Published and distributed by
InfoText Manuscripts,
93c Venner Road,
Sydenham,
London SE26 5HU.

ISBN 1-871473-06-3

Windows 3.1 and the END of WAR

or *George Weiss/World Peace*

2nd printing

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Windows 3.1 and the END of War or George Weiss/World Peace
324.6

ISBN 1-871473-06-3

Publisher's Foreword

This short publication is intended as a discussion document, a near-iconoclast and a kick in the teeth for the unelected, self-perpetuating university graduate elites of this world who think ordinary people are too stupid to make up their own minds on such trivial issues as whether or not to send their own sons to die in foreign wars and whether or not to commit genocide in the name of Mammon.

This publication is also available on 720k IBM compatible 3¬1/2 floppy disk. [Send a floppy disk plus sae to the above address.] Contributions: E-mail, letters, commissions, invitations to talk shows and especially money, are also welcome, especially by George Weiss.

Windows 3.1 and the

END of WAR

or *George Weiss\World Peace*

Although it has been fashionable for some considerable time to push the idea that wars are caused by "nationalism", this is simply not true. The causes of war are many and varied. Those who are forever taking pot shots at "nationalism" do so because they have a vested interest (or think they have a vested interest) in promoting one-worldism. The naïve, euphoric dream of John Lennon's song *Imagine* of a world of ever-lasting peace in which there will be no war, hunger or want, in which the wolf will lie down with the lamb and where we will all live happy ever after.

This piece of piffle is the bait used to lure the suckers into the trap of one-world government, which in reality will be one enormous cartel run by the power brokers of the Trilateral Commission and their dupes in politics, academia, the media etc. All we have to do is encourage each nation to surrender its national sovereignty to the all-powerful United Nations, which will administer justice through the world court, and all disputes will be settled by arbitration. (1)

If this sounds like an extract from that perfidious piece of garbage, *The Protocols of Zion,* the reader should think again. A careful reading of Trilateralist and other literature reflects this argument in spirit if not in words. (2)

All the same, there are many people who sincerely believe that a world dictatorship would be a small price to pay if it eliminated war for ever. Leaving aside the undeniable facts that the United Nations has proved itself totally incapable of preventing war, that it unilaterally endorsed the Gulf War and the genocide of the Iraqi people to resolve what was essentially a local dispute, and that the UN resembles a zoo rather more than a world court, in which "anti-Imperialist", anti-Semitism and every other bigotry are rampant, the simple fact is that world government does not promise world peace, but world dictatorship.

Already, we in Europe are being coerced, intimidated, bullied, cajoled and threatened into surrendering our respective national sovereignties to a supra-national deity in Brussels and a totally uncontrollable central bank in Germany. With world government will come not world peace but a tyrannical world order in which the people planners will decide who should live where, who should manufacture what, how much he will be able to sell it for and what all of us will be able to read, hear, see, and, most ominously of all, think. If that thought doesn't frighten you, bear in mind that some faceless bureaucrat in New York, Washington or Brussels will have the power to run a motorway through your back garden and there will be sweet F All you can do about it. And we still won't be any nearer to eliminating war.

All the above scenarios, indeed all the laws passed by our own Parliament, are presented as trade offs: comfort, security, peace for freedom. Every law that is passed, however well meaning, is essentially a further restriction on the right of the man and woman in the street to do what he or she pleases. Okay, we must have some laws, people can't choose which side of the road to drive on, but consider this. The government has passed laws against drugs, yet we've still got drugs. It's passed laws against incitement, yet

we've still got bigots. It's passed laws against the IRA (the *Prevention of Terrorism Act*) yet we've still got people letting off bombs. In effect, all many laws do is criminalise legitimate (if socially undesirable) behaviour, cause resentment among otherwise law abiding citizens and restrict such fundamental freedoms as the right of free speech, free associa tion, freedom of movement, and, in the case of the new drugs legislation, the presumption of innocence. In other words, they have all eroded rather basic freedoms and civil liberties on the spurious grounds of defending them.

