

Unravelling The New World Order

*An Exposé of How Government, Religious, and Financial Insiders
Are Deciding Your Future*

Volume XVII, No. 8

September 2010

The Founders' Greatest Fear: A Too-big and Too-Powerful Government - Part II

By Chuck Bates



Chuck Bates is Executive Vice President and News Director for IRN/USA News. He formerly served in the office of political affairs in the White House. Chuck is co-host with Larry Bates on the national radio talk show, "News & Views," broadcast M-F on the IRN/USA News network. In 2010, he co-authored the book, "A Nation in Crisis," with Dr. Larry Bates.

Last month we looked at how well-intentioned government programs can become liberty destroying despite the original intent. This month, we look at how a lot of lines are being blurred, posing yet another danger to all liberty-minded Americans.

The Founders of our nation sought to disperse power and maintain checks and balances on each branch of government. One need not look far to realize that the Founders debated vigorously over the issues of centralized government and the separation of powers. What they eventually designed was nothing short of genius, as it limited the role and power of government over the people to a bare minimum. Additionally, it codified not only the separation of powers between Executive, Legislative and Judicial Branches in the Federal government, but in the individual states as well. Keep in mind that the states are the last line of defense of the individual's liberty from an encroaching Federal government. All of these divisions of power were meant to allow government to govern as little as possible, while maintaining as much freedom as possible.

Today we have seen the lines blurred in some states to such an extent that our fellow citizens actually call out for Federal government assistance in the forms of financial aid and new laws! The Founders would turn over in their graves at such a turn of events in what heretofore has been a freedom loving nation. Of course, this has not

been by accident. Each successive generation seems to get more comfortable with Washington directing our lives at almost every level. State powers have largely been co-opted with the promise of "federal" dollars; those that dissent are threatened with a loss of those "federal" dollars. The tragedy of course is that there is no such thing as "federal" dollars; the government does not produce one single barrel of oil or one bushel of wheat. Rather, it takes dollars from productive citizens of the various states and then proceeds to dole out those so-called "federal" dollars, sending them back to the states where the money originated—*less Washington's cut, of course, which amounts to roughly 65%!*

A more troubling turn of events in the wake of 9/11 and the subsequent passage of the Patriot Act has been the blurring of the lines of law enforcement. "Fusion Centers" have been set up across the nation and those "federal" dollars are being doled out to local law enforcement agencies at break-neck speed. The problem is that these funds are often given with strings attached. The lines that supposedly govern the distribution of funds have become so blurred that some in law enforcement

continued on p. 2

Too-big Government (*from p. 1*) have ignored the laws in order to get their hands on some of the “federal goodies.” In one southwest Tennessee town, after being promised weapons (including a machine gun) for his department, a police chief literally proceeded to violate the *Posse Comitatus* Act—the law that prohibits the military from participating in local law enforcement activities. It was only after a national news network got wind of the story that the event came to a halt, with the Tennessee National Guard and the Governor’s office bringing an end to a lawless encroachment of Federal power into the state of Tennessee.

When we begin to tear down the separation of powers between the state and the federal government we are treading in dangerous territory because it bears directly on the personal liberty of American citizens. I have traveled around the world and in many countries you will find a local level of law enforcement that is largely a farce, completely inadequate to the job. Then you will also note a federal or military police organization with a tendency to become the 800-pound gorilla trampling on individual rights. This was a fear of the Founders of this nation.

A perfect example of the destruction of this separation of powers in law enforcement is the attack across the nation on the office of Sheriff. At least one state has done away completely with the position of County Sheriff. Still others have consolidated governments, leaving the Sheriff to be the delivery boy of court papers and the jailer for the community. The original intent was to establish the office of Sheriff as the highest law enforcer in the County. A Sheriff literally has the authority to tell the Federal government to get out of town—or to arrest them if they trample the rights of the citizens! For that reason, the office of Sheriff is—and should be—an elected position, making the Sheriff directly accountable to the citizens.

To make a long story short: we must be very careful to insure that we don’t cast away what may at times seem to be “inefficient” forms of

government. We need to remember that those separations of powers are, in the end, the best protection of the individual’s liberty.

“Beware when the political class preens about protecting us from ‘special interests.’ The most powerful, persistent, and anti-constitutional interest *is* the political class.”

Source Not Known

ON THE INTERNET

Visit our updated website for access to our entire programming schedule, 24-hour news, podcast information, and archived broadcasts.

