

Obama & the Council of Foreign Relations (CFR)

Commentary edited and posted by Chris *the Abducted Alien*, October 16, 2009

Obama's role is very important in CFR for a couple of reasons. This is the first appearance of a new president who has talked very much about working cooperatively with other countries, about multilateral diplomacy, and the importance of it. People are going to be looking very carefully to what he has to say along those lines generally, and I'm sure there will be a lot of contrast drawn with the past administrations. The two big issues that are going to be highlighted are disarmament and nonproliferation. That is very significant. And obviously climate change as well...

Again, one man cannot change the world or this country overnight. The conspiracy theories will continue to roll, and I do believe in many of the theories. However, neither you nor I, nor the people of this country will benefit from continuing to pander to them continually.

We must choose our priorities from these theories and post them online with great care. FEAR will only push people away...as it has done in past decades.

Yes, people need to be aware of the evil that exists in this world and in our country, that's why I post information about the secret groups like Bilderberg, 9/11, and others. To allow people to decide for themselves; to how very important it is to watch, listen, and participate.

Along the way we will get the extremist hate groups to jump in, and reasonable thinking people will run away...

Alex Jones is very good investigative journalist, however, he too panders to the extremist groups for popularity and ratings. I investigate what he states and publishes continuously before I post anything from him...

Only when the control of the CFR is fully exposed will the voters have a real democratic choice Thus why I posted this article. There is allot of truth in it...

Originally posted August 14, 2007 by **Now Public World News**

Link: www.nowpublic.com

The 2004 Democratic National Convention may be remembered most for a young and energetic senator that immediately drew comparison to the Kennedys. Obama's speech launched his name and image into the public spotlight, and his fresh style of rhetoric filled a growing anti-war political void – He voted against the Iraq war and wasn't afraid to criticize its handling. Excitement and support for the senator eventually snowballed into his current presidential campaign. He enjoys a popular image as a liberal democrat, and his harsh criticism of the Iraq war has earned him support from a population united in its discontent with the current government. To a select crowd of Americans, Obama preaches against the handling of the Iraq war. To other more private groups, Obama advocates military strikes on new Middle Eastern countries. Obama has aligned himself with several lobbying firms and nongovernmental organizations who seek further US militarization of the world. In several speeches and essays, Obama makes his foreign policy goals clear – and he is not anti-war. Is Obama intentionally sending a deceptive message to his constituency?

In a recent speech given to the American Israeli Political Action Committee, Obama outlines a plan for U.S. hegemony. He suggests polarizing political alignments that are already breeding anti-U.S. sentiment. Specifically, Obama pledges unfaltering military support to Israel. The U.S. has long supported Israel – this

year they were given \$30 billion for defense of the young state. To put this in perspective, less than \$7 billion has been federally granted to rebuild homes destroyed after hurricane Katrina. Although the U.S. has always given billions in aid to Israel, his alliance backs preemptive strikes against countries deemed a threat. Israel is unpopular in the region, and is threatened by Iran's desire for modern nuclear energy in the future. Regarding Iran's nuclear program, Obama states "We should take no option, including military action, off the table". The US has already constructed massive permanent military bases in Iraq and Afghanistan to serve as hubs for such an operation. The fleet of aircraft carriers in the Persian Gulf continues to grow, while politicians and media simultaneously hype a nonexistent enemy. This reckless policy leaves the U.S. on the brink of full scale war at all times.

Obama differed from many of his peers by admitting the Iraq war was heavily motivated by Iraq's oil reserves. Iran's oilfields, and the military buildup of the Persian Gulf creates an incentive for military action. It has been questioned if the U.S. military even has the capability of securing the strategic oil reserve. Iran has some of the most lucrative oilfields in the region, and provides energy to Asia and Europe. International economies would be disenfranchised with the US military disruption of its energy supplies. Meddling in other countries' foreign affairs has spurred backlash against the U.S. This phenomenon is referred to as "blowback" or, the consequences from provoking actions. Ignoring this cause and effect, Obama advocates troops in Iraq are redeployed to Pakistan and Afghanistan to fight amorphous groups of "terrorists". Regarding the war on terror, Obama differs from his colleagues in that he does not believe nuclear weapons should be used – a small concession for an ambitious military operation. This policy still backs preemptive strikes and the further militarization of the Middle East, all at the expense of US resources.

