

THE GREAT **RACKET**

**THE ONGOING
DEVELOPMENT OF THE
CRIMINAL GLOBAL
SYSTEM**

PAUL CUDENEC

The Great
Racket:
the ongoing
development of
the criminal
global system

Essays from 2022

Paul Cudenec



winteroak.org.uk

Copyright © 2023 Paul Cudenec. The author
formally retains copyright over this work but
permits non-commercial reproduction or
distribution

“It is the corruption of our societies, the poisoning of human relationships, the paralysis of our organic capacity to live together in mutual aid, solidarity and freedom. It is the enslavement of the people of the world by the money power, the stifling of our vital breath”.

CONTENTS

Preface	vii
The monstrous truth	1
Charles' empire; the royal Reset riddle	6
Empire of hypocrisy	37
Centering people in smart cities	74
A developing evil	80
Facing up to the crime in progress	106
The truth can no longer be hidden	110
Eight rights gone wrong	116
Puppets of power	124
This odious global system	132
A crime against humanity: the Great Reset of 1914-18	136
Five thoughts on the global dictatorship	203
System? What system?	214
The dominance of self-interest & the ruling cult of evil	224
Enemies of the people	231

PREFACE

This book, currently available exclusively in pdf format, is a compilation of the more significant essays that I posted online during 2022, following the publication of my short philosophical book *The Withway*.

It is a sequel to *Fascism Rebranded: Exposing the Great Reset*, which features some of my writing from 2018 to 2021.

I did ask myself whether it was useful to put together this volume, given that the contents are already available online, sometimes on more than one website.

But, on reflection, I feel that placing them together in one volume restores to each essay a sense of context that can be lost in the busy churn of the internet.

Even on a personal level, I find it interesting and *consolidating* to scan down the list of contents and track the path along which my research and reflections led me over an intense 12-month period.

I was reaching, intuitively, towards this overview for the whole period, I now realise.

Even in the first piece in this collection, *The Monstrous Truth* (March 15, 2022), a contribution to *The Acorn* bulletin, I was effectively setting out my personal mission for the months ahead: “Eventually, after layer after layer of artifice has been peeled away, we will see the horrible truth about the psychopathic mafia and the physical and psychological slavery they have imposed on us for so long”.

A key moment was the research I conducted into the man now known as King Charles III, who officially launched the Great Reset in 2020. In *Charles’ empire: the royal Reset riddle* (April 15, 2022), I unearthed a staggeringly complex web of financial interests built around the infrastructures bearing the royal branding, including organisations and individuals involved in criminal activity.

It was in the following month’s *Empire of hypocrisy* (May 15, 2022) that I really began to get to grips with the extremely close ties between the British Empire, rebranded The Commonwealth, and the worldwide “development” agenda behind the so-called Great Reset. I remarked that enabling the advance of private profit and the accumulation of “vast fortunes” was unmistakably a key part of The Commonwealth’s mission and said that I could discern the vague outlines of a global network or entity whose centre was difficult to identify but whose key

institutions clearly included the United Nations, the WHO, the WEF, the World Bank and the less-discussed Bank for International Settlements.

Centering people in smart cities (July 11, 2022) was another *Acorn* piece, taking a close look at a United Nations brochure of that name and concluding that the title would better be stated as “Imprisoning People in Digital Concentration Camps”.

A Developing evil: the malignant historical force behind the Great Reset (August 2, 2022), is the text of a talk I gave to fellow freedom-fighters in Italy in the summer. Here I plunged deeper into the phenomenon of “development”, starting from the way it had shaped my own life, and I concluded that what was being “developed” was, in truth, the money and power of those who had initiated and imposed the process.

Combined with my reading of Fredy Perlman, this investigation left me feeling, as I explained in *Facing up to the crime in progress* (August 8, 2022), that I was living within an ongoing crime, in which “we are all being reduced to the status of objects, human or natural capital, fit only to feed the dead-eyed totalitarian global greed-machine”.

I have included two articles from *The Acorn* 76, published on August 16, 2022. The first, *The truth can no longer be hidden*, looked at the

desperate attempts of the global power nexus, via its UNESCO agency, to discredit all analysis or questioning of its agenda.

The second, *Eight rights gone wrong*, explored the way in which manufactured phoney “rights”, such as the “right” to be universally regarded as something that you are not, serve to restrict other people’s real and fundamental rights to freedom and self-expression.

Puppets of power (September 6, 2022) explained that “the tiny gang of criminals with all the money that power can buy, and all the power that money can provide, want to hold on to their full-spectrum world domination” and looked at some of the techniques they use for controlling politicians and other key individuals.

We are looking today at the complete *capture* of state power by financial interests and the violent *imposition* everywhere of that illicit and non-consensual authority, I wrote in *This odious global system* (September 21, 2022).

I added: “It is a *scam*, a *racket*, which has gradually taken over the world’s institutions to the point that its insatiable greed for ever more ‘growth’ and ‘development’ has been written into the legislative infrastructures of our society”.

A crime against humanity; the Great Reset of 1914-1918 (October 14, 2022) looked at recent research on the First World War revealing that the horrific conflict was planned in advance by a

powerful group which aimed to profit from it in many ways.

I noted the striking parallels between the last century's Great War and this century's Great Reset: "The war represented a sudden acceleration of 'modernisation', the process by which human beings are torn from all their belonging and turned into helpless and isolated victims of a rapacious system of exploitation".

I began *Five thoughts on the global dictatorship* (October 25, 2022) with a question: "Suppose, a few days after you read this article, a group of international bankers hold a historic press conference in Basle, New York or London. Here they announce that they are in fact the real rulers of the world, that the pretence of democratic nation-states no longer serves any purpose and that from now on we will be living under an undisguised global dictatorship intent on pushing us all, regardless of our wishes, into a worldwide transhumanist digital slave camp designed to maximise profit and control for these same bankers. Do you think that men and women across the world would simply shrug their shoulders, go back to work and tell themselves that they had better adapt to this New Normal?"

My answer was that no, they wouldn't, and it was not by chance that in the following article, *System? What System?* (November 18, 2022), I

referred to Hans and Sophie Scholl of the White Rose underground resistance network in Nazi Germany, a regime which is one of the historical models for the authoritarian post-Reset world order.

In *The dominance of self-interest and the ruling cult of evil* (December 9, 2022), I speculate that the ruling criminal class have been forced to adopt an inverted spirituality in order to justify their sociopathic activities to themselves.

I note: “The struggle between them and the seekers of truth therefore incarnates, *in the present time and on the human plane*, the eternal battle between the forces of life and death, otherwise known as good and evil”.

Finally, I have included *Enemies of the people: the Rothschilds and their corrupt global empire* (December 22, 2022), despite its length and the fact that it already exists as a separate pdf booklet.

It would have been odd to have missed it out, given that it was in many ways the culmination of the research featured in the rest of the year’s output and that it tied together so many loose ends left dangling in previous essays.

Paul Cudenec, January 2023

THE MONSTROUS TRUTH

March 15, 2022

It is hard to fully grasp the sheer *monstrosity* of the system under which we live.

Most people simply cannot imagine that anyone could *deliberately* inflict untold misery and death on others, purely in pursuit of their own selfish goals.

Instead, even when they are not happy about what has happened, they cling to the semi-reassuring notion that it must have been some kind of *mistake*, or *accident*, the unforeseen outcome of a collision of social circumstances or geopolitical forces for which nobody in particular could be held responsible.

They consider it *outlandish* to suggest, despite the abundant evidence, that our own ruling clique has created, funded and trained terrorist groups [1] to attack its own populations so as to frighten them into cowed obedience.

They do not think it *likely* for a fake “pandemic” to be sold to a global public in a pre-planned and co-ordinated fashion in order to advance a certain nefarious agenda, with the

vast and irreparable suffering caused by this scam regarded as acceptable collateral damage.

They struggle to see how it could *really* be true that the social and environmental goals and solutions offered to us by virtue-signalling [2] “do-gooders” are nothing but lies, Trojan horses for yet more exploitation and destruction.

It is *impossible* for many folk to imagine that nightmarish military conflicts costing thousands, if not millions, of innocent lives, could be schemed up behind the scenes and sold to the public on false pretences.

They cannot believe any of this because they, like most of us, fall into the “mostly good” category of human being, tripping and stumbling our way through life trying not to cause *too much* harm to others and still feeling uneasy, years later, about the times when we did not meet our own moral standards.

But the powerful individuals who pull the strings in this world are *not like us* and therefore behave in ways which we cannot begin to fathom.

They are psychopaths, utterly lacking in empathy for their fellow humans and addicted to the taste of blood and power.

In their vile arrogance, they imagine themselves *better* than all the little people, all the peasants, all the nobodies and failures over whom they merrily trample in their quest for yet more wealth and glory.

Their sneering sense of superiority fuels their behaviour. They see themselves as the glorious end product of neo-Darwinian “dog eats dog” evolution, the “fittest” who are destined to survive and prosper at the expense of the despised masses.

In truth, of course, the opposite is true. These liars and manipulators, these mass-murdering mafiosi, represent the very *worst* of humanity.

Only in their own inverted and amoral view of the world do the ruthless and greedy occupy any kind of high ground. *They are the lowest of the low.*

But as long as we continue to see the world from their perspective, which they present to us as the one and only truth, we will not be able to grasp this.

We need to step right out of the picture they have painted for us, in which we will only ever be the background to the triumph of their own twisted will.

The first thing we obviously have to do is to stop listening to and believing their lies, refuse to base our understanding of reality on what they tell us, decline to take “sides” in the gruesome games they devise to further divide and control us.

We also have to shake ourselves free from the language they use and all the assumptions

this brings with it. Enough of their “economy” and “growth” and “security” and “progress”! These are all just mislabelled facets of their ongoing domination.

As we strip away the fake reality they have painted, we will ditch all kinds of previously unchallengeable “truths”.

No, we do not really have a “moral” duty to spend our lives working for the profit of the ruling class, just in order to live and eat and breathe!

No, our children do not belong to them and we do not have to hand them over for obligatory slave-think indoctrination or for experimental drug injection!

No, we do not “need” their infrastructures in order to live our lives and we certainly do not need “protection” from those who themselves represent by far the greatest threat to our well-being!

Eventually, after layer after layer of artifice has been peeled away, we will see the horrible truth about the psychopathic mafia and the physical and psychological slavery they have imposed on us for so long.

Once we have understood this, we will all know what to do next.

[1] <https://nevermore.media/2022/02/25/the-sordid-history-of-nato-sponsored-terrorism/>

[2] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2021/04/22/divide-rule-and-profit-the->

intersectional-impact-racket/

CHARLES' EMPIRE: THE ROYAL RESET RIDDLE

April 15, 2022 (updated September 9, 2022)

1. Charles the Great Resetter
2. Global goals
3. Impact imperialism
4. Powerful players
5. Banksters, cheats and spooks
6. The bringer of light?
7. Neo-colonial land-grabbing
8. Shaping history

1. Charles the Great Resetter

When the Great Reset was officially launched [1] in 2020, it was not done so by Klaus Schwab or Bill Gates, but by Charles, Prince of Wales, then heir apparent to the British throne.

Born in Buckingham Palace in 1948, Charles, now “King Charles”, is best known worldwide for his failed marriage to Lady Diana Spencer, who died in a road crash in Paris in 1997, a year after their divorce.

His official website [2] announced on June 3

2020: “Today, through HRH’s Sustainable Markets Initiative and the World Economic Forum, The Prince of Wales launched a new global initiative, The Great Reset”.

A royal tweet declared: “#TheGreatReset initiative is designed to ensure businesses and communities ‘build back better’ by putting sustainable business practices at the heart of their operations as they begin to recover from the coronavirus pandemic”. [3]

This may come as a bit of a surprise to those who see Charles as a bumbling but affable figure, who talks to his plants, loves traditional architecture, protects nature and tries to help young people get along in life.

But the reality, as we will show here, is that he is the head (or the very willing *figurehead*) of a vast empire of nefarious financial interests hiding hypocritically behind a facade of charitable philanthropy.

2. Global goals

Charles has been very busy over the last 50 years or so, establishing an alliance of organisations called The Prince’s Charities, described as “the largest multi-cause charitable enterprise in the United Kingdom”. [4]

These have also spread overseas to create a bewildering global web of trusts, foundations and

funds.

To make things simpler, we will focus here on just a few of the better-known organisations, starting in the UK with **Business in the Community**.

This body describes itself as “the largest and longest established business-led membership organisation dedicated to responsible business”, having been initially established in 1982 as The Prince’s Responsible Business Network.

Its agenda is very much in line with all the key elements of the Great Reset.

It declares, for instance: “Business in the Community (BITC) is working with business to accelerate the pace and scale of action to deliver against the United Nations Global Goals, also known as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)”. [5]

The great news for Charles’s money-loving entourage is that “running their businesses responsibly” in line with the UNSDGs “also opens business market opportunities”.

Business in the Community boasts its own WEF-style “Future Leaders Board” [6] and in 2017 was already insisting, [7] like Klaus Schwab, [8] that “business must ensure an inclusive digital revolution”.

Its report called “A Brave New World?” [9] features all the familiar Great Reset “priorities”, such as inclusivity (“Build digital access,

capability and confidence to allow all to benefit from the digital economy”) and lifelong learning (“Prepare employees. Provide digital skills and lifelong learning to create an adaptable workforce”).

It looks ahead to a **Fourth Industrial Revolution** (“Anticipate automation. Create new roles, where technology complements humans, and support communities to manage the transition”) with bigger profit margins naturally being its aim (“Transition to new business models that cut waste and increase asset productivity”).

There is an early mention of the “track and trace” phrase which became so familiar during the lockdowns (“Track, trace and resolve”) with a plug for **Blockverify**, “a London-based start-up that uses technology to track, record, and verify products in a way that is permanently logged in the blockchain... Blockverify has been piloting solutions with pharmaceutical and beauty companies”.

The report promotes smart agriculture in the form of Unilever’s Marcatus Mobile Education Platform, “a collaboration between **Unilever**, **Oxfam** and **Ford Foundation** to train smallholder farmers in rural areas” which aims for “additional farm revenues of £1.5 trillion by 2030”.

It concludes by giving “thanks to our corpo-

rate partners, **Barclays** and **Fujitsu**, for supporting our programme of work to create an inclusive digital revolution”.

The Prince’s Trust Group expands this same agenda across the Commonwealth, the vast sphere of influence formerly known as the British Empire.

It describes itself as “a global network of charities” delivering “education, employment, enterprise and environmental projects that enable young people and communities to thrive”. [10]

It is all about “transforming lives and building sustainable communities”, it seems.

One of its reports tells us: “During 2020/21, together with our partners we supported 60,146 young people in 16 countries across the Commonwealth and beyond: Australia, Barbados, Canada, Ghana, Greece, India, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Malaysia, Malta, New Zealand, Pakistan, Rwanda, Trinidad & Tobago and the United Kingdom. We also began our work in St Lucia and the USA”. [11]

The Prince’s Trust is joined in this task by another important node of Charles’ network, the **British Asian Trust**, as we will shortly see.

3. Impact imperialism

The impact industry is a sinister entity which,

over the last few years of research, we have found lurking under every dubious stone we have turned.

For more info, check out our articles on Extinction Rebellion, [12] Ronald Cohen, [13] intersectionality, [14] the WEF Global Shapers, [15] Guerrilla Foundation, [16] Edge Fund [17] and also our general overview. [18]

Impact profiteering is very much tied in with the Great Reset [19] and its Fourth Industrial Revolution, [20] which aims to set up the infrastructure through which this new form of digital serfdom can be imposed.

Inevitably, then, the impact agenda is very present throughout Charles' empire, even if somewhat hidden from casual view.

Sometimes it is just the *word itself* that gives the game away.

Business in the Community, for instance, says on its site that it works with its members “to continually improve their responsible business practice, leveraging the collective *impact* for the benefit of communities”. [21]

“Impact” crops up three times on the introductory page.

It appears again on the page [22] consecrated to BITC's entirely predictable commitment to the **United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals**, those cornerstones of impact capitalism. The term “positive impact” is

here linked to another related buzzword, “purpose”.

The impact theme is also very much embraced by The Prince’s Trust, which is very keen on “digital and blended programmes” and “online business simulation games”. [23]

In line with the Great Reset promoted by its founder, it used Covid to advance a hyper-industrial agenda, describing in one post how it had been measuring its “digital impact”. [24]

It was pleased to report that 61% of its respondents said “online learning had supported them to make changes in their life, with the majority developing new skills and making plans for the future”.

One of the tools which the Trust uses for what it worryingly terms “digital programming” [25] is something called **Vibe Check**. [26]

This bespoke programme, aimed at young people, is a “free (*fancy that!*) interactive personal development tool delivered via **WhatsApp**, that creates a safe and supportive online space for them to develop key life skills”.

“The programme has piloted in **Barbados** and **Ghana** during 2020 and early 2021, using innovative automation technology to tailor each young person’s experience with the service.

“Designed for the needs of young people in each country it rolls out in, Vibe Check focuses on confidence, communication and managing

feelings in Barbados, and self-employment and entrepreneurship in Ghana”.

This obsession with developing “new digital processes for gathering data”, hidden behind a do-good facade, is classic impact-think.

Indeed, the Prince’s Trust International boasts its very own Head of Impact, Diletta Morinello, [27] a professional “impact measurer”.

In January 2020, just before the Covid moment, Morinello was recruiting a data analyst “as we start our exciting new 5-year strategy” and “significantly upscale our operations”. [28]

The role was “to ensure our data is robust and supports our ability to accurately and effectively monitor our impact on young peoples’ [sic] experiences of education and employment as well as our financial performance and fundraising.

“Impact will need to be measured across a range of programmes or interventions, with a range of stakeholders across the world”. [29]

Impact, data, stakeholders... three terms from the same familiar crib sheet.

It is, however, with his British Asian Trust that Charles exposes most fully his involvement with the insidious world of impact imperialism.

He founded this organisation in 2007 with a group of well-connected British Asian business-people.

Although the British Asian Trust prefers the

term “social finance”, it does little else to hide its impact agenda.

Its website even proudly displays a recommendation from the “father” of impact investment Ronald Cohen, who declares: “What the British Asian Trust is doing in social finance is truly groundbreaking: it is capable of delivering vital social improvement at scale”. [30]

Indeed, as we have previously reported, Cohen gives an approving mention to Charles and the British Asian Trust in his 2020 book *Impact: Reshaping Capitalism to Drive Real Change*. [31]

The Trust, of course, claims to be “improving” the lives of children and young people in Asia “in line with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 4 on quality education”. [32]

It says: “The Quality Education India Development Impact Bond (QEI DIB) is an innovative results-based funding mechanism that aims to improve learning outcomes for more than 200,000 primary school children”.

And then it adds: “As the QEI DIB progresses, we aim to create an education rate card, setting out the costs of delivering specific outcomes at scale. Such a card can be used by government and funders to make informed policy and spending decisions and improve education across the whole country”.

This is what impact is all about. The “cost” of meeting UNSDGs is calculated and “stakeholders” take on this cost from the public purse. If the “outcomes” tick all the right boxes they will be reimbursed, plus a little extra to make their “investment” worthwhile.

In the meantime, the lives of these children, bundled together “at scale”, are turned into financial commodities – like the bundles of sub-prime mortgage debts that prompted the 2008 crash – which can be tracked, traced and traded in real time via 5G/6G and the “inclusive” global digital panopticon.

Speculators can bet on the “success” of these children’s lives or against it – little matter, as long as they are available as products for this vast new profitable market.

As we have previously warned, “social finance” or impact investing reduces human beings to the status of potential investments, sources of profit for wealthy ruling vampires.

It is a digital slave trade.

4. Powerful players

So what kind of people and organisations are involved in Charles’ global network?

Let’s start with Business in the Community. This label is probably intended to conjure up fond images of tiny cornershops in English market

towns (*like Grantham?*) or of organic Buddhist basket-weaving start-ups in Charles' pseudo-traditional Poundbury [33] development.

But no. As we would expect from the launcher of the Great Reset, the project [34] is a typical corporatist mixture of public and private sector, uniting loyal servants of the British empire with their extremely well-heeled friends in the world of big business and high finance.

BITC's dauntingly long list of members [35] includes the likes of **Accenture** and **Unilever** (both hailed by Cohen for their participation in his nefarious impact scam) and Big Pharma businesses **AstraZeneca**, **GlaxoSmithKline** and **Pfizer**.

While the **BBC**, **Sky**, **Facebook** and **Google** presumably constitute the propaganda and censorship wing, **British Airways**, **easyJet**, **Heathrow Airport Limited**, **Shell UK** and **BP** were no doubt all included for their special contribution to environmental sustainability.

Charles' passion for the health of his grateful subjects is reflected in the inclusion, alongside Knorr's Quick Soups manufacturers Unilever, of **Greggs** and **PepsiCo UK**.

We also find the likes of the **Bank of America**, **McKinsey** (the US consultancy firm controversially [36] employed by Emmanuel Macron in France) and **Morgan Stanley** (the

WEF partner and impact investor remembered for its financing of both Hitler and Mussolini). [37]

Other Business in the Community members are arms dealers **Rolls Royce** and **Thales Group**, superb examples of what Charles has in mind with “responsible” business activity.

The organisation is governed by a Board of Trustee Directors. This is chaired by **Gavin Patterson**, [38] president and chief revenue officer of **Salesforce**, the cloud computing business headed by billionaire Marc Benioff, [39] owner of *Time* magazine and inaugural chair of the WEF’s Center for the Fourth Industrial Revolution in San Francisco.

Another director is **Dame Vivian Hunt**, senior partner, UK and Ireland, of the aforementioned McKinsey. A member of the secretive **Trilateral Commission**, she is the former chair of **British American Business**, an exclusive transatlantic business networking group. [40]

One of the vice-presidents is **Sir Mark Weinberg**, “a South African-born British financier who co-founded **J. Rothschild Assurance**, which later became **St James’s Place Wealth Management**, and is chairman of blockchain company **Atlas City Global**”. [41]

The advisory board features **Sir Ian Michael Cheshire**, [42] formerly chairman of

Barclays UK and currently chairman of **Menhaden plc** with its “long only, multi-asset investment strategy which seeks to provide the best balance between risk & reward across equity, credit & private universes” offering “asymmetric risk-reward pay-offs”. [43]

Alongside this banker sits none other than **Frances O’Grady**, general secretary of the UK’s **Trades Union Congress (TUC)**. [44] As befits a representative of the British working class, O’Grady is also a non-executive director at the **Bank of England**. [45]

Finally, on the BITC’s Community Leadership Board we find none other than **Owen Marks** of everybody’s favourite vaccine manufacturer, **Pfizer**.

There he incarnates the striking overlap between the world of Big Pharma and the world of “woke” impact-intersectionality, co-chairing the **Pfizer UK Inclusive Diversity Group** with its focus on “OPEN (LGBTQ), Ethnicity, Gender, DisAbility and Cross Generational and Social Mobility”.

Let’s next turn to The Prince’s Trust Group, the global network of charities founded by Charles in 1976.

The UK entity involves very much the same kind of people as Business in the Community.

Its council [47] is chaired by **John Booth**, an “entrepreneur and philanthropist” who boasts

“a range of venture capital interests in e-commerce, media and telecommunications”.

It features two former partners at **Goldman Sachs**: **Michelle Pinggera** and **Ian Mukherjee**, who went on to found **Amiya Capital**, a “global emerging markets fund”.

There is also **Suzy Neubert**, former global head of distribution at **JO Hambro Capital Management**, and **Mark Dearnley**, previously a “digital transformation” advisor with global management consulting firm, **Bain & Company**.

The council’s vice-president is **Michael Marks**, former chairman of **Merrill Lynch Investment Managers** and founding partner of **MZ Capital** and **NewSmith Capital Partners LLP**.

It is informative to note the people and businesses with which the Prince’s Trust group is enmeshed worldwide.

In **New Zealand**, chairman of the Prince’s Trust board [48] is **Andrew Williams**, co-chairman of **Alvarium** – “With \$15 billion in assets under management globally, Alvarium is a collaboration between wealthy families, entrepreneurs and institutions in Asia, the Gulf and Americas”. [49]

The **Australian** entity’s corporate sponsors [50] include **Macquarie**, [51] Australia’s largest investment bank, while in **Canada**, the Prince’s

Trust is supported [52] by Finistra (working hard “to accelerate digital banking”) [53] and by Bank of America.

Its supporters also include **Scotiabank**, **KPMG** and arms dealer **Lockheed Martin**.

