

THE SOUNDING MEGAPHONE



ISSUE 22, JANUARY 2020



THE SOUNDING MEGAPHONE



Freedom of speech is a fundamental right in free societies. Do we have freedom of speech in Canada? I welcome you to read along on this issue and on my article on Social Engineering. God bless you.

Shawn Stevens

P. O. Box 933,
Lynden, WA 98264,
U. S. A.

You understand that by reading this magazine, you might be exposed to content that you regard to be offensive or objectionable and that you read this magazine at your own risk. We do not intend to offend anyone, however, what is offensive to one person may not be offensive to another. It is difficult, if not impossible, to speak on controversial topics in a clear way without offending someone. We ask that viewers would receive the contents of this magazine in the spirit in which they are given, that is, to speak the truth on sensitive issues in a loving way that does not compromise our conscientious convictions. Freedom of speech is a provision of The Canadian Charter of Rights And Freedoms (Section 2). We want to express in the clearest language possible that all statements made in this issue are meant to be taken not in malice towards any identifiable people group but, rather, as discussion on issues of public interest, for public benefit, in good faith. Our views on the issues contained here are also consistent with our faith beliefs which are contained in our statement of faith which can be viewed on our website freedomandsocialorder.com. Whether you agree or disagree with what we have stated here, we bless you and invite your feedback.

Visit our websites: <http://freedomandsocialorder.com/>
AND <http://zionchristianministry.com>

THE SOUNDING MEGAPHONE ISSUE 22

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

When most people think of human rights, they commonly think of concepts such as the right to pursuing sustenance, happiness and, perhaps, the right to education. Another freedom which is high on the list of human rights is the freedom of speech.

Freedom of speech is something that we often hear professors and radical activists demanding.

However, if freedom of speech is a basic human right, then all people in society have a right to use it, including Christians.

True freedom of speech allows for the free flow of ideas, including the expression of contrary ideas. This is often useful in determining courses of action in many different arenas and is needed in making social decisions. Even though freedom of speech is useful and constructive in many ways, freedom of speech is under attack in our postmodern world,

as well as in postmodern Canada.

A major idea which is set in opposition to freedom of speech is “inclusivism.” Inclusivism, or inclusive speech, is simply perceived “political correctness.” It is the refusal to speak things that would be divisive or offensive. It has the motive of including as many people as possible in something, without saying something that would push some person away.

Unfortunately, inclusivism has been applied to not only the refusal to speak divisively but, in many areas, the refusal to let others speak what they sincerely believe.

While in many contexts it is a positive thing to be inclusive, it is unrealistic and impossible to be inclusive in all things. We live in a real world. We live in a world with real issues that hotly divide society. We live in a society with contrary

and conflicting values. Once we require one segment of society to be silent on the values that it holds, we are violating the principle of freedom of speech.

Today, there are possibly no greater examples in of the stifling of free speech as the prohibition in many workplaces, institutions and public forums on critical objections being raised to the homosexual lifestyle and towards the abortion-on-demand movement. Those who come to these issues with heart-felt concerns, and convictions which do not support these movements, are often called “bigoted” or “homophobic” and are sometimes subjected to prosecution or disciplinary action.

Inclusiveness, many times, is just a code word for “group-think” (either coined by or used by Irving Janis).¹ It is the pressuring of individuals to adopt the views of a group, without any expression of opposition or dissent being allowed. The

dynamics of group-life are such that pressure is placed on individuals to abandon their personal views, or values, for the perceived good of the group.

In some contexts, inclusiveness and group-think may be constructive as teams work towards a common goal. However, when well-meaning, conscientious objections towards issues are being interpreted as hate towards people, and banned as such, then inclusiveness has gone too far and is being abused. In such cases, freedom of speech is being violated.