On the world stage, the lie we are sold is that by surrendering our national sovereignties, ie local democracy, we can eliminate war. That is a small price which everybody should pay willingly, is it not?

The only intelligent reply to this is unprintable.

The United Nations has demonstrated the utter vacuousness of that promise, but even if it were attainable, why should we erode democracy to achieve world peace when we can extend democracy in order to discourage conflict? But first, what really does cause war?

This is a bit like asking what causes crime? It is a simplistic question without a simplistic answer. The plain truth is that there are as many causes of war as there are wars. Wars start because of petty nationalism, the suppression of nationalism, mad dictators, idiots, misunderstandings and a host of other simple and complex causes. It is no more true that Saddam Hussein started the Gulf War by invading Kuwait than it is true that George Bush started it, or that the United Nations started it.

John Kander and Fred Ebb wrote a song called *Money Makes The World Go Round*, and while it is not true that wars are always traceable directly or indirectly to financial causes, it is true that wars once started are unnecessarily and often intentionally prolonged because vested interests find them extremely profitable. Under the current, lunatic, debt-based financial system, a profit can only be made at somebody else's expense. If the people who make profits out of wars also had to bear the costs, how long would they last?

The profits of wars can be measured in dollars, land, power etc. The debit column is measured in dollars, property, freedom, hate, bitterness, and, most terrible of all, human life. Soldiers are mostly young men, and, in this age of sexual equality, women. It is noticeable that young men are often enthusiastic about joining the army, their mothers less so. If the mothers of soldiers and prospective soldiers had the final say on whether or not to fight a particular war, it is inarguable that very few if any wars would be fought.

Enter George Weiss

What, one might ask, has all this to do with *Windows 3.1* and a middle-aged computer illiterate drop-out from Hampstead? Here is the connection. George Weiss, alias Captain Rainbow of the Rainbow Alliance Party, wants to abolish Parliament and have everybody vote by computer. (3)

Nobody takes George seriously, and why should they? A former diamond broker who jacked it all in, opted out for a *New Age* lifestyle, reclining on the dole, sharing a house with twelve hundred audio tapes, a massive pile of press cuttings and not much else. He hasn't paid the rent for nigh on ten years, he hasn't paid his printer, or MORI; the bailiffs have taken every thing of worth, and on top of it all,

the man is a convicted drug trafficker. Why should anyone take George Weiss seriously?

There is a widely-held misconception that the common people, those of us with little or no technical or scientific knowledge, should leave government to the "experts". A little knowledge is a dangerous thing, they say; the man in the street, the housewife... can't possibly make decisions about such things as national or local government, social policy, financial reform...

This would be true if all "experts" always knew what they were talking about; experience suggests otherwise. In fact, "experts" often disagree on a wide variety of issues: scientific, medical, social...as many court cases prove. One thing most experts in the political arena seem to agree on unanimously is that it is okay for other men's sons to kill each other in time of war. This is because these "experts", usually highly paid university graduates, do not have to bear the costs themselves. If it were their own sons who were dying they would quickly come to a different conclusion.

There is an old proverb that he who pays the piper calls the tune; this is not always so, but it is certainly only fit and proper when so much is at stake that he who pays the piper *should* call the tune. Power is not of itself a bad thing, but power without responsibility definitely is. Why should one group of people (bankers, arms manufacturers et al) reap the harvest of war while another group (boy soldiers, widows and weeping mothers) pays the price?

George Weiss (pronounced Weace as in peace) has made the alarmingly (disarmingly?) simple suggestion that the power to wage war should be taken out of the hands of faceless bureaucrats, bellicose politicians, media propagandists and international bankers, and placed in the hands of the people who are best qualified to decide whether or not a war is in the best interests of the nation, or the people who have to pay the price.