Over at the British Asian Trust, one member of the Board of Trustees is **Farzana Baduel**, former vice-chair of business relations for the **Conservative Party** and founder/CEO of **Curzon PR**. [54]

She appeared in *The Times* in May 2021 to explain how much she loved “remote working”, that mainstay of the “New Normal” promoted under the Great Reset. [55]

Another is **Varun Chandra**, [56] managing partner of “London-based corporate intelligence specialist” **Hakluyt**, whose astonishing recent £12.8 million rise in profits was “helped by the reduction in staff travel thanks to the pandemic”, according to *The Times*. [57]

In the words of one media report, “Hakluyt is an ultra secretive firm whose client list reads like a who’s who of the business world with corporations retaining their services for strategic intelligence and advice as they look to expand operations”. [58]

The British Asian Trust site says of Chandra: “Trained at Lehman Brothers, he went on to help build a regulated advisory firm for former UK Prime Minister **Tony Blair**”. [59]

Also on the board are **Dr Shenila Rawal** (who previously worked for the **World Bank**) [60] and **Ganesh Ramani**, former partner at **Goldman Sachs**. [61]

Ramani in fact has a family connection to the Trust's Big Chief, having married Ruth Powys, widow of Mark Shand, brother of Charles's wife Camilla. [62]

Vice-chairs are **Asif Rangoonwala** [63] (once described by *The Independent* as "powerboat playboy, bakery baron, property plutocrat") [64] and **Shalni Arora**, [65] who has a background in Big Pharma with **AstraZeneca** and **DxS Ltd** [66] and is the wife of retail magnate Simon Arora of **B&M Bargains**. [67]

Chair of the Board of Trustees is investment banker **Lord Jitesh Gadhia**, who has worked for **Barclays Capital**, **ABN AMRO** and **Baring Brothers**. [68]

He was previously senior managing director at global investment business **Blackstone** in London. On being appointed there in 2010, he enthused: "Blackstone's powerful network of relationships, access to capital and expanding geographic reach, across developed and emerging markets, offers a unique proposition for clients". [69]

Gadhia was also – surprise, surprise! – a **World Economic Forum Young Global Leader**. [70]

5. Banksters, cheats and spooks

From any genuinely ethical vantage point, the business activities of those involved with Charles' empire are, in themselves, cause for concern.

But the problem goes further than that. The amount of controversy and scandal surrounding numerous participants in his various projects makes one wonder how someone who likes to be referred to as "His Royal Highness" can associate with so many examples of what most of us would regard as low life.

Here are some illustrations:

HSBC is the Prince's Trust's Global Founding Corporate Partner and is praised in its Impact Report for its "transformational investment in young people", being identified as "one of our most committed and loyal supporters". [71] Never mind that the British-based bankers have a long history [72] of vast tax avoidance schemes and criminal activity such as money laundering. Dubbed "gangster bankers" involved in "stupefying abuses", Charles' loyal supporters even "hooked up with drug traffickers and terrorists", explains a 2013 article. [73]

KPMG (Business in the Community and Prince's Trust, Canada) has faced "multiple accusations of negligence, fraud, and conflicts of

interest stretching back years” [74] and was recently involved in a giant “cheating scandal”. [75]

NatWest (Business in the Community) was fined £264.8 million in December 2021 for failing to comply with money-laundering regulations. [76]

Bank of America (Prince’s Trust) faced boycott calls after spying on its customers’ activities for the FBI with regard to the January 6 2021 protests in Washington, DC. [77]

PwC (Business in the Community) has a “long history of controversies” [78] all over the world, not least in India, where it is said to have “a chequered past” with the tax authorities. [79]

Goldman Sachs International (Business in the Community, Ganesh Ramani of British Asian Trust) is afflicted by so many “controversies” that even *Wikipedia* devotes a whole page to them! [80]

Lockheed Martin (Prince’s Trust, Canada). The arms dealer is notorious [81] for its many bribery scandals.

Macquarie. (Prince’s Trust, Australia). Australia’s largest investment bank was involved in a recent \$80 billion controversy labelled the “biggest bank scandal in history“. [82]

Scotiabank (Prince’s Trust, Canada) had to pay out more than US\$120 million dollars in 2020 because of its price-manipulation activities.

[83]

Jitesh Gadhia (British Asian Trust), a Conservative Party donor in the UK, was involved in David Cameron’s “cash for access” scandal in 2014 [84] and in 2018 he was accused of a conflict of interest because he had become a director of fracking business **Third Energy**, while also being a non-executive director at **UK Government Investments**. [85]

Shalni Arora (British Asian Trust). Her husband Simon hit the headlines in 2021 for handing himself a massive payout of £30 million. His firm, **B&M bargains**, had enjoyed a surge in sales because of its “essential” status during **Covid lockdowns**. [86]

Varun Chandra (British Asian Trust). His firm, **Hakluyt**, says *The Times*, advises FTSE 100 companies and “was founded 27 years ago by former MI6 intelligence officers”. [87] An article in *The Evening Standard* describes the business as a “very secretive Mayfair company full of spooks” and “a convenient rest home for MI6 men”.

“The company attracted unwelcome publicity in 2001 when it emerged it had used an undercover agent known as Manfred to penetrate environmental groups targeting Shell and BP”. [88]

And Hakluyt was again forced into the media limelight in 2012 due to “the mysterious

death of one of its occasional investigators in a Chinese hotel room”. [89]

Finally, **Charles** himself has been caught up in various controversies over the years, not least regarding his links to BBC paedophile Jimmy Savile [90] or indeed his role in helping arms dealer **BAE Systems** sell fighter jets to **Saudi Arabia**.

Reported Scotland’s *The National*: “MP Margaret Ferrier said Princess Diana would have campaigned against its bombing raids on **Yemen**, which allegedly involve the use of banned cluster munitions, and claimed Charles was part of a ‘great effort’ to maintain the market”. [91]

And then, of course there was that unfortunate incident in the **Paris tunnel** back in 1997...

6. The bringer of light?

One particularly intriguing figure in Charles’ global network is another man who likes to be known as “His Highness”, namely **The Aga Khan**.

Khan is none other than the Global Founding Patron of the Prince’s Trust and, its site tells us, “supports the delivery of The Trust’s work in the UK and Canada and through local partners in India, Jordan, Kenya, Pakistan, Rwanda and

the Caribbean (Barbados, Trinidad & Tobago and Jamaica)". [92]

The business magnate has British, Swiss, French and Portuguese citizenship and his fingers in many a global pie.

One 2016 profile explains: "As founder and Chairman of the Geneva-based Aga Khan Development Network, he spearheads an organisation that employs 80,000 people in 30 countries, and spans non-profit work in poverty-stricken and war-torn areas of the globe, along with a huge portfolio of very-much-for-profit businesses in sectors ranging from aviation and energy to telecommunications, pharmaceuticals and luxury hotels". [93]

Khan's net worth has been estimated at \$13.3 billion and he is described as one of the world's fifteen richest "royals", although he does not actually rule over any particular geographic territory. [94]

Instead he is the spiritual leader of some 20 million Ismaili Muslims, who donate significant sums to him and worship him as the "bringer of light". [95]

Khan is a personal friend of Charles, as he was of his late mum, **Queen Elizabeth II**, and of the Spanish king **Juan Carlos**.

He is also said to have long connections to British intelligence services and other deep state networks.

Khan has been involved in a number of international scandals.

In 2012 it emerged that, although resident in France, he had been “exonerated” from paying any tax by the country’s former president **Nicolas Sarkozy**.

This, explained *The Daily Mail*, meant that he could protect his vast fortune across the Channel “despite being worth as much as £6 billion and owning mansions, yachts, private jets, some 800 race horses and even a private island in the Bahamas”. [96]

Then, in 2017, controversy broke out in Canada when it was discovered that prime minister **Justin Trudeau** had spent a holiday on a private Caribbean island owned by Khan. [97]

While he was there, he also took a ride in the bringer of light’s private helicopter.

Since the Khan’s foundation “receives millions from the Canadian government”, questions were asked about a certain conflict of interest!

Trudeau reassured the public that there was nothing to worry about because “the Aga Khan has been a longtime family friend”.

But he nevertheless became the first Canadian prime minister to be found in violation of ethics law and was forced to publicly apologize. [98]

Khan is also close friends with the **Rocke-**

fellers and the Rothschilds.

In a speech at New York's Plaza Hotel in October 1996, David Rockefeller said: "His Highness The Aga Khan is a man of vision, intellect, and passion. I've had the pleasure of knowing him for almost forty years, ever since he was an undergraduate at Harvard and a roommate of my nephew Jay Rockefeller". [99]

For his part, Khan expressed "warm thanks" to Rockefeller, adding: "He, his family, and his philanthropic organisations have been close to my family, our work, and me, for many years. I admire them for their consistent and exemplary commitment to world issues". [100]

A message from their mutual pal Lord Rothschild praised Khan for his "promotion of private sector enterprise and rural development". [101]

7. Neo-colonial land-grabbing

Khan, Rockefeller and Rothschild are also united by their common membership of the **1001 Club of the WWF**. [102]

According to researchers, this little-known group was set up in the 1970s by individuals including Charles's dad, the late Prince Philip, and Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands. [103]

As we noted in a 2021 report, Bernhard used to be in the Nazi **SS**, before founding the WWF.

[104]

He also chaired the Steering Committee of the **Bilderberg Group**, of which WEF boss Klaus Schwab was a fellow member. [105]

Bernhard was also honorary sponsor of Schwab's third European Management Symposium at Davos in 1973, when the body which was to become the World Economic Forum first adopted a more overtly political stance, by agreeing a document which became known as "**the Davos manifesto**". [106]

The WWF is notorious for throwing indigenous people off their land on behalf of its big business friends under the false green flag of "conservation" and is today very prominent in the industrial-financial lobby calling for a New Deal for Nature. [107]

For a full analysis of all this, we recommend the excellent work of the No Deal for Nature campaign, [108] Survival International [109] and Talking Africa. [110]

Here, we will simply note that Charles is very much on board this agenda, endorsing [111] the idea of "natural capital" and indeed launching a new "natural capital alliance". [112]

But then that is to be expected, because he is president of WWF-UK and "proud" to be so.

He declares on the WWF site: "I have long admired its efforts to tackle the many threats to the world's wildlife, rivers, forests and seas. And

I have come to see how effectively it uses its expertise and international reach to challenge the causes of degradation, such as climate change and the unsustainable use of natural resources". [113]

Yet again, the worthy-sounding language masks a very different reality: in this instance a newly accelerated wave of the global land-grabbing which has been a feature of the profit-driven British Empire for centuries.

8. Shaping history

Now that Charles has emerged from his 70-year stint in the Windsors' waiting room, he has become King Charles III and thus historically linked with his two predecessors of the same name.

Charles I, who became king in 1625, was the last of the *ancien régime*, a defender of the feudal order. Having been found guilty of tyranny and treason, [114] he was beheaded in front of the London crowds in 1649.

This was the apex of an English Revolution which, like so many others, was quickly shunted in a direction contrary to the interests of the mass of people who had fought and died for it.

When Oliver Cromwell crushed the radical elements in his New Model Army, at Burford, he was thanked with a celebratory banquet by the

financiers of the City of London.

From that moment onwards, the focus of the country was on commerce, expansion and exploitation, including, of course, the slave trade.

Starting with Cromwell's bloody re-occupation of Ireland, the 11-year period of republican rule, known as the Commonwealth, saw Britain's empire begin to take shape, with the grabbing of Jamaica, Surinam, St Helena, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

When the executed king's son, Charles II, took the throne with the restoration of the monarchy in 1660 it was as a "constitutional" king, beholden to parliament and happy to act as a figurehead for the military-mercantile entity known as the British Empire.

Charles III seems to be on course to combine the worst elements of both predecessors, fusing old-style feudalism with modern corporate control to forge a "sustainable" global empire built on digital serfdom and impact vampirism.

But it is important to remember that conspiracies cannot succeed if people are wise to what is happening.

By researching and exposing wrong-doing, we can shake off our status as helpless and passive spectators of history in order to become active and engaged participants, part of the resistance. [115]

Charles and his ruling-class collaborators

have to dress up their insidious agenda as “doing good”, as “philanthropy” or “conservation”, because they *know that otherwise the rest of us would not go along with it.*

Once this illusion has been destroyed and the horrible reality exposed, then decent people everywhere will turn their backs definitively on these vile parasites and their evil empire of exploitation.

[1] <https://twitter.com/ClarenceHouse/status/1268187326703898627>

[2] <https://www.princeofwales.gov.uk/thegreatreset>

[3] <https://twitter.com/ClarenceHouse/status/1268189467959070733>

[4] <https://www.mosaicnetwork.co.uk/about/hm-the-king>

[5]

<https://web.archive.org/web/20220322000117/https://www.bitc.org.uk/business-in-the-community-and-the-sustainable-development-goals/>

[6] <https://www.bitc.org.uk/future-leaders-board/>

[7] <https://www.bitc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/bitc-digital-report-abraveneworld-march2020.pdf>

[8] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2020/10/05/klaus-schwab-and-his-great-fascist-reset/>

[9] <https://www.bitc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/bitc-digital-report-abraveneworld-march2020.pdf>

[10] <https://www.princestrustglobal.org/>

[11] https://winteroakpress.files.wordpress.com/2022/04/fb3c1-printreadyptgimpactreport2020_21_.pdf

[12] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2019/04/23/rebellion-extinction-a-capitalist-scam-to-hijack-our-resistance/>

[13] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2021/01/27/ronald-cohen-impact-capitalism-and-the-great-reset/>

[14] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2021/04/22/divide-rule-and-profit-the-intersectional-impact-racket/>

[15] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2021/01/09/shapers-of-slavery-the-plan/>

[16] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2020/11/20/guerrillas-of-the-great-reset/>

[17] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2021/02/10/controlling-the-left-the-impact-edgenda/>

[18] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2021/03/16/impactor-alert/>

[19] <https://winteroak.org.uk/the-great-reset/>

- [20] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2020/04/17/resist-the-fourth-industrial-repression/>
- [21] <https://www.bitc.org.uk/who-we-are/>
- [22] <https://www.bitc.org.uk/business-in-the-community-and-the-sustainable-development-goals/>
- [23] <https://www.princestrustglobal.org/>
- [24] <https://princestrustinternational.org/measuring-digital-impact-at-princes-trust-international/>
- [25] <https://www.princes-trust.org.uk>
- [26] <https://princestrustinternational.org/princes-trust-internationals-vibe-check-programme-launches-in-ghana>
- [27] <https://www.f6s.com/dilettamorinello>
- [28] <https://twitter.com/DilettaMorinell/status/1213120892152225793?cx=HHwWgoC15cTB79UhAAAA>
- [29] <https://www.charityjob.co.uk/jobs/the-prince-s-trust/data-analyst/647652>
- [30] <https://www.britishasiantrust.org/our-work/social-finance/>
- [31] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2021/01/27/ronald-cohen-impact-capitalism-and-the-great-reset/>
- [32] <https://www.britishasiantrust.org/our-work/education/quality-education-india-dib/>
- [33] <https://poundbury.co.uk/>
- [34] <https://www.bitc.org.uk/who-we-are/>
- [35] <https://www.bitc.org.uk/list-of-business-in-the-community-members/>
- [36] https://www.lemonde.fr/en/politics/article/2022/04/01/mckinsey-affair-macron-government-in-hot-water-10-days-before-first-round-of-french-presidential-election_5979509_5.html
- [37] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2021/06/10/fascism-three-brief-insights/>
- [38] <https://www.bitc.org.uk/gavin-patterson/>
- [39] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2019/12/20/the-acorn-53/#2>
- [40] <https://www.babinc.org/>
- [41] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mark_Weinberg
- [42] <https://www.bitc.org.uk/sir-ian-cheshire/>
- [43] <https://www.menhaden.com/about-us/what-we-do/>
- [44] <https://www.bitc.org.uk/frances-ogrady/>
- [45] <https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/about/people/frances-ogrady/biography>
- [46] <https://www.bitc.org.uk/owen-marks/>
- [47] <https://www.princes-trust.org.uk/about-the-trust/people/council>
- [48] <https://www.princes-trust.org.nz/our-board/>
- [49] <https://citywireasia.com/news/wealth-manager-in-hong-kong-rebrands-as-alvarium-investments/a1213251>
- [50] <https://www.princes-trust.org.au/supporters/corporate-sponsors>
- [51] <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2021-11-26/macquarie-bank-cum-ex-tax-scheme-germany/100643674>

- [52] <https://www.princestrust.ca/en-CA/About-Us/Supporters>
- [53] <https://www.technologyrecord.com/Article/finastra-helps-union-of-arab-banks-to-accelerate-digital-banking-129352>
- [54] <https://www.britishasiantrust.org/about/governance/farzana-baduel/>
- [55] <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/how-i-learnt-to-stop-worrying-and-love-working-from-home-xrf00hfkx>
- [56] <https://www.britishasiantrust.org/about/governance/varun-chandra/>
- [57] <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/hakluyt-thrives-amid-global-expansion-kzlx3bztj>
- [58] <https://www.news.com.au/world/britain-is-concerned-about-australias-links-to-hakluyt-security-firm-created-by-former-mi6-agents/news-story/5d6a3c7ccb5cd9992379aeecaa5e3dc>
- [59] <https://www.britishasiantrust.org/about/governance/varun-chandra/>
- [60] <https://www.britishasiantrust.org/about/governance/shenila-rawal/>
- [61] <https://www.britishasiantrust.org/about/governance/ganesh-ramani/>
- [62] <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-4691344/Marriage-joy-lover-Camilla-s-late-brother.html>
- [63] <https://www.britishasiantrust.org/about/governance/asif-rangoonwala-profile/>
- [64] <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/people/profiles/asif-rangoonwala-he-s-got-lovely-baps-he-wants-to-be-the-new-bernie-and-he-ll-save-our-students-402477.html>
- [65] <https://www.britishasiantrust.org/about/governance/shalni-arora-profile/>
- [66] <https://uk.linkedin.com/in/shalni-arora-09579642>
- [67] <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-9121701/Covid-UK-B-M-Bargains-boss-gives-30million-bonus-soaring-Christmas-sales.html>
- [68] <https://www.britishasiantrust.org/about/governance/lord-jitesh-gadhia/>
- [69] <https://www.blackstone.com/news/press/jitesh-gadhia-joins-blackstone/>
- [70] <https://www.blackstone.com/news/press/jitesh-gadhia-joins-blackstone/>
- [71] https://winteroakpress.files.wordpress.com/2022/04/fb3c1-printreadytgmimpactreport2020_21_.pdf
- [72] <https://www.investopedia.com/stock-analysis/2013/investing-news-for-jan-29-hsbcs-money-laundering-scandal-hbc-scbff-ing-cs-rbs0129.aspx>
- [73] <https://www.rollingstone.com/politics/politics-news/gangster-bankers-too-big-to-jail-102004/>
- [74] <https://intpolicydigest.org/can-kpmg-recover-from-its-recent-scandals/>

- [75] <https://www.marketwatch.com/story/the-kpmg-cheating-scandal-was-much-more-widespread-than-originally-thought-2019-06-18>
- [76] <https://www.fca.org.uk/news/press-releases/natwest-fined-264.8million-anti-money-laundering-failures>
- [77] <https://nypost.com/2021/02/05/calls-for-bank-of-america-boycott-grow-after-data-given-to-fbi/>
- [78] <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/company/corporate-trends/tip-of-the-iceberg-pwc-has-a-long-history-of-controversies-in-india/articleshow/62456673.cms>
- [79] https://www.business-standard.com/article/companies/pwc-has-a-chequered-past-with-taxmen-109010901004_1.html
- [80] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Goldman_Sachs_controversies
- [81] https://historica.fandom.com/wiki/Lockheed_bribery_scandals
- [82] <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2021-11-26/macquarie-bank-cum-ex-tax-scheme-germany/100643674>
- [83] <https://www.ctvnews.ca/business/scotiabank-to-pay-us-127-4m-to-settle-spoofing-and-manipulation-case-1.5070793>
- [84] <https://www.mirror.co.uk/news/uk-news/david-camerons-tories-cash-access-4618443>
- [85] <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2018/feb/19/fracking-third-energy-north-yorkshire-treasury-jitesh-gadhia>
- [86] <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-9121701/Covid-UK-B-M-Bargains-boss-gives-30million-bonus-soaring-Christmas-sales.html>
- [87] <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/hakluyt-thrives-amid-global-expansion-kzlx3bztj>
- [88] <https://www.standard.co.uk/news/london/mi6-a-death-in-china-and-the-very-secretive-mayfair-company-full-of-spooks-7603151.html>
- [89] <https://www.standard.co.uk/news/london/mi6-a-death-in-china-and-the-very-secretive-mayfair-company-full-of-spooks-7603151.html>
- [90] <https://www.express.co.uk/news/royal/1592575/prince-charles-jimmy-savile-royal-family-news-princess-diana>
- [91] <https://www.thenational.scot/politics/14893067.mp-criticises-prince-charles-role-in-bae-systems-sale-of-fighter-jets-to-saudi-arabia/>
- [92] <https://www.princestrustglobal.org/>
- [93] <https://therake.com/stories/icons/earths-heavenly-treasures-extraordinary-life-aga-khans/>
- [94] https://wikispooks.com/wiki/Aga_Khan_IV
- [95] <https://www.smh.com.au/entertainment/celebrity/the-aga-khan-the-alleged-affair-with-an-air-hostess-and-the-75-million-divorce-settlement-20120112-1pwjt.html>

- [96] <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2223084/Sarkozy-exonerated-billionaire-Aga-Khan-paying-tax-corruption-inquiry-hears.html>
- [97] <https://www.thespec.com/news/canada/2017/01/12/7-things-you-wanted-to-know-about-the-aga-khan-controversy-but-were-afraid-to-ask.html>
- [98] <https://www.thespec.com/news/canada/2017/12/21/trudeau-becomes-first-prime-minister-found-in-violation-of-ethics-law.html>
- [99] <http://amaana.org/ISWEB/hadrock.htm>
- [100] <http://amaana.org/ISWEB/hadrasp.htm>
- [101] <http://amaana.org/ISWEB/hadroths.htm>
- [102] <https://isgp-studies.com/1001-club-membership-list>
- [103] <https://isgp-studies.com/1001-club-of-the-wwf>
- [104] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2021/06/10/fascism-three-brief-insights/>
- [105] <https://web.archive.org/web/20140202095633/http://www.bilderberg-meetings.org/former-steering-committee-members.html>
- [106] http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_First40Years_Book_2010.pdf
- [107] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2020/01/21/the-acorn-54/#2>
- [108] <https://nodealfornature.wixsite.com/info>
- [109] <http://www.survivalinternational.org/>
- [110] <https://www.mixcloud.com/talkingafrica/>
- [111] <https://nordsip.com/2020/11/19/prince-charles-endorses-lombard-odiers-natural-capital-strategy/>
- [112] <https://reneweconomy.com.au/prince-charles-launches-new-natural-capital-alliance-to-mobilise-us10-billion/>
- [113] <https://www.wwf.org.uk/who-we-are/our-president-hrh-prince-charles>
- [114] <https://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/building/palace/westminsterhall/government-and-administration/trial-of-charles/>
- [115] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2021/11/22/the-acorn-69/#3>

EMPIRE OF HYPOCRISY

May 15, 2022

1. The nice imperialists
2. A global agenda
3. Human capital
4. Impact outcomes
5. Vast fortunes
6. Devoted to deceit

1. The nice imperialists

In the middle of the 19th century, the British Empire ran into what would today be termed a “public relations crisis”.

Influential domestic voices were starting to criticise its industrial system and worldwide domination on ethical grounds, not least the art critic John Ruskin.

He wrote that all he had found at the heart of what was supposedly a great civilization was “insane religion, degraded art, merciless war, sullen toil, detestable pleasure, and vain or vile hope”. [1]

Lack of public support for the empire at home

from the wave of “Little Englander” sentiment also risked affecting the way Britain’s activities were viewed abroad.

As Carroll Quigley writes, its success was partly due to “its ability to present itself to the world as the defender of the freedoms and rights of small nations and of diverse social and religious groups”. [2]

It was therefore decided, by a powerful group based around Cecil Rhodes and Lord Milner, along with aristocrats such as Lord Esher, Lord Rothschild and Lord Balfour, [3] to rethink the form and appearance of Britain’s economic sphere of influence.

Gradually, the Crown’s possessions were encouraged to become supposedly independent nations, though very much remaining under Britain’s wing, and eventually, after the Second World War, The Empire was rebranded The Commonwealth.

In her foreword to a very useful 2019 collection of the Commonwealth’s declarations, its current secretary-general, Patricia Scotland, writes: “The 1949 London Declaration marks the opening of a new movement, maintaining the familiar harmony, yet developing it in ways never before attempted – the transformation of an empire into a mutually supporting family of nations and peoples. It was this brief yet visionary declaration which brought into being

the Commonwealth we know today”. [4]

Today we are very familiar with the two-faced language of power, which is constantly deployed to hide unpalatable truth from the public.

Whether in the form of corporate greenwashing, warmongering “humanitarian interventions” or censorship disguised as “fact-checking”, this cynical misuse of words has long since surpassed the satire of George Orwell’s mendacious Ministry of Truth.

The phenomenon is global now, but Britain can look back with pride at its leading role in developing this fraudulent double-speak.

The British Empire’s self-declared commitment to “the protection and advancement of the native races” [5] did not stop it from opening fire on unarmed Gandhi-supporting Indian independence protesters in Amritsar in 1919, killing 379 people, [6] or from using mass murder, torture and concentration camps to crush the anti-imperialist Mau Mau revolt in Kenya between 1948 and 1955.