What is “hate” and should people be allowed to speak it? Hatred must be carefully qualified when evaluated in relation to free speech. I think that people should not direct hatred at individuals or groups of people. However, hatred may, quite rightly, be directed at issues or lifestyles. For

example, few would argue against hating the practice of slavery or against hating the vice of racism. It is right, and good, to directly speak out against these evils. If someone participating in the practice of slavery, or racism, was offended by such remarks, they have no real right to be prosecuting such speech. In a similar way, practices, such as the homosexual lifestyle and abortion, should be spoken against. To do so, is not the same as hating individual people, or people-groups, involved in these practices.

Christians make a careful distinction between hating the sin while loving the sinner. This distinction must be recognized when addressing the issue of hatred and free speech. Christians are called to love and show Christ-like compassion towards others. Christians are also called to stand for what the Bible teaches on moral issues. On the topic of same-sex lifestyle, the Bible says; “Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is

abomination.” (Leviticus 18:22). Christians, and people in general, have a moral obligation to hate what is evil and to love what is good.

Historically, other regions in our 21st-century world have forbidden freedom of speech and freedom of dissent. Communist parties and totalitarian regimes crush and punish dissent and deny freedom of speech. By doing so, in many cases, regimes have streamlined their political operations, but at what cost? They have done so at the sacrifice of human rights and this is horribly wrong. Sadly, Canadian society has taken some steps down this same road of banning public dissent. Restricting freedom of speech and banning dissent may, in some ways, streamline Canadian politics and make society more inclusive but it ignores the larger issue of personal freedom. Instead of valuing its citizens as free

people, who have a right to their own opinions, society and governments sometimes view them as problems and obstacles to progress, as they define it. More seriously, they regard people's human rights and freedoms as problems and obstacles to their course of perceived progress.

What is fair play in the field of freedom of speech? Fair play allows for objections. Fair play also responds to objections to issues with responses to issues. That is to say, that when someone speaks out in objection to an issue, then that person's position should be heard and response should be made to the position, not necessarily to the person.

However, all too often, when someone speaks out against the homosexual lifestyle or abortion, the response to their objection, instead of being directed at the issue in contention, it is directed at the individual. The person raising the objection is often called a bigot or homophobic, instead of response being made to

the issue objected to. In such cases, it is the name-caller who is guilty of hatred, not the one objecting to the issue of the homosexual lifestyle or abortion. We need full freedom of speech to expose and respond to the weak arguments put forward in defence of the gay lifestyle and abortion-on-demand.

This distinction, of separating the issue from the person, must be made if we are ever to regain freedom of speech in Canada. It is wrong for governments, or institutions, to crush dissent or force conformity on conscientious objectors regarding controversial activities. Many would allow for freedom of thought in private life but would ban it in public life. However, thought in private becomes speech in public. It is a form of mind-control to take away a person's freedom of speech when in public life.

To take away freedom of

speech is to shut the door on reform. Human societies, institutions and countries cannot grow and progress without reform. Canada needs reform. Canada needs freedom of speech.

To deny a people freedom of speech is to deny them their very identity. It is to demand a surrender of their identity and to insist that they conform to something foreign to their very beliefs and values. Freedom of speech, even in democratic nations, is a precious freedom that is becoming fragile. When governments take steps to limit the freedom of speech of their citizens, it shows that those governments view their citizens as anomalies and even obstacles to their national plans. Without the freedom to express dissent, there is no possibility for reforming our world. This is too important a freedom to let go of. 2

Freedom of speech is directly connected to freedom of conscience. In the early days of

settlement in North America, Puritans left England in search of freedom to practice their faith and speak its truths. They found this freedom on the shores of North America. This is one of the great virtues of colonial America. Modern-day America and Canada must decide if they will again be known for this essential freedom.

Freedom of speech allows freedom of belief and the profession of it. A Christian's profession of faith is the most important profession he or she will ever make in their lifetime. Freedom of belief is a fundamental human right and the freedom to profess that belief is every bit as fundamental and foundational to a person's humanity. To disallow a believer the right to profess his or her faith is to reject that person's humanity. How? It is rejecting a person's humanity because a Christian's faith is the foundational thing by which he or she defines

themselves; it is their very identity.