As stated, George actually goes much further than this, he wants people to vote by computer on a much wider range of issues. (4) This may or may not be practicable at this moment in time, but an instant computer referendum could be held tomorrow, or certainly next month, on a subject of such major importance as:

SHALL WE BOMB IRAQ AND MURDER UPWARDS OF A HUNDRED THOUSAND INNOCENT PEOPLE JUST SO WE CAN KEEP THE OIL FLOWING IN THE PERSIAN GULF AND THE WORLD STOCK MARKETS RIDING HIGH?

Of course, the actual phrasing of the question needn't be so quite so neutral. How about instead:

THIS ONE IS FOR MARRIED WOMEN AND MOTHERS ONLY, (THE LATTER WHETHER MARRIED OR NOT WHOSE ELDEST CHILD IS AT LEAST FIFTEEN). DO YOU WANT TO SEND YOUR SON(S) TO THE GULF TO DIE FOR THE AMIR OF KUWAIT, THE OIL COMPANIES, THE TRILATERAL COMMISSION OR TO GET GEORGE BUSH RE-ELECTED?

ALTERNATIVELY, DO YOU SUPPORT THE GOVERNMENT'S INITIATIVE TO RID THE WORLD OF SADDAM HUSSEIN BY SENDING SOME OTHER MOTHER'S SON TO WIPE HIM AND A HUNDRED THOUSAND OR SO OF THOSE FILTHY ARABS OFF THE FACE OF

THE EARTH: MEN, WOMEN AND CHILDREN ALIKE?

Politicians don't like referenda because it takes power away from them; power is addictive, few men give up power unless the responsibilities that come with it are particularly arduous.

Enter Windows 3.1

The latest version of the (supposedly) remarkably-easy-to-use-indeed-intuitive graphical interface is now widely available; MS-DOS even more so. Every large business, every medium sized business worthy of the name and an increasing number of small businesses now have personal computers, most running under MS-DOS or Apple. When one adds to this home computers including games machines - Ataris and Amigas - it will be seen that a sizable percentage of the population already has more or less instant access to this most wonderful manifestation of new technology.

If housewives and mothers throughout the land were to be issued with personalised voting cards, possibly smart cards such as Big Brother is currently trying to foist on us, it would be a simple matter for the government to organise an instant poll anytime this nation was being dragged towards war, be it "intervention" in something like the current dirty business in Yugoslavia (or whatever they now call it) or a full scale act of genocide as happened in the Gulf.

In addition to this, the system could be entirely voluntary; nobody would be compelled to vote either on the issue of "Shall we go to war?" or anything else.

Anyone who owned a home computer and a modem could vote from home. Other people, working women, could vote from their places of work, there could even be special polling shops in the high street, or perhaps in the local library. The normal problems of commandeering a school or church hall for the day would not arise since voting would need no supervision. Computer elections on current but not urgent issues could take place over a period of days or even weeks.

Voting With Windows

The point and shoot method could be used to vote, alternatively one of the usual keyboard shortcuts could be substituted. Point the mouse at the appropriate icon, click once on the right hand button and open the voting window. Then, point to the dove icon to vote for peace, or to the mushroom cloud to start World War III.

Enough!

The remainder of this document consists of results extracted from George Weiss' MORI polls (as dated). What we want now is contributions. No, we're not after your money, (though George never refuses for fear of offending). Here is what you can do:

Distribute, disseminate and give away copies of this document/disc.

Organise at a local level, maybe get a computer company to sponsor a dummy run, in a village or small town, perhaps.

Commission a feasibility study on voting by computer.

Contact me at the above address, preferably by mail, or
George Weiss
c/o Highpoint,
21 Perrins Walk,
Hampstead,
London NW3 6T8,
England.

Spread the idea. Think of all the other things this form of voting could be used to do besides stopping wars.

