

America's Identity Crisis And The Coming National I.D. Chip

By: Terry L. Cook

"We are not part of a military program to implant [biochip I.D.] tags in humans. In fact, we are not part of any plan to implant transponder tags in humans. But a glass encapsulated animal tag only begs the question of the definition of what kind of animal, and if that definition is a 'mammal,' certainly it would include man. Are humans running around somewhere on the globe with tags---radio-frequency tags---implanted in them? Yes! Absolutely, conclusively so!" Donald G. Small, Vice-President, Hughes Identification Devices, Southern California. Excerpted from the video The Mark of the New World Order

Is there a plan to biometrically identify everyone in America, first with an identity card, then with an injected identity chip in the hand? Will only those implanted with this unique electronic identification "mark" be permitted to buy and sell while the rest of us are hunted down as outcasts in the coming global government called the New World Order? Will these biochip implants eventually become The-Mark-of-the-New-WorldOrder? Will they control and enslave us electronically? Yes! Absolutely, conclusively so!

In recent years, a lot of progress has been made in the area of implantable biochip technology. The above quote from Mr. Small suggests that we are crossing the line between animal and human applications, and Hughes Identification Devices has been at the forefront of this development. Effective August 29,1993, the Safe Medical Devices Registration Act requires all prosthetic medical implants in humans to be identified with a rice-size biochip-the same kind that is being implanted in animals---which contains vital information. Hughes Identification Devices is the main supplier of these medical biochips. A recent article in Popular Science magazine titled, Future Watch: Body Binary (October, 1994) predicts, "Within the next ten years, we'll have miniature computers inside us to monitor and perhaps even control our blood pressure, heart rate, and cholesterol. Within twenty years, such computers will correct visual and hearing signals, making glasses and hearing aids obsolete."

As technology advances, the various uses for microchips and biochips seems to be limited only by our imagination---a truly frightening thought given the humanistic, socialistic, Orwellian-type society in which we live. Today, the most popular application of the implantable biochip transponder is for the purpose of animal, or pet, identification. But the day is not far off when Big-Brother's New-World-Order global government will "tag" humans with the same "animal" biochips.

BRIEF HISTORY OF RADIO-FREQUENCY BIOCHIP TECHNOLOGY


During the late 1970's, pet owners and animal shelters around the country became increasingly aware of the need to identify or track animals in order to return lost pets to their owners. This seemingly harmless and beneficial idea gave rise to an entire industry now devoted to this very purpose. However, this technology has ominous overtones for anyone concerned about the potential for human application.

The basic prototype for the microchip used in the biochip transponder first was introduced in 1979 by California inventor Mike Beigel. AVID, Inc. (American Veterinary Identification Devices) was incorporated in Norco, California, in 1985 and spent the next six years in research and development. Implantable microchips were tested first in 1987 when International InfoPet Systems, based in Agoura Hills, California, started marketing a microchip made by Destron IDI. By 1991, the market began to heat up and Destron IDI sold its radio-frequency-transponder I.D. card technology to Hughes Aircraft, converted its Boulder, Colorado, location to a research facility, and merged with a Minnesota-based firm. Destron-Fearing Corporation now offers a wide selection of implantable biochips for animals. Also in 1991, InfoPet changed hands and became InfoPet Identification Systems, which markets a microchip developed by Trovan. Trovan is a German-based subsidiary of AEG/telefunken, which is the major supplier of this technology in Europe. Countries using this technology include Austria, France, Germany, Holland, Ireland, Spain, Italy, Switzerland, and the Scandinavian countries, as well as Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States. During this same time, Texas Instruments has gotten into this growing market. Now, Texas Instruments' TIRIS Division of Dallas, Texas (214917-1451), is the leading manufacturer of implantable biochips as well as all other forms of radio-frequency identification devices in America.

By 1993, one industry observer described the implantable ID market as a "mosaic of technology." Various animal shelters, clinics, and human societies have begun calling for a unified, standardized biochip system. In this regard, an article was published recently in the Orange County Register which sums up everyone's frustration about these proprietary systems: "The National Animal Control Association, members of which include animal shelters, and humane societies, suggested a boycott of microchips until the companies agree to share enough information so any chip implant could be read by any scanner." AVID and Destron agreed on the need to develop a standard system, while InfoPet was not so willing.