Canada is a country which has a long history of extending freedom to its citizens. However, in recent history, for a time, activists and special-interest groups had been successful in establishing “hate speech” legislation in Canada. Hate speech laws were set up in the 1970's and were codified in section 13 of the human rights act. Since that time over 100 Canadians have come under fire from this legislation. Conservative reforms led to revisions being made. Canadian hate speech legislation, after being revised, did make some provision for religious doctrine and did allow critical speech directed toward an identifiable group on religious grounds. The first revision established that free speech was not to be prosecuted “if, in good faith, the person expressed or attempted to establish by an argument an opinion on a religious subject or an opinion based on a belief in a religious text.”³ Many activists were

upset by this provision and would like to have seen it changed. For a season, freedom of religion and freedom of speech in this country depended on this provision. The situation changed again when Conservative MP Brian Storseth put forward Bill C-304, which having passed, has repealed the section 13 hate speech clause from the Human Rights Act. This is the single greatest victory for freedom of speech that our nation has ever seen. The greatest barrier to freedom of speech in our country was the human rights code itself. This does not mean that speech cannot be prosecuted in Canada. What it does mean is that speech over the internet or over the phone cannot be investigated and prosecuted by Canada's Human Rights Tribunals. This does not mean that the battle over freedom of speech is completely over. There are also federal restrictions on certain kinds of speech

allowed on public broadcasting.

Freedom of speech in Canada is still tenuous. Liberals have long favoured hate speech laws and former Justice Minister Jody Wilson-Raybould's office has said that they are considering reviving section 13. Canadian parliament also passed an Islamophobia motion that calls for government to condemn anti-Islamic rhetoric.

Sometimes people can't express in print all that they would like to because of copyright laws. This is regarding quoted material. I think that this is a form of denying freedom of speech. I would like to see reforms come to copyright law which would expand the boundaries of "Fair Use" and the Public Domain. I also think that publishers should not be allowed to hold rights over works that they allow to go out of print.

Freedom of speech is a basic human right, as fundamental as any, within a democratic society. Freedom of speech allows for the free flow of ideas and the

expression of both affirmation and dissent. In our country of Canada an on-going battle is being fought as the boundaries of freedom of speech are hotly debated. May God keep our land glorious and free.

Shawn Stevens

ENDNOTES:

1. Tammy Bruce, *The New Thought Police – Inside the Left's Assault on Free Speech and Free Minds* (Roseville: Prima Publishing, FORUM, 2001).
2. Thomas R. Berger, *Fragile Freedoms* (Toronto: Irwin Publishing, 1982).
3. Section 319 of Canadian Criminal Code. info@cipme.org
- 4.

REFERENCES :

Berger, Thomas R. *Fragile Freedoms*. Toronto: Irwin Publishing, 1982.

Brasch, Walter M. *Social Foundations Of The Mass Media*. Lanham: University Press of America, 2001.

Bruce, Tammy. *The New Thought Police*. Roseville: Prima Publishing, 2001.

Canadian Criminal Code, Section 319. info@cipme.org

Cookson, Catharine.
Ed. *Encyclopedia of Religious Freedom*. New York: Routledge,

2003.

Levant,
Ezra. *Shakedown*. Toronto:
McClelland & Stewart, 2009.

<https://nationalpost.com/news/politics/liberals-reviewing-option-to-revive-controversial-hate-speech-law-repealed-in-2013>

“Hate Speech Laws in Canada” http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hate_speech_laws_in_Canada

Scripture taken from the King James Version.