Obama outlines his ambitious geopolitical plans in a recent essay for Foreign Affairs magazine. Foreign Affairs is published by the Council on Foreign Relations, which describes itself as a non-partisan group of which he is a member. Established in the 1920's and headquartered in New York, its membership includes prominent politicians and business elite, including heads of academia and media. The organization seeks to centralize both political power and market power to craft legislation outside the checks and balances of democracy. The CFR is rarely mentioned by the mainstream media, making it difficult to fully gauge its influence. When it is mentioned in the press, it is likely whitewashed as trivial or irrelevant.

Notable members of the CFR include:

Dick Cheney, John Kerry, Bill Clinton, Al Gore, Ronald Reagan, George H. W. Bush, Gerald Ford, Richard Nixon, John, David & Nelson Rockefeller, Condoleezza Rice, Paul Wolfowitz, Alan Greenspan, Colin Powell, Henry Kissinger, Angelina Jolie (Yes, the actress has a five year term membership as an ambassador)

Its membership list is a who's who of Washington and Wall St. elite going back nearly a century. It should not be surprising that most presidential candidates in the 2008 election are CFR members. Candidates do not advertise their CFR membership to the public. They pose as "liberals" and "conservatives" to control all aspects of the debate. The CFR has stacked the deck for the 2008 election with several members in the race from both sides of the aisle:

Republican CFR Candidates:

Mitt Romney, Rudy Giuliani, John McCain, Fred Thompson, Newt Gingrich

The mainstream media's self-proclaimed “top tier” candidates are united in their CFR membership, while an unwitting public perceives political diversity. The unwitting public has been conditioned to instinctively deny such a mass deception could ever be hidden in plain view. Presidential Candidate & Congressman Ron Paul is the only “top tier” candidate who is not a member of the CFR.

Although many politicians hold membership, it must be noted that the Council on Foreign Relations is a non-governmental organization. The CFR's membership is a union of politicians, bankers, and scholars, with several large businesses holding additional corporate memberships.

Corporate members include:

Halliburton of Dubai, British Petroleum, Dutch Royal Shell, Exxon Mobile, General Electric, (NBC), Chevron Lockheed Martin, Merck Pharmaceuticals, News Corp (FOX), Bloomberg, IBM, Time Warner, JP Morgan/Chase, Manhattan & several other major financial institutions...

Members are united in their interventionist intentions with the goal of consolidated global governance. The CFR's mission is to influence policy through the reach of its members and publications. Those who study the CFR ideology are recruited and cultured for membership. The best and brightest university students are taught to propagate the CFR model. Individuals who both subscribe to the CFR ideology and can bring an element of capital (political status, business influence, money) to the group will be given membership. Members meet at the CFR headquarters in Manhattan and Washington DC, and round-table style discussions are held for its membership to discuss foreign affairs and make recommendations on policy. The CFR often creates “task forces” to report “findings and policy prescriptions” (cfr.org) for specific current world events, and also publishes the periodical Foreign Affairs magazine. CFR authors are often found in mainstream media publications. In a recent issue of TIME magazine, one CFR member writes: “*The US should make [Pakistani President](#) and the US intelligence an asset. Musharraf should be the best dictator he can be.*” Another author, this time in Newsweek magazine objectively argues to the readers that the world really isn't all that bad in an article titled “Don't Worry, Be Happy”. Currently, the front page of CFR.org features essays on European anti-terrorism measures, radical Iranians, and the reemergence of the nuclear threat [CFR members in government control the nuclear football](#); *opinion from one person...*

Many prominent publications are influenced and controlled by the CFR:

Time Werner, Newsweek, US News & World Report, Atlantic Monthly, Forbes & several major publishing houses.