Lindy Harton, an InfoPet Senior Account Executive, claims her chips and scanners are better because they work from a farther distance and don't have to be used as closely. In the end, she argues, "The best technology will win. Currently, however, AVID, Inc. has the best and most popular technology because its chip implants truly can be read from a greater distance than most others, and its scanners can read at least four other brands of chips in addition to its own. In 1992, Destron entered negotiations with Texas Instruments Corporation to develop jointly a worldwide operating standard for animal ID biochips. Daryl Yurek, Chairman of Destron, says, Developing and implementing a worldwide standard paves the way for governments and government organizations to adopt electronic identification without worrying

about being locked into a single proprietary technology." Doesn't a worldwide operating standard for electronic identification sound like a great idea? Just think of all the happy pets and pet owners who will benefit from this wonderful technology! Now, try to imagine a future Big-Brother-style world dictator getting hold of this stuff and you will have some idea what the New World Order is all about.



So how does this implantable biochip technology actually work? The basic system consists of an implantable biochip (also known as a **radio-frequency transponder tag**) and an external **RFID scanning device**. Biochip transponders come in various sizes, the smallest of which is about the size of a grain of rice (about 11 mm---note the enlarged photo of an actual biochip). The electronic components in the biochip transponder are encapsulated in a small glass tube made of **soda lime glass** which is known for tissue biocompatibility. In others words, there is never any risk of infection or tissue rejection due to this design. During manufacture, the glass tube is hermetically sealed after the components have been installed so that it is impossible for any body fluids to reach the internal electronics. Generally, **there are only three major components inside the tube. The first is a silicon computer chip (a custom integrated circuit) which contains the biochip's unique ID number** that has been laser-etched onto the chip's surface at the factory. Once this permanent ID number has been encrypted onto the chip, it is impossible to alter. **The second component in the tube is a coil of copper wire wound tightly around a small ferrite (iron) core rod. This coil serves both as a send/receive antenna and as a transformer induction system that converts radio-frequency wave energy broadcast from the scanner into useful electricity that energizes the chip.** Accordingly, the biochip is a passively powered device that has no battery. Therefore, it can never wear out. **The third component in the biochip tube is a capacitor which stores energy and tunes or facilitates the signal to and from the microchip.**

Most biochips and radio-wave scanners utilize low frequency 125 kHz radio signals; the same frequency used in AM medium-wave broadcasting. These low frequency radio waves can penetrate all solid objects except those made of metal. Electronic ID based on these radio signals is referred to as **Radio Frequency Identification (RFID)**. Once the scanner is activated, it digitally displays the chip's decoded ID number on a liquid crystal display screen. **Destron can encode up to ten digits on its chips, whereas Texas Instruments can encode up to nineteen digits.** The smallest biochips can be encoded with up to 34 billion unique ID numbers! **A spokesman from Trovan says that with the latest technology "the number of possible code combinations could approach one trillion."** That certainly is a lot of identification capability!

One of the more interesting features of the biochip implant technology is the injection system. The trademark name for Destron's injection-needle system is "Life Chip. It would be hard to imagine a more deceptive title than this, especially as this technology moves closer and closer to human applications. **Each biochip transponder comes pre-packed inside a sterilized needle which is discarded after use.** Because of the sharpness of the needle, 'there is minimal discomfort to the animal while injecting the chip.' Special injectors are necessary because **most biochips come with antimigration tips attached to them.** Polypropylene antimigration tips prevent the biochips from moving around inside the body after implantation. In other words, once the biochip is implanted, it becomes part of the animal forever. And **according to AVID, "Once implanted, the identity chip is virtually impossible to retrieve.** Surgical removal, using the most advanced radiographic technics available is extremely difficult."

The final step in animal biochip identification occurs when the scanner transfers chip ID codes to various external computer databases. Pet owners are then located via various database networks maintained by many organizations including the American Kennel Club (AKC). From these sources pet owners are located and notified of their animal's whereabouts. InfoPet has a "Recovery Network" with a 24-hour Hotline (1-800-INFOPET). Government animal regulation and control agencies, shelters, and clinics participate in this network. InfoPet can identify any of its registrants by means of this microchip ID number. In most cases the pet's name, owner's name, social security number, zip code, and telephone number are available. AVID is participating with the PetTrac system, which is another national network of animal databases. **The typical charge for biochipping a pet is \$30.00.**

It should be noted that radio-frequency identification technology is not limited to biochip implants. RFID can be very useful and effective in many other applications as well. For example, **the developers at Trovan envision a day when transponders will replace the bar code system.** And many existing applications of RFID include coded automobile chassis numbers, automated toll collection systems for highways, automated vehicle parking systems, copyright protection for video and computer software, documents, passports, ID cards, credit cards, badges, warehouse/stock handling, valuable

items registration, insurance, shipping containers, luggage tags, cargo pallets, Mobil's new SpeedPass gas pump activation system, ammunition, arms, spare parts, aviation parts, customs, seals, blood samples, anti-theft security devices for cars, and various medical/hospital/laboratory applications. It is not surprising to note that **European countries are way ahead of the rest of the world when it comes to utilizing this technology.** One can quickly observe RFID technology in use virtually everywhere in Europe.

