

Norman Dodd

Testimony on Regionalism

In 1978 the legislature of Illinois created a committee to study Regionalism in Illinois. The Committee held three hearings—the first in Springfield, Illinois, April 11, 1978; the second in Chicago, July 10, 1978; and the third and final hearing in Edwardsville, on September 26, 1978. The following is a transcript—from the September 26th hearing— of the testimony of Mr. Norman Dodd, beginning on page 51 and ending on page 61. Mr. Dodd was chief investigator in 1953 for U.S. Congressman, B. Carroll Reece, whose committee (referred to as the Reece Committee) investigated tax-exempt foundations.

The investigation was eventually narrowed down to about 10 foundations, chiefly among them being Rockefeller, Ford and Carnegie Foundations, their sub- foundations, and the Rhodes Scholarship Fund. Mr. Rene Wormser, Council for the Reece Committee subsequently wrote a book—titled “Foundations - Their Power and Influence”, which relates information uncovered during the hearings, as well as the difficulties and roadblocks encountered throughout. Congressman Cox had begun this process in the previous Congressional Session and died suddenly, bringing the hearings to a halt. Reece braved it out and the results are staggering to the mind of an American who once believed in a “free” America, under the Constitution.

In his book Wormser listed, among the major instruments of these foundations, the CFR, United Nations Association, Foreign Policy Association and Institute of Pacific Relations. From pg 200 – 201 of “Foundations...”: (remember, this was 1953)

“It would be difficult to find a single foundation-supported organization of any substance which has not favored the United Nations or similar global schemes; fantastically heavy foreign aid at the burdensome expense of the taxpayer; meddling in the colonial affairs of other nations; and American military commitments over the globe ... The influence of the foundation complex in internationalism has reached far into government, policymaking circles of Congress and State Department”.

“Foundations” is available through Covenant House Press; P.O. Box 4690, Sevierville, Tenn.; 37864. Regionalism is a plan which emanates from the United Nations, is taking place on a world scale, and its ultimate aim is to organize populations into groups small enough that no people can challenge a World Government. The 50 Sovereign States united in America have been unconstitutionally divided into ten federal Regions with populations a little over 20 million in each—comparable to the Regional population divisions in all other countries.

We, in America, are the last bastion of hope. Although the Regional Plan is deeply entrenched, although we are indeed at the 11th Hour, we can, by the loving Grace of God and our intelligent activity stop and reverse the process. The transcripts of the Illinois hearings are relevant to the further understanding of the plan to eliminate the states and to transform America into a region of the world government.

Transcript of Public Hearing,
Joint Committee on Regional Government,
September 26, 1978,
Edwardsville, Illinois

Norman Dodd (pp. 51 – 61)

MR. DODD: Mr. Chairman. After listening to the very able descriptions of how complex the question that is before the Committee is, I have been thinking in terms of drawing on my own experiences that relate to the development of the proposal called “regional government”, which might be helpful to the Committee. I think the Committee deserves to understand and have a first-hand look at the origin of the idea of regional government, and also to be made aware of the purpose for which the idea has been introduced, so I would like to share with the Committee two experiences.

One of them... and these experiences are traceable to a position that I, at one time, held as the Executive Director of a Congressional Committee that was called upon to investigate the relationship of the economy, really, and wealth in this country to the purpose

represented by the Constitution of the United States. As a result of that investigation, experiences began to accrue, and one of them stemmed from the entity—or the head of the entity—responsible for the proposition which you all now face called regional government.

This individual was the head of the Ford Foundation, and this experience took place back in 1953. It took the form of an invitation from the President of the Ford Foundation to me to visit the Foundation's offices, all of which I did, and on arrival, was greeted by the President of the Ford Foundation with this statement:

“Mr. Dodd, we have invited you to come to New York and stop in and see us in the hope that, off the record, you would tell us why the Congress of the United States should be interested in an operation such as ours”.

Before I could think of just exactly how I would reply, Mr. Gaither volunteered the following information, and these are practically in his exact words:

“Mr. Dodd, we operate here under directives which emanate from the White House. Would you like to know what the substance of these directives is?”

I said, “Indeed, I would, Mr. Gaither.” Whereupon he then said the following:

“We, here, operate and control our grant-making policies in harmony with the directives, the substance of which is as follows: We shall use our grant-making power so to alter life in the United States that it can be comfortably merged with the Soviet Union.”

This is a shocking, almost unbelievable attitude that you can run across. Nevertheless, this is what clarified the nature of the grants of this Foundation, which incidentally, of course, was the largest aggregation of privately-directed wealth in the United States.

Now, the second experience that I would like to share with you... oh, and incidentally, it is the Ford Foundation's grants which are responsible for the formulation of this idea of regional government, and also the idea that given regional government, we must, in turn, develop and accept and agree to a totally new Constitution which has already been drawn up, as was mentioned just a few minutes ago. [previous testimony]

The next experience ran this way. This followed an invitation from the head of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Also, it entailed visiting their offices, all of which I did. The invitation itself came because of a letter which I had written to the Carnegie

Endowment, asking them certain questions which would clarify the reasons for many of the grants which they had made over a period of time. On arrival at the office of the President, I was greeted with this statement:

“Mr. Dodd, we have received your letter. We can answer all the questions, but it will be great deal of trouble. The reason it will be a great deal of trouble is because, with the ratification by the Senate of the United States of the United Nations Treaty, our job was finished, so we bundled all our records up, spanning, roughly speaking, fifty years, and put them in the warehouse. But we have a counter-suggestion, and that counter-suggestion is that if you will send a member of your staff to New York, we will give them a room in our library and the minuted books of this organization since its inception in 1908.”