Members of the CFR in the media intend to inject its pro-globalist arguments into the mainstream consciousness. Although the CFR is self-described as a non-partisan association, it unabashedly promotes a one-world-government agenda without regard for US sovereignty or the desires of the American people.

The goals of the CFR are best described by its very own members. Bill Clinton's Georgetown mentor and CFR member Carroll Quigley states: “The Council on Foreign Relations is the American branch of a society which originated in England. They believe national boundaries should be obliterated and one world rule established.”

Quigley differs from many of his CFR colleagues in that he believes their plan for a new world order should be more publicly disclosed. In his book Tragedy and Hope, Quigley concedes he is unique among his peers in that he believes the new world order plan of global government's “role in history is significant enough to be known.”

Quigley also admits that the two-party system allows for both groups to be controlled at the highest level but operate like bitter rivals. As Quigley says, this gives the voters the chance to “throw the rascals out at any election without leading to any profound or extreme shifts in policy.” Controlling Washington elite allowed private central banks to “dominate the political system... ..and economy of world as a whole” and implement a new system of “feudalist fashion” through “secret agreements”. Although he believes the CFR's intentions should be more public, Quigley understands the average person doesn't understand feudalism or serfdom and will never read his book.

Surprisingly, many of its own members admit the CFR goal is to subvert the democratic process. CFR member and Judge Advocate General of the US Navy Admiral Chester Ward writes “The main purpose of the (CFR) is promoting the disarmament of US sovereignty and national dependence and submergence into and all powerful, one world government.” This high ranking military officer went on to explain their procedures for influencing policy, claiming, *“Once the ruling members of the CFR shadow government have decided that the US government should adopt a particular policy, the very substantial research facilities of the CFR are put to work to develop arguments, intellectual and emotional, to support the new policy and to confound and discredit, intellectually and politically, any opposition.”*

The CFR's strategy is also being used to promote world government as well as the new environmental agenda. Obama and most candidates have made the environment a major issue in the policy. The CFR has long suggested a global tax, specifically identifying the environmental movement as a means for its advancement. All CFR candidates align themselves with the position that the government has both the ability and responsibility to maintain the world's environment. Good intentioned individuals may genuinely seek environmental protection, but nongovernmental organizations are quickly capitalizing on land acquisitions and taxes in the name of global warming. While most scientists agree the planet earth is undergoing a degree of climactic change, the CFR admits the environmental argument will be used to erode national sovereignty and build up their global authority.

Proposed “Carbon Taxes” place carbon expenditure ratings on mundane human activities. Contrary to popular misconceptions, CO2 is by no means a pollutant. As an essential gas for life, plants thrive on increased levels of CO2 which in turn they produce higher levels of oxygen. Furthermore, carbon based life forms emit carbon to the atmosphere; hence a “Carbon Tax” is a tariff for doing nothing but maintaining life. A popular movement lead by the CFR's own Al Gore would have you believe CO2 is the root cause of environmental woes while ignoring real industrial pollution in developing countries. There are serious environmental problems that are ignored in favor of issues that can be used to tax the broad population.

Environmental protection has already lead countries to willingly surrender control of natural resources. The US has ceded control of natural resources to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in a land grab under the guise of environmental protection. UNESCO is part of the United Nations, an organization controlled by many CFR members like permanent US ambassador John Bolton. The CFR's President Richard N. Haass boldly admits “Some governments are prepared to give up elements of sovereignty to address the threat of global climate change.” He adds that this “Globalization thus implies that sovereignty... ..needs to become weaker.” While it is important to be conscious of humans' effects on the earth, nongovernmental organizations like the CFR see an opportunity to redistribute wealth through selective enforcement targeting the US. The CFR openly states its intentions of using the environmental movement and other emotional arguments to build up global authority and undermine US sovereignty.