COULD HUMANS BE NEXT?

Since animal identification first was tested in 1987, the idea really has begun to catch on. However, selling this technology to the public has not always been easy. On May 1, 1989, Mann Humane Society (CA) announced that it would join other humane societies and begin using the biochip ID technology. Diane Allevato, Director of the Novato Animal Shelter in Mann County, cautioned, "The idea of implanting dogs and cats with identifying microchips is a concept we're taking slow." She added, "We want to make sure it's right for the animals, and that the community is willing to accept this new technology." Concerned citizens remarked that the implants were "unnatural and weird." "There's no doubt about it--- injecting an animal with a computer chip is a pretty unnatural thing to do," responded Allevato. "But it's also unnatural, obscene really, that 15 million stray animals are destroyed in the country every year." **On November 8, 1991, the Los Angeles City Council voted to implant pets, making Los Angeles the first big city to adopt the microchip program in America. Since then, other major cities have endorsed RFID technology.** The American Kennel Club has endorsed the AVID biochip already in use at the San Diego Zoo. The Canadian Kennel Club has endorsed Destron's biochip, along with nearly 500 humane societies. Destron President, Jim Seiler, is enjoying his firm's success, but he also is aware of many "Big-Brother" type concerns the public shares about possible human applications: "Destron is only concerned with animal identification," says Seiler, "and is not considering human application." Mr. Seiler's company may not be considering RFID biochips for humans,

CONSIDER HAVING A "CONVENIENT" I.D. BIOCHIP IMPLANTED IN YOUR HAND!

One such individual is **Tim Willard, Executive Officer of the World Future Society**, a Washington, DC-based organization that claims 27,000 members worldwide, including Future Shock author, Alvin Toffler. **In a disturbing article appearing in The Mann Independent Journal (4-2-89), Willard openly suggested using biochip technology in humans. "The technology behind such a microchip is fairly uncomplicated and with a little refinement could be used in variety of human application. Conceivably, a number could be assigned at birth and go with a person throughout life. . Most likely the biochip would be implanted on the back of the hand so that it would be easy to scan." Willard says it would be like a universal ID card, replacing all other forms of ID. "At the checkout stand at a supermarket, you would simply pass your hand over a scanner and your bank account would automatically be debited."** Sounds so convenient, doesn't it?

Remarkably, Willard goes on to suggest that a human microchip identification system "would work best with a highly centralized computer system." Now, Mr. Willard probably is not "Big Brother," but he certainly will applaud the real one when he comes! Notice how practical, logical, high-tech, humane and efficient all of this sounds. Yet, most people still are very uncomfortable with this kind of technology. Sensing this, Willard comments, "While people over the years may have grown accustomed to artificial body parts, there is definitely a strong aversion to things being implanted. It's the "Big Brother is watching" concept. People would be afraid that all of their thoughts and movements were being monitored". He arrogantly concludes, "People tend to romantic about their independence and privacy." Mr. Willard, and others like him in the New World Order crowd, always display their arrogance when it comes to such "sentimental notions" as freedom, independence, national sovereignty, and privacy. After all, this is a "New Age" and we have to think globally and act locally.

In another article appearing in The Washington Times (10-11-93), **Martin Anderson, a Senior Fellow at The Hoover Institution, makes some interesting observations regarding the National Health Security Card proposed by the Clinton administration during 1993. The article was titled "High-Tech National Tattoo," and in it he said that the "health card" was nothing more than a "slick-willy" proposal for a de facto national ID card. This "smart card" could contain hundreds of pages of information, a digital photograph and signature, and a digitized, biometrically-analyzed and stored fingerprint for positive identification.** "The uses will be limited, not by technology," writes Anderson, "but only by the imagination of government officials and their respect for our privacy." That's comforting to know, isn't it? Anderson continues, "Cost is not a serious problem. A state-of-the-art ID card can be manufactured in quantity for a dollar or two each. To make this tracking system work, every one of us must have a number that can be fed into the national computer banks. That is why the National Health Board, which would be set up under Mr. Clinton's program, would enforce unique identification numbers for consumers." One of the advantages cited by government officials would be to help cut down on consumer fraud. "This card could be used to crack down on welfare fraud, trace deadbeat dads who refuse to pay child support, supplant our social security cards, our draft cards, and out passports, maybe even to register voters and control voting fraud." All of this sounds good, but conservative author Donald McAlvany is not convinced. "The ulterior objective of these new government cards is to improve none of these things. Rather, they are a devious new means of further consolidating and computerizing all available information on each of us into a new electronically digitized, centralized government database that will ultimately lead to a complete loss of privacy, enslavement, and control" (The McAlvany Intelligence Advisor, 8-94).