My first reaction to that suggestion was that these officers had more or less lost their minds. I had a pretty good idea, by that time, of what those minute books might well have shown. The executives who made this proposal to me were relatively recent, in terms of their position, and I was satisfied that none of them had ever read the minutes.

To make a long story short—as short as possible—a member of my staff was sent to New York and spent two weeks there, and did what they call “spot reading” of the minutes of this organization.

Now, we are back in the period of 1908, and these minutes reported the following: The Trustees of the Carnegie Endowment bring up a single question; namely, if it is desirable to alter the life of an entire people, is there any means more efficient than war to gain that end? And they discuss this question at a very high academic and scholarly level for a year, and they come up with an answer—there are no known means more efficient than war, assuming the objective is altering the life of an entire people.

That leads, then, to a question: How do we involve the United States in a war?

This was in 1909. I doubt if there was any question more removed, or any idea more removed from the minds of us, as a people, at that time than war. There were certain of what we call “intermittent shows” in the Balkans, and I also doubt if very many of us knew, really, where the Balkans was, or their relation or possible effect on us.

We jump, then, to the time when we are in a war, and these Trustees. . . oh, before that, the Trustees then answered the question of how to involve us in a war by saying, “We must

control the diplomatic machinery of the United States”; and then that brings up the question of how to secure that control, and the answer is we must control the State Department.

Now, at that point, research discloses a relationship between the effort to control the State Department and an entity which the Carnegie Endowment set up – namely, the Council of Learned Societies. And through that entity are cleared all of the appointments – high appointments in the State Department, and they have continued to be cleared that way since then.

Now, finally, we are in a war. Eventually, the war is over, and the Trustees turn their attention, then, to seeing to it that life does not revert in this country to what it was prior to 1914; and they hit upon the idea that in order to prevent that reversion, they must control education in this country. They realized that that is a perfectly tremendous, really stupendous and complex task – much too great for them alone. So they approached the Rockefeller Foundation, with the suggestion that the task be divided between the two of them.

The Carnegie Endowment takes on that aspect of education which is a domestic in its relationship. These two run along in tandem that way, disciplined by a decision—namely, that the answer lies entirely in the changing of the teaching of the history of the United States. They then approached the... five of the then most prominent historians in this country with the proposition that they alter the manner of the teaching of the subject, and they get turned down flatly; so they realized then they must build their own stable of historians, so to speak.

They approach the Guggenheim Foundation, which specializes in Fellowships, and suggest to them that when they locate a relatively young potential historian, will the Guggenheim Foundation give that person a Fellowship, merely on their say-so... and the answer is, they will.

Ultimately, a group of twenty are so assembled, and that becomes the nuclei of the policies which emanate to the American Historical Association. Subsequently, around 1928, the Carnegie Endowment granted to the American Historical Association \$400,000 in order to make a study of what the future of this country will probably turn out to be and should be. They came up with a seven-volume set of books, the last volume being a summary and digest of the other six. In the last volume, the answer is as follows:

“The future belongs to the United States ... the future in the United States belongs to collectivism administered with characteristic American efficiency”.

And that becomes the policy which is finally picked up and manifests itself in the expression of collectivism all along the line, of which the dividing of this country into regions, using all of the logic which supports the ultimate idea that in order that regional government, in turn, be effective, there must be a new Constitution of the United States.

That is the background, gentlemen, of this very serious question with which you all are now wrestling. I felt that, possibly, that might tend to help a little bit as you take on this high responsibility, which is tremendous. You must have been thoroughly impressed with the complexities which arrive and confront you if you do not go at this problem in terms of the origin of the idea and the real purpose behind that idea; and skipping all the way over to try to distill a system, or a working plan, whereby our society can cope with these complexities, such as they exist today. I am very appreciative of the opportunity to be with you. I wanted to make these points as brief as possible...

REP. LUCCO: Pardon me, Mr. Chairman. Will you please speak into the mike? I am not able to hear you.

MR. DODD: Oh, yes. I beg your pardon. I was saying that I appreciate very much the privilege of being with you. I wanted to give you these two bits of experience which tend to focus on the difficulty of discharging the responsibility which has been presented to you.

REP. HUDSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Dodd, for your testimony, and coming such a distance—as I believe you must have—to do so. Now, are there questions from the Committee membership?

REP. LUCCO: Yes, Mr. Dodd... Mr. Chairman, first.

REP HUDSON: Yes.