Watch radio hosts Chuck and Larry Bates live on *News & Views*, M-F, 1-3 pm, ET.

www.irnusanews.com

ECONOMIC & POLITICAL CRISIS

A special update briefing on significant events that are affecting each of us

With Dr. Larry Bates

Lake Havasu, AZ

Tuesday, October 19, 2010
6-10 pm
London Bridge Resort
1477 Queens Bay

Irvine, CA

Saturday, November 6, 2010
9 am – 1 pm
Hilton – Orange County Airport
18800 MacArthur Blvd.

Visalia, CA

Tuesday, November 9, 2010
6 – 10 pm
Holiday Inn
9000 West Airport Dr.

San Diego, CA

Saturday, Nov. 13, 2010
9 am – 1 pm
Marriott at Mission Valley
8757 Rio San Diego Drive

OTHER SPECIAL EVENTS

Phoenix, AZ

Saturday, October 16, 2010
“A Rabbi Looks at the Last Days”
All arrangements by JVMI
For details, go to www.JewishVoice.org
(click on Jewish Voice Events)

POLITICAL INSIGHTS

The Sneaky Back Door to Card Check *NLRB to Revisit 2007 Dana Decision*

Another of Barack Obama's "wrecking balls for America" is likely to come up in a lame duck session following the November election. It's a pay-back to unions for tens of millions of dollars of support for Obama in the 2008 election. Called "card check," it is a tactic designed to dramatically increase unionization throughout the American workforce—with the political objective of a vastly increased fund-raising base for the Democrat Party.

Recognizing that he would not be able to get card check pushed through Congress, President Obama installed his secret weapon—labor lawyer Craig Becker—on the National Labor Relations Board last spring. After the U.S. Senate had earlier rejected Becker's nomination on a 52-33 cloture vote in February, Obama thumbed his nose at Congress and sneaked Becker into place by recess appointment in March.

"Card check" (if implemented) allows a workplace to be organized if 50% of workers at the site sign a union card, indicating they want to unionize. There is no secret ballot to allow worker privacy in exercising their choice, and no chance to "decertify" until after the first negotiated contract has expired. In other words, if workers experience buyer's remorse after 50% of them have consented to unionization, they will nevertheless be stuck with it until the first contract negotiated has run its course and expired.

At the end of August, Becker's considerable influence on the Board was manifested: the NLRB dropped a bombshell with a 3-2 decision to revisit its Dana Corporation ruling. In the decision rendered back in 2007, the NLRB recognized that card check is an inferior substitute to secret ballots. Therefore, it held that when a company recognizes a union via card check, workers have the right to force an im-

mediate secret vote on whether they really want to join that union.

The Dana ruling was (and is) about protecting workers from union harassment. The reasoning goes, if card check is as popular as unions claim, labor leaders should have no problem letting workers vote by secret ballot to ratify or reject a card-check process.

Becker Behind the Scenes, Pulling the Levers

Michelle Malkin, writing at her blog on August 18, 2010, noted, "Becker's anti-business views date back to his days as a UCLA professor, when he argued that unions should not be subject to the same rules of democracy and fair elections as everyone else. He favors radical rewriting of union organizing rules and elimination of the secret ballot process by administrative fiat."

As a key lawyer for the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), Becker has maintained that the NLRB has "legal authority" to unilaterally impose card check and thereby eliminate secret ballots in union elections.

Forget ethics. The contractual ethics commitment that Becker signed in April states, "I will not for a period of two years from the date of my appointment participate in any particular matter involving specific parties that is directly and substantially related to my former employer or former clients, including regulations and contracts." Becker has ignored that commitment, and has refused to recuse himself from numerous NLRB cases involving the SEIU and its affiliates.

In the Dana case of 2007, Becker filed a brief for the AFL-CIO, arguing that there is no essential difference between card check and secret ballots. He made clear his position that he considers Dana-style protections "bad labor-relations policy."

In 2009, Becker generously provided his legal expertise to the White House, serving as an Obama transition team member for labor issues and helping draft several union-backed executive orders.

Obama chose to go around Congress in appointing Mr. Becker. Now, our largely irrelevant Congress could at last demonstrate some cojones if members would stand up to Obama and expose Becker's conflicts of interest. But that might be too much to ask.

The NLRB has requested briefs from all parties by November 1. By any reasonable standard, Becker's clearly expressed bias against Dana should preclude him from ruling on it.