Privacy is always the main concern people have. President Clinton and his aides are aware of how sensitive this issue is," writes Anderson, and they are attempting to disarm the public by promising national privacy safeguards." It even has been suggested that the government should establish a National Data Protection and Security Panel, but remember, the government once promised that social security numbers never would be used for identification purposes either. "The technology is now perfected," warns McAlvany, "and the Establishment is moving toward the National ID Card people-control system at Mach 10 speed."

FIRST A NATIONAL ID, THEN A NATIONAL IDENTITY CHIP IN THE HAND!

The technology for a national ID card is clearly available. However, Martin Anderson, in concluding his "High-Tech National Tattoo" article, asks a very important question---what if we lose the card? Jokingly, he says we can wear the card on a chain around our necks. But there is another solution, writes Anderson, "Although I hesitate to mention the idea because one of Mr. Clinton's White House aides may take it seriously. You see, there is an identification system made by Hughes Aircraft Company that you can't lose. It's the syringe implantable transponder.. a tiny microchip is simply placed under the skin." Of course, this is the same biochip now being used in animals, it's sort of like a technological tattoo," says Anderson, "and far more efficacious than the numbers that the Nazis marked indelibly on the inner forearms of concentration camp prisoners. . Of course, most Americans will find a surgically implanted government microchip repugnant. So at least for the foreseeable future, the use of this ingenious device will be confined to its current use: the tracking of dogs, cats, horses and cattle." Perhaps only for the foreseeable future---perhaps sooner than we think. Many futurists would argue there is no difference in principle between being forced to carry a microchip in a plastic card in your wallet or in a little glass tube in your right hand or forehead. "The principle that Big Brother has the right to track you is inherent in both. The only thing that differentiates the two techniques is a layer of skin" [emphasis added]. Whether or not you are familiar with Bible prophecy regarding the "666-Mark-of-the-Beast" found in Revelation 13:16-18, these comments are very frightening. "Once you denigrate the idea of privacy," warns Anderson, "all kinds of innovative government controls are possible, things that didn't even occur to Aldous Huxley when he wrote his chilling novel, Brave New World [Order?]." But, of course, such things never could happen in America. right?

Not long ago, Jack Dunlap, a private investigator in Tucson, Arizona, tried to launch a new program called KIDSCAN. Concerned over lost children (not just pets), **Dunlap proposed the same biochip technology now being used on animals.** "Each child whose parents signed up for KIDSCAN would get a computer chip planted under the skin and an identification number. The chip would transmit a signal that would bounce off a satellite and be picked up by police on a computer-screen map. A parent with a missing child could call the police, give the KIDSCAN number, and have the child traced. Police everywhere would have the equipment, so you could find a child anywhere" the Arizona Republic 6-20-89). Anyone who has seen a missing child poster can understand the grief which parents must feel. Again, here is another example of how such ID programs are being promoted. Many seemingly valid reasons support the alleged need for most of these proposals, but the risks to freedom and privacy are far too great. Martin-Marietta Energy Systems, Inc., originally showed some interest in Dunlap's plan, but the idea soon died and the project never got off the ground.

In a more recent example of how far things have come along, **the Food and Drug Administration passed a new ruling call the Safe Medical Devices Registration Act of 1993. This 1993 ruling now requires that all artificial body parts (prosthetic devices) have a biochip attached to them containing basic medical information, the microchip manufacturer, and the name of the surgeon performing the implant.** Each year, six million medical devices are surgically implanted in people worldwide, everything from breast implants to chin implants. Lately, there has been concern that patients may forget or lose information regarding this implant, "No problem," writes Kathleen Wiegner (Los Angeles Times, 8-17-94), "if the patient's implant carries an implant of its own---a microchip on which all relevant information has been encoded." The microchip/biochip being used in the U.S. is called "Smart Device" and is manufactured by, you guessed it, Hughes Identification Devices of Southern California, a subsidiary of Hughes Aircraft Company.

For the first time, implantable biochip technology designed for animals now is being tested on human beings! Admittedly, it is not yet being used as a form of personal alphanumeric identification, but it is a giant step in that direction. Wiegner notes that medical personnel can decode the information on the biochip with a scanner. "The information on the chip would also be recorded on a computer-linked global registry," says Wiegner. Welcome to the Internet and the Super Information Highway! LipoMatrix, Inc., a partial subsidiary of Collagen Corp., Palo Alto, CA, has been issued a patent for the use of Smart Device in their medical devices, and has begun putting them into their new soybean oil breast implants. Meanwhile, Smart Device biochips are already in 100 LipoMatrix breast implants being tested since October, 1994, on woman in Germany, Italy, and Great Britain. Note again how far advanced Europe is in their application of RFID biochip technology.

