

CONNECT	
Liberty – But Only For US!	

2205 PA

If this were football, the referee would surely give a Red Card.

- 1 Imagine finding out that a London football club has been working to damage another London club. If this were to go on in football, the referee would surely give – not a player, but an entire team - a Red Card.

Worse still, the club has persuaded other clubs to help it bring down the second club. Is this really happening? Yes – It IS happening - but the parties involved are not football clubs. They are nations. The deliberate and unjustified harm one nation has been planning to cause to another – with the help of many other nations around the world - will hurt so many people.

- 2 The imaginary Football Club A is a professional level club in the Premier League, where it has been for a long time. The imaginary Football Club B, in contrast, has languished one division below for decades.

Recently, Club B has been on the up. It's now a force to contend with. If they go on this way, they'll be playing in the Premier League soon. Or will they? Because allegations have exploded in the media about Club B.

- 3 The stories include that the Club B's manager has been bribing referees and players are on illegal performance-enhancing drugs. Worse still, it's alleged that the club is interested in the young people in its community - but for the wrong reasons.

Club B's reputation is in tatters. Its team gets booed at matches. Its supporters are viciously attacked on social media. It's professional and social suicide to admit to ever being a supporter.

Here's the scandal. It's been revealed that Club A commissioned a think tank to carry out detailed research to find out how it could make itself a more successful club – mainly, by making Club B *less* successful.

The evil plan was discovered by a citizen journalist who broadcasts on the Internet, following a tip-off.

What the journalist found was MIND BLOWING. He found a report produced by a think tank, on the think tank's website, in the public domain. It proves Club A's plan is real.

- 4 The research by the think tank – commissioned by Club A – centred on an in-depth exploration of Club B's weaknesses. The think tank came up with a lot of suggestions for how Club A could become the number one football club in the world. Some involved Club A becoming a better football team. But most didn't. Most of the think tank's ideas were about how Club A could make Club B weaker – by making their *existing* weaknesses greater.

In other words, the researchers explored a wide range of different methods that Club A could use to damage Club B. They also assessed the consequences that the different strategies were likely to have for Club A.

Club B's weaknesses at the time, as reported by the think tank, included the absence of a really strong training programme for the players. Other weaknesses were a lack of supporter confidence – supporters were loyal but didn't really expect the club to go far, because it hadn't, to date – and a difficulty in recruiting great players.

Specific ideas by the think tank included: persuading trainers not to work with Club B, spreading negative information among Club B's supporters and briefing against Club B in schools, colleges and among young people in the community. But they came up with a great many other ideas, too.

The think tank concluded that most of the ideas they came up with to weaken Club B would work much better if Club A involved other football clubs in putting the ideas into practice. They explored which strategies for gaining the support of other clubs were more likely to prove successful.

So, how DID Club A persuade the other clubs to help it damage Club B? Well, it helps that Club A has a lot of supporters, many of whom are wealthy people – and the club's owners are wealthy.

Most importantly, however, Club A has influence. It carries clout. Whatever is said by Club A, people believe it to be the truth.

So getting other clubs on board with its scheme was not difficult.

And once other clubs were on board, persuading the rest of the football world to join Club A's plan was easy. To decline to join – or should I say, refuse? – would mean being labelled as a "Club B sympathiser" or worse.

- 5 This story is not really about two football clubs. Not even the London football club whose name begins with a B and which bears an eerie resemblance to my imaginary Club B, being on the up as it is – and long may it continue!

To my knowledge, there is no *conspiracy* by any football club whose name begins with an A or any other letter. I only wish I could say the same about the country that is involved in the shocking real-world version of this story, which is this:

The USA commissioned a think tank to carry out detailed research, some

time ago, into how it could make itself a more successful country – mainly by making Russia *less* successful.

Interestingly, at the time, the USA did not regard Russia as a threat – the research stated explicitly that Russia *was not seeking parity with the USA*.

This plan by the USA to damage another sovereign country – and involve other countries around the world - was discovered by a citizen journalist who broadcasts on the Internet, following a tip-off.

What the journalist found was MIND BLOWING. He found was a report called [Extending Russia - Competing from Advantageous Ground](#) produced by a think tank called the RAND Corporation.

The report is on the think tank's website, in the public domain.

- 6 [Extending Russia - Competing from Advantageous Ground](#) is an extremely long report. However, its content is summarised briefly by the citizen journalist I mentioned, iEarlGrey, in a video [The US plan to fight Russia REVEALED in 2019 Report - Inside Russia Report](#).

Even the list of contents of the report is extremely revealing. I urge you to read – or at least skim - the report. It is not difficult to understand – although long, it is written in plain English. It is a must-read for anyone who wishes to understand better what is going on – that is, what most of the world's governments have been persuaded to collude with – knowingly or unknowingly. Knowledge or none, it makes no difference to the outcome.