OBAMA TAX HIKES

Data from a recent study by Heritage Foundation, reported 9/30/10, indicates Obama's tax hikes will:

- Destroy an average of 693,000 jobs every year through 2020.
- Drain \$726 billion from disposable income, \$38 billion from personal savings and \$33 billion from business investments.
- Raise taxes on the 55% of all joint filers earning more than \$250,000 who run small businesses that employ others.
- Cost the average non-farm small-business owner \$3,500 more in taxes.
- Cost the 49% of all seniors with income below \$250,000 an additional \$525 in dividend taxes.
- Cost the 25% all seniors with income below \$250,000 an additional \$742 in higher taxes.

INSIDE WASHINGTON

Sally Pipes on ObamaCare at Six Months

It's worse than we thought . . .

by Roger Aronoff

Accuracy in Media

AIM recently interviewed Sally Pipes, President and CEO of the Pacific Research Institute (PRI), a San Francisco-based think tank—and the author of the new book, *The Truth About ObamaCare*. Ms. Pipes has been president of PRI since 1991. The Institute promotes free market solutions to issues such as the environment, education, and health care. She is a renowned expert on health care and economic issues. In 2005, she was named one of the “Top Ten Women in the Conservative Movement in America,” as published by *Human Events*. She has written three books, including *The Top Ten Myths of American Health Care: A Citizen's Guide*, published in 2008.

While many in the media treated the six-month anniversary of the passage of the legislation as a reason for great praise and appreciation, most polls indicate that a majority of Americans disagree. According to Sally Pipes, “The American people are going to be very upset with *higher taxes, higher deficits, and, ultimately, rationed care*—because that’s what’s going to happen under ObamaCare as we move down the path to government-run Medicare-for-all.”

Below are excerpts from the interview, which took place on September 16th. Ms. Pipes points out that Obama’s two goals were (1) to achieve universal coverage and (2) to bend the cost curve down. She addresses those issues:

“Well, we’re not going to achieve universal coverage: *23 million Americans will still be uninsured in 2019—and the cost curve is not going to bend down.*”

“[President Obama] originally wanted a bill that would cost \$900 billion dollars over ten years. The CBO says this will be \$940 billion over ten

years, but I believe most of the tax increases and [other costs to taxpayers] do not come into effect until 2014. So between 2014 and 2024, I believe—and many other economists believe as well—that this legislation, if not repealed and replaced, is going to cost the American taxpayers about \$2.5 trillion dollars.”

“So we won’t have universal coverage; and the cost curve is not going to go down, it’s going to go up. These are going to be two of the things that are going to lead us to this single-payer government that’ll run our health care system.”

“If you think back, when Medicare and Medicaid came into being in 1965, Medicare cost \$3 billion dollars in the first year, and the precursor to the Congressional Budget Office predicted it would cost \$12 billion dollars by 1990. Well, in fact, it cost \$110 billion dollars. So you can’t rely on statistics that come out of government because they just don’t know what the increased demand for health care will be. No government program ever costs what people think it will cost.”

“Of the uninsured, the President said we would be adding 30 million to the rolls of the insured, and 18 million of them would be eligible [to] be put on Medicaid, the program for low income Americans. Well, I find it very interesting that today 14 million are [already] eligible for Medicaid, and haven’t signed up. I believe it’s because lower income people, who don’t have insurance, would [rather] turn up at an emergency room. If you have Medicaid, it’s becoming increasingly difficult to find a doctor, since doctors don’t want to take these patients because the reimbursement rates are so low. This is only going to get worse; it’s also going to have a major impact on our seniors, because this legislation is going to cut

Medicare by \$529 billion dollars over 10 years.

Trouble for Seniors

“As Richard Foster, Chief Actuary at Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, has said, seniors are going to have trouble getting access to health care; and also, they will have a very hard time finding a doctor. One in three new Medicare-eligible people today are already having a difficult time finding a doctor.”

Not Health Reform, But Insurance Reform

“159 new boards and commissions are going to be established under ObamaCare—plus, 16,000 new IRS agents are going to be hired to monitor our tax returns to see whether we have health insurance—or if we’re going to pay a fine (\$695 dollars by 2016). But a more important point is this: during the health care debate—in February, before it was actually passed on March 23 this year—the President was very much in favor of the ‘public option.’ There isn’t a public option in the final bill. Also, he wanted to have a health insurance rate exchange. Remember: He originally talked about ‘health care reform,’ but he ultimately moved to talking about ‘health insurance reform.’”