In another example of Europe's lead in the area of identification technologies, **the smart card was developed first by a French inventor, Roland Moreno, in 1974. Today, many years later, the Europeans have almost 150 million smart cards in use, compared with only a couple of million in America.** Two years ago, the Carte 1994 Conference was held in Paris. There was significant attendance from other EC countries, however, only a "smattering" of visitors from North America. The Conference celebrated the 20th Anniversary of smart cards with the theme "Smart Cards in the Year 2000" (Personal Identification News, Sept/Oct. 1994).

THE 'MARC' One of the more advanced uses of the smart card in America is by the U.S. military. **The MARC card (Multi-Technology Automated Reader Card) is a smart card now being issued by the Department of**

Defense (DOD) to military personnel. According to an official release last year, "The DOD's test of MARC technologies and acceptance among a large beneficiary population will provide a great deal of information to the National Health Care Reform Team" (Current News Analysis & Research Service, 1-20-94). It seems that the Clinton administration first is trying out their prototype for a national ID card with a captive audience. And how fitting that the card is being called The MARC! How could anyone possibly label conservatives and Christians as 'paranoid' for even speculating that this card might eventually lead to the 666 Mark-of-the-Beast chip in the right hand or forehead exactly as Scripture indicates in Revelation? **The MARC card combines many different ID technologies into one system: It uses a standard 3 of 9 bar code; a magnetic stripe; embossed data; printed information including a digitized photograph; and an Integrated Circuit (IC) computer chip bonded into the left side of the card.** The combination of several media on one credit card-sized device gives the MARC card its versatility. **The MARC can interface with a variety of technologies and systems, from standard imprinting machines, to computer systems that use IC chips as data carriers.** The DOD Information Technology Policy Board initiated the MARC project in response to a proliferation of single-use card programs in the military. I find it extremely interesting and coincidental that both the military MARC card program and the national debate over a new civilian health-care card came on the scene simultaneously. Indeed, both of these new ID concepts surfaced during 1993! Donald McAlvany believes that the MARC "is a prototype for the National ID Card to be issued to every member of the U.S. civilian population" (MIA, 8-94).

The MARC card and its IC chip will be used to manage medical information on all U.S. military personnel worldwide. It also will store personal information regarding your educational background, police records, family and religious background, and other legal information. Although the MARC card looks like a regular credit card, it is a highly sophisticated smart card with powerful identification capabilities! The MARC card replaces the current meal card, and DOD project coordinators currently are evaluating it as a means of paying military personnel. It already has been tested for this purpose at the **Parris Island Marine Corps boot-camp facility.** "The military has long been in the forefront of such tracking technology," notes Peter LaLonde. "To speed the processing of personnel and supplies. For example, the DOD has married bar codes and smart cards with personal computers and portable readers" (Mark-of-the-Beast book p.113).

THE MILITARY ALSO USES RFID WRISTBANDS!

A recent example of how the DOD has utilized high-tech identification systems is the method it has used to supervise the Haitian and Cuban refugees on Guantanamo Bay Naval Base in Cuba. In 1994, 50,000 Cuban and Haitian refugees flooded into this 45-square-mile base between June and September. The United States Atlantic Command (USACOM), under the direction of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, implemented the **Deployable Mass Population Identification and Tracking System (DMP ITS),** a system which has been tested since 1992. This highly sophisticated system utilizes all of the latest technology: a Hewlett-Packard 715 UNIX workstation sporting a 2 gigabyte internal hard drive; a 19-inch color monitor, keyboard, mouse; an Identix TY-555 Touchview Fingerprint Scanner, and a Panasonic CCD color video camera. The system server configuration includes an HP-735 workstation with 80M of RAM and a 525 GB external hard drive, a 9.6 KBPS analog communications modem, a flat-bed scanner, an HP LaserJet printer and 6M of memory and a V.42 highspeed modem. And how is all this hardware put to use? With **the AVID RFID transponder in a plastic wristband, along with an AVID RFID Tag Scanner!** According to a firsthand report, "Military personnel place a black plastic wristband on the person's right wrist. It is secured using an aluminum metal pop riveter.