SOCIAL ENGINEERING

Imagine if you were to ask someone what they did for a living. Imagine they answer, “Oh, I'm an engineer.” Then you ask further, “What kind of engineer are you? Are you a civil engineer, constructing and designing buildings and other public works? Are you an electrical engineer, studying and designing various electronic systems? Are you a mechanical engineer, designing mechanical systems?” Now, imagine they answer, “No, I'm a social engineer. It is my responsibility to use my position of authority and power to bend the minds of people and to change their whole way of thinking and behaving in the overall goal of

creating a new society where people think, believe and behave the way myself and a core of elite want them to think, believe and behave. I'm a social engineer.” You would probably throw up your hands and cry, “Conspiracy!” Could it ever happen in a civilized society that the financial, political and educational elite would involve themselves in a program of social engineering? Many today believe that such elite have done just that. A brief walk through history may shed light on this fear.

History has much light to shed on social engineering. What is social engineering? Social engineering can be called a

discipline within social science that involves influencing the attitudes and behaviours of people within society on a large scale. It is the restructuring of culture itself by government, media and other elite members of society.

The term is also used for a type of computer crime but I am not using this application of the term in this article. Could it be that our educational system and media are brainwashing the public towards a planned-out way of thinking, believing and acting? Who are these elite and what do they believe about themselves? They are among those who are the most financially advantaged members of society. Not all financially advantaged members of society are necessarily trying to social

engineer their society.

However, it would seem that some are. These ones often see themselves as being above the common members of society. They occupy a superior status that they feel is a reflection of their advanced wisdom, knowledge, intelligence and virtue. They see themselves as especially qualified to lead and to direct according to their advanced judgment. For the most part, we will be looking at Western history in this article.

To understand social engineering as it exists in modern western society, we must understand its predecessor, the eugenics movement.

What is eugenics? The word “eugenics” was first coined in 1883 by the British scientist, Francis Galton. Galton used the word “eugenics” to convey social uses by which information on a person's heredity could be used for selective breeding. Eugenics represented the idea of the social selection of “fit” persons within society and the removal of “unfit” persons. Fit persons were those deemed strong, healthy and independent, whereas, unfit persons were those who, in some way, were dependent on the society, social order and family to which they belonged. Eugenics presupposed that fitness and unfitness was largely determined by heredity and that positive changes in humanity could be

obtained by selective breeding. Before the word “eugenics” was used in 1883, the idea had already been hashed around and developed by philosophers for a long time. In 1798, the English writer, Thomas Malthus, theorized that the finite world food supply would not be enough to support the expanding human population worldwide and that population control was needed to address this deficiency. He also spoke out against charity for the poor. In 1850, Herbert Spencer taught that man and society followed the rules of cold science and not that of a caring God. He was the first to coin the phrase “survival of the fittest.”¹ This would become a much-used

phrase in years to come, especially in evolutionary circles. Spencer taught that the fittest would perfect society and the unfit would become more impoverished, less educated and die off.¹ Eugenics has always been about population control.

The publishing of Charles Darwin's book, *The Origin Of Species*, in 1859, added tremendous fuel to the developing philosophy, not yet named, of eugenics. Darwin's theory was built on the concept of the survival of the fittest and, after him, a fury of philosophers began writing on the topic of the biological breeding of the strong people in society and leaving the weak to perish. By the time

Galton coined the word “eugenics” in 1883, the concept was already highly developed and popular. As things digressed, the concept of “unfit” was expanded to include “races” of people, not only the handicapped and the poor. Between 1890 and 1920, 18 million refugees migrated to the United States. Rather than blending into a melting pot of culture and diversity, most retained their distinctive differences and there was little integration. The mainstream culture had little patience for those who would not, or could not, integrate and racism in America skyrocketed. All of these developments influenced the philosophy of eugenics

during this time. Many social activists began voicing their belief that some people and some people-groups were superior to other people and other people-groups. It was not long before such opinions were being spread, not only by social activists but by elite philosophers, educators and politicians.