“A number of regulations on insurance companies came into effect on September 23, 2010. That includes reducing, and finally eliminating (in 2014) annual limits or lifetime caps on an insurance company plan. [Another regulation] allows young adults to stay on their parents’ health insurance until they’re age 26, with no co-pays and no co-deductibles for preventative care, including an annual physical exam,

continued on p. 6

ASSAULTS ON LIBERTY

The Federal Government Is At War With Its Own Constitution

by John Russell

John Russell is the senior national correspondent for IRN/USA News. He has been involved in broadcasting for over twenty years, both as a news presenter and writer. John appears regularly on the news and commentary radio program, "News and Views."

There is one indisputable fact that needs to be repeated until it is understood and absorbed by every freedom-loving American. The United States was not attacked on September 11, 2001, because we lacked the "safeguards" that misguided individuals believe comes with having a police state. No, we were attacked because officials in the federal government, who were responsible for protecting the American people, did not do their jobs.

The basic outline for the Twin Towers attack was in the hands of the FBI in 1995. It was given to them by the Philippine National Police after its discovery in the apartment of Islamic terror mastermind, Ramzi Yousef. It included the plan to use airliners as missiles, and it named at least some of the targets that were hit by the Moslem terrorists.

Senior federal officials ignored warnings by FBI field agents and employees of flight schools that Arabs were taking lessons on how to steer airliners but not on how to put them in the air or land them.

We were told that the confusion regarding these warnings arose from an opinion in a memo written by Ms. Jamie Gorelick, a Justice Department hack serving under Janet Reno during the Clinton administration. This same person, whose actions, in effect, prevented a timely response that could have stopped the 9/11 attacks, was then

allowed to sit on the commission investigating the worst act of terrorism in the nation's history!

In the days following 9/11, President Bush said there would be no recriminations for those who had failed in their duty. In fact some of those whose lack of action and judgment made us vulnerable were promoted. In short, it was immediately apparent that no one in the federal government would be held responsible for what can only be called deadly incompetence.

The Rush to Expand Government Power

As frightening as these facts are, they pale in comparison with the rush by the federal government to seize extra-constitutional power following the destruction of the Twin Towers by radical Islamists.

First, we were told that instead of changing the policy that allegedly prevented the FBI and the CIA from sharing intelligence—which would have required a one-page memo—we would have to create a monstrous new cabinet department with a host of new and often secret powers. The overarching security apparatus that is The Department of Homeland Security was as foreign to the American people in its concept as in its name, which recalled the police states of recent European history.

We were informed that because the 9/11 plotters had acquired phony identity documents, the American people for the first in our history would be forced to carry an internal passport, albeit masquerading as an enhanced driver's license. Let's be clear on this point. The idea that numbering Americans like cattle will stop state-supported terrorists from acquiring documentation needed for their evil ends reveals a naïveté unworthy of a thinking adult.

Then there is the so-called Patriot Act. There is no doubt that some believe this legislation was formulated by wise men rushing to address shortcomings of the law in order to protect the American people against further terrorist atrocities. But the Patriot Act is, in fact, a shopping list of extra-constitutional police powers that the federal establishment had been wanting for decades. The enabling legislation was presented to Congress fifteen minutes before the vote for its passage. Further, the actual language of the act was presented as amendments to the existing federal code—the size of which is roughly equal to 8-10 sets of the Encyclopedia Britannica. Those who voted for the Patriot Act had no idea whatsoever of its contents; yet in order to do "something," they signed their name to one of the gravest insults to liberty since the Alien and Sedition Acts.

Now I need to make it clear that when this handbook for tyrants first reared its ugly head, I railed with all the force I could muster against its passage, Republican sympathies notwithstanding. I do not trust any human institution with this kind of power. However, in fairness to those who first let loose this beast, they at least included a sunset provision, should the law prove dangerous to freedom. However, it took a Democratic Congress and a Democratic president to make it permanent, without any means for its abolition.

Since then, the newly established security establishment has piled on in its attacks on American freedoms, grabbing any power that suits its fancy. There are the secret warrants—not signed by any judge—that permit federal agencies free rein to

continued on p. 6

ObamaCare (from p. 4)

mammogram, colonoscopy, and diabetes testing. All of these things are going to add significantly to the cost of insurance, and insurance companies are going to have to increase premiums.”