The self-righteous defender of worldwide freedom acquiesced in the rise of Hitler’s Germany, simultaneously denounced (in public) and tolerated (in private) Mussolini’s 1935 invasion of Ethiopia and did all it could to hinder resistance to Franco’s far-right coup in Spain in 1936, despite its own public’s overwhelming

support for the other side.

“Britain’s attitude was so devious that it can hardly be untangled,” [8] writes Quigley about this period. “The motives of the government were clearly not the same as the motives of the people, and in no country has secrecy and anonymity been carried so far or been so well preserved as in Britain”. [9]

Over the 70-plus years of its existence, The Commonwealth has proudly continued this official practice of manipulative and virtue-signalling language.

Back in 1944, the nascent entity declared: “We seek no advantages for ourselves at the cost of others. We desire the welfare and social advance of all nations and that they may help each other to better and broader days”. [10]

In 1971 The Commonwealth absurdly claimed to “oppose all forms of colonial domination” [11] and in 1983 this new cuddly version of the British Empire even had the gall to announce that “an ethic of non-violence must be at the heart of all efforts to ensure peace and harmony in the world”. [12]

All it wanted in 2002 was “a better world for our children”, [13] with secretary-general Scotland confirming in recent years that the aim was purely and simply “to build a more equal, just and peaceful world” [14] and “to achieve practical progress for the good of all”. [15]

In her fanciful framing, The Commonwealth, which embraces 54 countries and 2.5 billion people, is not an empire but “a vibrant geopolitical ecosystem”. [16]

And, according to The Commonwealth’s own charter, it is “a compelling force for good” dedicated to “international understanding and world peace”. [17]

However, the same document also describes the organisation as “an effective network for co-operation and for promoting development” and here we catch a glimpse of the reality behind the rose-tinted verbiage.

The same is true of a 2003 declaration in which Commonwealth leaders committed themselves to “strengthen development and democracy, through partnership for peace and prosperity”. [18]

Through the use of alliterative pairings, the authors of this text obviously aimed to give the impression that “development and democracy” are but two sides of the same coin, as are “peace and prosperity”.

But this is mere verbal manipulation and the four words would perhaps better be re-arranged as a contrast between the idealistic packaging of “democracy and peace” and the essential contents of “development and prosperity” – terms which, although themselves euphemisms, point us towards the real core Commonwealth agenda.

Needless to say, from The Commonwealth's point of view, "development" is a good thing and it even claims that there is such a thing as "pro-poor development". [19]

Likewise, globalisation, which is just the extension of the same process, is not seen as the cause of worldwide misery but as the magic "solution" to the "problem" termed "poverty".

"The benefits of globalisation must be shared more widely", insisted a Commonwealth declaration in 2002. [20]

The Commonwealth likes to tell people that they are poor and "underdeveloped" and that they are being unfairly deprived of what it calls "the right to development". [21]

But this, as the Mexican activist Gustavo Esteva has pointed out, is "a manipulative trick to involve people in struggles for getting what the powerful want to impose on them". [22]

He adds: "The metaphor of development gave global hegemony to a purely Western genealogy of history, robbing peoples of different cultures of the opportunity to define the forms of their social life". [23]

In the same way, "sustainable development" is presented as additionally being a "solution" for the environmental degradation inflicted by the original "pro-poor development".

However, as Esteva observed, "sustainable development has been explicitly conceived as a

strategy for sustaining ‘development’, not for supporting the flourishing and enduring of an infinitely diverse natural and social life”. [24]

The German researcher and author Wolfgang Sachs also warned the world about so-called sustainable development back in 1992.

He wrote: “This is nothing less than the repeat of a proven ruse: every time in the last thirty years when the destructive effects of development were recognized, the concept was stretched in such a way as to include both injury and therapy.

“For example, when it became obvious, around 1970, that the pursuit of development actually intensified poverty, the notion of ‘equitable development’ was invented so as to reconcile the irreconcilable: the creation of poverty with the abolition of poverty.

“In the same vein, the Brundtland Report incorporated concern for the environment into the concept of development by erecting ‘sustainable development’ as the conceptual roof for both violating and healing the environment”. [25]

Once again, we are witnessing the old imperial trick of cynically using deceptively positive-sounding terms to mask a negative reality.

As we will discover later, The Commonwealth and its friends are now intent on pushing their holy cow of “development” into chilling new

areas.

But first, let's have a look at the organisation's political agenda as revealed by its own literature.

2. A global agenda

The Commonwealth makes no secret of the fact that its mission is a globalising one, even referring to a mysterious something called "the world community". [26]

In this respect it very much doffs its hat to the United Nations.

Already in 1951 it was announcing: "Our support of the United Nations needs no re-affirmation. The Commonwealth and the United Nations are not inconsistent bodies. On the contrary, the existence of the Commonwealth, linked together by ties of friendship, common purpose and common endeavour, is a source of power behind the Charter". [27]

A 1985 declaration stressed "the need for world order and the central importance of the United Nations system". [28]

It added that it placed The Commonwealth's resources "at the service of the United Nations and of all efforts to make it more effective" because "in the future of the United Nations lies the future of humanity". [29]

Dr Musarrat Maisha Reza writes in The

Commonwealth's 2020 Global Youth Development Report of the critical need to "reach our Agenda 2030 and to deliver national and global goals". [30]

It is also notable that the version of reality presented by The Commonwealth, along with the language it uses to convey it, is almost indistinguishable from that of another global organisation, namely the World Economic Forum and its subsidiary tentacles like the Global Shapers. [31]

This is perhaps none too surprising, given that the WEF's Great Reset was launched by the future head of The Commonwealth, as we reported in *Charles' Empire*.

And, of course, some of the most extreme and draconian Covid-facilitated repression since 2020 has been in the Commonwealth nations of Canada, Australia and New Zealand.

The Commonwealth is fully on message with the whole Great Reset agenda: its youth development report welcomes a Fourth Industrial Revolution which is "blurring the distinction between the digital and physical worlds" [32] and deploys the phrase "build back better" on four separate occasions.

Despite voicing pious concerns about the negative effects of "the pandemic", it clearly joins the WEF's Klaus Schwab in regarding Covid as rather good news.

On one level the crisis created a new “problem” for which “solutions” can be sold via the mechanisms associated with “development”.

Mamta Murthi of the World Bank Group, a guest contributor to The Commonwealth’s youth report, is delighted to relate that his organisation is “taking fast, comprehensive action to fight the impacts of the pandemic”. [33]

He continues: “Between April 2020 and June 2021, WBG financing commitments reached over \$150 billion, including an unprecedented \$12 billion response to improve social protection and create employment opportunities in 56 developing countries, including 15 countries facing fragility and conflict”.

Murthi also sees a positive in the fact that “the pandemic has intensified the pace of change in the labor market and the demand for new skills”. [34]

The report’s Executive Summary likewise enthuses that Covid “has created new opportunities for online work”. [35]

“The pandemic has fast-tracked our reliance on digital communication, business and retail technologies, and centred the need for pervasive digitisation”, adds another article. [36]

This aspect, in fact, seems to be the chief cause for Covid celebration at Marlborough House, The Commonwealth’s headquarters on London’s swanky Pall Mall.

They are in awe of “the scope, speed and scale” of changes which will create for young people “an entirely different world to that experienced by previous generations” and they stress that “at the core of this change is the digitalisation of the economic system”. [37]

Being what it is, The Commonwealth has always felt the need to dress up this digital agenda in hypocritical fakespeak.

Thus a 2002 declaration spoke of the need to “bridge the information and communications technology gap between rich and poor”, [38] while the 2018 Commonwealth Cyber Declaration poured on the saccharine wokeness with its commitment to “take steps towards expanding digital access and digital inclusion for all communities without discrimination and regardless of gender, race, ethnicity, age, geographic location or language”. [39]

Its list of Commonwealth Youth COVID-19 Heroes, “who are positive lights in the pandemic” [40] reveals the same theme.

One young woman in India is praised for having set up “a virtual learning programme in 6 community libraries” and for having worked with doctors “to create informative posters in regional languages to tackle health misinformation” and a “hero” in Pakistan “partnered with private institutions to provide telemedicine services to the public”.

A young New Zealander helped her community by launching “GirlBoss Edge – a virtual career accelerator”, a Nigerian man “translated COVID-19 health messages from WHO into more than 100 languages, reaching over 1.5 million people” and “launched an Artificial Intelligence-driven app and chatbot”, while a Commonwealth hero in Jamaica “co-launched an online app helping 100,000 people find their nearest COVID-19 testing sites”.

When The Commonwealth’s youth report argues that “greater investment in skilling for the digital economy will be required” [41] for the sake of “disadvantaged youth’s career prospects”, [42] it is hard not to think of the original British Empire’s avowed mission to “civilize the natives”.

And, lo and behold, The Commonwealth has chosen to recycle that very term for the 2020s, stating: “The need for young people to become digital natives has never been more important”. [43]

It even promotes a “digital natives indicator, which measures young people’s skills and online engagement”. [44])

The report looks at the project of “redesigning work with a digital future in mind” [45] and contributors Swartz and Krish Chetty, from South Africa, even provide a list of suitable jobs for young people in the post-Covid New Normal.

They could work in “3-D printed designs”,

“Recycling through smart tagging”, “Smart farming through Internet of Things (IoT) applications”, “Online retail”, “IoT applications linked to construction projects”, “FinTech applications” (finance), “X-tech” (new innovations) or as a “solar cell manufacturer”. [46]

The one thing they cannot do, of course, in this “entirely different world to that experienced by previous generations” will be to live a traditional lifestyle close to the land.

This was already being spelled out in a 2003 declaration, made in Nigeria: “It is the strategic goal of the Commonwealth to help their pre-industrial members to transition into skilled working- and middle-class societies, recognising that their domestic policies must be conducive to such transitions”. [47]

And the same message was repeated in 2007, with talk of “the objective of speeding up the transition from rural-based towards skilled, middle class-based, industrialised and diversified societies”. [48]

In traditional societies, women usually have a very close connection to the land. But the 2018 Commonwealth Cyber Declaration prefers “to develop skills in the workforce, particularly for women and girls”. [49]

Once again, we find The Commonwealth’s aims perfectly aligned with those of the global banking and “development” mafia.

The World Bank has admitted in its own words that its favoured policy of rural development is “designed to increase production and raise productivity. It is concerned with the monetization and modernization of society, and with its transition from traditional isolation to integration with the national economy”. [50]

To achieve this “transition”, advocates of a global Fourth Industrial Revolution would have to pull off a massive feat of social engineering similar to that imposed on the people of England during the First Industrial Revolution, when the “lower orders” were thrown off the land of their ancestors by the ruling classes.

The dispossessed masses were herded into the slums and factories of domestic industrial “development” or used to advance the empire’s “development” overseas, whether in the armed forces, the merchant navy or colonial administration and policing.

As C. Douglas Lummis, author of the book *Radical Democracy*, observes: “To ‘mobilize’ (i.e. to conscript) peoples and cultures into the world economic system would require the same disembedding of economic man, the same uprooting, as occurred in the migrations to the US or in the land enclosure movement in England. Only this time, the scale is awesome”. [51]

There is a definite link between the desire to

turn young Africans and Asians into “digital natives” and the current global “conservation” agenda aimed at “protecting nature” by depopulating vast swathes of the world.

This insidious project, known variously as the New Deal for Nature, Nature Positive, Global Goal for Nature or 30×30, is backed by the world’s most powerful corporations and financial institutions, as well as by the WEF, which teamed up with the UN in 2019 to push its Sustainable Development Goals or Global Goals.

The charge for the “deal”, an imperialist land grab from the most self-sufficient peoples on the planet, is being led by the human rights violating WWF, [52] which just happens to be an official Commonwealth partner. [53]

3. Human capital

From the heartless perspective of the global development machine, “human beings are perceived as simply one of the many resources required by economy for its own needs” writes Majid Rahnema, a one-time employee of the United Nations Development Programme who became an important and outspoken critic of their global agenda. [54]

The terms used to describe this callous reality have changed over the decades. In 1991 The Commonwealth was still calling for “the

development of human resources”. [55]

But, by then, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) had already published, in 1990, its first Human Development Report [56] and this term was soon taken up by The Commonwealth.

The phrases “human development” and “people-centred economic development” featured in Commonwealth declarations in 1999 [57] and in 2002. [58]

In the 2020s the language has gone a step further. Murthi of the World Bank, where he specialises in “human development”, writes in The Commonwealth’s youth report that “protecting and investing in young people builds human capital”. [59]

Secretary general Scotland also mentions “human capital development” in her foreword [60] and the term “human capital” appears no fewer than ten times in the report.

What most attracts these financial blood-suckers is the tender flesh of the “more than 1.2 billion young people between the ages of 15 and 29 years who live in our 54 member countries”. [61]

Licking its metaphorical lips, The Commonwealth declared in 2013: “With over 60 per cent of its population aged under 30, the Commonwealth is well placed to reap a demographic dividend”. [62]

It added: “Investing in young people today is the foundation for a prosperous and equitable tomorrow”. [63]

Prosperous for whom, exactly?

A similar question is raised by the words of The Commonwealth’s 2020 youth report: “Today’s global youth boom represents a much-needed opportunity”. [64]

An opportunity for whom? To do what?

The Commonwealth deploys all the usual verbal camouflage to conceal the answers to such questions, affirming, for instance, in 2018, its “commitment to making trade and investment truly inclusive by encouraging the participation of women and youth in business activities”. [65]

In true gaslighting style, it even pretends that young people are crying out to be exploited: “We also hear young people’s call to be facilitated as drivers of economic development”. [66]

The duplicitous term “youth-led”, giving the false impression that its insidious schemes are arising from below rather than being imposed from above, is rolled out a magnificent 40 times in the youth report.

But the truth behind the hype is clearly stated by two particular contributors to that same publication.

Firstly, there is Chris Morris, manager of the Asian Development Bank’s Youth for Asia initiative, whose participation in the report is, in

itself, somewhat revealing.

He writes that “accelerating progress towards a prosperous, inclusive, resilient, and sustainable Asia and the Pacific will require mobilizing the potential of its one billion young people”. [67]

Secondly, there is Tijani Christian, chairperson of the Commonwealth Youth Council, who says: “Today, the world has the largest population of youth people [*sic*] in existence, with the Commonwealth alone having 60 per cent of its population below the age of 30.

“These extremely important assets must be protected and upskilled for countries to truly advance their economic growth and development agendas”. [68]

The real relationship between The Commonwealth and its “family of nations and peoples” here becomes starkly clear.

When the City of London vampires look at men, women and children in Africa, Asia or elsewhere, they don’t see fellow human beings but “assets” with “potential”, “human capital” from which they hope to derive a highly lucrative “demographic dividend”.

4. Impact outcomes

The principal tool with which the global imperialists aim to force future generations into a UN-approved “resilient and sustainable future”

[69] is digital data.

This was already being announced in 1991, when The Commonwealth declared its intention “to improve the collection of data – quantitative and qualitative – and the development of methods and statistical indicators, globally and nationally”. [70]

Florence Nakiwala Kiyingi, chair of the Commonwealth Youth Ministerial Task Force, recalls that at the 9th Meeting of Commonwealth Youth Ministers in 2017, they committed to “developing new ideas for financing youth development and improving data for monitoring our progress on pursuing positive outcomes for youth in relation to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)”. [71]

Regular Winter Oak readers will have immediately spotted that we are dealing here with “impact” imperialism, the means by which financial interests hope to make their profiteering domination “sustainable” and “resilient” in the decades to come.

As we have explained elsewhere, the aim is not only to privatise social interventions once handled by the state, but to bundle people’s lives into tradable commodities on which financiers can speculate.

The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals constitute the framework through which this new digital form of slavery is to be

legitimised and imposed worldwide.

For this to work, those in charge have to be able to measure the “outcome”, the success or failure of their asset, either of which can be profitable for wily speculators.

Because impact investments involve areas of life which have not until now been readily quantifiable, every detail of a human commodity’s ongoing “development” must be electronically recorded and tracked, preferably in real time.

So it was that, in 2009, The Commonwealth’s leaders committed themselves to “the strengthening and creation of partnerships and networks to increase development effectiveness, emphasising high-impact initiatives with clearly measurable outcomes”. [72]

Secretary general Scotland wrote in 2021: “Continuing progress towards achieving the Sustainable Development Goals is vital to building the world we want to see, and to do so we need to be able reliably and progressively to measure and monitor the ways in which young people live, learn and work in our communities”. [73]

“Impactful youth development programmes” [74] and associated “pragmatic remote evaluation tools” [75] are very much part of the agenda of The Commonwealth’s 2020 report.

Indeed, its full title is “Global Youth Devel-

opment Index and Report” and alongside its enlightening articles are pages of statistical data.

Speaking before the report’s release, Scotland began with the usual platitudes about giving young people “a future that is more just, inclusive, sustainable and resilient”.

But then she added: “By measuring their contributions and needs with hard data, our advocacy for their development becomes more powerful, and we are then able incrementally to increase the positive impact...” [76]

“The measurement of differential impact is critical”, declares the brochure’s Executive Summary. [77]

The twisted mentality behind the impact industry is hard to take in. Everything in life is reduced to statistical “scores” linked to financial return.

In an opening section of the brochure, a member of the Commonwealth Secretariat reports that “the scores for HIV, self-harm, alcohol abuse and tobacco consumption rates improved by less than 2 per cent each”. [78]

In the warped impact world, people’s mental health becomes a source for potential profit.

One article states: “Even before the COVID-19 pandemic, mental health was becoming better understood and prioritised as a development outcome”. [79]

A development outcome? Really?

And here again the parasites seem to find “the pandemic” has served their pecuniary purposes, with the brochure informing us that “mental health has gained even greater significance since the COVID-19 pandemic” [80] and has been “yielding positive outcomes”. [81]

As we have previously shown, [82] there is a strong proven connection between impact capitalism, the UN Sustainable Development Goals and the “intersectionality” which is such a key part of the contemporary corporate-friendly cult of “wokeness”.

So it is no surprise that The Commonwealth is proud to have produced “the first global index on youth inclusion, with an important emphasis on gender equality”. [83]

We learn: “The domain is designed to measure multiple aspects of inclusion, recognising that the factors that create social exclusion for young people are diverse and intersectional and have wide-ranging impacts”. [84]

Writing about “applying inter-sectionality”, Commonwealth collaborator Puja Bajad explains: “Participation processes and frameworks can be responsive only if they consider the intersections of race, sexuality, gender, class, caste, ethnicity and economic status that could obstruct inclusive youth participation”. [85]

Beneath this language lurks, as ever, the underlying reality of “development partners” who

want to “invest to optimise the ‘youth dividend’ by pursuing innovation, creativity and risk for youth cohorts to participate” and who need to “build an evidence base to show the impact of youth engagement”. [86]

A rather frank guest contribution by an organisation called Generation Unlimited introduces The Youth Agency Marketplace (Yoma), [87] “a digital ecosystem platform where youth grow, learn and thrive through engaging in social impact initiatives and are linked to skilling and economic opportunities”. [88]

It says: “Initiatives on the platform align with the SDGs, creating a vibrant youth marketplace for skills, digital profiles, employment and entrepreneurship.

“Yoma offers the opportunity for public and private partner organisations to reach and interact with youth to support and tap their potential”. [89]

To tap young people’s potential is apparently to “create value” – to make money in anybody else’s terms!

Worse still, this “digital ecosystem platform” aims to push its victims still further into the nightmare future of digital tyranny being rolled out under the Great Reset.

The article reveals: “As youth engage in the opportunities offered by Yoma, their active involvement and skills acquired is recorded on a

verifiable digital CV with certified credentials using blockchain technology.

“Their efforts are further rewarded and incentivised with the platform’s digital currency (ZLTO), a digital token, that can be spent in the Yoma marketplace to purchase goods and services”. [90]

5. Vast fortunes

We have written previously [91] about the similarities between Klaus Schwab’s public-private “stakeholder capitalism” and the economic model of Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany.

But the arrangement was also a feature of the economic “liberalism” [92] practised by the British Empire.

By the start of the 1600s it was clear to the merchants of London that “there were big profits to be made in overseas trade”, as historian Christopher Hill writes. [93]

The East India Company, formed in 1601, was making a profit of 500% by 1607 and basically administered India in a public-private arrangement with the British state until 1858.

Hill notes that the company, like The Royal African Company, “enjoyed the peculiar patronage of the government” and that both were “deeply involved in politics”. [94]

In *A People's History of England*, A.L. Morton describes the firm as “the real founder of British rule in India”, [95] being “the first important joint stock company” which allowed it “a continuous development”. [96]

A “sustainable development” in today’s language, perhaps?

The East India Company was also notoriously corrupt and violent, to the point that in the 18th century even the company’s own directors were forced to condemn the fact that “vast fortunes” had been obtained by “the most tyrannic and oppressive conduct that was ever known in any country”. [97]

Enabling the advance of private profit and the accumulation of “vast fortunes” is unmistakably a key part of The Commonwealth’s mission.

In the words of its own dead-eyed corporate blurb, this means that it should “play a dynamic role in promoting trade and investment so as to enhance prosperity, accelerate economic growth and development and advance the eradication of poverty in the 21st century”. [98]

In 1997 it explicitly insisted that “wealth creation requires partnerships between governments and the private sector” [99] which it trendily decided to call “smart partnerships”. [100]

It seeks “more effective ways of meeting

infrastructure financing gaps that engage the private sector” [101] and has set up schemes such as the Commonwealth Private Investment Initiative “to support a greater flow of investment to developing member countries”. [102]

Despite all its pseudo-environmental talk, The Commonwealth has always been adamant that “to achieve sustainable development, economic growth is a compelling necessity”. [103].

It warned sternly, in the same 1989 statement: “Environmental concerns should not be used to introduce a new form of conditionality, nor as a pretext for creating unjustified barriers to trade”.

At the end of the 1990s The Commonwealth seems to have become a little rattled by the rise of the anti-globalisation movement and felt the need to announce: “Globalisation is creating unprecedented opportunities for wealth creation and for the betterment of the human condition. Reduced barriers to trade and enhanced capital flows are fuelling economic growth”. [104]

Recognising that there were some issues arising from globalisation, it insisted: “The solution does not lie in abandoning a commitment to market principles or in wishing away the powerful forces of technological change. Globalisation is a reality and can only increase in

its impact.

“We fully believe in the importance of upholding labour standards and protecting the environment. But...”

Forgive us an ironic chuckle here.

“... But these must be addressed in an appropriate way that does not, by linking them to trade liberalisation, end up effectively impeding free trade and causing injustice to developing countries”. [105]

Good grief! We can't have free trade impeded! What about the poor natives in Africa who are simply crying out to have their economic potential developed by our friends at the World Bank?

In more recent years The Commonwealth has, of course, been greatly excited by the profitable potential of “climate finance”, looking forward in 2009 to “a Copenhagen Launch Fund starting in 2010 and building to a level of resources of US\$10 billion annually by 2012”. [106]

It “places a great emphasis on facilitating the capacity development of member countries to access climate finance” [107] and likes the idea of “governments exploring with development banks in facilitating the provision of more accessible financing facilities for youth-led climate research projects”. [108]

To this public-private effect, it is proud to have set up the Commonwealth Climate Finance

Access Hub, which “deploys climate finance experts in government departments”. [109]

We learn from the Commonwealth Innovation website that “in its short time of operation, the Hub has already recorded remarkable results for Commonwealth countries, securing a total of USD\$28 million of climate finance with another USD\$460 million in the pipeline”. [110]

The site provides helpful links to two completely different climate finance organisations.

One is the Global Environment Facility, [111] which was initially set up in 1992 to promote “sustainable development” within the structure of the World Bank. [112]

The other is Adaptation Fund, [113] an organisation “helping developing countries build resilience and adapt to climate change”, whose sole trustee is... the World Bank. [114]

Oh. Perhaps “completely different” wasn’t quite the right term.

6. Devoted to deceit

Since its beginnings, the Commonwealth has been based on a double deception, a concealment on two levels.

Behind the facade of “a mutually supporting family of nations and peoples” [115] is the reality of a ruthless empire designed to grab the land, loot the resources and profit from the “human

capital” of the peoples it has annexed.

And hiding behind that empire have always been the nefarious financial interests historically centred in that great stinking den of greed and corruption, the City of London. [116]

Quigley writes that Britain became “the center of world finance as well as the center of world commerce”. [117].

And he notes that one of the key factors in Britain’s historical global domination was “the skill in financial manipulation, especially on the international scene, which the small group of merchant bankers of London had acquired in the period of commercial and industrial capitalism and which lay ready for use when the need for financial capitalist innovation became urgent”. [118]

He describes them as being “devoted to secrecy and the secret use of financial influence in political life” and as “persons of tremendous public power who dreaded public knowledge of their activities”. [119]

The Commonwealth likes to boast of its “enduring values”, depicting itself as “an organisation which draws on its history”. [120]

Its secretary general, Scotland, writes of the “dynamism combined with continuity” involved in “maintaining the familiar harmony, yet developing it in ways never before attempted”. [121]

She says that the “brief yet visionary” 1949 London Declaration which brought into being The Commonwealth we know today “meant that nothing had changed and yet everything had changed”. [122]

It is interesting to consider this remark in the context of the 27 “partner” organisations listed by her body on its Commonwealth Innovation platform. [123]

Sitting proudly at the top of the list is the World Health Organization, followed by the African Development Bank Group, the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development Data, the United Nations and five of its various sub-organisations.