[A highlighted version](#) of [Extending Russia - Competing from Advantageous Ground](#) is also linked to at the end of this article as well as the original report on the think tank's website. I'm sure I will have missed out a great many important sections when I did the highlighting – I merely identified some particularly revealing [to me] extracts.

I include below a summary of what the think tank did – again, I have merely identified some particularly revealing [to me, at least] extracts.

At 12mins into his video, iEarlGrey refers to [RAND's 2019 annual report](#) which states under the heading "Russia's Hostile Measures in Europe" that Russia has the motivation and the means to cause trouble throughout Europe. Corruption, misinformation and attacks on the rule of law are some of the tools the researchers claim Russia will use.

As so often, I observe in this report a lot of what I refer to as *inversion* and *projection*. I use these terms to indicate that, often, the message people put out is *inverted* – they refer to someone else but are really talking about themselves - and they are *projecting* their own intentions or actions onto another person or group.

In this case, the researchers saying that "Russia has the motivation and the means to cause trouble throughout Europe" in a report created for their

client, the US government to justify causing trouble for Russia is "the pot calling the kettle black."

Similarly, the researchers' claim that "corruption, misinformation and attacks on the rule of law" are some of the tools Russia will use is "the pot calling the kettle black."

The plan set out in this report has its basis in corruption, misinformation and attacks on the rule of law. A moment's reflection and inner honesty would reveal the hilarious irony of the above statements.

The RAND report continues by *predicting* that Russia will apply a range of different types of pressure. So this justifies the USA doing exactly what they accuse Russia of doing – in the future, -which is what used to be called *innocent* - as in *not guilty*.

At 13 mins into the video, iEarlGrey draws attention to the researchers' claim that Russia is working with far-right groups in other countries including Latvia and Lithuania. Having already investigated the regimes in these and other countries, iEarlGrey questions whether it was Russia who put them into power. "The facts would differ," is how he puts it. Beautifully expressed.

As iEarlGrey says, if he had presented this story before certain recent events took place he would probably have been called a "conspiracy theorist." He also says correctly that there is a lot for people to get their teeth into and that the report is a treasure trove. He also says that RAND itself appears to be a gold mine for people interested in how our world operates - conspiracy theorists, in other words!

As an aside, iEarlGrey mentions that one of RAND's many funders, listed in their 2019 annual report, is the Epstein Family Foundation. I don't know for certain, because I can't find a website for it, whether this was a foundation set up by the late sex offender Jeffrey Epstein.

I DO know now, however, that the [Jeffrey Epstein VI Foundation](#) - which WAS set up by Jeffrey Epstein – funded, among other projects, Harvard University's Programme for Evolutionary Dynamics, a software initiative for Artificial intelligence and NEURO.tv. The latter was reported on the Foundation's website in this way: [A New Channel on the Brain, Sends Waves Across the Internet](#). I also discovered, incidentally, that Epstein was a member of Harvard University's Mind, Brain and Behaviour Advisory Committee, the Trilateral Commission and the Council on Foreign Relations.

I strongly recommend that you do get your teeth into this report and iEarlGrey's videos on this and related subjects.

- 7 The think tank, [RAND's](#) brief - on page 3 of [Extending Russia - Competing from Advantageous Ground](#) - was to:

"examine a range of possible means to extend Russia. By this, we mean nonviolent measures that could stress Russia's military or economy or the regime's political standing at home and abroad. The steps we posit would not have either defence or deterrence as their prime purpose, although they might contribute to both. Rather, these steps are conceived of as measures that would lead Russia to compete in domains or regions where the United States has a competitive advantage, causing Russia to overextend itself militarily or economically or causing the regime to lose domestic and/or international prestige and influence."

Key Findings of the report included that Russia's economy was its greatest vulnerability because it was – and is - comparatively small and *highly dependent on energy exports* of oil and gas:

"In some respects, contemporary Russia is a country in stagnation. Its economy is dependent on natural resource exports, so falling oil and gas prices have caused a significant drop in the living standards of many Russian citizens. Economic sanctions have further contributed to this decline."

Despite this weakness of Russia, RAND advised the US government - in great detail - on the best way to make sure Russia extended itself – to weaken Russia further.

Other ideas were encouraging people with skills and well-educated youth to emigrate from Russia - to *help the United States and hurt Russia* - promoting regime change in Belarus – perhaps by starting a revolution - and *expanding US assistance to Ukraine*.

RAND concluded that the USA should also weaken Russia by *placing maximum pressure on Russia's export business and thus on its national economy* - and encourage other countries to do the same.

It concluded that, out of the many measures considered, this one carried *the least cost and the least risk – for the USA, that is - not for Russia*.

What are we seeing now?