When discussing the spread of eugenics by activists, philosophers, educators and politicians, it would be hard

to overstate the extent to which they popularized the philosophy of eugenics in America during the late-nineteenth century and early-twentieth century.

Well-placed scientists, medical doctors and social activists were instrumental in mainstreaming eugenics as the science of their day. In fact, eugenics had become so much a part of health reform by the 1920s that anyone daring to criticize it was mocked.

While eugenics was finding a place among universities in America, it was also making inroads into the political arena. In America, for example, on January 29th of 1907, the Indiana representative, Horace Reed, introduced a bill which was later passed. This eugenics bill made lawful the sterilization of poor-house residents, the mentally impaired and prisoners. The State of Washington also adopted the use of sterilization of habitual criminals, as did California and Nevada, of convicts. Connecticut sterilized mental asylum residents. Iowa sterilized those it considered “criminals, idiots, feeble-minded, imbeciles, drunkards, drug fiends,

epileptics, ... moral or sexual perverts,” whom they had in custody. ⁴ In 1911, the State of New Jersey passed legislation which created a “Board of Examiners of Feebleminded, Epileptics and Other Defectives.” ⁵ The term “other defectives” was ambiguous and open to interpretation. The board was also to identify prisoners and children, residing in poor-houses as well as charitable institutions, of whom “procreation is inadvisable.” ⁶ Decisions were made in a formal hearing where persons being considered defective were given a court-appointed attorney, but denied a family-hired or personally-selected attorney. New Jersey's

governor, Woodrow Wilson, signed the bill into law on April 21, 1911. In 1912, the State of New York practically duplicated the New Jersey legislation for its own state. It would shock many readers that in the United States thousands of people were sterilized involuntarily. Statistics vary on the exact numbers. The most conservative figures begin at 60,000, though the highest numbers are estimated at up to 180,000. 7

The most famous eugenics program was that of Adolf Hitler. Hitler exterminated six million Jews in a gigantic eugenics experiment. The horror of this influenced public opinion against

eugenics. The Nazi regime had forever blackened what had previously been a well-accepted philosophy, that is, eugenics. The elites who funded the eugenics movements around the world began dropping the word for what they were doing, as well.

Most people are aware of the triumphs of the civil rights movement within American society which led to Afro-Americans to be treated more fairly in the twentieth century than in previous centuries.

Many people assume that the discrimination that Afro-Americans faced was a result of a grass-roots prejudice against

them on the part of common white American society. Most do not realize how entrenched racism was, not only within common society but, within the upper levels of American society as a direct result of the eugenics movement. Eugenics projects like *The National Committee For Mental Hygiene's Sterilization Program* received financial support from Rockefeller philanthropies. The wealthy Rockefeller philanthropies were also involved with the *Bureau of Social Hygiene*. (For more information on eugenics, read my writings *The Rising and Falling of Western Civilization*, *The Truth About Planned Parenthood* and *Charles Darwin and The Races of Man*).

Social engineering has always been a component of eugenics as well as being a separate science of its own. It has existed within and alongside of eugenics. After eugenics lost its public appeal, social engineering continued as a discipline of studies and also as an experiment, as it has been applied in western society. The turn of the twentieth century saw an increasing interest in what is called *The Science of Man*. This was, in fact, a renewed interest in the human being. It attempted to delve into every aspect of human nature from the psychological dimensions of people to the social aspects of human relationships to the biological

breakdown of the human being itself. Why were, and why are, elites so intent on understanding the human being and the human mind?

In the field of psychology, the 1920s saw the rise of behaviorism. Behaviorism emphasizes that changes in human behavior can come about by frequent repetition of desired actions with rewards and discouragements. Behaviorism observes behavior and seeks to understand how to predict behavior and even how to control behavior. A great deal of interest was now directed at understanding the human psyche.

The sociological roots of social engineering stretched back into the nineteenth century and, in some regards, can be traced to the sociologist, Edward Alsworth Ross. Ross began writing on the topic of "*Social Control*."