We also find the likes of Bloomberg Philanthropies (founded by US billionaire Michael Bloomberg), [124] the International Trade Centre (“a multilateral agency with a joint mandate with the World Trade Organization and the United Nations through the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development”), [125] Global Innovation Fund, an impact investment specialist, [126] and NDC Partnership, a big player in the world of “climate finance”. [127]

Alongside the other connections revealed in this article, this confirms that what *hasn't* changed is that financial interests still very much direct the activities of the empire.

What *has* changed is that the British Empire

is no longer the principal “public-private” instrument through which these interests pursue their agenda of all-inclusive exploitation.

Instead, we can discern the vague outlines of a global network or entity whose centre is difficult to identify but whose key institutions clearly include the United Nations, the WHO, the WEF, the World Bank and the less-discussed Bank for International Settlements, [128] as well as the good old Commonwealth.

This contemporary entity is more than happy to use the “nice guy” deceit first developed in the days of the original British Empire in order to hide its existence and its activities.

The philanthropic, do-gooding, sustainably “woke” posturing of the institutions behind which it hides is meant to see off the possibility of any serious scrutiny or criticism.

Indeed, this device even enables it to rally to its support the very people (on the “left”) who should be opposing it.

Not only is their potential dissent disabled, but they are also used to attack the entity’s remaining enemies from what appears to be the moral high ground.

Anyone who dares to expose and challenge their sugar-coated sociopathy is likely to be denounced as a selfish, reactionary, right-wing conspiracy theorist.

After all, what decent citizen could possibly

have a problem with an empire which is “a compelling force for good” working to “eradicate poverty”, to bring about “peace and harmony” and “a better world for our children”?

- [1] John Ruskin, ‘Athena Keramitis’, *The Genius of John Ruskin: Selections from his Writings*, ed. by John D. Rosenberg (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1964), p. 361.
- [2] Carroll Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope: A History of The World in Our Time* (New York: Macmillan, 1966. Reprint. New Millennium Edition), p. 31.
- [3] Quigley, p. 83.
- [4] Patricia Scotland, secretary-general of the Commonwealth, Foreword, [*Commonwealth Declarations*](#) (London: Commonwealth Secretariat, 2019), p. ix.
- [5] *Kenya White Paper*, 1923, cit; Quigley, p. 96.
- [6] Quigley, p. 109.
- [7] <https://www.sahistory.org.za/article/mau-mau-uprising>
- [8] Quigley, p. 379.
- [9] Quigley, p. 365.
- [10] Declaration Signed by the Five Prime Ministers, United Kingdom, 1944, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 2.
- [11] The Declaration of Commonwealth Principles Singapore, 1971, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 9.
- [12]. The Goa Declaration on International Security, India, 1983, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 16.
- [13]. The Coolum Declaration, Australia, 2002, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 53.
- [14]. Patricia Scotland, Foreword, [*Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*](#) (London: Commonwealth Secretariat, 2021), p. vi.
- [15] Scotland, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. ix.
- [16] Scotland, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. ix.
- [17] <https://thecommonwealth.org/charter>
- [18] The Aso Rock Commonwealth Declaration Nigeria, 2003, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 55.
- [19] The Aso Rock Commonwealth Declaration Nigeria, 2003, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 56.
- [20]. The Coolum Declaration Australia, 2002, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 51.
- [21] Colombo Declaration on Sustainable, Inclusive and Equitable Development, Sri Lanka, 2013, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 88.
- [22] Gustavo Esteva, ‘Development’, [*The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power*](#), ed. Wolfgang Sachs (London/New York, Zed Books, Second Edition, 2010, first published 1992), p. 3.
- [23] Esteva, ‘Development’, *The Development Dictionary*, p. 5.

- [24] Esteva, 'Development', *The Development Dictionary*, p. 13.
- [25] Wolfgang Sachs, 'Environment', *The Development Dictionary*, p. 28.
- [26] The Nassau Declaration on World Order, The Bahamas, 1985, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 19.
- [27] Declaration by Commonwealth Prime Ministers United Kingdom, 1951, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 6.
- [28] The Nassau Declaration on World Order, The Bahamas, 1985, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 17.
- [29] The Nassau Declaration on World Order, The Bahamas, 1985, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 19.
- [30] Dr Musarrat Maisha Reza, Chair, Commonwealth Students' Association, and Lecturer, University of Exeter, UK, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 72.
- [31] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2021/01/11/shapers-of-slavery-the-empire/>
- [32] *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 134.
- [33] Mamta Murthi, Vice President of Human Development, World Bank, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 75.
- [34] Murthi, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 75.
- [35] Executive Summary, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. xxvi.
- [36] Swartz and Krish Chetty, Human Sciences Research Council, South Africa, Youth Education and Employment in the Digital Economy, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 117.
- [37] *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 134.
- [38] The Coolum Declaration Australia, 2002, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 54.
- [39] Commonwealth Cyber Declaration, United Kingdom, 2018, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 92.
- [40] *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, pp. 97-98.
- [41] Executive Summary, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. xxvi.
- [42] *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 16.
- [43] *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 16
- [44] Swartz and Krish Chetty, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 117.
- [45] Swartz and Krish Chetty, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 120.
- [46] Swartz and Krish Chetty, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, pp. 121-22.
- [47] The Aso Rock Commonwealth Declaration, Nigeria, 2003, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 55.
- [48] Kampala Declaration on Transforming Societies to Achieve Political, Economic and Human Development, Uganda, 2007, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 66.

- [49] Commonwealth Cyber Declaration, United Kingdom, 2018, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 93.
- [50] World Bank, *Assault on World Poverty* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975), p. 16, cit. Arturo Escobar, 'Planning', *The Development Dictionary*, p. 153.
- [51] C. Douglas Lummis, 'Equality', *The Development Dictionary*, p. 46.
- [52] <https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/tomwarren/wwf-world-wide-fund-nature-parks-torture-death>
- [53] <https://www.thecommonwealth.io/partners/page/2/>
- [54] Majid Rahnema, 'Poverty', *The Development Dictionary*, p. 187.
- [55] The Harare Commonwealth Declaration, Zimbabwe, 1991, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 29.
- [56] Esteva, 'Development', *The Development Dictionary*, p. 13.
- [57] The Fancourt Commonwealth Declaration on Globalisation and People-Centred Development, South Africa, 1999, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 49.
- [58] The Coolum Declaration, Australia, 2002, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 53.
- [59] Murthi, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 75.
- [60] Scotland, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. vi.
- [61] Scotland, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. vi.
- [62] The Magampura Declaration of Commitment to Young People, Sri Lanka, 2013, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 83.
- [63] The Magampura Declaration of Commitment to Young People, Sri Lanka, 2013, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 83.
- [64] *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 2.
- [65] Declaration on the Commonwealth Connectivity Agenda for Trade and Investment, United Kingdom, 2018, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 97.
- [66] A Declaration on Young People, Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago, 2009, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 77.
- [67] Chris Morris, Head of NGO and Civil Society Center and Concurrent Manager of the Asian Development Bank's Youth for Asia initiative, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 73.
- [68] Tijani Christian, Chairperson of the Commonwealth Youth Council, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. viii.
- [69] Bora Kamwanya, Deputy Secretary General, Pan-African Youth Union, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 71.
- [70] Ottawa Declaration on Women and Structural Adjustment Zimbabwe, 1991, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 33.

- [71] Florence Nakiwala Kiyangi, chair of the Commonwealth Youth Ministerial Task Force, Foreword, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. vii.
- [72] The Declaration of Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago, 2009, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 74.
- [73] Scotland, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. vi.
- [74] Tim Conibear of Waves for Change and Sallu Kamuskay and Margaedah Michaela Samai of the Messiah Leone Trust with the Wave Alliance Sierra Leone, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 83.
- [75] Conibear et al, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 82.
- [76] <https://thecommonwealth.org/news/new-global-youth-development-index-shows-improvement-state-young-people>
- [77] Executive Summary, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. xxviii.
- [78] Layne Robinson, Head of Social Policy Development, Economic Youth and Sustainable Development Directorate, Commonwealth Secretariat, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. x.
- [79] Conibear et al, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 82.
- [80] *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 80.
- [81] *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 81.
- [82] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2021/04/22/divide-rule-and-profit-the-intersectional-impact-racket/>
- [83] *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 9.
- [84] *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 9.
- [85] Puja Bajad, Consultant, youth and social policy, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 63.
- [86] *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 31.
- [87] <https://www.yoma.foundation/>
- [88] Generation Unlimited, The Youth Agency Marketplace (Yoma): Designed by youth and led by youth, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 145.
- [89] Generation Unlimited, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 145.
- [90] Generation Unlimited, *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 145.
- [91] Paul Cudenec, *Fascism Rebranded: Exposing the Great Reset*, e-book, 2021.
- [92] <https://orgrad.wordpress.com/articles/liberalism-the-two-faced-tyranny-of-wealth/>
- [93] Christopher Hill, *The Century of Revolution 1603-1714* (London: Sphere, 1969), p. 42.
- [94] Hill, p. 188.

- [95] A.L. Morton, *A People's History of England* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1995), p. 174.
- [96] Morton, p. 175.
- [97] Morton, p. 261.
- [98] Edinburgh Commonwealth Economic Declaration, United Kingdom, 1997, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 46.
- [99] Edinburgh Commonwealth Economic Declaration United Kingdom, 1997, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 40.
- [100] Edinburgh Commonwealth Economic Declaration, United Kingdom, 1997, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 44.
- [101] Perth Declaration on Food Security Principles, Australia, 2011, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 81.
- [102] The Millbrook Commonwealth Action Programme on the Harare Declaration, New Zealand, 1995, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 38.
- [103] Langkawi Declaration on the Environment Malaysia, 1989, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 23.
- [104] The Fancourt Commonwealth Declaration on Globalisation and People-Centred Development, South Africa, 1999, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 47.
- [105] The Fancourt Commonwealth Declaration on Globalisation and PeopleCentred Development, South Africa, 1999, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 48.
- [106] The Commonwealth Climate Change Declaration, Trinidad and Tobago, 2009, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. 71.
- [107] *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 170.
- [108] *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 170.
- [109] *Global Youth Development Index and Report 2020*, p. 171.
- [110] <https://www.thecommonwealth.io/climate-finance-access-hub/>
- [111] <https://www.thegef.org/>
- [112] <https://fifitrustee.worldbank.org/en/about/unit/dfi/fifitrustee/fund-detail/gef>
- [113] <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/>
- [114] <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/about/governance/trustee/>
- [115] Scotland, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. ix.
- [116] <https://www.almendron.com/tribuna/the-city-of-london-is-hiding-the-worlds-stolen-money/>
- [117] Quigley, p. 45.
- [118] Quigley, pp. 33-34.
- [119] Quigley, p. 34.
- [120] The Coolool Declaration, Australia, 2002, *Commonwealth Declarations*, pp. 52-53.
- [121] Scotland, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. ix.
- [122] Scotland, *Commonwealth Declarations*, p. ix.
- [123] <https://www.thecommonwealth.io/partners/>
- [124] <https://www.bloomberg.org/>
- [125] <https://intracen.org/about-us/who-we-are>

[126] <https://www.globalinnovation.fund/introducing-our-2021-impact-report/>

[127] <https://ndcpartnership.org/climate-finance-explorer>

[128] <https://t.co/cUiWdB6zpE>

CENTERING PEOPLE IN SMART CITIES

July 11, 2022

The totalitarian agenda behind Smart Cities has been revealed in a brochure issued by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat). [1]

The title of the 80-page publication is, in itself, disturbing: *Centering People in Smart Cities: A playbook for local and regional governments*.

Centering people rather than people centering themselves? We see here that the UN regards people as objects, which it owns and can place where it pleases, rather than as free agents who decide themselves where and how to spend their lives.

What does it actually imply to be “centered” by the United Nations and the local and regional governments that blindly follow its orders?

Do they mean “concentrate”, perhaps? Concentrating people? Imprisoning them? Forcing them to live confined in a place where they would not have chosen to have lived, had

they been free agents?

And the term “smart” is a dishonest one, because the intelligence it implies is of the artificial kind and is not required of the people involved, who are instead expected to relinquish any vestige of control over their own lives, homes and even bodies by allowing digital algorithms to take over the role previously played by their brains and their hearts.

Maybe the title of the brochure could be translated, in plain and truthful English, as “Imprisoning People in Digital Concentration Camps”?

If that sounds like an alarmist exaggeration, please consider the actual content of the brochure.

It is repeatedly made clear that there is an overarching agenda behind the smart cities project.

This is described on page 17 as “leveraging digital transformation for sustainable and equitable outcomes”.

The language is designed to deceive. “Sustainable”, here, has got nothing to do with being environmentally-friendly but indicates ongoing profitability. And “equitable” does not mean “fair” but refers instead to “equity” in the sense of financial assets.

When we, again, translate the misleading verbiage, we understand that smart cities are

about creating huge long-term financial profits for those promoting and investing in them.

The same page describes a 2019 UN resolution stating that “digital technologies have the potential to facilitate efforts to accelerate human progress, and ensure that no one is left behind in the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals”.

“Accelerating human progress”, from the forked tongue of the global mafia, means nothing more than accelerating their control and profit by means of technological tools, particularly via “new streams of data that feed intelligence platforms” (page 13).

No one being left behind (often termed “inclusivity”) means that they want nobody to escape their net of digital global exploitation.

But our self-appointed rulers came up against a couple of serious problems.

Firstly, there are a lot of people in the world who have not yet been turned into smart-phone zombies.

On page 6 the authors bemoan the fact that “so many remain outside of the digital world” and on page 9 they complain that “3.7 billion people were offline in 2019”.

So how were they going to address this obstacle to their designs in 2020?

In their own words, on page 8: “The COVID-19 pandemic introduced even greater urgency for

local and national governments alike to bridge the digital divide”.

The second big problem was that people were wising up to their scheming and refusing to go along with it – even more so now, ironically enough, thanks to their blatant use of Covid to push their project!

They admit on page 14: “Emerging public awareness of surveillance technology and bias in algorithmic decision-making, particularly in the wake of COVID-19, has also challenged the traditional smart city framework”.

The answer, of course, was to ramp up the propaganda and invent yet another weasel word aimed at hiding the vile reality behind what they are trying to do.

From now on, all the talk is evidently going to be about “people-centered smart cities”.

Remembering the title of the brochure, we can appreciate the depths to which their language-twisting deceit has sunk.

They think they can get away with calling smart cities “people-centered” not because they will be centered around people and their needs, but because they are about “centering”, concentrating, people within their virtual prison walls.

This criminal inversion of the truth continues, still on page 14, with the claim that these smart cities will “leverage data, technology and

services for common good”.

Common good? The reality is revealed on page 21, with its talk of “public private partnership”, “achieving economic development goals” and “prosperity and growth”.

The authors had already stated on page 13 that “estimates of global spending on the smart cities market ranges from USD 820.7 billion to USD 2.5 trillion by 2026”.

We can be sure that the global development mafia’s sustainable goals of prosperity and growth will only have been achieved if the return made from such vast investments is a considerable one!

And the final nail which the brochure itself hammers into the coffin of its project’s plausibility comes on that same page, in the form of its account of the origins of the “smart city” brand.

It admits: “It entered mainstream consciousness when IBM initiated the ‘Smarter Cities Challenge’ in 2010. Under the Smarter Cities Challenge, IBM targeted technology offerings to local governments and developers of urban infrastructure, proposing that computational solutions would serve to optimise city infrastructure”.

IBM has gone down in history for its role in providing “computational solutions” for Adolf Hitler’s murderous “public private partnership”

in Germany in the 1930s and 1940s.

As one article reminds us, IBM's "streams of data" enabled the regime to innovate inclusive and sustainable people-centered hubs at the likes of Auschwitz and Belsen.

"The software company's punched-card technology helped the Nazis carry out the genocide of millions". [2]

[1] <https://unhabitat.org/programme/people-centered-smart-cities/centering-people-in-smart-cities>

[2] <https://allthatsinteresting.com/ibm-nazis-ww2>

A DEVELOPING EVIL: THE MALIGNANT HISTORICAL FORCE BEHIND THE GREAT RESET

August 2, 2022

The so-called Great Reset is nothing but the extension and violent acceleration of a longstanding process.

Over the decades, I have often despaired at the general apathy of my fellow citizens in the face of the dark forces which I could clearly see – and feel – gathering.

Wondering how we could ever hope to see a mass uprising against the dominant system, I sometimes comforted myself with the thought that one day “they” would become so arrogant, or impatient, that they would push things too far, beyond the limits of what humankind is collectively prepared to tolerate.

What we have been experiencing for the last two years could well be that moment, so that the Great Reset would prove to be not just the extension of the existing process, but its culmination, the hubris which announces its final demise, its nemesis.

So what is this “process” I am talking about? There are lots of different ways of describing it. It is the increase of centralising power, the tightening of control, the growth of “the economy”, the ever-closer convergence of power and money.

Today I want to focus on one concept which I think is key to understanding the essence of this process, namely “development”.

The term, in English, is a very broad and ambiguous one, which allows it to be seriously misused and manipulated.

Sometimes it is used in the intransitive context to refer to something that happens by itself, from the inside, like the development of a child’s abilities or character as it grows into an adult, the development of somebody’s understanding or the development of a particular culture.

In this sense, it carries the implications of being natural and positive – resonances which serve to disguise the quite different qualities of other applications of the same word.

Development used in a transitive sense refers to actions taken from the outside to develop a certain thing.

It could refer to what I am doing right now – the development of an idea or an argument. This kind of development is the act of organising various elements (information, personal

experience, opinions) in order to create something which is (hopefully!) coherent and useful.

Again, this sense carries positive implications which can be used to camouflage the reality behind other processes with the same semantic label.

In terms of the historical process I referred to, development could broadly be applied to the industrialisation which began in the country of my birth in the 18th century and subsequently spread across what we term the West.

Here we can immediately see how the other meanings of the word “development” obscure our understanding of the industrial variety.

The first, intransitive, association can lead us into imagining that industry was something that “developed” organically, all by itself, as the unfolding of a natural socio-economic evolution.

And the second, transitive, association could make us assume that industrial development was a positive process of using our collective intelligence to organise something useful for society.

Conventional opinion within industrial society usually amounts to a combination of these two, faulty, interpretations: people tend to imagine that the natural evolution of our collective intelligence leads us to organise this inevitable and ongoing development.

Continuous industrial development has been the background to all our lives, but it is not necessarily something of which we are always conscious.

For me, the form in which it first became visible and real was that of what in England is called “property development”, namely the building of houses, shops and factories on what was previously “undeveloped” land.

My first encounter with this phenomenon was when I was about ten years old and living on the very southern edge of the London conurbation.

One summer day I discovered, with some schoolfriends, what seemed to me like an amazing paradise – a meadow, ringed with trees, with a tiny stream running through the middle of it, over which we leapt time and time again, tumbling and laughing into the lush green grass.

Some time later I went back there to taste again that moment of pure happiness and discovered that somebody had left mysterious piles of large concrete pipes in our field.

Being children, we didn’t care too much, had no idea what all this meant, and happily spent the afternoon clambering around, and through, these pipes.

But the second time I went back, the field was a housing estate and there was no more grass, no more stream, no more playing.

A few years later, my mother bought, as a present for an elderly friend, a book of photographs of the local area dating from the beginning of the 20th century, when this lady was a girl.

Glancing through the images, I noticed that one of them apparently showed a road that I knew well. But I couldn't believe it was the same place.

In the photograph was a simple country lane, surrounded on all sides by trees, along which a man was leading a horse and cart.

The road that I knew in the 1970s, although still called a "lane", was lined with identical 1930s houses along its whole length and was intersected by one of the busiest traffic routes out of London.

Suddenly I understood why older people had always referred to the local suburban shopping parade as "the village". It really had been a village when they first knew it!

How could everything have changed so quickly, within the living memory of people I personally knew?

I could never see the area in which I had always lived in the same way again and later chose to live and work outside of London, in Sussex, where I discovered villages and country lanes which no longer existed in the area where I grew up.

For a long time I was happy there. I felt I was breathing an air which had been denied me for too long.

But, of course, I wasn't safe from the advance of development, whose principal requirement is that it must never slow down, let alone stop.

All around me were appearing new housing developments, new roads to serve the houses, more new houses to fill the spaces opened up by the new roads, new shopping precincts to serve the people living in the houses and more new roads to take them there.

Both in my work as a journalist on a local newspaper and in my parallel role as a campaigner trying to protect the countryside, I came to understand the mechanisms by which this development came to happen.

The first thing I observed was that there was always local opposition to any proposed development on a greenfield area – the bigger the project, the greater the opposition.

But this opposition was very rarely successful.

Several methods were used to ensure that development triumphed over the wishes of the local people.

The first was for local politicians and officials to denigrate opponents of the scheme in question, in which ever way seemed most

appropriate.

If the opponents were local people living close to the proposed development, they were selfish individuals termed NIMBYs – Not In My Back Yard.

If people from further away were involved, who could not be accused of having a purely personal interest, they were dubbed “outside agitators” or “rent-a-mob troublemakers”.

In this way, no dissent could ever be seen as legitimate.

Alongside this approach came the inevitable narrative that the development was badly “needed”, providing homes for families, jobs for workers, or a “boost” for the local economy.

This argument was welded to the message that there was something inevitable about the whole process, that losing green space to concrete and tarmac was simply something one had to accept in life.

I also came across a degree of corruption, of course, of very close connections between local officials and the property development businesses whose projects they authorised.

But behind these levels of propaganda and corruption was something else, something even more important: the “need” for development was written into the bureaucratic planning structures devised by central government, with which local authorities had to comply.

All that the local council could really decide was *where* this development would be accommodated.

So even if the people living in an area were unanimously against a certain development, even if they had somehow, miraculously, managed to elect representatives who were prepared to respect their opposition, all that could be achieved was for that development to be delayed, modified in some way so as to make it more acceptable or, at the very best, displaced to some other corner of the local area where the residents were less vociferous or influential.

The overall process of development itself was sacrosanct and officially ensured.

All the language and arguments in favour of development therefore served not so much to convince people that it was necessary, as to cloak the reality that it would in any case be imposed on them against their will by central power.

This is important, as we will see later...

There are, of course, lots of different kinds of “development”.

Wolfgang Sachs describes, in *The Development Dictionary*, a very insightful resource on this subject, how the idea of development used to be based on the notion of a nation-state’s transition from agrarian to industrial status. “The state was conventionally considered to be the main actor, and the national society the main

target, of development planning”. [1]

But in the closing decades of the last century the phenomenon outgrew the national scale and turned into globalization. For Sachs, development and globalization are one and the same phenomenon. He says: “Globalization can be aptly understood as development without nation-states”. [2]

A narrative is always needed to dress up development and sell it to the public.

As Gustavo Esteva points out in the same book, the promotion of development as a good thing, as a worthy and humanitarian cause, depends on the theoretical existence of “the undignified condition called underdevelopment”. [3]

He writes: “In order for someone to conceive the possibility of escaping from a particular condition, it is necessary first to feel that one has fallen into that condition. For those who make up two-thirds of the world’s population today, to think of development – of any kind of development – requires first the perception of themselves as underdeveloped, with the whole burden of connotations that this carries”. [4]

This idea of “underdevelopment” is, he concludes, “a manipulative trick to involve people in struggles for getting what the powerful want to impose on them”. [5]

The term “poverty” is used in the same way.

Certain ways of life are designated with this term and the people and communities involved are identified as a “problem” for which development can provide the solution.

Those pushing this agenda are happy to cynically exploit the naivety of those who fall for the lie and enthusiastically jump aboard the bandwagon of “helping” those who have not yet been turned into what Otto Ulrich calls “a mechanical cog in a great production apparatus dominated by the world market”. [6]

In Europe, a key institution promoting development is The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, founded sixty years ago. [7]

Its slogan speaks of “better policies for better lives”, by means of, again in its own words, “accelerating development”.

This body started out its life as the Organisation for European Economic Co-operation, formed to administer the USA’s Marshall Plan aid for the “building back better” of Europe after the devastation of the Second World War.

The OEEC officially turned into the OECD at a ceremony in 1960 at the Chateau de la Muette in Paris, which is still the organisation’s headquarters.

Coincidentally, this building originally belonged to a member of the French branch of the Rothschild family, who have played such a

key historical role in development, of railways, all over the world, of the Suez Canal, of mining, and who were also pre-eminent, as the company boasts on its website, in the “development of the sovereign bond market, beginning in Europe and Russia, and expanding to every continent”. [8]

Rothschild and Co add that the foundations for their current success were laid during the Second World War when they established their business presence in the USA and were thus able to vastly expand their global operation, “opening offices in every major market around the world”.

A key role in pushing the idea of development has also been played by the United Nations, set up on the initiative of the USA at the end of the Second World War.

