakota-made pasta, or even pasta from certified “organically grown” wheat. The example given of a new manufactured good is a special snowmobile. “New services” in the state are understood to be tourism-related.

With little variation, this is the same kind of thing recommended for the other states where SRI International is active. One new “alternative” economic activity for Iowa is river-boat gambling, now being organized in the Quad Cities area for the Mississippi River.

Social engineering = brainwashing

All the talk of this kind of “innovation” diverts attention from the breakdown process under way in these states, where there is a large out-migration from the rural areas, while the cities are decaying. In practice, the “Vision” and “Futures” projects foresee providing large pools of low-cost labor to local facilities owned by multinational companies, with a few “regional agro-industrial metropolitan centers” replacing the dying local villages and towns. Already in states like Iowa, such companies as the “big three” meatpackers (IBP, Cargill, and ConAgra), which dominate all U.S. beef and pork slaughtering, plan to operate when and where they choose, with no restraints.

SRI International tolerates no talk of anti-trust suits, or

emergency measures such as debt moratoria to keep farmers on the land. John Gardner, the head of the Iowa Futures Project, said, “The state must diversify its economy away from agriculture.”

The SRI International staff has carefully worked out arrangements for how they conduct their public meetings to stimulate discussion of their economic proposals. They send out workshop materials in advance, with pre-prints of “key SRI findings and conclusions” on the economy. They then give people attending the meetings a set amount of time to answer such questions as, “How do you feel about this?” on a scale of one to five. Group leaders and recorders report on the “consensus” reached on the pre-formulated issues.

In Iowa, the first round of these sessions has ended, and the extension service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has been brought in to form a group of community leaders called the Public Education Policy Project (PEP), whose purpose is to implement the recommendations of the SRI International report for Iowa. According to John Gardner, 100 Iowa newspapers and five of the largest television stations are now supporting the goals of the Iowa Futures.

The credentials of the SRI group to conduct this kind of social engineering go way back to an integrated network of sinister think-tanks founded by Dr. Kurt Lewin, and his associates at the London-based Tavistock Institute, around the time of World War II. During the war, the Tavistock Institute was the headquarters of the British Army’s Psychological Warfare Bureau and also dictated policy to the U.S. forces in matters of psychological warfare. From this root, grew an entire postwar network of outfits that today are deciding how to brainwash Americans into accepting a global economic system controlled by a few powerful political and financial interests.

At the Tavistock Institute, Dr. Kurt Lewin and cohort John Rawlings Rees studied the techniques and methods of mass social engineering, including manipulating dislocated peoples, refugees, orphans, and other potentially depressed populations. Lewin and Rees fostered the Stanford Research Institute and a string of other such centers in the United States and abroad.

The job of all these social research centers is to conduct mass-scale psychological profiling and social manipulation. In the farm sector, many Tavistock techniques have been used to rein in political activity by farmers in times of economic crisis. These techniques include hot line call-in numbers, support groups, farm coalition groups, Farm Aid/Willy Nelson benefit concerts, and other such efforts. The net effect has been to blunt citizens’ legitimate anger, and keep them from organizing themselves politically to reverse the crisis.

Now, SRI is even advocating the reorganization of the agricultural states, to eliminate whole communities if necessary, to conform with their “future vision.” And this process is already well under way. Since 1980, 600,000 American farmers have left the land.