Social Control went on to become a major field of study within sociology, itself.

Ross argued in favor of a new liberalism that would accept inequality and class conflict in favor of advancing the social interests of society.

As liberalism would evolve in the twentieth century, it took on more and more aspects of social control. It advocated eugenic ideals such as abortion on demand. It embraced socialism. Socialism and communism, while advocating for equality, actually have delivered a police state in every society where they have been implemented. Police states are the epitome of social control. Liberalism also supports an environmental movement that increases government regulation in the name of protecting the environment. This increase of regulation also serves to increase social controls.

Twentieth-century higher

education did not stop at studying psychology and sociology but also began exploring the science of man from a whole new angle, the biological dimension. Eugenics had taught that human behavior was a result of human traits that were inbred. Biologists now began coding the connections between physical structural biological mechanisms and behavior. Genes came into focus as a supposed indicator of human behavior.

The financially elite Rockefeller Foundation began funding the collaborative work of geneticists, biophysicists and biochemists to explore the role

of proteins in determining power over heredity. Many geneticists came to accept the idea that proteins determined behavior.

Throughout the 1930s, 1940s and into the 1950s the Rockefeller Foundation heavily supported research projects into human genetics.

As molecular biology progressed through the twentieth century, the 1950s saw the discovery of DNA. This discovery was monumental because DNA was found to be self-replicating and it contains the genetic information that many geneticists believe guide human nature and behavior. Because DNA is self-replicating, some social engineers began dreaming

of the possibility of manipulating DNA in ways that would influence behavior.

The Rockefeller Foundation has come under much criticism for assisting in the development and funding of the German eugenics program in Nazi Germany. Another financial giant, the Carnegie Institution, has also been criticized for supporting the eugenics movement. Why have organizations, such as these, invested in such a socially destructive cause as social eugenics? Why have they also invested so much into the science of man and social sciences? The Rockefeller Foundation funded the

construction of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institutes', institute for brain research. The Rockefeller Foundation created the International Health Commission which established the School of Hygiene and Public Health at John Hopkins University and, later, at Harvard and went on to spend 25 million dollars in developing other public health schools. It funded a twenty-year support program to research and educate on birth control, sex education and maternal health. In 1918, the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial (LSRM) was established which was involved in supporting research into social science. In 1922, Beardsley Rumi was hired to direct the LSRM and, more than

ever before, he shifted Rockefeller philanthropies towards social science. He also created the Social Science Research Council. Overall, the Rockefeller Foundation has donated over 14 billion dollars to education and research and this has been divided between 1) health, medical and population sciences, 2) agricultural and natural sciences, 3) social sciences, 4) international relations and 5) arts and humanities. It has also been a big supporter of the United Nations. The Carnegie Corporation of New York is also involved in supporting higher education and advanced research on learning and cognitive development and on

public interest broadcasting. How might the new technologies that arise out of this research affect our lives?

Up until the 1950s, the Rockefeller Foundation had been possibly the largest private financial contributor to sociological and biological studies. In the 1950s, another financial super-giant, The Ford Foundation, began investing in behavioral studies. They coined the term “behavioral sciences” and by 1957 had contributed almost 24 million dollars to behavioral research. Dr. Linus Pauling of Caltech (California Institute of Technology) was one beneficiary of this funding.

Dr. Pauling advocated using this new science of DNA to purify the human germ plasm pool and to treat defects caused by heredity. He also advocated for population control and birth control. He said; “We shall have to find some way to purify the pool of human germ plasm so that there will not be so many seriously defective children born. ... We are going to have to institute birth control, population control.”⁸ I disagree with this because it is like playing God. A new eugenics was born, one based on DNA manipulation to create desired traits in humans. What traits will the scientific and medical communities create in the new generation of humans. Robert

Sinsheiner, from Caltech, said:

“The old eugenics was limited to a numerical enhancement of the best of our existing gene pool.