In the Preamble to its Founding Charter in 1945, it announced its determination “to promote social progress and better standards of life... and to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples”. [9]

The “First UN Development Decade” between 1960 and 1970, which claimed to identify a problem with “underdeveloped” people, again insisted that its aim was to improve the quality of their lives.

This spin was reflected in the name of the development body it spawned in 1963, the United Nations Research Institute for Social Develop-

ment. *Social* development. Nothing to do with money!

In 1970 it launched an International Development Strategy and an associated UN resolution announced a unified approach to development and planning, “which would fully integrate the economic and social components in the formulation of policies and programmes”.

This declared that its aims were to “leave no sector of the population outside the scope of change and development” and “to give high priority to the development of human potentials ... the provision of employment opportunities and meeting the needs of children”. [10]

That is to say the “needs” of children as defined by those who aim to extract maximum profit from developing their human potential.

In 1986 the UN went even further when it published its Declaration on the Right to Development. [11]

Although this text clearly identified the aim of establishing what it called “a new international economic order”, it hid this agenda behind the absurd statement that “the right to development is an inalienable human right”.

“States have the primary responsibility for the creation of national and international conditions favourable to the realization of the right to development”, it insisted.

“States have the duty to co-operate with

each other in ensuring development and eliminating obstacles to development”.

“Sustained action is required to promote more rapid development of developing countries”.

And the final passage, Article 10, declares: “Steps should be taken to ensure the full exercise and progressive enhancement of the right to development, including the formulation, adoption and implementation of policy, legislative and other measures at the national and international levels”.

And that is what we have seen shaping up over the subsequent decades...

In 1990 the United Nations Development Programme published its first Human Development Report, defending the inalienable right of all human beings to be developed. [12]

Then ten years later, in 2000, it launched its Millennium Development Goals, based on the International Development Goals drawn up at Chateau de la Muette by the OECD’s Development Assistance Committee. [13]

Private-public partnerships were very much encouraged. Goal 8 was “to develop a global partnership for development”, which could mean “cooperation with pharmaceutical companies” or making available the “benefits of new technologies” by working with Big Tech. [14]

Collaborating closely with the United Nations on creating these global development-

imposing infrastructures has been the World Bank Group, which in fact has a treaty-based relationship with the UN that dates back to its founding. [15]

Describing itself as “the world’s largest development institution”, it was founded in 1944 (again at that key historical moment at the end of the Second World War) as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and, like the OECD, it was originally involved in making loans to facilitate the post-war Build Back Better. [16]

It is worth considering Klaus Schwab and Thierry Malleret’s comment in their 2020 book *Covid-19: The Great Reset* that wars, like pandemics, “have the potential to be a transformative crisis of previously unimaginable proportions”.

They write: “World War II was the quintessential transformational war, triggering not only fundamental changes to the global order and the global economy, but also entailing radical shifts in social attitudes and beliefs that eventually paved the way for radically new policies and social contract provisions”. [17]

When there was no more money to be made from post-war reconstruction, the World Bank shifted its focus towards “development”, with a heavy emphasis on infrastructure such as dams, electrical grids, irrigation systems, and roads.

It has also long been interested in so-called “rural development”, aiming to “increase production and raise productivity” by means of what it calls a “transition from traditional isolation”. The World Bank would like to enable the “transfer of people out of low productivity agriculture into more rewarding pursuits”. [18]

Rewarding for whom, exactly?

Gradually the World Bank built up a network of institutions, including the International Finance Corporation (IFC), which allowed it, in its own words, to “connect global financial resources to the needs of developing countries” under the feel-good catchphrase of “ending extreme poverty and boosting shared prosperity”. [19]

What this connection actually means is clear from the IFC’s own reports. While boasting that, since 1956, it has “invested more than \$321 billion in emerging markets and developing economies”, it also stresses: “IFC operates on a commercial basis. We invest exclusively in for-profit projects in developing countries”. [20]

It is not for nothing that the World Bank/IFC use the slogan “Creating Markets, Creating Opportunities”. [21] For all the do-good language, the bottom line is that investment, like development, is really about making money and accumulating power.

In this light, it is hardly surprising that the

World Bank was an enthusiastic partner of the UN in pushing its Millennium Development Goals and its global partnership for greed.

As it admitted: “The World Bank is committed to helping achieve the MDGs because, simply put, these goals are our goals”. [22]

The World Bank has been peddling the greenwashing scam of so-called “sustainable development” for quite a while now.

As far back as 1988, its senior vice-president David Hopper was announcing that it would be getting involved in “formulating, implementing and enforcing environmental policies”. [23]

And, needless to say, the World Bank is fully behind the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, adopted in 2015 and targeting 2030 as their completion date. It declares that these are “an historic global achievement”, boasts that they were “formulated with strong participation from the World Bank Group” and are, of course, “fully consistent” with its own dubious goals. [24]

In fact, in 2018 it signed a Strategic Partnership Framework with the UN to push the SDGs and help bring about all sorts of noble outcomes, such as “helping countries attract and manage private capital” so they can “achieve measurable results at scale to transform their economies and societies” and “build human capital”. [25]

The World Bank/United Nations – which seem to be so close that they are almost the same thing – are also keen on “enhancing countries’ digital data capacities to improve implementation and maximize positive development impacts” and “harnessing data to improve development outcomes”.

In reality, the “sustainable” development they are promoting is every bit of an oxymoron as “equitable” development, being just another aspect of the camouflage with which its proponents hide the reality of their insidious agenda from public view.

As Esteva writes: “Sustainable development has been explicitly conceived as a strategy for sustaining ‘development’, not for supporting the flourishing and enduring of an infinitely diverse natural and social life”. [26]

The real significance of the UNSDGs is as the administrative foundation of the totalitarian technocratic dystopia which the money-power is currently trying to impose on us.

They essentially amount to the same thing, on a global scale, as the planning criteria which force local councils to override public opinion and develop green spaces.

They fix certain development objectives – goals as they term them – into law so that they have to be imposed on the public, whatever the views of that public.

But because they don't want this profoundly undemocratic situation to be visible, they also construct the propaganda layer which aims, like the propaganda about the need for local "development", to conceal the true nature of the process.

The propaganda for the UNSDGs amounts to everything "woke" and "progressive", an official saccharine liberal agenda which has now crept into every part of our culture.

And, just as people who oppose new roads, railways, factories or housing estates being built over the countryside are condemned as being "selfish" or "anti-social", so are opponents of the SDGs also condemned as being politically unacceptable.

Because the development mafia depicts itself as representing "good", all those who go against its agenda must necessarily be "bad" – reactionary, right-wing, conspiracy theorists.

But, in reality, this represents a remarkable inversion of the truth. The "goodness" of development may be enshrined in law and chorused from every direction, but it is nevertheless non-existent.

The process which calls itself "development" in fact equates to nothing other than destruction, in every context.

It is the destruction of nature, now seen as a mere resource to be used for development or as

an empty undeveloped space in which development could, should and, ultimately, *must* take place.

It is the destruction of natural human communities, whose self-sufficiency gets in the way of the advance of development, and of authentic human culture and traditional values, which are incompatible with the dogma and domination of development.

In the words of Ivan Illich: “Development can be imagined as a blast of wind that blows people off their feet, out of their familiar space, and places them on an artificial platform, a new structure of living”. [27]

It involves the destruction of individual autonomy, since human beings are seen as nothing more than human resources, human capital, to feed the unending appetite of development.

Development also implies the destruction of democracy, as the goals of development are imposed on us by mechanisms hidden from general public view.

All in all, development amounts to the negation of all that is organic, all that is living. It is vitaphobic.

And why does development exist, what is the purpose behind all this destruction? It is nothing more than money and power, which are the same thing in our society.

What is being “developed” in all these various life-destroying ways is, in fact, the money and power of those who initiated and imposed the process.

Their money “develops” because they extract a profit from all these destructive activities and because they lend money, at interest, to governments in order to “finance” huge projects represented as being for the common or national good.

Where they got this money from in the first place – whether it is rightfully theirs or a creation of wealth out of thin air from dubious bookmaking practices – is another matter.

But what is for sure is that debts owed to such financiers give them even more leverage over governments and the ability to insist on yet more “development” in order to generate the money needed to keep the repayments coming. They will, of course, be very happy to “finance” this next phase of development, which is always lurking on the horizon as a seemingly unavoidable economic necessity.

This is blackmail on an unimaginably vast scale. Unending, spiralling blackmail. Sustainable blackmail.

So those behind “development” have been destroying everything of real value in our natural world and our human societies in the pursuit of personal wealth and power.

And they have taken care to conceal this crime behind all the positive-sounding rhetoric associated with development on every level.

Far from being something inherently good, development therefore represents something which is very close to what we might call evil.

We have seen so many signs of this evil in all the development we have been collectively enduring for many centuries.

Rivers turned black and the air turned toxic by the pollution of industrial development.

Forests rased, land desecrated, species wiped out by its endless greed.

Children crushed to death by its machineries, lives ruined and cut short by decades of thankless toil in its factories, mines and sweatshops.

Communities across the world ripped from the land, ripped from each other, ripped from the happy natural lives that should have been their birthright.

All meaning and value stolen from our existences, everything reduced to profit and concealed by lies.

As Sachs writes: "Suspicion grows that development was a misconceived enterprise from the beginning. Indeed, it is not the failure of development which has to be feared, but its success. What would a completely developed world look like?" [28]

It would simply be a dead world.

Since 2020, the evil inherent to this development-based system has become much more visible to many more of us.

We have seen people forbidden to gather together, made to cover their faces with masks, told not to touch each other. Children have been prevented from playing together, old people left to die alone without someone to hold their hand during their final hours, millions and millions of people reduced to a state of cowering fear by the manipulative lies of the system as it seeks to ramp up its malignant control.

This expansion of power is now threatening our very bodies, which it claims as its own.

It wants to infect us with its gene-altering chemicals, pollute our bodies with its nanotechnology, control our fertility, imprison us – “center us”, as the United Nations puts it [29] – in smart cities, digital concentration camps in which our online virtual twins are used as lucrative sources of speculation and profit for impact investment vampires in their psychopathic plans for a whole new kind of “human development” that is indistinguishable from slavery.

This thing we call development is a force of darkness and so to oppose it we need to harness the power of light.

Light, first of all, to illuminate the truth of this entity’s activities, its destruction, blackmail

and concealment.

As we have seen, its first line of defence is the pretence that “development” has no sinister intent and is just an inevitable and natural part of human evolution.

If we can break through that line of defence, by exposing its real raw agenda, its physical power will be visible and thus open to general attack.

But we also need to harness the light in what we might call a spiritual sense.

Because development is vitaphobic, we need to summon up the power of life itself to fight it.

This power is within each and every one of us. It does not start with us, but comes to us from the wider living organism of which we are part, the organism which is being murdered by the dark force of development.

We can access this vital energy, individually and then collectively, only if we really want to, if we are prepared to lower all the barriers of subjectivity and separation behind which we have learned to hide.

First of all, this means searching for our real selves, which cannot be found in the virtual online identities currently being constructed for us, of course, nor in the legal identity given to us by the state, nor even in the sense of individual identity provided by the ego.

Our real self, we will find, is a self which

knows itself to be merely a part of a greater reality.

We can discover ourselves to be part of the place where we live, modelled and adapted to the landscape, the climate, the food that grows there: we are shaped by this place and it, in turn, is shaped by us.

We can discover ourselves to be part of a community, to be surrounded not by anonymous strangers whom we do our best to avoid, but by fellow beings who share our belonging to that local place and with whom we could forge networks of mutual aid, solidarity and autonomy.

We can discover ourselves to be part of the living world, human nodes in a great network of organic interaction which amounts to one enormous and unimaginably complex organism.

And we can discover ourselves to be part of the entire universe, to be one tiny nerve-ending of a living cosmic whole.

It is the vital energy of this cosmic whole, the energy that animates and propels every facet of its healthy living, that we might call the light.

We can only draw on this light, this energy, when we know that it is there. Knowledge of the light, however we choose to describe it, involves knowledge of our belonging, it involves knowledge of unity.

The darkness represented by development knows only separation and fragmentation. Its

reign of quantity, to use René Guénon's term, is based on the idea of multiplication, of an endless accumulation of objects, possessions, so-called wealth.

But within a given finite context, such as our world, this multiplication can only amount to division – it merely slices up the existing unity into billions of smaller pieces, cut off from each other and from the whole.

The light, the knowledge of unity, gives us the power to combat that fragmentation and restore the reign of quality and living authenticity.

We need to allow ourselves to be flooded by this light, to be taken over by it and used by it in whatever way is necessary to free our world from the vile and all-destroying monster which goes by the name of “development”.

[1] Wolfgang Sachs, 'Preface to the New Edition', *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power*, ed. Wolfgang Sachs (London/New York, Zed Books, 2010), p. vii.

[2] Sachs, 'Preface to the New Edition', *The Development Dictionary*, p. vii.

[3] Gustavo Esteva, 'Development', *The Development Dictionary*, p. 2.

[4] Esteva, p. 3.

[5] Esteva, p. 3.

[6] Otto Ulrich, 'Technology', *The Development Dictionary*, p. 320.

[7] <https://www.oecd.org/>

[8] <https://www.rothschildandco.com/en/about-us/our-story/>

[9] Preamble to the Charter of the United Nations, New York: UN Office of Public Information, 1968). cit. Wolfgang Sachs, 'One World', *The Development Dictionary*, p. 112.

[10] UNRISD, *The Quest for a Unified Approach to Development* (Geneva: UNRISD, 1980), cit. Estava, p. 10.

[11] un.org/en/events/righttodevelopment/declaration.shtml

- [12] <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/what-human-development>
- [13] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Millennium_Development_Goals
- [14] https://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/Goal_8_fs.pdf
- [15] <https://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/sdgs-2030-agenda>
- [16] <https://www.worldbank.org/en/about/history>
- [17] Klaus Schwab, Thierry Malleret, *Covid-19: The Great Reset* (Geneva: WEF, 2020), e-book. Edition 1.0, 5%
- [18] World Bank, *Assault on World Poverty* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975), cit. Arturo Escobar, 'Planning', *The Development Dictionary*, pp. 152-53.
- [19] <https://www.worldbank.org/en/about/history>
- [20] https://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/corp_ext_content/ifc_external_corporate_site/home
- [21] <https://online.flippingbook.com/view/533220018/>
- [22] <http://www5.worldbank.org/mdgs/>
- [23] D. Hopper, 'The World Bank's Challenge: Balancing Economic Need with Environmental Protection', Seventh Annual World Conservation Lecture, 3 March 1988, cit, Wolfgang Sachs, 'Environment', *The Development Dictionary*, p. 32.
- [24] <https://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/sdgs-2030-agenda>
- [25] sdg.iisd.org/news/un-world-bank-group-sign-sdgs-partnership-framework
- [26] Esteva, p. 13.
- [27] Ivan Illich, 'Needs', *The Development Dictionary*, p. 104.
- [28] Wolfgang Sachs, 'Introduction', *The Development Dictionary*, p. xviii.
- [29] *The Acorn* 75, 11 July 2022, winteroak.org.uk

FACING UP TO THE CRIME IN PROGRESS

August 8, 2022

The events which have been unfolding since 2020 have obliged me, more than ever, to take an overview of the place at which humankind finds itself today.

And my recent reading of Fredy Perlman, [1] alongside my research on the global mafia and their odious “development” agenda which has led to the Great Reset, has left me with a somewhat disturbing new impression.

I now feel that I was born into, and have spent my whole life within, a crime!

I am not the perpetrator of this crime, of course, nor am I more a victim than anyone else.

The aggrieved party is the whole of humankind and all the other beings with whom we share this world.

We are all being reduced to the status of objects, human or natural capital, fit only to feed the dead-eyed totalitarian global greed-machine.

Life itself is under attack, life and all the joyfulness and sense of well-being that goes with

it.

Life is being suffocated, raped, tortured, injected with poisons, dismembered, processed into pulp.

The crucial point here is that this is not just a phenomenon that has randomly arisen or evolved; this is more than just an ongoing disaster.

We are talking about a process which has been deliberately planned, engineered and extended for many centuries.

Life is not dying, she is being murdered.

She is being murdered by a venal clique of philanthropaths [2] whose sole “value” is the exponential increase of their own wealth and power.

Furthermore, these scheming gangsters have worked very hard to conceal not only their own identity but even the fact that a murder is taking place.

They have constructed an edifice of deceit which presents everything that they do as being “innovative” and “forward-looking”, as representing the necessary and laudable advance of something they like to call Progress.

The corollary of this lie is, of course, that anyone who challenges their supposedly do-gooding goals is automatically considered bad or insane.

The moment that we wake up to the horror

of what is happening around us and start to speak out, we are shouted down, mocked, insulted, threatened, shamed.

To identify and challenge any aspect of the crime in progress, let alone the whole vile thing, makes us “extremists”, “subversives”, “cranks”, “conspiracy theorists” or even “terrorists”.

We risk being investigated, intimidated or imprisoned, losing our jobs and our friends, being branded, smeared and ostracised.

Through practical expediency, we therefore start to take care of whom we talk to, we hide our traces, nurture anonymity, water down our views in certain company.

Gaslighted by the criminals who rule over us, we end up criminalising ourselves, acting as if *we* were the ones with something to hide, the ones with a guilty conscience!

If we don't pay attention, we risk embracing the labels they stick on us, confining ourselves to political and cultural ghettoes, cutting ourselves off from the rest of society and from badly-needed potential allies.

Now that the criminals seem at the point of pushing humankind into an unimaginable condition of abject slavery, all the while killing off the natural world with their machineries of control, there is no point in hiding away in safe spaces, no point in prevaricating.

The stage has clearly been reached where we

all need to throw caution to the winds, break free from doubt and fear.

We need to embrace the *certainty* that we represent the force of light and truth against the dark sickness of the psychopaths and their lies.

Our moral and spiritual self-empowerment will allow us to together find the clarity and courage to directly confront the criminals who are destroying everything that is good and alive.

We know who they are, we know what they are doing and we know that if we are prepared to give everything – really everything! – we have the collective power to rise up and throw off, once and for all, the deathly grip of this murderous money-mafia.

[1] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/07/14/fredy-perlman-against-the-system/>

[2] <https://margaretannaalice.substack.com/p/anatomy-of-a-philanthropath-dreams>

THE TRUTH CAN NO LONGER BE HIDDEN

August 16, 2022

Imagine you are navigating a small boat through a large harbour on a dark and foggy night.

It is extremely difficult to find your way because you can hardly see anything and even the buoys marking your way are only visible when they are right next to you.

You become aware of a sound ahead of you and you see several very vague different shapes appearing in the gloom.

There's a light there and another there. So two vessels approaching, perhaps. But, wait, what's that right up high?

Suddenly you realise that these are not separate objects at all, but parts of one huge oil tanker bearing down on you, which you urgently need to avoid!

This ability to interpret minimal incoming data in order to understand the bigger picture, this capacity for joining the dots, making the connections, is an essential one, as Max Wertheimer [1] set out.

It is a particular kind of intelligence. It is not the kind of intelligence that allows people to remember lists of dates or to perform complex mathematical equations, but it is still intelligence, and crucial intelligence at that.

Over the last few years, something very alarming has been looming up ahead of us in the fog of unfolding history.

Initially, this looked like a variety of different issues and trends that were not necessarily connected.

It was not obvious to us all, to start with, that climate capitalism was linked to the Covid operation, [2] that war in the Ukraine was linked to the Great Reset, [3] that the pope was linked to the transhumanists, [4] that left-wing “intersectionality” was linked to the impact investment agenda, [5] that Charles and the British “Crown” were very close to the global financial mafia, [6] that the United Nations and the World Bank had been working together for decades to deliberately impose a “development” agenda that benefited financial interests at the expense of humankind and nature. [7]

But now, vast numbers of people are aware of these connections and understand that all these elements are aspects of one single agenda being imposed on us by one single power.

This power depends on its own invisibility for its success. Its scams will simply not work if

we can all see who is pulling the strings and with what aim in mind.

It is therefore important for this single power, this criminal global money power, to try to discredit those who can see the bigger picture and to stop them from communicating what they have seen.

In their propaganda, the crucial form of intelligence that enables us to make sense of the world around us, despite their attempts to keep us in the dark, is denigrated as something bad.

“Conspiracy theorists” have long been the target of ridicule and attack from the mafia and their henchmen.

But now they are going even further by announcing that they want to “stop” alleged conspiracy theory in the same way that they have already banned and censored so-called “misinformation” on specific health issues.

A #ThinkBeforeSharing campaign has been launched on the UNESCO website. UNESCO [9] is, of course, an agency of the United Nations, the global body which is pushing, with the World Bank and the World Economic Forum, the Sustainable Development Goals 2030 agenda, aka The Great Reset.

Among the thought crimes highlighted as part of this inquisition, under the heading of “antisemitism“, is “linking an alleged conspiracy to Jewish individuals or groups (e.g. the

Rothschild family or George Soros, a philanthropist) or the State of Israel”. [10]

So it is “antisemitic” to mention the role played by any individual who happens to be Jewish, even if this role is demonstrably real and significant? Ridiculous.

But more alarmingly still, the campaign attacks the very capacity for joined-up thinking which allows us to identify the oil tanker in the fog, the danger with which we are faced.

It complains that what it calls conspiracy theories “offer an explanation of events or situations which are difficult to understand and bring a false sense of control or agency”. [11]

They present us with “an alleged, secret plot”, “a group of conspirators” and “‘evidence’ that seems to support the conspiracy theory”.

Note here that by placing quote marks around ‘evidence’ they hope to cunningly imply, without even addressing any specific issues, that the evidence backing what they term “conspiracy theories” is invariably and necessarily invalid!

UNESCO and its friends are alarmed at the very idea of “suspicion of official accounts” or of “reinterpreting random events as part of a broader pattern”. [12] Their sly quote marks would better have been deployed here, around the word ‘random’...

They warn people off any author who is “not attached to a reputable organization or

institution” (such as the UN, the WEF or the World Bank, presumably) and even, astonishingly, any author who “raises questions instead of providing answers”!

Unauthorised explanations of what is going in the world are “dangerous” because they help “violent extremist groups” and “spread mistrust in public institutions”, somehow causing both “political apathy” and “radicalization”. [13]

“Suspicion breeds confidence” as the posters declared in Terry Gilliam’s classic film *Brazil*, [14] and UNESCO warns us to “beware” that the dreaded theories could even be spread by “friends, relatives”. [15] “Don’t suspect a friend, report him”, to quote the 1985 film again. Is that the chilling dystopia in which we now find ourselves, in 2022?

In truth, the campaign reeks of panic and is likely to prove a spectacular own goal.

The very announcement that “this UNESCO campaign is implemented jointly with the European Commission, Twitter and the World Jewish Congress” [16] is surely likely to fuel the kind of “conspiracy theories” that they are supposedly combating?

Simply the fact that the campaign has been launched, let alone its content, confirms that there is indeed a conspiracy that the global authorities are desperately trying to cover up and that the UN are part of it.

Even those who have not yet realised that there is a bigger picture to be seen will quickly do so, thanks to this “stop the conspiracy theorists!” scaremongering.

The truth is the truth, no matter how loudly the global mafia shriek the opposite.

And once it has come into view, it can never be unseen.

[1] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/08/16/the-acorn-76/#4>

[2] <https://winteroak.org.uk/climate-capitalists/>

[3] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/03/09/the-great-reset-phase-2-war/>

[4] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/05/30/francis-a-pope-of-the-poor-a-pope-for-the-environment-or-a-pope-of-the-global-elite/>

[5] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2021/04/22/divide-rule-and-profit-the-intersectional-impact-racket/>

[6] See *Charles' empire*.

[7] See *A developing evil*.