Pressure on Russian exports of oil and gas. We in the West are having our supplies reduced through extortionate price increases, the constant threat of an end to supplies and the expectation that we should *go without to "hurt Putin"*.

A massive expansion of *assistance* to Ukraine from the USA. Assistance in the form of weapons – not *aid* for Ukrainian people living in a *war zone*. Weapons – because that will extend Russia and benefit the USA – or rather, the US government.

This is despite the report saying that, in 2016, US weapons intended for Syrian rebels -shipped into Jordan and Saudi Arabia by the CIA - had been

systematically stolen and as a result, *the Middle East black market for arms is now awash in assault rifles, mortars and rocket-propelled grenades.*

RAND also suggested sanctions on Russia to limit its economic potential. They pointed out that, to really work, *sanctions would need to be put in place by a lot of countries – not only the USA.*

What has been implemented?
Sanctions.
By a lot of countries.

- 8 RAND also suggested that the USA *increase its brain drain from Russia.*

Some people would, I'm quite sure, describe the RAND report as an act of non-military aggression by one country against another.

Why does the US government feel so threatened by another country?
I can't answer that.

But I find it interesting that it DOES feel so threatened that it has carried out a lot of these actions. It commissioned the research to justify doing so.

Not only that, it has persuaded an increasing number of other countries to join its gang.

- 9 The RAND Corporation produces reports on a wide range of subjects for government departments of The USA. It has branches in the USA, Cambridge in the UK and Brussels in Belgium.

[About the RAND Corporation](#) on RAND's website explains where [their income](#) comes from. Most of it comes from various departments of The USA's government. RAND is also funded by universities, other charities and foundations, some of which funding is referred to as *philanthropic* funding.

Governments of other countries as well as the USA are clients of the RAND Corporation, including the UK. RAND also receives funding from NATO, the United Nations Development Programme, the World Bank, Google and the International Federation of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers and Associations.

- 10 Margaret Mead, the anthropologist, was [once a researcher for RAND](#).

How ironic, given her often-used quote:

"Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has."

We know, now, that a *small group* of people – at RAND – have produced research that has been – and is being – used to justify decisions that could take the world into war.

Knowledge, however, is power.

And now we know that a plan was in place to bring about a – if not THE –

major situation that is unfolding in front of our eyes right now.

[RAND](#), in its website footer, describes itself as “non-profit, nonpartisan, and committed to the public interest.” It claims that it “develops solutions to public policy challenges to help make communities throughout the world *safer and more secure, healthier and more prosperous.*”

Clearly, this being *safer and more secure, healthier and more prosperous* doesn't extend to Russia.

To damage another country outside the realm of self-defence – and to hurt its people - breaches all kinds of treaties and laws. When it comes to rules, however, once again it appears that- in the eyes of the self-appointed elite - they only apply to ordinary people.

The US government clearly believes it is above the law, as Edward Snowden revealed when he disclosed the extent to which the US and UK governments -among others spy on their own citizens – with no lawful reason for doing so.

RAND, when [incorporated as a nonprofit](#) corporation in 1948, stated in its articles of incorporation that it existed to:

“further and promote scientific, educational, and charitable purposes, all for the public welfare and security of [the USA].”

It's important to understand that the USA's plan was only to benefit the USA – or rather, the people in power there. Nobody else.

If you believe I'm wrong about what all this means, it is simple to turn the story around and ask yourself:

“If there was a political plan by another country to weaken YOUR country - would that be acceptable?”

If not – why should it be acceptable just because it's a plan to weaken Russia – and the Russian people - most of whom have done nothing wrong?

CONNECT'S Maxim and Oath

Connect is only interested in finding and sharing the TRUTH.
In search of that TRUTH, we only pose questions – we have no answers.

By: Helen King

Source: CONNECT-M3: [Magazine](#)

- 5 [LINK](#) The RAND Corporation: Extending Russia - Competing from Advantageous Ground
- 6 [LINK](#) iEarlGrey: The US plan to fight Russia REVEALED in 2019 Report - Inside Russia Report
- 6 [LINK](#) Extending Russia - Competing from Advantageous Ground – highlighted report

- 6 [LINK](#) The RAND Corporation: 2019 Annual Report
- 6 [LINK](#) Wikipedia: Jeffrey Epstein VI Foundation
- 6 [LINK](#) Jeffrey Epstein VI Foundation: A New Channel on the Brain, Sends Waves Across the Internet
- 7 [LINK](#) The RAND Corporation
- 9 [LINK](#) The RAND Corporation: About RAND
- 9 [LINK](#) The RAND Corporation: How We Are Funded
- 10 [LINK](#) The RAND Corporation: Studying Soviets, Not Sex: Margaret Mead's Research at RAND

PLEASE DOWNLOAD AND SHARE THIS ARTICLE



Opportunity to join the CONNECT [team and network](#)

END