“Obama has done a great job of saying, ‘I’m offering you, the American people, all these wonderful things. . .’ But starting in 2011, there will be new excise taxes on insurance companies, medical device companies, and pharmaceutical companies—all of which, I think, are going to destroy research and development and innovation in these areas. And really, America is where innovation takes place, and where people come from all over the world in order to take advantage of the finest care.”

“The individual mandate, I believe, is unconstitutional. We have seen, in Virginia, Judge Hudson ruled that the Virginia suit against the federal Department of Justice can go forward. About a month ago, in Missouri, 71 percent of voters voted in favor of banning the individual mandate. And just this past week, in Florida, federal judge Vinson said that by October 16th he’s going to make a decision—but he’s probably going to allow a lot of that suit—the Constitutional challenge suit which is being filed by 20 states’ Attorneys General and the National Federation of Independent Business—to go forward. Ultimately, this will probably be the lawsuit [that] will have to go to the Supreme Court. I would hope that [Obamacare law] would be overturned, and [that] the individual mandate would be overturned in the Supreme Court. But, of course, one can’t always depend on the Supreme Court, because in many decisions of late, they have said that if the Congress approves something, they don’t want to go against what the elected representatives do. But my feeling is, we do want this to go to the Supreme Court; and if the individual mandate is ruled unconstitutional, it’s going to destroy ObamaCare.”

“I hope the Republicans can take the Presidency and the Congress in 2012, so that in 2013 there would be a great shot at repealing the whole

legislation and replacing it with health care reform that will bring about competition, reduce the number of uninsured, and make changes that I think the American people will be happy with. Even today, 58 percent of American people polled want to have this health care legislation repealed. Obama, Pelosi, and Reid went against the will of the American people and pushed this through, and not a single Republican voted for it. And, as I say, the American people were against it.”

“I think the Don Berwick recess appointment was really very bad on the part of Obama. He did not keep his promise that he was going to bring transparency to the government. Everything is completely opaque.”

“I would say the mainstream media, of course, always like to increase the role of government in our lives; and Obama, Pelosi, and Reid believe that government can make better decisions for the American people than we can make for ourselves. It’s an ideological vision that they have, and that is not the American way. This debate on health care since has been [given] tremendous [coverage]. Fortunately, we have *Accuracy in Media*. We have *Fox*. We have *The New York Post*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *Investor’s Business Daily*, and a lot of talk radio. They have covered this debate very, very fairly. And then I have done a lot of media and speeches and debates on this.

“But if you read *The Washington Post*, *The New York Times* (I debated Howard Dean on CNBC, who’s a huge single-payer fan)—I think the mainstream media has definitely been biased towards government takeover of our health care. But, fortunately, as I say, talk radio, blogs—all of these things are at least educating the American people. I think that is why 58 percent of the American people would like to see this legislation repealed and replaced.”

Roger Aronoff is a media analyst with Accuracy in Media, and is the writer/director of the documentary, *Confronting Iraq: Conflict and Hope*.

Fed at War . . . (from p. 5)

search what they please, without restraint. In pre-revolutionary America these would have been called Writs of Assistance; they were one of the acts of tyranny that led to the end of British rule in America. Further, anyone who revealed that such a warrant had been served was subject to prosecution.

There is also the presumption on the part of many in the federal government that U.S. citizens have no right to privacy in their electronic communications. Now there is a ruling by the Ninth Circuit court of Appeals which says that the government can come onto your property and attach tracking devices to your automobile, with no warrant needed. There is an exception if your home is surrounded by a fence with a gate; then, and only then, does the Fourth Amendment apply.

These are but a few of the tentacles of a police state regime that are hateful to the basic concepts of liberty. Still, there are those who argue that we must sacrifice freedom for security. This is perhaps the most frightening aspect of this naked power grab. The supposition that government can protect you from the dangers posed by madmen is as pernicious as it is false. No free American should put his trust in this dangerous illusion of safety. The only thing I want the federal government to protect is my freedom. I will depend on Almighty God to protect my life.

Now—one big question: If these assaults on liberty are not meant to protect the populace, then whom are they meant to protect? It is becoming more and more obvious that both the speed and the thoroughness of these social controls can have only one purpose: complete control of the populace.