[8] <https://en.unesco.org/themes/gced/thinkbeforesharing>

[9] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2021/06/21/cultures-silent-exiles/>

[10] <https://en.unesco.org/sites/default/files/unesco-conspiracy-english-4.jpg>

[11] <https://en.unesco.org/sites/default/files/unesco-conspiracy-english-0.jpg>

[12] <https://en.unesco.org/sites/default/files/unesco-conspiracy-english-1.jpg>

[13] <https://en.unesco.org/sites/default/files/unesco-conspiracy-english-3.jpg>

[14] https://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Brazil_%281985_film%29

[15] <https://en.unesco.org/sites/default/files/unesco-conspiracy-english-0.jpg>

[16] <https://en.unesco.org/themes/gced/thinkbeforesharing>

EIGHT RIGHTS GONE WRONG

August 16, 2022

The whole question of “rights” is problematic. For a start, they are generally seen as something “given” to us by authority. In accepting “rights” do we also inadvertently accept authority? And how real are these “rights”? Are they for keeps or will they be withdrawn by authority the moment that they are no longer convenient? We have all gained a little more insight into these questions since March 2020: it has become painfully clear that rights most of us consider fundamental to our society are not regarded as such by those in power. But at the same time as being deprived of rights we want to have, we have also been landed with rights we could well do without! Here are some examples.

i. The Right to Work

Calls for the “right to work” [1] always sound strange to those who have spent years setting the alarm for 5.30am so as to be able to embark on another glorious day of mind-numbing wage

slavery. Surely what we should really be demanding is the right to lead a decent life without being economically forced to sell our living time and energy to someone else? The right to decide for ourselves how and when we wish to contribute to society? The right to be what we *want* to be rather than what we *have* to be? The “right to work” is a particular and peculiar demand which has long been cherished by the kind of Left which pretends to oppose the system while enthusiastically defending the global work camp it has built for us, which defines the oppressed majority in terms of their enslavement and in whose future utopia this majority will remain in exactly the same condition as now, as “workers” sacrificing their days on earth for the benefit of the minority in power. *Arbeit macht frei?* No, it doesn’t, comrades!

ii. The Right to Vote

The “right to vote” [2] sounds like a good thing from a distance; after all, being deprived of the right to vote because you were not rich enough, or not a man, would seem grossly unfair. But, on closer inspection, the “right to vote” turns out to be a great ball of nothingness. For a start, voting does not generally involve expressing your opinion on a specific topic, but is rather a matter

of choosing a “representative” who will express your opinion in your place, as he or she sees fit. Given that the choice of representative is limited, that a party system has been set up to ensure that these potential representatives toe a certain line, that these parties are all owned and controlled by the ruling mafia, that the framing of the electoral issues is carried out by the media wing of the same system, as is the credibility afforded to the various contenders, and that there are growing suspicions that the vote-counting process itself is fraudulent, we might conclude that the right to vote is not all that it seems. If it serves to channel efforts and hopes into a pointless and draining dead-end, then it in fact amounts to a thoroughly poisoned chalice.

iii. The Right to Development

As pointed out in *A developing evil*, the global financial mafia have long packaged their vile activities as something desirable called “progress” or “development”. They have gone so far as to use the United Nations, one of their main front organisations, to declare that “the right to development is an inalienable human right”. [3] This is pushing the idea of a “right” into the realm of absurdity. The right to have your ancestral land stolen from you and plundered by corporate crooks? The right to be

deprived of your community, your self-sufficiency and your happiness in exchange for the right to be exploited for the profit of the global financial slavemasters? The right to stand by and watch as our world is turned to toxic sludge by the Greed Monster?

iv. The Right to Internet Access

The “right to internet access” [4] is another phoney concept invented by the United Nations and co. It is sometimes termed “inclusivity”, with the suggestion that there is something nice about generously allowing every man, woman and child in the world to be “included” in a digital concentration camp termed the metaverse. There they will enjoy the “right” to be monitored, controlled and commodified by a vast faceless machine, whose algorithms and measurable outcomes are the new chains with which our self-appointed rulers aim to bind humankind. How about the right to live beyond its toxic reach?

v. The Right to be Protected from Terrorism

A superb example of how new “rights” are often devised as weapons against existing and much more important rights, came in 2005. Charles Clarke, at the time the UK’s Home Secretary,

used the terror attacks in London to call for changes to the European Convention on Human Rights. In particular, he said that “citizens’ right to privacy had to be balanced with their right to be protected from terrorism”. [5] One of the central planks of the UK’s post-7/7 “anti-terror measures” was a proposed data retention law, calling for increased surveillance of phone calls and emails. It’s funny how every single “shock” event that takes place serves to advance the same techno-tyrannical agenda...

vi. The Right to Self-Identify

There are some “rights” which are not so much misleading as in flagrant contradiction of any notion of truth. Giving someone the right to say they are a man, when they are in fact a woman, or a woman, when they are in fact a man, is a prime example. We might decide, like the Judean revolutionaries in *Monty Python’s Life of Brian*, that even if it is physically impossible for a man to be pregnant, there is no harm in granting him the theoretical right to be so. [6] While we’re at it, we could also give people the theoretical right to become invisible at will, to walk across the Atlantic Ocean or to turn themselves into golden eagles at any moment they fancy. Where’s the harm in the delusion? But the trouble is that this “right” impacts on other people. How can we

reply to someone who insists that they were ahead of us in the queue at the Post Office, but happened to be invisible for most of the time? If we challenge their account, will we be guilty of Invisibility Denial, a serious hate crime? There is always a potential clash between our own rights and those of others: our social interactions depend on a subtle organic balancing of our respective needs. But giving credence and weight to absurd fabricated “rights”, such as the “right to self-identify”, [7] in other words the “right” to be universally regarded as something that you are not, restricts others’ rights in a very unbalanced way. Such pseudo-rights, far from being silly but harmless, become a threat to real and fundamental rights to freedom and self-expression.

vii. The Right to be Vaccinated

The same phenomenon is apparent with the “right to be vaccinated”, [8] currently being acclaimed all across the world. This “right” is often expanded to include the notion of a “right” to be protected from contamination from those who have, for some reason, not taken up their “right” to be injected with toxic substances developed and sold by a sociopathic global criminal mafia. We see here how easily the notion of a “right” can morph into an obligation.

The great thing is, of course, that it remains disguised as a positive, thus allowing the world's virtue-signallers to self-righteously wield it as a morally-authorised weapon with which to attack their non-conforming enemies.

viii. The Right to Die

The previous item leads us seamlessly onto the “right to die“, [9] which is a surprisingly popular cause at the moment. There are very real concerns about the way that “voluntary” euthanasia could provide a cloak for deliberate murder and open the door to a society in which human beings past their productivity sell-by date are quietly disposed of before they become too much of a drain on the economy. In broader terms, the concept of a “right to die” is nonsensical, since it is the one “right” with which we are all born and which can never be taken from us, in the long run. Much more useful, surely, would be a “right to live”? But this, along with the right to be free, is something that will never be accorded to us by our rulers, who much prefer fake “rights” that merely serve their own interests. Our right to live fully and freely is something we are going to have to claim for ourselves by joyfully demolishing the machineries and machinations of the money power.

[1] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Anq3qJ0w-wo>

- [2] <https://www.ohchr.org/en/elections>
- [3] <http://un.org/en/events/righttodevelopment/declaration.shtml>
- [4] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Right_to_Internet_access
- [5] <https://euobserver.com/rule-of-law/19822>
- [6] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sFBOQzSk14c>
- [7] <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/jun/20/our-gender-is-not-for-others-to-decide-a-bill-for-trans-people-to-self-identify-is-a-good-start>
- [8] <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/access-vaccine-human-right>
- [9] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Right_to_die

PUPPETS OF POWER

September 6, 2022

The tiny gang of criminals with all the money that power can buy, and all the power that money can provide, want to hold on to their full-spectrum world domination.

Historically, they have used a range of techniques to ensure that key people, particularly politicians and royalty, are safely under their control.

Bribery is one possibility and many unprincipled individuals are quite prepared to sell their soul if the price is right.

But what happens if they start getting too greedy or unreliable? How many gifts will it take to keep them on board for the long term?

The manipulators may choose instead to *lend* money to their target, gaining a legal hold on the debtor. This works for institutions, such as nation-states, as well as for individuals, by the way.

Even better is to combine the use of bribery and debts with blackmail. [1] The target has simply to be lured into a trap, such as involve-

ment in dubious sexual activity.

The criminals have evidence of this serious misdemeanour and the possibility of it becoming known will shut the victim up for the rest of his or her life.

As a last resort, of course, there is always violence and the implied threat of violence for anyone stepping out of line or spilling the beans. “Dead men don’t talk”, as gangsters like to say.

While the global manipulators have successfully used combinations from this bag of tricks for centuries, it is a time-consuming process.

Rather than ambushing each new individual who arrives in the corridors of power, wouldn’t it be easier to take control of the *supply* of these individuals?

When the criminal conspiracy already owns all the existing key players in positions of power, what could be simpler than to instruct them to appoint as their successors the next generation of remote-controlled agents?

These can be selected and prepared for their role well in advance through various programmes.

The most notorious of these is the World Economic Forum’s Young Global Leaders project, whose origins have been traced back, by independent journalist Johnny Vedmore, to Henry Kissinger and the CIA. [2]

But there is an abundance of grooming

schemes with similar names: a quick internet search reveals a bewildering number of them in an ill-defined network which spreads out way beyond the official structures of the World Economic Forum [3] and yet is somehow obviously part of the same vast and all-embracing über-entity.

France, for example, boasts not just “le programme Young Leaders” [4] from the French-American Foundation, but also “Les Young Leaders franco-britanniques” [5] launched in 2017 by the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge and supported by the UK Foreign Office.

In the UK itself, the Queen’s Young Leaders [6] project, begun in 2014 and involving the Duke of Cambridge and Prince Harry, has “also provided grants to youth-led and youth-focused organisations in Bangladesh, Jamaica, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, the UK and Zambia”.

But there is also the Commonwealth Future Leaders [7] founded by the Queen’s late husband, “a network reaching beyond borders... that spans 54 countries and sectors ranging from informal community organisations through trade unions and academia to the private and public sectors”.

And this is not to be confused with the London-based Future Leaders Network Ltd, “a not-for-profit organisation aimed at discovering and developing the next generation of social, political and economic leaders”. [8]

Its “proudly produced” Y7 Impact Report reveals in the “Acknowledgments” section on page 82 that the Future Leaders Network is sponsored by none other than vaccine manufacturer AstraZeneca. [9]

There is also an apparently unrelated Future Leaders project in New Zealand. [10] This is run by an outfit called Inspiring Stories: “We’re the Kiwi charity founded with a bold vision to back young people to change the world. Now ten years on, we’re an intergenerational movement for impact”. [11]

They add: “Legally we’re a charity, but we operate like a business”.

No kidding!

The Italian Young Leaders [12] project is co-funded by the Lazio region and the European Commission and organized by SOS Europa, [13] an “independent association” accredited by the European Voluntary Service [14] and the European Solidarity Corps, an EU funding programme. [15]

The Asia 21 Young Leaders [16] scheme is run by the Asia Society which, we learn, was “founded in 1956 by John D. Rockefeller 3rd”. [17]

And the photo line-up of “the board” of the Johannesburg-based Africa Leadership Initiative Young Leaders, featuring multiple photos of the same woman, amusingly confirms the overall

impression of a global production line of cloned zombie agents! [18]

Beneath a certain level, there must be millions of puppets who serve the worldwide crime syndicate without knowing what they are doing.

The control exercised from above passes through a number of layers, so that the entire reality is not readily visible from lower down.

Imagine someone who has for many years been involved in some kind of radical campaign group or political organisation. She imagines that she thinks and acts purely from her own sense of right and wrong, not noticing the way that she allows herself to be steered in certain directions by the organisation's publications and activities.

She thinks that she is fighting for social justice, fairness, a better world for her children and grandchildren.

What she doesn't know is that the person controlling this organisation (along with, probably, several of his lieutenants) works for the intelligence services.

This man is not motivated by the same ideals as the woman. He was placed in the organisation to monitor, control and manipulate it, according to the preferences of his employers.

His employers are the state. The man therefore imagines that he is acting in the interests of

that state and indeed of the nation. His motivation, in his terms, is to protect the public of that nation, and its institutions, its democracy, its way of life, from the threat of subversion.

Like the woman, he thinks he is working for the common good.

What he doesn't know is that his intelligence service and the state apparatus of which it is part (called "The Crown" in the UK) does not really work for the interests of the nation, however that is conceived.

It has, in fact, long been completely taken over by the tiny gang who operate the global racket that we term the system.

He has not been manipulating the radical campaign group on behalf of the state to which he owes his allegiance, but on behalf of the criminals who use the vast resources of that state (and of other states and of various international institutions...) for their own purposes.

Thus, as well as using bribery, fear, blackmail and grooming to exert their complete control, these criminals also use the good motivations, the positive energy, of millions of unsuspecting people (in all sorts of realms quite different from our hypothetical example), deploying many layers of deceit to dupe them into following their agenda.

For this to work, it is important that the

victims remain trapped within the illusion, that they still think they are on the side of good, whether conceived as social justice or national well-being.

But what happens if, through undue haste or panic, the puppet-masters neglect to take proper care of the way they conduct their manipulation?

What happens if they tug too violently at the strings, sending shivers of instability down through layer after layer of their structures of control?

What happens when the little people at the bottom look up in alarm and, far above, catch their first glimpse of the sinister hand that has been controlling their activities all along?

What happens if they don't at all like what they see?

We may well be about to find out!

[1] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Anq3qJ0w-wo>

[2] <https://www.ohchr.org/en/elections>

[3] <http://un.org/en/events/righttodevelopment/declaration.shtml>

[4] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Right_to_Internet_access

[5] <https://euobserver.com/rule-of-law/19822>

[6] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sFBOQzSk14c>

[7] <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/jun/20/our-gender-is-not-for-others-to-decide-a-bill-for-trans-people-to-self-identify-is-a-good-start>

[8] <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/access-vaccine-human-right>

[9] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Right_to_die

[1] <https://www.waterstones.com/book/one-nation-under-blackmail/whitney-alyse-webb/9781634243018>

[2] <https://unlimitedhangout.com/2022/08/investigative-reports/the-kissinger-continuum-the-unauthorized-history-of-the-wefs-young-global-leaders-program/>

- [3] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2021/01/11/shapers-of-slavery-the-empire/>
- [4] <https://french-american.org/programmes/young-leaders/>
- [5] <https://francobritish.org/young-leaders-2/>
- [6] <https://www.royal.uk/queens-young-leaders>
- [7] <https://www.cflprogramme.org/>
- [8] <https://www.futureleaders.network/>
- [9] https://winteroakpress.files.wordpress.com/2022/09/57145-y7_impact_report_2021-final.pdf
- [10] <https://www.futureleaders.nz/>
- [11] <https://www.inspiringstories.org.nz/about>
- [12] <https://www.youngleaders.it/>
- [13] <http://www.roseuropa.it/chi-siamo/>
- [14] <https://europeanvoluntaryservice.org/>
- [15] https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/find-funding/eu-funding-programmes/european-solidarity-corps_en
- [16] <https://asiasociety.org/asia21-young-leaders/global-leadership-initiatives>
- [17] <https://asiasociety.org/about/background-history>
- [18] <https://youngleadersafrica.org/about-us/>

THIS ODIIOUS GLOBAL SYSTEM

September 21, 2022

Throughout my adult life I have tended to describe the thing to which I am primarily opposed as “capitalism”.

Over the last couple of years, however, I have started to wonder whether this is quite the right word.

Not only does it hinder communication with people used to different political terminologies, but it is looking increasingly outmoded as the powers-that-be try to push us into a harsh new totalitarian era.

I have gradually stopped using the term and, when I share pieces of my older writing which contain the word, I feel slightly awkward and don't quite know how to reply to people who feel it is not altogether appropriate.

The funny thing, though, is that my views have not actually changed. The entity which I have spent my life combating remains the same, regardless of the label I might stick on it.

It is not really an “-ism”, an abstract ideological concept which mysteriously casts our

societies under its motivational spell, but a real and physical *system*, built on capital, which is maintained by real and physical players.

It is an *arrangement* by which a tiny minority of extremely wealthy people possess all the power and privilege in the world at the expense of the vast majority of us, whom they regard as both dangerous and dispensable.

It is *accumulation* for the few, *dispossession* for the many.

It is a *plutocracy*, a *dictatorship* of the ultra-rich hiding behind the rhetoric of democracy while knowing that real democracy would be incompatible with its ongoing supremacy and thus doing all it can to prevent it from ever flourishing.

It is an organized *religion* of greed, a *cult* of power. It is an *octopus*, a *monster*, it is *Leviathan*.

It is the *rule* of gold, of usury, of filthy lucre, of pelf, of Mammon.

It is a *mega-organization*, an *empire* which has deliberately and consciously expanded its domination and control to the point where it can now imagine this becoming all-inclusive and permanent.

It is a *spider's web* of carefully-woven manipulation and deceit, a vast and complex *conspiracy* which has concealed its existence behind layer after layer of lies.

It is the complete *capture* of state power by financial interests and the violent *imposition* everywhere of that illicit and non-consensual authority.

It is a *scam*, a *racket*, which has gradually taken over the world's institutions to the point that its insatiable greed for ever more "growth" and "development" has been written into the legislative infrastructures of our society.

It is an ongoing *crime* on an unimaginable scale, a slow-motion *robbery* of 99.9% of humankind and the *rape*, *pillage* and *pollution* of the natural world.

It is the *corruption* of our societies, the *poisoning* of human relationships, the *paralysis* of our organic capacity to live together in mutual aid, solidarity and freedom.

It is the *enslavement* of the people of the world by the money power, the *stifling* of our vital breath.

It is the *denial* of beauty, truth, justice, nature, poetry and the mystery of existence in the name of a stale dogma of sterility, materialism, pseudo-science and artifice aimed at reducing us to a condition of powerless and abject submission to authority.

It is the endless *acceleration* of the reign of quantity, [2] our *descent* into a grim grey future from which all that makes our lives worth living will have been banished by our vile vitaphobic

overlords.

Even if I may now definitively ditch the term, all this is in fact what I have always meant by “capitalism”.

And this is the odious global system which we have to expose and destroy...

[1] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/07/14/fredy-perlman-against-the-system/>

[2] <https://orgrad.wordpress.com/a-z-of-thinkers/rene-guenon/>

A CRIME AGAINST HUMANITY: THE GREAT RESET OF 1914-1918

October 14, 2022

- I. The trauma: corpses and tears
- II. The conspirators: gold and empire
- III. The means: corruption and lies
- IV. The ends: profit and control
- V. The future: memory and rage

I. The trauma: corpses and tears

Millions of men died in the First World War, or the Great War as it was originally known, in a sickening and grotesque spectacle of mass carnage that is perhaps the closest we have ever come to bringing hell to earth.

Piles of corpses, half-buried in mud and entangled in barbed wire, young bodies blown to pieces, limbs scattered in seas of blood as once again the order came to go “over the top” and advance into near-certain death in the face of shells, poison gas and machine guns.

“In the year 1916, in two battles (Verdun and the Somme) casualties of over 1,700,000

were suffered by both sides... On all fronts in the whole war almost 13,000,000 men in the various armed forces died from wounds and disease". [1]

For years the butchery went on, while all that was gained by this odious sacrifice of humanity was a few hundred yards of territory, soon to be relinquished in the other side's counter-attack.

Visions of the sheer horror of the trenches have haunted my imagination since I was a boy and have shaped the way I see the world.

Over the years, I have met many others of my generation who felt exactly the same way and I sometimes ask myself why this should be.

The Second World War was a much closer event and I heard first-hand accounts of the German bombing raids on England from my parents, but the First World War took place half a century before I was born. Why did it move me so much?

As a young man, I was very aware that I too would have been caught up in this nightmare had I been born at another moment in history, that it would have been me and my friends left blind or crippled or indeed wiped from the face of the Earth before we had even had the chance to live.

I wondered at times whether I had been there, in person, in some previous existence, but I now think an enormous trauma was suffered by

our collective soul, which would take many years to heal.

It was above all the sheer senselessness of the killing that remained etched into the hearts of several generations.

Apart from some vague notion of stopping Prussian militarism, it was never clear to us why the First World War was even fought.

We were all aware, of course, that there were those who had profited from the war, but the event itself seemed to have been the result of chaotic clashes of conflicting national and imperial interests and ambitions; an explosion of pressure, somehow both inevitable and random, that had been building for decades and was finally sparked by the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in June 1914.

How did those in power allow this absurd war to happen and carry on for so long, when the human cost was so painfully in evidence? There was a callousness there which was always hard to understand.

My later anti-war and anti-arms-trade activism was undoubtedly fuelled by various cultural expressions on the topic, not least the many songs that have been written on the horrors of WWI and of warfare in general.

One of my favourites is Eric Bogle's *Green Fields of France*, originally called *No Man's Land*, which is addressed to the grave of Willie

McBride, a member of the whole generation that was “butchered and damned”.

And I can't help but wonder, young Willie McBride

Did those that lie here know why they died?

And did they believe when they answered the cause

Did they really believe that this war would end wars?

The sorrow, the suffering, the glory, the pain

The killing and dying, were all done in vain

For young Willie McBride, it all happened again

And again and again and again and again

Songs like these, along with books, poems, films and artwork still make me cry. Tears are welling as I type these words, in fact.

These are tears not just of sadness for those who died, but of anger for those who allowed the mass murder to take place.

This anger was strong enough when I put the war down to misguided nationalism or uncaring incompetence.

But now, having read two crucially important books by a pair of Scots researchers, my lifelong sorrowful fury has found a more precise target.

In their forensically-investigated and me-

ticulously-referenced 2013 book *Hidden History: The Secret Origins of the First World War* and their 2018 follow-up *Prolonging the Agony: How the Anglo-American Establishment Deliberately Extended WWI by Three-and-a-Half Years*, Gerry Docherty and Jim Macgregor show that the horrific butchery was deliberately planned and orchestrated in the interests of a very specific agenda.

They reveal, in their own words, that “far from sleepwalking into a global tragedy, the unsuspecting world was ambushed by a secret cabal of warmongers in London”. [2]

This network, which we might today term the military-financial-industrial complex, not only conspired to start the war, but then conspired to keep it going to fulfil its own odious aims.

I would very much recommend people read these works, along with the authors’ blog at firstworldwarhiddenhistory.wordpress.com, to gain full insight into what they have discovered.

Alternatively they could watch the excellent documentary [3] from James Corbett which summarises their findings.

Here, I aim to make a connection which they could not do in these pre-2020 publications, nor on their website to which they last posted in 2019, and which could not be made by anyone else marking the centenary of the war’s end.

In order to do so, I will also draw on the work of historians Carroll Quigley and Niall Ferguson, both, in their own way, “insiders” granted access to archives not accessible to the general public.

That connection is obviously to the 21st century’s Great Reset, which boasts a toll of suffering rapidly rivalling that of the 20th century’s Great War and seems, chillingly, to have been organised along the same lines, with the same aims, by the same interests.

II. The conspirators: gold and empire

First of all, let’s take a look at some of the key individuals accused of having engineered the Great War.

They were all part of a publicity-shy group rooted in upper-class British society but with strong ties to what Quigley terms the “Eastern Establishment” in the USA. [4]

The driving force behind what is today called The Commonwealth, their initial wealth and influence was based largely on the looting of gold and diamonds from southern Africa.

Cecil Rhodes (1853-1902)

Although he died 12 years before the war began, Rhodes played a crucial role in ensuring it took

place, having initiated the creation of the secret imperialist society that planned the conflict.

The man who gave his name to Rhodesia, now Zimbabwe, is today somewhat notorious, to the point that an international protest movement, Rhodes Must Fall, [5] was set up to call for his statue to be removed from Oxford University and elsewhere.

While he has mainly been targeted for his racist views, perhaps less well-known is the extent to which he was motivated by money and power.

Quigley explains that Rhodes “feverishly exploited the diamond and goldfields of South Africa” [6] and rose to be prime minister of the Cape Colony, while journalist William Stead described him as “the first of the new dynasty of money-kings which has been evolved in these later days as the real rulers of the modern world”. [7]

Rhodes had emigrated from England to South Africa as a young man and found himself working at the Kimberley diamond fields. Docherty and Macgregor explain that Rhodes attracted the attention of a Rothschild agent, who was assessing the local prospects for investment in diamonds.

“Backed by Rothschild funding, Cecil Rhodes bought out many small mining concerns, rapidly gained monopoly control and became intrinsi-

cally linked to the powerful House of Rothschild.

“Although Rhodes was credited with transforming the De Beers Consolidated Mines into the world’s biggest diamond supplier, his success was largely due to the financial backing of Lord Natty Rothschild, who held more shares in the company than Rhodes himself... Neither had any qualms about the use of force against African tribes in their relentless drive to increase British dominance in Africa”. [8]

Rhodes was very close to Rothschild – in three of his wills he left the banker as his trustee, in one as his sole trustee [9] – and the two of them were founding members of the conspiratorial group, although Rothschild preferred to remain in the background.

The Rhodes Trust, with its transatlantic Rhodes Scholarships, was later to play a key role in extending the group’s influence in the USA and was part of the grand scheme for world control of which the man himself had dreamed.

Stead wrote to his wife after meeting Rhodes: “I cannot tell you his scheme because it is too secret. But it involves millions... He took to me. Told me some things he has told no other man – save Lord Rothschild”. [10]

Lord Natty Rothschild (1840-1915)

Rothschild was an extraordinarily influential

international banker and financier, head of the British branch of the family and “a massive investor in gold, diamonds, oil, steel, railways and armaments”. [11]

Docherty and Macgregor note that “the Rothschild dynasty epitomized ‘the money power’ to a degree with which no other could compete”, adding that they were “all-powerful in British and world banking”. [12]

On the eve of the Great War they were “a formidable financial force”, writes Ferguson: “N.M. Rothschild & Sons was far and away the largest private bank in the City of London in terms of capital”. [13]

The family also wielded great influence in the USA through its associates at J.P. Morgan, as we will see.