DOD systems designer, Mike Humphrey, Chief of Applications Programming for USACOM, said he got the idea to tag refugees with RFID technology from reading Automatic I.D. News, an industry journal. Mark David, Editor-in-Chief for Automatic I.D. News, remarking on the DMPITS operation, exclaimed, "It is an incredible application---one of the first to cross a controversial line and tag humans with RFID transponders" (AIDN, 12-94). Indeed it is, and the only thing lacking is a "layer of skin"! Reaction from the refugees was mixed. One woman said, "We have to wear it to get medical help at the hospital, and I have an injury. So it's OK." Others were not so compliant. Some managed to cut them off with homemade knives, while some actually chewed through the hard plastic! One man being interviewed was particularly upset---and for a very good reason. He said, "In Revelation 13:16 the Bible says that the devil will mark us on our right hands. It says that we'll be marked with the number 666. It really bothers me that it's in the Bible" (AIDN, 12-94). I'm absolutely amazed that his politically-incorrect "religious" response was ever published by the journal.

VARIOUS NEWSPAPERS TELL US "THE MARK" CHIP IS COMING!

Many articles suggesting the "chipping" of humans with RFID "tags have appeared in various newspapers and magazines nationwide over the past few months. The most shocking article appeared last year on the front page of the May 7, 1996, edition of the oldest newspaper in the city of Chicago, the Chicago Tribune. The article was titled, IN FUTURE; TINY CHIP MAY GET UNDER SKIN. The subtitle read, CRITICS ARGUE THE DEVICE INVITES BIG BROTHER.

The article stated in part, "A tiny chip implanted inside the body. . . long a popular delusion among paranoids. is likely to be marketed as a consumer item early in the next century [around the year 2000]. Edward Cornish, president of the world future society in Maryland, says "This is currently very hot." He continues, 'Although potential problems are huge, [implantable] locator ID chips may be inevitable. . . at least initially, such chips would be voluntary. but things that are voluntary today have a way of becoming compulsory tomorrow. . . Some employers now require staff to wear pagers. Someday, they may require chips." Mr. Bernard Beck, a Northwestern University sociologist, "If I have a universal id [chip] implanted, I can cash a check anywhere in the world. There's no worry about credit cards being stolen. These are attractive matters." In another place in the article the following admission was made. "The notion of using implantable

chips to control humans isn't entirely absent, even in these early stages of the technology's development." Well, there you have it! Can you believe it? These clowns are now freely admitting that biochip implants will help them "control" us! Hello, Big Brother! Do you still think I'm crazy?

In another article published on January 12, 1996, in the Tucson Citizen newspaper, Tucson, Arizona, the headline reads, MAGAZINE PREDICTS FUTURE OF SOCIETY. The article states in part that "an ID chip will be implanted in our bodies. . that will replace your driver's license, credit card and other forms of ID."

How about another article published on March 3, 1996, in the Wentzville Journal, Wentzville, Missouri. The headline reads, ST. PETERS MAYOR GETS EARFUL OF IRE OVER TALK OF MICROCHIP. The article indicates that St. Peters Mayor Tom Brown wants to inject everyone's ear with an ID microchip! Can you believe this garbage? Are you as outraged as I over such Hitlerian/communistic talk? Are these people insane? Don't they remember history? Are we nothing more than sheep being quietly led to the slaughter? I could go on and on, but you get the picture. Big Brother isn't coming---he's already here!


BIG BROTHER OR "666" ANTICHRIST?

Many officials in government today talk of a glorious "New World Order" of "peace and security." These government officials dogmatically advise us that the only remaining hope for peace, prosperity and survival in the world today is a system of global government via the communist founded United Nations. But should we blindly and naively', believe such carefully orchestrated totalitarian propaganda, or should we continue to believe in our constitution and the Christian principles upon which our nation was founded? Is the New World Order our messiah? Will it save us from destruction, or will it actually initiate it? Will the New World Order fulfill Bible prophecy regarding a system of world government that will ultimately be led by the Antichrist? Will biochip ID implants become the dreaded Mark-of-the-Beast/Mark-of-the-New-World-Order? Indeed, will the final leader of the communist New World Order be Big Brother or the devil incarnate, Mr. "666" Antichrist? What do you think? I'll let you be the judge. Case rested.

For more information on this subject, you may call the author in Oregon at (541) 593-9916. He has available presently a very informative 400-page book and a one-hour documentary video titled, The Mark of the New World Order.

Terry L. Cook
61535 S. Highway 97
Unit 9, Suite 288
Bend, Oregon 97702
(541) 593-9916

Neuron on a chip - this is an example of an actual neuron bonded directly to the surface of an integrated circuit. Such developments, particularly in the realm of neural prosthesis implant devices, are progressing rapidly from the domain of research, and into the arena of medical device applications.