The CFR backs other programs that promote regional governments. Another ambitious goal of the CFR is the implementation of regional unions under the control of a central world government. World leaders are moving towards a regional partnership of North America consisting of Canada, the US, and Mexico. In 2005, the CFR released a report titled “Building an American Community” which sought to eliminate borders between the three North American countries. One part of the plan called for decreasing government control of cross-border traffic in an effort to dissolve national borders. Robert Pastor, a vice chairman of the task force that released

“Building a North American Community,” names the “Amero” as a hypothetical unified North American currency similar to the Euro. Carried out with precision, the private, run-for-profit Federal Reserve Bank has massively devalued the US dollar, allowing foreign corporations to buy up US resources for literal pennies on the dollar.

The European Union is a similar model to the North American partnership. The EU was hugely opposed by Europeans, and took a half century for the complicit European power elites to fully implement the union. During his time as Prime Minister, Tony Blair tried several times for the United Kingdom's adoption of the unpopular EU constitution that was also staunchly rejected by French and Dutch voters. The current Prime Minister Gordon Brown continues to advance a similar constitution under a new name. Like the EU, American countries would keep their governmental infrastructure but all policy would be superseded by a regional constitution.

Already in place the [North America is the Security and Prosperity Partnership](#) (SPP) established in a meeting between Bush, Mexican President Vicente Fox, and Canadian Prime Minister Paul Martin. The SPP consolidates protection of the North American Union by establishing a security perimeter extending north of Canada to the Mexican/ Guatemalan border. This measure was authorized under Bush's ambiguous executive authority, thus avoiding any congressional input or oversight. It is a precursor to a trilateral authority between the three North American economies.

A similar measure to the SPP in the establishment of a unified North American region is the “[NAFTA Superhighway](#) (NS),” ([also check Wiki](#)). NS which eliminates border restrictions on shipping is allowing imported goods destined for the U.S. to arrive in North America at ports in Mexico. Rather than arriving at the port of Long Beach, imported goods would enter the U.S. via a “port” in the mid-west that lies along the shipping lane. This measure has been unanimously opposed by U.S. cities in proximity of the highway, but the democratic voice is ignored as the government covertly advances. Congress has largely looked away from the issue. Members who are aware of this plan avoid this issue and prefer that it stay secret, and the CFR presidential candidates will not address it.

The presidential candidates' association with the self-described “shadow government” compromises the voting process and defrauds the constituency.

Barack Obama has captivated voters from all parties with his refreshing new style of rhetoric. He has the voting record to back his criticism of the Iraq war. But like his CFR colleagues, he vows to continue the pursuit of a shadowy enemy under the vague threat of “terrorism” - a policy that has cost citizens their personal liberties, trillion's in debt and untold lives. The war on terror has been crafted to spend the US into bankruptcy and setup a domestic police state. Money continues to be being printed out of thin air by the private run-for-profit Federal Reserve, while China remains leveraged with over \$1 trillion in US dollar holdings. In the Middle East, the CFR's blank check for U.S. military operations will deplete U.S. resources while inciting sectarian strife and anti-U.S. sentiment, ignoring the history of blow back as documented by the CIA. Obama and other CFR candidates affiliation with the organization is not promoted on their websites or in any press releases because the organization has centralized political power and financial capital to set policy the public would otherwise oppose. The career politicians in the CFR know corporate sponsorship is frowned upon by voters. The Council is one of the major conduits between government and business leaders in the US. The CFR is guaranteeing power by owning all the horses in the race that is the 2008 election. Obama is captivating unlike most of his competition, undoubtedly intelligent enough to understand his political niche. Another CFR US president guarantees more of the same costly foreign policy that protects corporate interests and isolates the US. Like his colleagues, Barack Obama's stated foreign policy intentions foment the long term militarization and balkanization of the Middle East while resources will continue to be spent in deficit to finance an illegal foreign policy.

Only when the control of the CFR is fully exposed will the voters have a real democratic choice.