

## **DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FREEDOM FORCE AND THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY**

Statement by G. Edward Griffin updated 2007 March 15

I am a Life Member of The John Birch Society and possibly the oldest living member. I joined in 1961, only a few months after the Society began actively recruiting. I was given the immediate task of forming a chapter, which I did in Playa del Rey, California. I became a volunteer Section Leader and eventually resigned from my junior-executive position with a large insurance company to become the Society's Los Angeles Coordinator, and then Major Coordinator for California. Later, I traveled around the U.S. to train other Coordinators and Section Leaders. I was authorized to deal with the public as an official national spokesman. In 1972 I produced a recruiting film entitled *This Is The John Birch Society*. In 1975, I wrote *The Life and Words of Robert Welch*, the biography of the Society's founder. I left the staff that same year to go into business on my own as an independent writer and documentary film producer.

I have learned much from The John Birch Society, and I am grateful to it for introducing me to the reality of organized collectivism. Its publications have been extremely valuable as a source of reliable information amid a sea of media propaganda. There is no doubt in my mind that, if it had not been for the dissemination of this information by members of the Society, we would be much further along the road to totalitarianism than we are now.

There is no basis for conflict or competition between Freedom Force and The John Birch Society. It may appear on the surface that they are similar, but they are not. While their mutual objective is the defeat of collectivism, their structures and strategies are entirely different. It is like having an army and a navy, both with a common enemy. Each is made more effective by the presence of the other. Their differences do not make them competitive but complimentary. I am glad The John Birch Society is in the battle and I recommend that members of Freedom Force become members of the Society as well.

Why, then, did I create Freedom Force International? The answer is that the differences between these organizations involve features that are unique to Freedom Force and which, in my opinion, are essential for victory over collectivism. The following chart shows a comparison of those features:

JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY	FREEDOM FORCE
<p><b>The scope of operations is national</b>, focused on issues that are of interest primarily to Americans. The assumption is that the best way to solve world problems is for citizens of each nation to attend to their own internal affairs. The U.S. should solve its problems first and then be an example for the world.</p>	<p><b>The scope is international</b>, focused on issues that apply with equal force to all nations. National units deal with matters of local importance, but the assumption is that, because collectivism is organized globally, it must be challenged by a comparable global force of individualism.</p>
<p><b>The structure is monolithic:</b> Local leaders and field staff are appointed from the top. Members do not control the organization. It is not clear how top leadership can be replaced, as evidenced by power struggles that have convulsed the Society recently.</p>	<p><b>The structure is holographic:</b> Local leaders and field staff are appointed and dismissed by the members. If top leadership is eliminated by opponents or must be replaced, the organization can regenerate from its members and field staff.</p>
<p><b>Projects originate from the top:</b> Members are encouraged to undertake only projects that are part of an agenda approved by headquarters. Unity of approach is viewed as beneficial.</p>	<p><b>Projects originate from members:</b> Members are encouraged to undertake any project that is consistent with <i>The Creed of Freedom</i>. Differences of approach are viewed as beneficial.</p>
<p><b>The goal is education:</b> The assumption is that truth will ultimately prevail if enough people can be exposed to it. It is recognized that those with knowledge must become influential in power centers, but coordinating that activity is not part of the organizational program.</p>	<p><b>The goal is power:</b> The assumption is that knowledge will not triumph unless those who possess it also have power within society to convert it into political and social policy. A primary membership activity is to become influential in local and national power centers.</p>
<p><b>The strategy is to communicate:</b> Activities focus on writing letters, sponsoring lectures, and distributing educational materials. Members are encouraged to support or oppose legislation. They rally behind important national projects, such as “Get US out of the UN” and Stop FTAA.” In this way, they seek to influence leaders to pursue pro-freedom policies.</p>	<p><b>The strategy is to lead:</b> Activities focus on becoming influential in mass organizations and institutions. Members are expected to lead these groups in support of any cause that is consistent with <i>The Creed of Freedom</i>, and that will vary widely depending on the organization. They seek to influence leaders but, more important, their mission is to <i>become</i> leaders.</p>
<p><b>The creed is</b> expressed in the words of Robert Welch: “Less government, more responsibility, and, with God’s help, a better world.” How much less government? How much more responsibility? These questions are to be answered by each member in accordance with his or her ideological perspective. There is often disagreement over specifics.</p>	<p><b>The creed is:</b> <i>The Creed of Freedom</i>, a 400-word document that describes the three pillars of individualism. This provides an ideological basis for resolving literally any political or social issue. There is no ambiguity or disagreement over specifics. It is a clear blueprint for the future.</p>