Concern over microchip implants: New technology getting under some people's skin

By Jon E. Dougherty

© 1999 WorldNetDaily.com

Researchers say the technology is currently available to implant biometric devices in human beings, which can be monitored by government satellites and utilized by private industry. In fact some developers are currently attempting to bring the technology to the public and private sector. Though not yet generally available to the public, trials of sub-skin implants have been underway for nearly a year. For instance, **The London Times reported in October 1998, "... Film stars and the children of millionaires are among 45 people, including several Britons, who have been approached and fitted with the chips (called the Sky Eye) in secret tests."** Critics, however, are worried about the increased support such devices are receiving because of the inherent risk to individual privacy. They contend that several governments, including the U.S., possess the ability to monitor such devices and, as a consequence, the people who have them -- even though they may not be wanted for a crime, listed as a missing person, or considered dangerous in any way.

A recent study of microchip implantation technology, written by Elaine M. Ramish for the Franklin Pierce Law Center, examined at length the ethical issue of privacy, which engulfs every debate surrounding implanted biometric devices. The study provided details about current research and development as well as marketing plans developers are likely to use to "sell" the idea to a generally skeptical American public and U.S. Congress. In her study, though, Ramish said **she believes the implementation of such devices will eventually become a reality despite their controversial identification role.** But, she said, the concept is not a new one; other researchers have advocated the

widespread use of biometric identification devices as early as 1967. **Although microchip implantation might be introduced as a voluntary procedure, in time, there will be pressure to make it mandatory,**" Ramish wrote in her research paper entitled, "Time Enough? Consequences of Human Microchip Implantation."


"A national identification system via microchip implants could be achieved in two stages," she said. "Upon introduction as a voluntary system, the microchip implantation will appear to be palatable. After there is a familiarity with the procedure and a knowledge of its benefits, implantation would be mandatory." Indeed, of the test cases in Great Britain, so far benefactors have reported no negative consequences.

Ramish believes that "legislative protection(s) for individual rights" should be enacted by Congress and signed into law before any such devices could be brought to market. In her paper, Ramish said recent polls have found that if guaranteed certain privacy protections, the number of Americans who would be willing to accept a medical information implant "rose by 11 percent." Such tracking devices have already been available to pet owners for nearly ten years, and biometric devices such as fingerprint scanners are quietly making their way into the public sector. **Ramish noted that a few U.S. firms were already developing, or had developed, implantable biometric devices capable of "read only, read-write and read-write with tracking" abilities.** IBM, Hughes Aircraft, and Dallas Semiconductor are among several firms Ramish said currently were working to develop such systems, but none of them returned phone calls for comment from WorldNetDaily.

A spokesman for Rep. Lamar Smith, R-Texas, also declined to comment on the possibility that someday Congress may be faced with the decision to mandate the implementation of such technology. Though Smith is head of the House Ethics Committee -- a committee that normally examines only the ethical behavior of other House members -- his spokesman declined to say how Smith personally felt about the implementation of biometric technology in humans. "He (Smith) has never addressed that issue," the spokesman said.

A spokesman for Democratic presidential nominee candidate and former U.S. Senator Bill Bradley told WorldNetDaily his boss, too, had never considered the possibility nor thought about the ramifications of personal privacy. But George Getz, the communications director for the Libertarian Party, said party director Steve Dasbach "has considered the issue of privacy on many occasions." "In fact," he said, "that's one issue we consistently address as Libertarians." Getz said to the extent that this procedure is voluntary, "there certainly shouldn't be a law against it, because Libertarians believe that individuals, rather than the government, should have sole control over their own bodies." "But the concept of government-mandated microchip implants is reprehensible," he added.

Implantable Biochips:



Getz said he believes the inevitability of such a device lies in "the government's ability to make living a normal life without one impossible." Though the chip implantation procedure might legally remain "voluntary," he said it's very likely that government at all levels would eventually force everyone to have one. "After all, the government has never forced anyone to have a driver license," he said. "But try getting along without one, when everyone from your local banker to the car rental man to the hotel operator to the grocery store requires one in order for you to take advantage of their services." "That amounts to a de facto mandate," he said. "If the government can force you to surrender your fingerprints to get a drivers license, why can't it force you to get a computer chip implant? These are differences in degree, not in kind -- which is why it's essential to fight government privacy invasions from the outset."

A spokesman for the House Science and Technology Committee, who requested anonymity, told WorldNetDaily that indeed the committee has "looked into the question of biometrics and the use of such technology on society." He said at

present, however, no legislation requiring or permitting the use of such devices in humans is being considered in the House. "We've looked at the issue across the board -- whether to fight fraud, fight crime, improve safety," he said, "but as far as this particular use of biometrics, I don't think we've ever really addressed it."

Not everyone is opposed to the idea, however. **Amitai Etzioni, Director of a group known as the Communitarian Network** and a professor of Sociology at George Washington University, believes there are definite benefits to society using biometric technology. In an article published recently, Etzioni -- who has written extensively on the issue of privacy -- said, "**Opposition to these new technologies is particularly troubling given that the benefits are considerable.**" "Once biometric devices are more fully developed, and as unit costs decline ... a person may forget his password, pin number and access code, and leave his ID card and keys at home," wrote Etzioni.