On Rothschild’s death, the *Western Morning News* wrote: “This prince of financiers and friend of King Edward probably knew more of the inner history of European wars and diplomacy in general than the greatest statesman we have ever had. Every great stroke of policy by the nation in the last half-century has been preceded by the brief but all-significant announcement, ‘Lord Rothschild visited the Prime Minister yesterday’”. [14]

As already indicated, the financier was in on the warmongers’ conspiracy from the start; indeed even before its concrete beginning with

the founding of Rhodes' secret society in 1891. "On 15 February 1890, Rhodes journeyed from South Africa to Lord Rothschild's country estate to present his plan", explain Macgregor and Docherty. [15]

Alfred Milner (1854-1925)

Milner, an academic and journalist turned civil servant, took up where Rhodes had left off, pushing forward the secret group's full-spectrum domination of the upper echelons of British life.

Says Quigley: "He became one of the greatest political and financial powers in England, with his disciples strategically placed throughout England in significant places, such as the editorship of *The Times*, the editorship of *The Observer*, the managing directorship of Lazard Brothers, various administrative posts, and even Cabinet positions. Ramifications were established in politics, high finance, Oxford and London universities, periodicals, the civil service, and tax-exempt foundations". [16]

Milner's connection to members of the secret conspiracy can be traced back at least to April 1891, when he is known to have dined with Rothschild. [17]

Quigley reveals that he later found lucrative employment as "confidential adviser to certain international financiers in London's financial

district”, [18] while Docherty and Macgregor note that he was “well rewarded by his banking and industrialist friends for the tireless work he did to reinstate and increase their profits”. [19]

Milner became a member of the board of the London Joint Stock Bank (later the Midland Bank), chairman of Rothschild’s Rio Tinto Co., a director of the Mortgage Company of Egypt and of the Bank of British West Africa.

Significantly, those who knew him stressed that he “believed in the highly-organised state”. [20]

He has also been cited as an early proponent of the “managerial revolution”, which is to say the control of society by an unelected group not answerable to the general public.

In both these respects we can see strong parallels between Milner’s political position and those of later controversial characters.

In *Fascism Rebranded: Exposing the Great Reset*, I describe the way that a post-WW2 German “management academy” was run by former members of Adolf Hitler’s notorious SS. [21]

And, of course, Klaus Schwab’s fascistic World Economic Forum started out life in 1971 as the European Management Forum.

Like Milner, Schwab spurns democracy at the expense of “agile governance” [22] and aims for the “system management of human

existence”. [23]

It is essential for anyone seeking a real understanding of our society to grasp the historical continuity between British plutocratic imperialism, fascism and the current plutofascist Great Reset.

Field Marshall Jan Smuts (1870-1950)

Remembered today for his two spells as Prime Minister of South Africa and his racist defence of the apartheid system, Smuts was a key member of the conspiracy.

He went on to sit on the British War Cabinet, an inner circle formed of trusted members of the Milner entourage to direct the 1914-1918 conflict. [24]

I have written a lot in recent years about fake greens, [25] fake anarchists [26] and fake leftists, [27] but Smuts is a notable example of a fake nationalist.

Originally an enthusiastic supporter of Rhodes, who even acted as his agent, Smuts suddenly seemed to turn into his fanatical opponent.

Quigley writes that this reputation as an Anglophobe enabled Smuts to rise to a position of power in the Transvaal at a very early age.

But it was a sham: “He clung to that ideal which he shared with Rhodes and Milner – the

ideal of a united South Africa. All his actions from this date onward [1895] – no matter how much they may seem, viewed superficially, to lead in another direction – were directed toward the end ultimately achieved: a United South Africa within the British Empire”. [28]

His ultimate aim of a British-dominated world empire makes Smuts an early example of what is now often termed a “globalist”.

During the Second World War he was already foreseeing the creation of NATO and perhaps the EU when he “suggested that a federated Western Europe be included in the United Kingdom regional bloc” [29] of a global system.

And students of the global development agenda will be interested to learn that Smuts wrote the first draft of the preamble to the United Nations Charter. [30]

Plus many more...

Quigley goes into detail about an extraordinary number of members of the secret Rhodes-Milner network in his books *Tragedy and Hope* and *The Anglo-American Establishment* and I won't attempt to describe them all here.

But it is worth noting the role played by the Liberal and then Labour politician Richard Haldane (1856-1928), who acted as a Rothschild

legal adviser for many years [31] and whose pre-Great War programme of army reforms was “publicly endorsed” by Natty Rothschild, according to Ferguson. [32]

There was also Liberal politician Reginald Baliol Brett (1852-1930), who became Viscount Esher in 1899, and wielded enormous influence behind the scenes.

Quigley explains: “This opportunity for influencing decisions at the center came from his relationship to the monarchy. For at least twenty-five years (from 1895 to after 1920) Esher was probably the most important adviser on political matters to Queen Victoria, King Edward VII, and King George V”. [33] He ended up in charge of the physical properties of all the royal residences.

And another semi-invisible imperial manager was Lionel Curtis (1872-1955), one-time secretary to Milner. Quigley says that what Curtis thought should happen to the British Empire often turned out to be what actually happened a generation later.

For instance, in 1911 he decided that the name of His Majesty’s Dominions should be changed from ‘British Empire’ to ‘Commonwealth of Nations’. This was done officially in 1948. “Curtis, working behind the scenes, has been one of the chief architects of the present Commonwealth”, says Quigley. [34]

Later in life, Curtis became an advocate of a world state. [35] Imperialism and globalism are but two ways of describing one insidious process.

III. The means: corruption and lies

Anyone who has researched what has been happening to us since 2020 will be well aware of the degree of pre-planning involved.

This goes well beyond the Event 201 [36] pandemic rehearsal, or early proposals for vaccine passports [37] or the failed “bird flu” manoeuvre of 2005/2006. [38]

Covid was just the trigger, the starting pistol, for the very broad Great Reset which is now being rolled out in all its phases.

Various preparations for this complex transition have been underway for a long time now, with the long-term “development” agenda and the UN Sustainable Development Goals playing a pivotal role.

The same is true of the Great War, which the conspiratorial network had been carefully planning right from the turn of the century, as soon as they had completed the Boer War manoeuvre which delivered the whole of South Africa, with all its gold and diamonds, into the grasp of their empire of greed.

And part of this project was to use the human and financial resources of that same vast

empire to fuel the Great War.

The British Empire at the time boasted a population of around 434,000,000, including over 6,000,000 men of military age. But it could not be taken for granted that they would be available for the planned bloodbath.

Milner therefore set about bringing what he called “the most effective pressure to bear”, [39] arranging a colonial conference in London in 1907 to try to ensure that the various dominions would obediently take part in the war.

As Docherty and Macgregor explain, he and his associates had to be sure that Australia, South Africa and the other great dominions of the Empire were ready and willing to stand shoulder to shoulder with Britain. [40]

At this conference, a plan was therefore adopted to organise dominion military forces in the same pattern as the British Army, so that they could be integrated in the case of “an emergency”. [41]

Two years later, Milner staged an Imperial Press Conference, bringing together more than 60 newspaper owners, journalists and writers from India, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and the rest of the empire, plus British counterparts, politicians and military staff. [42]

The aim was to encourage support, in advance of war, for the mother country and to

foster imperial cooperation in communication and military matters.

The pre-planning paid off handsomely. Docherty and Macgregor record: "In the final analysis, Canada sent 641,000 men. By 1917, it was delivering more than a quarter of the artillery munitions used by Britain on the Western Front. Over 250,000 Canadians worked in the armaments factories under the British Imperial Munitions Board. South Africa provided 136,000 fighting troops as well as enlisting 75,000 non-whites. Australia placed its navy under British command, and a total of 332,000 Australians went to war for the Empire. New Zealand provided 112,000 men, while India alone raised 1,477,000, including 138,000 men stationed on the Western Front in 1915. In general, the governments that sent colonial troops paid for them". [43]

Great efforts were also made to ensure that the USA would be on the side of the British empire in the coming conflict.

A Round Table group was established in New York to encourage links between Westminster and Washington, and between high finance in the City of London and Wall Street. Needless to say, it was managed in secret, hidden from the electorate and went unreported in the press. [44]

The American connection was particularly needed to finance the Great War. Explain our

two authors: “Wars require to be financed and cost immense sums of money. In Britain, France, Russia and Germany the national coffers were almost bare. Outrageous spending on armaments had left virtually every treasury in Europe dangerously close to empty.

“A new source of funding was required, a supply of money that could expand in line with the demand of desperate nations willing to pay handsomely for massive loans. Now that was something that a US central bank, unfettered by government control, responding to unlimited demand, could do. The Federal Reserve Act was passed in December 1913, and the seven-man board took office on 10 August 1914”. [45]

Just in time. How very convenient!

Belgium was also involved in the pre-planning. It was the German violation of its mythical “neutrality” that was lined up as the pretext for Britain’s entry into the war, so it had to be on board.

In 1912, two years before the curtain was raised, King Albert of Belgium convened a secret meeting of the Belgian parliament and disclosed that he had evidence that Belgium was in dire and imminent danger.

The Belgian army was expanded and, significantly, the National Bank of Belgium began preparations to cope with the financial emergency that war would bring.

“In utmost secrecy, they printed 5-Franc notes to replace silver coins and planned the transfer of their reserves of gold and note-making plates to vaults in the Bank of England in London”. [46]

Serbia also had to be groomed in advance for her starring role in the outbreak of war.

“The war-makers required an incident so violent, threatening or dangerous, that Austria would be pushed over the brink”, say Docherty and Macgregor. [47]

The convoluted plot to assassinate Austria’s Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo involved Serbian government officials being manipulated by Russian diplomats who were in turn being manipulated by the warmongering conspiracy: “the real sources for their slush funds could be traced back to Paris and London”. [48]

The Russian role in the desired war likewise needed to be meticulously set up well beforehand.

Because the Czar’s regime was desperately short of capital for war preparations, following its disastrous defeat in the 1905 war with Japan, cash was invested via the involvement of the French government, with the main vehicle being L’Union Parisienne, a French bank linked to the Rothschilds through Baron Anthony de Rothschild. [49]

This capital was to be used for specific war-

related enterprises in Russia, such as naval construction, armaments production and railway carriages and infrastructure.

The Russian economy grew rapidly as a result and by 1914 there were almost a thousand factories in Petrograd alone, many devoted to producing armaments. [50]

Strings attached to the financing included the stipulation that the money had to be used to build and improve railway lines heading towards Germany.

Questioning why this should be so, Docherty and Macgregor conclude: “A capable railway network was a prerequisite for the mobilization of the huge Russian armies which would be critical when war with Germany was declared. Look again at the men who laid down the stipulation. International bankers. How odd, unless of course it was they who were planning the war”. [51]

It was also obviously important to have the right people in positions of power to ensure that the war advanced as planned.

There was a hitch in this respect in France, where Prime Minister Joseph Caillaux unhelpfully stepped in to stop war breaking out in 1911.

The war conspirators, say Docherty and Macgregor, “realised that they would need to take complete control of the French government”.

[52]

After much manoeuvring, involving a radical paper being bought off and politicians being bribed to vote in a certain way, the uncooperative Caillaux was replaced in 1912 by the pro-war Raymond Poincaré, who also became Minister of Foreign Affairs and then, in 1913, President.

The two authors describe the corruption and engineering of public opinion which accompanied this coup as classic methods of the controlling clique.

And they detect the same process at work in the USA, where the compliant Woodrow Wilson became President in 1913 thanks to these “machinations”. [53]

The conspirators also faced a potential problem in the United Kingdom, where the Liberal Party had swept to power on an anti-war ticket in 1908, with its fiery rabble-rouser David Lloyd George boasting real popular support.

As Docherty and Macgregor remark: “An anti-war Liberal group headed by him would have represented the Secret Elite’s gravest nightmare. The damage he could have caused was literally boundless. A splinter Cabinet led by a national figure, a rallying point for the Liberals and the Labour Party in Parliament, would have spelled disaster for the warmongers”. [54]

But there was no need for the pro-war cartel to replace him with their own man; instead they

used one of the approaches I listed in *Puppets of power* and used the Welsh firebrand's own weaknesses to bring him under control.

Lloyd George's taste for a luxurious lifestyle beyond his means and his insatiable sexual interest in women rendered him vulnerable, explain the two authors. His career could have been ended several times over had the powers-that-be chosen to destroy him. Instead, they protected his reputation, defended him against damaging allegations and saved his career.

He had sold his soul, he was their man and the rest of his actions, including his enthusiastic support for the war, amounted to long-term payback to his powerful benefactors. [55]

You have to wonder, today as a hundred years ago, exactly how many key figures in political life are kept in line by chains of financial obligation or blackmail.

Set-ups like the Epstein/Maxwell child prostitution ring obviously spring to mind in the current context.

It is noteworthy that the influential Viscount Esher, so close to Rhodes, Rothschild and royalty, had a sexual secret that had to be hidden from the public: he had a proclivity for promiscuity with adolescent boys, which, according to his biographer, James Lees-Milne, extended to an unusual relationship with his younger son, Maurice. [56]

The involvement of the ultra-rich Rothschild clan in the warmongering group obviously made classic forms of political corruption easy to carry out.

Write Docherty and Macgregor: “The Rothschilds had amassed such wealth that nothing or no-one remained outwith the purchasing power of their coin. Through it, they offered a facility for men to pursue great political ambition and profit. Controlling politicians from behind the curtain, they avoided being held publicly responsible if or when things went wrong”. [57]

They add that the Rothschilds “frequently bankrolled pliant politicians” [58] and exercised immense influence within the leadership of both the main British political parties: “They lunched with them at New Court, dined at exclusive clubs and invited all of the key policy makers to the family mansions, where politicians and royalty alike were wined and dined with fabulous excess”. [59]

I would say that the way in which important decisions were made about the future of the country and the world in such private and exclusive settings amounts in itself to corruption.

There was no suggestion of accountability, no actual respect for the “democracy” to which these circles paid cynical lip service.

This process was amplified by the way in which the dominant clique groomed subsequent

generations to take over the administration of its ill-deserved and ill-deployed power.

While today we have the WEF's Young Global Leaders project and a plethora of other similar schemes (see *Puppets of power*), a century ago there was "Milner's Kindergarten".

Docherty and Macgregor report: "Alfred Milner organized and developed a talented coterie of Oxford graduates inside his South African administration, men who by 1914 held critical positions of power in the City, the Conservative Party, the Civil Service, major newspapers and academia... 'Milner's Kindergarten', the men who rose to high office in government, industry and politics". [60]

Milner and his accomplices made an art form out of identifying potential talent, putting promising young men into positions that would serve their future ambitions and "slowly wrapping them in the warmth of Establishment approval and ultimate personal success", [61] they say.

These men became agents of the controlling clique, without necessarily ever knowing exactly what powerful interests they served. They perhaps imagined they were merely dutifully serving their King, which was true in a way...

Many people in Britain and beyond were shocked to discover that Klaus Schwab's Great Reset was officially launched in 2020 by the man

who is now King Charles III.

But we have witnessed the same phenomenon before, as his predecessor, King Edward VII, played a leading role in the political machinations leading to the Great War, even though he died in 1910.

He engaged with political and social circles that the warmongers sought to influence, explain Docherty and Macgregor. He was their “principal ambassador, bringing to fruition plans devised in the great country houses and clubs of England”. [62]

The influence of Viscount Esher was obviously a key factor, but Edward was also very good friends with another member of the conspiratorial group, namely Lord Rothschild.

Ferguson reveals that Natty Rothschild had been introduced to Edward, then the Prince of Wales, in 1861.

This was a “real social breakthrough” [63] for the banking family, who were able to become an integral part of Edward’s social circle.

Add Docherty and Macgregor: “Encouraged by their ‘generosity’, the prince lived well beyond his allowance from the Civil List, and Natty [Rothschild] and his brothers, Alfred and Leo, maintained the family tradition of gifting loans to royalty.

“Indeed, from the mid 1870s onwards, they covered the heir to the throne’s massive

gambling debts and ensured that he was accustomed to a standard of luxury well beyond his means”. [64]

They say that both the great estates of Balmoral and Sandringham, so intimately associated with the royal family, were facilitated, if not entirely paid for, through the largess of the House of Rothschild. [65]

Obviously this was not something their adoring subjects were meant to know about and so, as Ferguson remarks, the Rothschilds’ “gift” of the £160,000 mortgage (around £11.8 million today) for Sandringham “was discreetly hushed up”. [66]

Edward led a debauched life. He apparently visited the most luxurious brothel in Paris, Le Chabanais, so often that his personal coat of arms hung above the bed in one of the exclusive rooms. [67]

But this was not so much kept quiet as used for cover. “He was shielded from public awareness of his political machinations by the very playboy image he so readily embodied”, [68] comment Docherty and Macgregor.

Whether deliberately or not, the image of a bumbling, traditionalist, nature-loving Prince of Wales has served in the same way to hide the real political role of the present incumbent of the British throne!

The mind-boggling unanimity with which

every great institution fell in line with the Covid propaganda, along with its New Normal, Great Reset and Build Back Better agenda, has opened a lot of people's eyes to the reality of power in the 2020s.

Religious leaders, not least the Pope, [69] have very much been part of this phenomenon and the Church in Britain also played an important and shameful role in cheerleading for the slaughter in the trenches of the Great War.

Leading academics at Oxford University claimed that Britain and her Empire were fighting for "the supreme interests of Christian civilization". [70] The concept of a Christian duty to fight was virtually universal among the Anglican clergy. [71]

The Bishop of London, Arthur Winnington-Ingram, claimed to have added ten thousand men to the armed services with his sermons and other recruiting crusades.

After a year of war, he called for the men of England to "band in a great crusade – we cannot deny it – to kill Germans. To kill them, not for the sake of killing, but to save the world; to kill the good as well as the bad; to kill the young men as well as the old; to kill those who have showed kindness to our wounded..." [72]

He later wrote: "This nation has never done a more Christ-like thing than when it went to war in August 1914... the world has been

redeemed again by the precious blood shed on the side of righteousness”. [73]

There seem to have been very material considerations behind this cruel inversion of the teachings of Jesus Christ by the Church of England. Docherty and Macgregor note that “many of their senior churchmen held shares in the armaments industries”. [74]

From Kosovo to Kiev, “humanitarian” excuses are often provided for military engagements and massive dubious transfers of money.

Docherty and Macgregor do a great job in explaining how, in the First World War, aid to Belgium amounted to “one of the world’s greatest con jobs”. [75]

In short, the narrative was that the Belgian people were at risk of starvation under German occupation, which wasn’t really the case, and that therefore supplies had to be sent to help them.

Not only did certain people rake off a lot of profit from this scam, but it also allowed much of Belgium’s own home-grown produce to be sent back to Germany, where a starving population would have forced the Kaiser to seek an end to the conflict.

This way, the lucrative war show was kept rolling for a few more years.

The Commission for Relief in Belgium (CRB) hailed itself as “the greatest humanitarian

undertaking that the world had ever seen”. [76]

It later claimed to have spent over \$13,000,000,000 on relief for the people of Belgium, a truly staggering figure for the period. [77]

The man in charge was Herbert Clark Hoover, later the 31st President of the United States, whom the two authors do not hesitate to describe as “a confidence trickster and a crook”. [78]

With a certain inevitability, it turns out that he was deeply connected to the circles that had planned the very disaster which he was now allegedly alleviating.

“The American-born mining engineer lived in London for years and was a business colleague of the Rothschilds. He was a friend of Alfred Milner... He had assisted Alfred Milner in South Africa. He held shares in the Rothschilds’ Rio Tinto Company and was associated with the same all-powerful Rothschild dynasty which invested in his Zinc Corporation”. [79]

“When Herbert Hoover negotiated the massive loans for Belgian Relief from Allied governments he used the J.P. Morgan organizations in America, co-ordinated through Morgan Guaranty Trust of New York which, in turn, made the requisite transfer to London”. [80]

“Hoover was fearless in overspending other

people's money. By mid-1916 the commission's expenditure in Belgium exceeded its income by \$200,000 a month, but Hoover knew that he would be able to source the funding for the simple reason that it was planned... Financial muscle was never far from his center of power. The Morgan/Rothschild axis was wrapped around the entire project". [81]

Phoney morality, of the kind preached by the pro-war churchmen or cynically exploited by warmongering "humanitarians" and "philanthropists", has been very much in evidence in the 2020s, as voices from all sides insist that everyone has an ethical duty to wear a mask, obey orders, get the jab and unquestioningly believe the narrative.

Shame has been brought to bear on those who fail to comply – directly from official messaging and indirectly from family, friends or colleagues who have fallen for the manipulation.

In the Great War, shaming was likewise used against dissenters. White feathers [82] were widely handed by women to men who declined to volunteer for the mass slaughter and were therefore branded "cowards".

Anti-war activist Fenner Brockway [83] later said he had received enough white feathers to make a fan!

The white feathers were not, needless to say, a spontaneous pro-war gesture on behalf of the

women of Britain, inexplicably eager to lose sons, brothers, husbands, boyfriends and future dreams to the hell of the trenches.

Nicoletta F Gullace reveals that the shaming initiative was launched by Admiral Charles Penrose Fitzgerald. [84]

This inveterate conscriptionist was a disciple of Lord Roberts, himself an associate of Rhodes and Milner who had been involved with their activities in South Africa. [85]

On August 30, 1914, the imperialist admiral deputized thirty women in Folkestone, Kent, to hand out white feathers to men not in uniform.

He warned the men of the seaside town that “there is a danger awaiting them far more terrible than anything they can meet in battle,” for if they were found “idling and loafing tomorrow” they would be publicly humiliated by a lady with a white feather.

One of the most painful aspects of the Covid scare for me was the way in which people on the left, even supposed anarchists, suddenly abandoned all criticism of the state, the media and Big Pharma and used the weight of their supposed moral high ground to shame those of us who had seen through the scam.

In researching the white feather campaign, I discovered that an eerily similar thing happened at the outbreak of the Great War.

Suffragettes Emmeline and Christabel

Pankhurst [86] and their Women's Social and Political Union (WSPU) had spent the decade before the war attacking the British state in the name of women's rights, using direct action tactics that shocked public opinion at the time.

However, shortly after the outbreak of the war, the Pankhursts carried out secret negotiations with the government and, on August 10 1914, the British state announced it was releasing all suffragettes from prison.

In return for agreeing to stop their militant activities, reveals another article, "the WSPU was promptly awarded a grant from the government for the sum of £2,000 (not an insignificant amount back then).

"Emmeline Pankhurst also declared her support for the war effort and began to demand military conscription for men (which was not introduced until 1916).

"Furthermore, the suffragettes were among those who handed white feathers to males not in uniform, including teenage boys as young as 16.

"Mrs. Pankhurst toured the country, making recruiting speeches. Her supporters handed the white feather to every young man they encountered wearing civilian dress". [87]

In October 1915, the WSPU even changed its newspaper's name from *The Suffragette* to *Britannia!* [88]

Emmeline Pankhurst's new-found enthusi-

asm for the British state was reflected in the paper's new slogan: "For King, For Country, for Freedom".

Daughter Christabel demanded the "internment of all people of enemy race, men and women, young and old, found on these shores".

In 1917 this pair of Pankhursts formed The Women's Party with a programme which echoed the warmongering conspiracy's agenda by calling for "a fight to the finish with Germany".

Gullace comments that the WSPU had "turned itself into a junta of pro-war militants, distinguished by an enthusiasm for war that rivalled the radical right.

"Indeed, the confluence between the ideology of the WSPU and the actions of the white feather girls was so striking that Christabel Pankhurst's pacifist sister, Sylvia, even surmised that the two groups were one and the same". [89]

A second reason for the British state to fund these pseudo-radicals' activities was that they were "useful in helping to break down union resistance to women filling the roles left by men in the workplace". [90]

"The Pankhursts sponsored gigantic parades demanding female admittance to union jobs, while engaging in a theatrical strike-breaking campaign in the North, where they argued that women workers would never 'down tools'," writes Gullace. [91]

John Simkin notes that Christabel and Emmeline ended up completely abandoning their apparently left-wing beliefs and “advocated policies such as the abolition of the trade unions”. [92]

As with the activities of the contemporary “Pfizer Left”, the warmongering and shame-dispensing Pankhursts were part of a two-pronged assault on dissent.

The British state took its own kind of direct action against the likes of Brockway, recipient of so many white feathers: the offices of the *Labour Leader*, which he edited, were raided in August 1915 and he was charged with publishing seditious material. [93]

In 1916, Brockway was again arrested, this time for distributing anti-conscription leaflets. He was fined, and after refusing to pay the fine, was sent to Pentonville Prison for two months.

Like the Covid crisis, the Great War was used as a general excuse to ramp up state control and clamp down on ordinary people’s freedom.

The Defence of the Realm Act was amended and extended six times over the course of the war to give the government powers “close to those enjoyed by a military court martial in a dictatorship”. [94]

Meanwhile, the Munitions of War Act of 1915 imposed unprecedented control over workers and introduced draconian limitations on

their rights.

Factories could be declared “Controlled Establishments” in which no wage increases were allowed without the state’s consent.

Strikes and lockouts were outlawed. Workers could no longer move from one part of the country to another without explicit permission and were obliged to take certain jobs and work overtime, paid or unpaid. [95]

As Docherty and Macgregor remark, this loss of liberty had to be justified by “cleverly staged propaganda”. [96]

The “lies and deceit” [97] formed an essential part of what Quigley describes as the overall picture of “censorship, propaganda, and curtailment of civil liberties” [98] – and these sinister outlines are all too familiar to us today.