Consequences

It is my opinion that the political establishment realizes the American people no longer believe their claims of acting “for the national good.” American citizens are realizing it is they who will pay the price for the excesses of irresponsible government, and they are outraged at the degree to

which the power elites are destroying their freedoms and liberties.

This awakening on the part of the American people has instilled among ruling elites a dread of political retribution that would mean an end to their unearned power and privilege. Could it be that those who have laid waste to this great nation see a potential for a middle class revolt? Tea Parties, conservative rallies, and polling indicate that those who actually produce wealth and stability for the nation are rising up to declare, "We will tolerate no more!"

I believe the elite ruling class misperceives America as no longer having a majority of educated, informed citizens with religious beliefs that engender self discipline and restraint. But a populace that no longer believes in absolutes and does not expect to face judgment at life's end can be a dangerous de-stabilizer. Perhaps, too late, the power elites understand

they may have created an amoral, unreasoning monster that will not be mollified when promised benefits fail to materialize. No amount of force can control an unreasoning, angry mob mentality, loosed among a populace that lacks self discipline and restraint.

Either way, ruling elites believe they must adopt radical measures to control the populace.

Last Chance?


I believe there is only one hope for maintaining freedom and a social order capable of restoring the greatness of this once blessed country. We must first repent before the divine author of our blessings and resolve to live as a people who truly believe that without the help of Almighty God, we are lost. Secondly we must no longer tolerate the insane prescriptions of those whose political and social theories have never worked, no matter where they have

been tried. It may be that the coming elections will be our last chance to begin the arduous task of restoring the country we love without experiencing the horrors that tend to accompany profound social dislocation. I can say without any reservation that those who fail to become politically involved and vote for candidates that are committed to the re-establishment of our Republic and its Constitution are unworthy of the title American. They are to my mind the most wretched of traitors.


"First they ignore you, then they ridicule you, then they fight you, then you win."

--Mahatma Gandhi.

RAHIREZ INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY
2010 © CREATORS.COM



WWW.IBDEditorials.com/cartoons



SPEAKING OF BOOK BURNING.

WWW.IBDEDITORIALS.COM/CARTOONS

FAMC, INC. SERVICES

- Economic and market forecasting.
- Information and analysis of world/domestic political events and their resultant impact on markets and business cycles.
- Information and analysis of current economic conditions and monetary trends.
- Information and analysis of banking conditions, specific banks, credit unions, and regulatory trends.
- Consultation for financial planning and asset allocation for individuals and corporations.
- Acquisition and sale for clients: gold, silver bullion, and other precious metals.
- Acquisition and sale for clients: rare coins and other numismatic material.
- Acquisition and exchange for clients: all major foreign currencies.
- Analysis and acquisition services for clients: real estate investments.
- Information summary to clients and subscribers through our monthly publication, *Monetary & Economic Review* and *Unravelling The New World Order*.
- Educational audio/video libraries; tapes and recommended books for sale to clients and subscribers.

For information, call in North America:
Memphis, TN office: 1-800-325-0919;
Fort Collins, CO office: 1-800-336-7000.

ANECDOTE

Some people
impart happiness
wherever they go.
Others, whenever
they go.

While the entire content of this newsletter is copyrighted, we lift the copyright for those wanting to disseminate this information by photocopying all or part of this material, provided it is not done for commercial purposes. Time is short, and we urge our readers to get this information into the hands of friends, relatives, and associates.



PUBLISHING INFORMATION

Unravelling The New World Order (ISSN 1542-3654) is published quarterly by FAMC, Inc., 2900 S. College Ave., Fort Collins, CO 80525. Publisher and Editor: Dr. Larry Bates. Associate Editor: Marilyn M. Brannan. *Unravelling The New World Order* presents news and factual information, and may, from time to time, include the views, opinions, and recommendations of individuals or organizations deemed to be of interest to our subscribers.

Entire contents copyright 2010 by FAMC, Inc. All rights reserved. Unauthorized duplication or reproduction, in any manner, in whole or in part, is prohibited by law. For permission to reprint any of the contents, call Cindy Standley, Vice President of Administration, at 1-800-336-7000.

Subscription rate: \$29 per year. For institutional or bulk rate discounts, contact our circulation department at 1-800-325-0919. For individual subscription, call 1-800-336-7000 or send check or money order to *Unravelling The New World Order*, c/o FAMC, Inc., 2900 S. College Ave., Fort Collins, CO 80525. MasterCard, Visa, and American Express accepted.