REP. LUCCO: Mr. Dodd, I shouldn't use the word “amaze”, but I am thoroughly amazed at your ability to recall and take us through history, which you have done, and I congratulate you on that. If you could, very briefly, for my edification—I'm just a little coal miner's son, and I haven't been around, except to two County Fairs and a Rodeo—but I

would like to know a little bit about you, sir. Could you, in a brief capsule, tell me—what have you done since, let's say the age of 25?

MR. DODD: Yes, indeed, I can, sir. My life has been spent in pretty nearly every phase of the world of finance that you can think of; that is, commercial banking, what they know as fiduciary banking, investment advisory work, membership in a firm that was a member of a Stock Exchange... Rep.

REP. LUCCO: Let me interrupt you, please, sir, if I might. As that type of background, how do you feel about holding companies and cartels and consolidation, branch banking, etc?

MR. DODD: Good gracious, you don't want me to start in on anything such as that....

REP. LUCCO: Well, to me it's relative because we are talking about regionalism, and to me, if regionalism is bad, then these other things could be bad.

MR. DODD: They not only could be, sir, but in my opinion, they are detrimental to the objectives of the founding fathers of this country.

REP. LUCCO: Fine. You've answered my question. Now, another thing. You took us back to 1908, and I came on the scene in 1912, about the time of the Balkan Wars, which you alluded to, and World War I. Now, today, and you said that we actually created—or “they”, whoever “they” are—actually created the situation of a war. Now that we have the...

MR. DODD: Wait, now. You deserve to know who the “they” are.

REP. LUCCO: I was going to ask you that.

MR. DODD: The “they” in this instance are the Trustees. . . were the Trustees of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. They were men who were prominent lawyers in New York; men like Nicholas Murray Butler, the head of Columbia University; also, and subsequently, Allen and Foster Dulles, as attorneys—that caliber of gentlemen.

REP. LUCCO: Then I'm trying to collate what you are talking about—1912—with 1978, the meeting at Camp David, the problems in the Middle East, the Sino-, or Chinese-Russian situation--are they now getting us ready for a third world war?

MR. DODD: My answer to that, sir, is that they have set forces in motion, and these forces cannot help but culminate in World War III. I happen to personally believe that it is possible to prevent it from working out that way, but I'm alone in my beliefs.

REP. HUDSON: Apparently, you're not alone, Mr. Dodd.

REP. LUCCO: No. I was in public education for 39 years. I basically am a history teacher. When I walk into a classroom today, I don't see American History taught—as you alluded to—as we used to teach it. American History, in fact, is not a course anymore. We have a general smattering of human relations, or what not, but not American History. That's what I was saying, and I agree with you on that.

Now, what I was going to ask. I came from a small community of about 700 people. I graduated from a High School of 110. When I graduated, in 1929—of course, you know, in those days we graduated real young; I was only 7, being only 39 now—but there were 7 of us in my graduating class, and I was the only [pg 60] boy. The 6 girls elected me President, and I have been trying to make up for that ever since. But the idea is that today we are doing away with these small, community schools. The problem, as I see it, is not only of regional government, but of consolidation of schools.

I was Principal of a High School here that had 1,900 students. When I came here, there were 550 students in this High School, and we had a lovely school, I thought. Then we got 1,000 and I thought we'd reached our peak; and from then on— and I'm not trying to be critical of anyone in the school administration—but I'm just saying that I think we've gotten too big; and with 1,950 students in our present High School in this community, we have problems that did not exist, and I don't think individuals have changed that much.

It is a matter of groupings and numbers of people; and you get too many people here. So I think you and I would be in agreement that possibly regionalism might lead, and is leading, and has led to consolidation of schools doing away with the small schools on the idea that they can't get a good education there. As I say, in my background (and I don't claim to be successful, by any means) but, coming from a coal-mining town, from a coal-mining family, from an ethnic background of Italian immigrants, I think we've done real well through the Depression, and all that, in the small school.

And so, I agree whole-heartedly with you with the idea that regionalism may—I mean , I'm talking about regional government—may lead to the wiping out of such things, and we

have so much busing, so much transportation, so much taxation, so big, so much budget, that I don't know whether we can continue living with it. Thank you very much.

REP HUDSON: Mr. Dodd, I have one question. You mentioned a proposed new Constitution, or federal charter, for this country, sort of waiting in the wings, you might say.

MR. DODD: Yes.

REP HUDSON: Is that the one... I have heard tell of a Tugwell type. Is that the one you refer to?

MR. DODD: That's it, sir.

REP. HUDSON: Thank you. All right, well, thank you very much, Mr. Dodd. We are grateful for your being here.

End of Dodd Testimony. Further critical testimony will be forthcoming. We urge you to share this information with State legislators who are implementing Regional Governance through the many bills they pass, unknowingly.

Permission is granted and we urge you to redistribute to lists, web sites, etc. Because of evidence presented in the hearings which convinced the Illinois Committee members of the dangers of Regionalism, the Committee proposed, and the Illinois General Assembly passed, legislation which would create a standing committee. The duties of the standing Committee were to STOP any further encroachment of Regional Governance in Illinois and to begin repealing legislation which had already been passed by the General Assembly implementing the Regional Plan. The legislation was vetoed by the Governor, and there were evidently insufficient votes (2/3) to override the veto. The rest is history.