The new eugenics would permit in principle the conversion of all the unfit to the highest genetic level.”⁹ I disagree with this new eugenics because, like the old eugenics, it still views some of society as unfit. Again, Dr.

Pauling, from Caltech, even went so far as to say; “There should be tattooed on the forehead of every young person a symbol showing possession of the sickle-cell gene or whatever other similar gene. ...

It is my opinion that legislation along this line, compulsory testing for defective gene before marriage, and some form of semi-public display of this possession,

should be adopted.”¹⁰ I

disagree with this opinion of Dr. Pauling because it has no regard for the human rights and privacy of individuals who do not wish to be identified by their genes and who do not consider themselves to be defectives.

Historically, as the nature versus nurture debate unfolded, psychologists and sociologists coming down on the side of nurture and biologists and geneticists coming down on the side of nature, each was well funded to conduct their research by financial elites represented by organizations such as the Rockefeller Foundation, the

Ford Foundation and others. It was all a part of the science of man. Their studies were aimed at understanding human behavior. The result of their research has been clamored over by the elite. What will they do with this information? What will social engineers do with this information?

ENDNOTES :

1. Herbert Spencer, quoted in Edwin Black, *War Against The Weak* (New York: Four Walls Eight Windows, 2003), 12.
2. Nancy Leys Stepan, *The Hour of Eugenics* (London: Cornell University Press, 1991), 5.
3. Edwin Black, *War Against The Weak*, 9.
4. Ibid., 68.
5. Ibid., 68.
6. Ibid., 68.
7. J. P. Watson, "Psychology as the Behaviorist Views It," *Psychological Reviews*, 20 (1913), 158-177.
8. CIT, Historical File, Box 88, Pauling File, "The Next Hundred Years," pgs 10-12. KRCA , Channel 4, December 13, 1958. Also OSU, Pauling Papers, "The Future of Science and Medicine," John P. Peters Memorial Lecture,

- Yale, November 17, 1958
9. Robert Sinsheiner, "The Prospect of Designed Genetic Change," *Engineering and Science*, 32 (1969), pp. 8-13.
 10. Linus Pauling, "Reflections on the New Biology," *UCLA Law Review*, 15 (1968), p. 269.

REFERENCES :

Black, Edwin. *War Against The Weak*. New York: Four Walls Eight Windows, 2003.

CIT, Historical File. Box 88.

Pauling File, "The Next Hundred Years". KRCA , Channel 4, December 13, 1958.

Kay, Lily E. *The Molecular Vision of Life – Caltech, The Rockefeller Foundation, And The Rise Of The New Biology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Leys Stepan, Nancy. *The Hour of Eugenics*. London: Cornell University Press, 1991.

Maafa 21. Denton, Tx: Life Dynamics, Inc., 2010. DVD.

OSU, Pauling Papers. "The Future of Science and Medicine." John P.

Peters Memorial Lecture, Yale. November 17, 1958.

Pauling, Linus. "Reflections on the New Biology." *UCLA Law Review*, 15 (1968).

Sinsheiner, Robert. "The Prospect of Designed Genetic Change." *Engineering and Science*, 32 (1969).

Watson, J. P. "Psychology as the Behaviorist Views It." *Psychological Reviews*, 20 (1913).

INTERNET REFERENCES :

"Social Engineering." Wikipedia.
[en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_engineering_\(political_science\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_engineering_(political_science))

"The Philosophy of Social Engineering – An Irrational and Inconsistent World View." rebirthofresearch.com/Articles/Youngkins/The_Philosophy_of_Social_Engineering_And_Irrational_and_Inconsistent_Worldview.shtml

"Rockefeller Foundation." Wikipedia.
en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rockefeller_Foundation

“Carnegie Corporation of New York.” Wikipedia.

en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carnegie_Corporation_of_New_York.