Getting Britain out of the Common Market.
Stopping development on the Green Belt.
Scrapping useless laws and bye-laws.
Abolishing the Federal Reserve!

signed A. Baron
the Publisher
21st September 1992

Public Support for the Rainbow Alliance: Research conducted on behalf of the Rainbow Alliance, September 1990 (MORI)

2,002 adults

questions put to people aged 18+

"At the next General Election, the Rainbow Alliance plans to have a candidate in every constituency. They will offer everyone the opportunity to vote to abolish Parliament and to introduce a computerised voting system which will give people the power to vote in local and national decisions which affect their lives. How likely or unlikely would you be to vote for them?"

	%
Certain to..... ..	2
Very likely to.....	4
Fairly likely to..... .	8
Not very likely to.....	19
Not at all likely to....	19
Certain not to.....	37

Don't know/no opinion... 11

Public Support for Computer Voting: Research conducted on behalf of the Rainbow Alliance, March 1991 (MORI)

"At the next General Election, a new party plans to have a candidate in every constituency. They will offer everyone the opportunity to vote to abolish Parliament and to introduce a computerised voting system which will give people the power to vote in local and national decisions which affect their lives. How likely or unlikely would you be to vote for this new party?"

1,547 adults

	%
Certain to.....	4
Very likely to.....	9
Fairly likely to.....	14
Not very likely to...	17
Not at all likely to...	18
Certain not to.....	29
Don't know/no opinion...	10

Public Attitudes to a Revised Parliament: Research conducted on behalf of the Rainbow Alliance, August 1991 (MORI)

"At the next General Election, a new party plans to have a candidate in every constituency. Were they to win an overall majority of seats, they would introduce a system of home-based electronic voting which would, in effect, mean all voters would become members of an extensively reformed parlia ment. How likely or unlikely would you be to vote for this new party?"

1,793 adults

	%
Certain to.....	2
Very likely to.....	6
Fairly likely to.....	14
Not very likely to....	26
Not at all likely to...	19
Certain not to.....	17
Don't know/no opinion...	16

Published by

InfoText Manuscripts
c/o 93c Venner Road
Sydenham
London SE26 5HU
England +44 (0)81 659 7713
or E-mail to ABaron @ CIX

Notes and References

(1) The Trilateral Commission is an organisation of which precious little is heard in the UK thanks to the machinations of our "free press". In the United States though it has become a political hot potato thanks mainly to the unwelcome publicity given it by the so-called cranky conspiracy theorists and bigots of the extreme right.

The Commission has now come out of the closet and tries to pass itself off as an elitist "think tank" of like-minded individuals who are so concerned about the world's problems that they meet in secret to decide how best to avoid war, frame social policy and improve the lot of the poor.

Other conspiratorial groups include the Bilderbergers and the daddy of them all, the Council on Foreign Relations.

(2) Or even in words; here is what Rear Admiral Chester Ward USN (Retd.) has to say about the one-worlders:

"Their goal is to impose a benign stability on the quarreling family of nations through merger and consolidation. They see the elimination of national boundaries, the suppression of racial and ethnic loyalties as the most expeditious avenue to world peace."

With No Apologies: The Personal and Political Memoirs of United States Senator Barry Goldwater, page 278, published by William Morrow, (1979).

Goldwater himself is even more forthcoming: "The CFR is the American branch of a society which originated in England. Internationalist in viewpoint, the CFR...believes national boundaries should be obliterated and one-world rule established." Page 128, (ibid).

(3) The Rainbow Alliance is now called the Rainbow Convention. Life membership is £5. This is valid either until you die or until the day after the abolition of Parliament. Each individual is required to register as the leader of his own party.

(4) It was brought to my attention a while back that this idea is not entirely new. The fellow who mentioned it said it had originated in the States in the Sixties and is called Quaker voting (or something like that). Further research on this is pending. George himself says he has never heard of Quaker voting; and who needs Quakers anyway when you've got Captain Rainbow!