A spokesman on science and technology issues at the Communitarian Network, who also requested anonymity, confirmed that the organization -- and Mr. Etzioni specifically -- "has done extensive work on researching the benefits to society of biometric technology." "Communities ... stand to reap considerable benefits," said Etzioni. "Once biometric devices are widely deployed, they will make it much more difficult for the estimated 330,000 criminals to remain on the lam. These fugitives not only avoid trial and incarceration but also often commit additional crimes while they roam the country with little concern." The group also expresses support for all forms of biometric technology -- from scanners to implants -- as a way to increase benefits to child care facilities, decrease losses to businesses, and protect Americans who now fall prey to identity theft. Jon E. Dougherty is a senior writer and columnist for WorldNetDaily, as well as a morning co-host of Daybreak America.

"Is there a number or a mark planned for the hand or forehead in a new cashless society? Yes, and I have seen the machines that are now ready to put it into operation." --**Ralph Nader**

The implantable microchip is perhaps the most likely candidate for a real-life Mark of the Beast. Previously relegated to the often pulpy pages of science fiction, recent technological advances have brought this frightening concept into reality. A number of companies currently market implantable microchips for animals. One of the first such products available was the InfoPet transponder, available for as little as \$10 at your local animal shelter. The InfoPet chip is small enough to inject using a special syringe under the scruff of Muffy's neck. One quick jab, and your beast is marked with an electronic ID number which can be easily read using a hand-held scanner. If Muffy ever runs off to chase a cat and gets lost, his chip can be read at the animal shelter via portable scanner to retrieve the name, phone number and address of the owner.

AVID, another animal identification company, says that once implanted, "the identity tag is virtually impossible to retrieve. Surgical removal, using the most advanced radiograph techniques available, is extremely difficult. The number can never be altered." AVID's plans for its system are ambitious: "**Our goal is to 'chip' every pet in the U.S.**" **Texas Instruments even boasts in promotional literature for its transponder-based TIRIS system that "You can run, but you can't hide."** Over the course of a few short years, millions of animals have been injected with these microchip transponders. For those involved in the livestock industry, these chips offer an efficient way to track their herds. Pet identification companies, on the other hand, exploit the fear of losing one's beloved pooch to sell their product. "Most pet owners believe it could never happen to them," reads an InfoPet brochure. "But collars and tags get lost, tattoos can be missed or mis-read..."

A brochure for Scherng Corporation's HomeAgain Companion Animal Retrieval System reads, "It only takes a moment, a door left ajar, an unlatched gate... and your precious pet is gone. And then comes the sorrow, the worry, the guilt..." The fear of losing something as beloved as a pet led millions of people to have their beasts marked. How far of a stretch would it be for these same products to be marketed to parents for an identical purpose? Representatives at Destron-Fearing, the company which manufactures the DESTRON/IDI injectable transponder used in animal tracking systems, claim to have no intention of advancing their product for use in humans. (Incidentally, Destron-Fearing's manufacturing partner is military-industrial giant GM/Hughes.)

Dr. Daniel Man, on the other hand, holds the first patent in the United States for a homing device designed specifically for implantation in humans. Man had the idea for this device "while I was a resident in plastic surgery and I kept seeing on TV all those stories about missing and abducted children." Man's device was designed for use in conjunction with a network of existing communications satellites, which would locate the implantee via triangulation.

This same concept was very nearly realized by **entrepreneur Jack Dunlap, who proposed the KIDSCAN system in Arizona. The system would track children who had an ID chip planted under their skin by transmitting a signal to a satellite. The satellite would then relay the child's location to police via a map on a computer monitor.** A local ACLU spokesperson who objected to the plan told the Arizona Republic, "police could use the system to enforce curfew laws or trace the movements of teen-agers who had not agreed to such scrutiny." Scary, huh? But not nearly as scary as losing your child. Dunlap was originally encouraged by employees at military-industrial powerhouse Martin Marietta, who initially agreed to manufacture a prototype at the company's Oak Ridge National Laboratory. Then, mysteriously, the folks at Martin Marietta threw him a cold shoulder. "It was like they had been told to shut up and stay away from it," Dunlap said. "It was really weird." As soon as Martin Marietta turned away from the project, Dunlap's financial backers left him high and dry, and the KIDSCAN system never progressed past the planning stage. The year was 1989. Perhaps the idea came before its time. But as the technology for such tracking systems continues to advance, more and more companies are eyeing the potentially lucrative human tracking market.