This manipulation of public opinion started as soon as the Boer War ended and the warmongers’ next objective came into sight.

“A massive and consistent propaganda drive was needed to create a German ‘menace’ and whip the British people into a froth of hatred towards Germany and Kaiser Wilhelm”, [99] write the two authors.

“In 1906, the British electorate had voiced an overwhelming desire for peace and substantial reduction in spending on armaments, but the Secret Elite turned pacifism on its head through an age-old weapon: fear.

“Fear was required to stir the complacency of Edwardian England and counter the anger of workers on poverty wages evidenced in strikes and walkouts in mines, factories and shipyards across the land.

“Fear generates doubt and suspicion. Fear is the spur that has the masses demanding more and more weapons to defend homes and families, towns and cities. It has always been so”. [100]

Fear and suspicion. It does indeed appear that the same methods and devices are rolled out time and time again to help advance a certain nefarious agenda.

Taking control of the media was then, as it has been since, an important element of the conspirators’ pre-planning.

The Times was not the most widely-read newspaper in Britain but it certainly wielded the most influence on those in positions of power.

Quigley considers that although Milner’s associates did not actually own “The Thunderer” until 1922, they clearly controlled it as far back as 1912 and that it had probably been safely in the hands of those circles since 1884. [101]

He adds that *Encyclopedia Britannica* was, in turn, controlled by *The Times*, [102] which presents some interesting parallels with its contemporary equivalent, *Wikipedia*. [103]

Propaganda had already been deployed in the Boer War, which was dressed up as a defence

of British settlers' rights against Boer oppression, rather than as the grab of gold resources that it really was. [104]

Now, censorship and propaganda were employed together to simultaneously conceal all accounts of wrongdoing or mistakes by Britain and its allies and to publicise, exaggerate or invent stories of atrocities or dastardly plans by the German and Austro-Hungarian enemy. [105]

In August 1914 Winston Churchill, then First Lord of the Admiralty, announced the formation of an all-powerful press bureau with the purpose of providing "a steady stream of trustworthy information supplied both by the War Office and the Admiralty... to keep the country properly and truthfully informed from day to day of what can be told, and what is fair and reasonable; and thus, by providing as much truth as possible, exclude the growth of irresponsible rumours". [106]

Trustworthy information, as much truth as possible, countering irresponsible rumours. The similarities to the 2020s Great Reset would be amusing if they were not so alarming.

Famous academics and novelists also became willing cogs in the sophisticated propaganda machine [107] as the media, in Britain and France, obediently and enthusiastically toed the official line and peddled state propaganda, with the usual outrageous distortions which have

now became so familiar.

When the *Lusitania*, a liner used for transporting munitions, was sunk by a German U-boat, *The Times* announced that “four-fifths of her passengers were citizens of the United States”, while the actual proportion was 15.6 percent.

And a French newspaper published a picture of the crowds in Berlin at the outbreak of war in 1914 as a picture of Germans “rejoicing at news of the sinking of the *Lusitania*”. [108]

In the USA, newspaper editors and owners played an important role in turning public opinion there in favour of involvement in the European war.

The corrupt machinations that made this possible were exposed by Congressman Oscar Calloway of Texas, who placed a damning statement on the Congressional Record on February 9, 1917.

He revealed that, in March 1915, “J.P. Morgan interests, the steel, shipbuilding and powder interests and their subsidiary organizations” had employed 12 men high up in the newspaper world to assess the influence of more than 170 newspapers across America.

These had come to the conclusion that by buying 25 of the most famous titles, they could control public opinion.

The plan went into action, thanks to Morgan

money, and a compliant editor was placed in each paper to supervise and edit the so-called “news”. [109]

All conspiratorial activity depends for its success on its victims not being aware of what is being done to them.

As well as feeding them false and misleading information, it is obviously of great importance to stop them learning the truth.

This was already true of the network in general and why they chose the form of a secret society to advance their agenda.

Quigley’s assessment is that “this organization has been able to conceal its existence quite successfully, and many of its most influential members, satisfied to possess the reality rather than the appearance of power, are unknown even to close students of British history”. [110]

As far as the specific war issue was concerned, this need was even more pressing. As Docherty and Macgregor stress: “Had the public known of their intention to manipulate a war with Germany, the government would have been swept from office”. [111]

Manufactured hysteria over “German spies” in the build-up to war was used as an excuse to create intelligence agencies MI5 and MI6 [112] and at the same time the Official Secrets Act was brought in: the common aim was to protect the war conspirators from public scrutiny and

exposure.

During the war, whistleblowers were silenced. Docherty and Macgregor detail how Captain Turner of the *Lusitania*, whose account of the sinking differed from the official version, “was subjected to a concerted legal attack from the British establishment” [113] and suggest that famous nurse Edith Cavell was killed at the behest of the gang because she was about to blow the whistle on the “aid” scam to Belgium. [114]

After the war, there was the need to destroy all evidence of what had really happened. “Had the truth become widely known after 1918, the consequences for the British Establishment would have been cataclysmic”, [115] say the two authors.

Most of the official records of the Admiralty, Foreign Office and Board of Trade were removed, presumed destroyed. [116]

In the early 1970s, Canadian historian Nicholas D’Ombrain noted that the War Office records had been “weeded”, with as many as five-sixths of “sensitive” files removed as he pursued his research. [117]

Diaries and memoirs have been censored and altered, evidence sifted, removed, burned, carefully “selected” and falsified. [118]

Ferguson laments that Natty Rothschild’s order that all his correspondence be destroyed after his death in 1915 resulted in there being

little for him to examine in the Rothschilds' own archives, "leaving the historian to wonder how much of the Rothschilds' political role remains irrevocably hidden from posterity". [119]

Most extraordinary is the story of how hundreds of thousands of important documents concerning the origins of the Great War were hoovered up across Europe and deposited in the locked vaults of Stanford University in the USA.

"Hoovered" is very much the right term, as the man in charge of the operation was Herbert Hoover, fresh from his fake-humanitarian exploits in Belgium.

He was now presented as a scholarly individual who "loved books" and wished to collect manuscripts and reports relating to the war because they would otherwise "easily deteriorate and disappear". [120]

Despite having no official permission to do so, he employed teams of men, in their army uniforms, to snoop around official archives everywhere and steal as many documents as they could.

The first haul of this "Great Heist" amounted to 375,000 volumes of the "Secret War Documents" of European governments, according to the *New York Times*. [121]

How Hoover's organisation managed to pay more than 1,000 agents for this task remains a mystery. His declared "donation" of \$50,000

would have paid for only around 70 of them for a year. [122]

Docherty and Macgregor devote a 500-page book to describing how the warmongers conspired to prolong the “narrow window of opportunity” (to use Klaus Schwab’s apposite 2020 phrase [123]) represented by the Great War.

“War was a source of profit that benefited them all, and the longer it lasted, the greater that profit”, [124] and so “every action they took deliberately prolonged the war”. [125]

The war could have been over in 1915, they argue, but it was stretched out at the cost of millions of lives.

An early end did not bear contemplation for the manufacturers whose investments in new plants, new infrastructure and expanded capacity was predicated upon several years of conflict.

“The profiteers had initially bought into procuring the loans and providing the munitions because they had been promised a long war”. [126]

The authors even make a good case that Lord Kitchener, in favour of ending the war with a fair peace, was deliberately killed, along with 700 others, at Scapa Flow in 1916. [127]

The supposed British naval blockade of Germany between 1914 and 1916 was “a cruel

charade that was designed to fail”, [128] they say, and didn’t even stop the transatlantic supply of gun cotton for the German howitzers. [129]

Oil supplies were maintained to Germany, notably via the Steaua plant, which by 1914 had become the largest and most productive installation in Romania.

Again, there is a link to members of the warmongering network, explain the authors.

Steaua’s success had only been achieved through sourcing vast sums of money, “and much of that investment came from the Rothschilds”.

“In due course Deutsche Bank appointed a friend and colleague of the Rothschilds, Emil von Stauss, to manage the Steaua Romana Company. He was Managing Director of the Rothschild/Nobel/Deutsche Bank oil consortium, the Europäische Petroleum Union (EPU).

“Thus, in the pre-war years, a strategy emerged to guarantee Germany’s future oil supplies, under the benign direction of the Rothschilds”. [130]

IV. The ends: profit and control

Having looked at the means by which the conspirators engineered and prolonged the war, and successfully hid their activities from the public, we now come to the question of *why* they did so.

As will already be apparent, short-term monetary gain was a significant factor.

During the current Great Reset, there have obviously been massive profits to be made for businesses prepared in advance to sell masks, plastic screens, signage, various online services and “vaccines”.

During the last century’s Great War, the most obvious and immediate source of profit was by the arms trade.

Most people at the time would have imagined the businesses involved to be independent firms, competing for government contracts.

But this was not true and they in fact formed a monopolising ring based, in Britain, around Vickers Ltd; Armstrong, Whitworth and Co Ltd; John Brown and Co Ltd; Cammell, Laird & Co, and the Nobel Dynamite Trust.

Write Docherty and Macgregor: “The ring equated to a vast financial network in which apparently independent firms were strengthened by absorption and linked together by an intricate system of joint shareholding and common directorships.

“It was an industry that challenged the Treasury, influenced the Admiralty, maintained high prices and manipulated public opinion”.
[131]

There were some at the time who saw through their game. Lord Welby, former

permanent secretary to the Treasury, warned: “We are in the hands of an organisation of crooks. They are politicians, generals, manufacturers of armaments, and journalists. All of them are anxious for unlimited expenditure, and go on inventing scares to terrify the public and to terrify ministers of the Crown”. [132]

After the war, in 1921, a sub-committee of the Commission of the League of Nations concluded that arms firms were guilty of promoting and profiting from war, bribing government officials both at home and abroad, and swaying public opinion through the control of newspapers. [133]

Were our war-planning conspirators part of this arrangement? Ferguson states: “There is no doubt that the Rothschilds had their own economic interests in the rearmament”. [134]

In 1888 the London Rothschilds issued shares worth £225,000 for the Naval Construction and Armaments Company and later issued £1.9 million of shares and debentures to finance the merger of the Maxim Gun Company with the Nordenfelt Guns and Ammunition Company. [135]

Natty Rothschild “retained a substantial shareholding in the new Maxim-Nordenfelt company and exerted a direct influence over the firm’s management”. [136]

At the same time, the Austrian Rothschilds

also had an interest in the enemy's war machinery, with a substantial stake in the Witkowitz ironworks, supplier of iron and steel to the Austrian navy and later of bullets to the Austrian army. [137]

Little surprise that Lord Rothschild "vehemently supported" [138] increased defence spending before the war or that, as Ferguson reveals, "he remained an enthusiast for naval construction even when it was obvious that the costs were likely to lead to higher taxes". [139]

Once they had successfully launched the Great War, the arms trade and its friends wanted to make sure it kept going.

Lloyd George had essentially written them a blank cheque and promised that the British taxpayer would cover whatever the cost of extending production lines or constructing new factories, irrespective of how long the war lasted.

Note Docherty and Macgregor: "He committed the government to compensate them and any of their sub-contractors for any subsequent loss. The War Office protocols to protect the public purse were torn to shreds". [140]

Every shell fired on the front line represented another transfer of money from the public purse to the arms industry.

So the guns had to keep firing and the young men had to keep dying in the interests of the arms trade's sustainable prosperity.

The notorious Battle of the Somme of 1916 saw almost two million shells fired over six days at German positions before the infantry attack.

It was a failure. But, comment Docherty and Macgregor, “you might even believe that it was a striking victory if viewed in terms of the profligate use of munitions rather than the awful carnage and wasteful sacrifice of mutilated armies”. [141]

“War is a racket,” wrote Major General Smedley Butler of the United States Marine Corps. “It always has been. It is possibly the oldest, easily the most profitable, surely the most vicious. It is the only one international in scope. It is the only one in which the profits are reckoned in dollars and the losses in lives.

“A racket is best described, I believe, as something that is not what it seems to the majority of the people. Only a small ‘inside’ group knows what it is about. It is conducted for the benefit of the very few, at the expense of the very many. Out of war a few people make huge fortunes”. [142]

Expert racketeers, whether their subject is war or a fake pandemic, make sure that they benefit in multiple ways from their scam.

It wasn’t just the arms firms themselves that grew fat from public spending on war. All the businesses supplying the conflict, not least the oil industry, amassed huge profits from the

1914-1918 conflict.

But the racket didn't even stop there. There was vast "value" to be created from the financing of death.

Quigley is forthright in his description of the role played by international bankers: "The outbreak of war in 1914 showed these financial capitalists at their worst, narrow in outlook, ignorant, and selfish, while proclaiming, as usual, their total devotion to the social good". [143]

"The attitudes of bankers were revealed most clearly in England, where every move was dictated by efforts to protect their own position and to profit from it". [144]

He explains that the dominance of these investment bankers was based on their control over the flows of credit and investment funds through bank loans, the discount rate, and the rediscounting of commercial debts; they could dominate governments by their control over current government loans and the play of the international exchanges. [145]

The gold standard was generally suspended at the outbreak of war, thus removing the automatic limitation of the supply of paper money.

This meant that the banks were able to lend unlimited amounts of money to governments to pay for the war, without having the gold to back

up the money.

“The creation of money in the form of credit by the banks was limited only by the demands of its borrowers”, writes Quigley. [146]

Obviously these loans would all have to be paid back later, plus interest...

The primary winner from the financing of many aspects of the Great War was undoubtedly J.P. Morgan, based in New York but with close ties to the City of London.

In January 1915, the British Treasury appointed John Pierpoint Morgan as its sole purchaser in the United States, thereby handing him control over the spending of thousands of millions of British tax-payers' pounds. [147]

His agents controlled the orders for steel and armaments, for cotton, wheat and meat, for the transportation of these goods across the Americas and the maritime fleets that crossed the oceans.

Once America entered the war, J.P. Morgan's loans to the Allies were guaranteed by the US government, making it impossible for his banks to lose money. [148]

After the war, J.P. Morgan was heavily involved in the reparations programmes and was, according to Quigley, the “chief influence” [149] on both the Dawes Plan of 1924 and the Young Plan of 1929.

While J.P. Morgan may appear to be a quite

distinct entity from those involved in the British warmongering cartel, Docherty and Macgregor insist that this is not the case.

Investigating the way in which the original family firm had been saved from ruin in 1857 by a massive loan from the Bank of England, where the Rothschilds held “immense sway”, they come to the conclusion that it had become a front company for the Rothschilds. [150]

“It was the perfect front. J.P. Morgan, who posed as an upright Protestant guardian of capitalism, who could trace his family roots to pre-Revolutionary times, acted in the interests of the London Rothschilds and shielded their American profits from the poison of anti-Semitism”. [151]

Having profited from the war itself, the same financial capitalist circles were also keen to be involved in the subsequent reconstruction.

It has been estimated by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace that the war destroyed more than \$400,000,000,000 of property [152] and so more massive loans were required in order to “build back better”.

Years of wild public spending, free of the usual constraints, were good for those lending the money but not for the population as a whole.

Quigley writes: “Since the middle classes of European society, with their bank savings, checking deposits, mortgages, insurance and

bond holdings, were the creditor class, they were injured and even ruined by the wartime inflation.

“In Germany, Poland, Hungary, and Russia, where the inflation went so far that the monetary unit became completely valueless by 1924, the middle classes were largely destroyed and their members were driven to desperation”. [153]

After inflation came the crash and depression, The Great Depression as it was perhaps coincidentally labelled, and millions were plunged into unemployment, poverty and starvation.

A Great Theft facilitated by corrupt governments, an enormous transfer of wealth from ordinary people into the already-bulging pockets of a tiny but ruthless ultra-rich ruling class? If that doesn't sound familiar to you in the 2020s, then you haven't been paying attention!

While short-term profit was made by supplying the war and medium-term profit came from the payback on various government loans, there was also a long-term element to the plan.

This was to advance, by a giant war-propelled step, the co-ordinated centralization of the dominant clique's power and control – a process which was to receive a further mighty boost after the Second World War and which is being pushed still further with the Great Reset.

The real nature of the British Empire, later rebranded The Commonwealth, is not generally understood.

Britain was, as Quigley writes, “the center of world finance as well as the center of world commerce” [154] and, in 1914, British overseas investment amounted to some \$20 billion. [155]

With larger and larger aggregates of wealth falling into the control of smaller and smaller groups of men, [156] the empire was the vehicle through which financial capitalists could centralize their global economic control.

It was the first phase of what we now call globalisation.

This agenda was successfully pushed forward in various ways during the First World War.

Inside the British government, the war-mongering conspirators carried out in 1916 what Docherty and Macgregor describe as “nothing less than a coup, a planned take-over of government by men who sought to impose their own rule rather than seek a mandate from the general public”. [157]

The unelected Milner was appointed directly to the inner-sanctum of Britain’s war planning and Lloyd George “revolutionized government control of production by bringing businessmen into political office”. [158]

Public-private partnerships therefore did not

start with Benito Mussolini, Adolf Hitler, Margaret Thatcher or Tony Blair, let alone with Klaus Schwab!

In the USA, President Woodrow Wilson created the US Food Administration and the man placed in control was none other than Hoover, saviour of the starving Belgians and subsequent looter of incriminating documents.

Citing his biographer Lawrence E Gelfand, Docherty and Macgregor describe how Hoover became the “food dictator” [159] and say that he was essentially made “chief-executive of the world’s first multi-national food corporation”. [160]

The post-war period saw a kind of merger of American and British economic interests, they add: “These immense changes represented a long-term financial realignment in favor of Wall Street”. [161]

This was but a step towards a greater aim, which was, as Quigley reminds us, “nothing less than to create a world system of financial control in private hands, able to dominate the political system of each country and the economy of the world as a whole”. [162]

The Federal Reserve Bank having been conjured up in 1913 to enable war funding, the next part of this plan involved the creation of the private Bank for International Settlements in Basle, Switzerland. [163]

Owned by the chief central banks of the world, themselves private corporations, and holding accounts for each of them, the Bank for International Settlements was to serve as “a Central Bankers’ Bank” and allow international payments to be made by merely shifting credits from one country’s account to another on the books of the bank. [164]

At the same time, new institutions were set up to steer and co-ordinate this anglo-american financial imperialism.

The Institute of International Affairs (IIA), also known as Chatham House, was formally established in 1920 and was granted a Royal charter in 1926. It was helped on its way with a gift of £2,000 from Thomas Lamont of J.P. Morgan.

While it pretends to be an independent think tank, Quigley stresses that this is not at all so and warns of the sinister implications of its true function.

“The Milner Group controls the Institute. Once that is established, the picture changes. The influence of Chatham House appears in its true perspective, not as the influence of an autonomous body but as merely one of many instruments in the arsenal of another power.

“When the influence which the Institute wields is combined with that controlled by the Milner Group in other fields – in education, in

administration, in newspapers and periodicals – a really terrifying picture begins to emerge...

“The picture is terrifying because such power, whatever the goals at which it may be directed, is too much to be entrusted safely to any group...

“No country that values its safety should allow what the Milner Group accomplished in Britain – that is, that a small number of men should be able to wield such power in administration and politics, should be given almost complete control over the publication of the documents relating to their actions, should be able to exercise such influence over the avenues of information that create public opinion, and should be able to monopolize so completely the writing and the teaching of the history of their own period”. [165]

Across the Atlantic, a sister organization, the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), was created with J.P. Morgan money. [166]

Quigley comments that the Morgan bank has never made any real effort to conceal its position in regard to the Council on Foreign Relations and the published lists of CFR officers and directors “have always been loaded with partners, associates, and employees of J.P. Morgan and Company”. [167]

These moves by financial interests to centralize economic and political power across the

world, by means of a network of private institutions, speak of their complete contempt for any kind of real democracy.

But then democracy implies rule by the people, by the majority – if you are a tiny minority determined to flourish by fooling, controlling and exploiting that majority, this is the very last thing you would welcome!

When you nevertheless find it expedient to *pretend* to support democracy and to pass off your minority control as majority rule, you have created the central and permanent hypocrisy of our contemporary global system.

Another element in the consolidation of the international financiers' control was the extinguishing of any flames of revolt against their life-destroying industrial slave-system.

Rebellion had been on the rise in the years before the Great War, particularly in German-speaking central Europe, as I wrote a few years back in *The Stifled Soul of Humankind*. [168]

Free-thinking young people, gathering notably at Ascona in Switzerland, were rejecting the cold machineries of modernity and dreaming of an alternative world based on free communities and harmony with nature. [169]

This was, as I added in 2021, a powerful counterculture, a rebellion against the extinction of life and happiness which was being ruthlessly inflicted by the industrial empire of greed and

profit under the false flag of “progress”. [170]

But this blossoming of hope was crushed and buried in the deliberately pre-planned slaughter of the Great War.

Moreover, not just hopes for the future, but connections to the past were blasted into smithereens by the shells and machine-guns on the fields of France.

The war represented a sudden acceleration of “modernisation”, the process by which human beings are torn from all their belonging and turned into helpless and isolated victims of a rapacious system of exploitation.

In wars, says Quigley, “changes which in peacetime might have occurred over decades are brought about in a few years”. [171]

Many old folk customs that had survived the onrush of industrialism stopped for the war and never started up again afterwards. Communities were shattered, traditions abandoned.

It was a different world after 1918: the 20th century New Normal of electrification, telephones, radio, cinemas and urban living.

A local historian here in France told me that the loss of so many young men in the Great War had killed off peasant culture, with the older men and the womenfolk often unable to keep the smallholdings running and forced to seek paid labour in Lyons or Paris.

A step on the road to smart city slavery?

This remodelling of human life to suit the material needs of the industrial system was to be attempted again in Mussolini's Italy, Hitler's Germany, Stalin's Russia and Mao's China.

In the first year of Mao's 1958 "Great Leap Forward" (*funny how the branding is again so similar!*), 90 million peasant women "were relieved of their domestic duties and became available to work for the state", writes Quigley. [172]

A similar thing happened during and after the Great War in Britain, thanks in part to the Pankhursts' state-funded campaigning.

This was good news for the money-men. A ruthless employer will pay his workers the lowest wage for which they are prepared to work. If women weren't the family's main wage-earner he could get away with paying them less and was thus provided with a handy cheap source of labour.

At the same time, these women were no longer available to perform their previous unwaged work at home and so the family as a whole became yet more dependent on the products of commerce and industry and on the wages required to pay for them.

Communal cohesion, local customs and traditional ways of living have always got in the way of the growth of empires and their centralized control and profiteering.

Imperialists, or globalists if you prefer, have therefore always aimed to rip people up from their roots and throw them into the jaws of their flesh-devouring system.

Our lives and our wishes are of no interest to them.

Docherty and Macgregor write: “By 1912, the Secret Elite had spent over a decade in pursuit of their ultimate aim to create a new world order through the destruction of the old”. [173]

In the same way Klaus Schwab and his accomplices, representatives of the global finance-based dictatorship under which we now so obviously live, welcomed Covid as the destroyer of pre-2020 normality and the great accelerator of everything they have been wanting to foist upon us for years.

Are we really expected to believe that this is all just a Great Coincidence?

V. The future: memory and rage

It has become very clear to me, in the course of researching and preparing this article, that the Great War of 1914-1918 and the Great Reset of the 2020s are related.

They both form part of a *series of events* intended to trigger a bundle of outcomes beneficial to those organising them, as I have outlined.

The obsessive secrecy displayed by the powers-that-be, the way that they hide their machinations and slander those who threaten to reveal them, confirms the obvious: that these resets, these wars, these great leaps forward, are crimes.

Criminal activity does not always bring social disapproval. Sometimes we can have a sneaky admiration for cheeky rascals who get away with a daring heist or scam.

But these crimes are something else. This is not a question of people robbing a bank, but of banks robbing the people.

Moreover, these robbers are not only prepared to kill in order to grab their booty, but they evidently take a special delight in bloodshed. A massive loss of lives – other people’s lives, the little people’s lives – seems to be a treasured feature of their great historical showpieces.

These are psychopaths, twisted mass murderers who take a sadistic pleasure from the piles of corpses they leave behind them.

Their vision of the future is that of the cruel ruling clique depicted by George Orwell [174] in his novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: “a boot stamping on a human face – for ever”. [175]

Each “Great” event in their infernal historical series is another stamping of that boot of power and greed on to our collective human face.

So how can we stop them? How can we

reassure young Willie McBride that it will not all continue to happen “again and again and again and again”?

The circles behind the Great War and the Great Reset have such loathsome and malign intentions that they can effectively be described as evil. Against this dark force, we therefore need to channel the light, as I have written before. [176]

We also need to enshrine and radiate all that we love about the life that they want to steal from us: our belonging to nature, our friendships, our local traditions, our romances, our dreams, our sense of joy at being ourselves, in our own bodies, in our own communities.

But I am not sure that this positive energy, necessary though it is, will be enough.

The ruling clique has been perfecting its grip on power for a very long time now. In the world it has carefully constructed, where all real value has been replaced by the reign of ill-gained money, it has the physical means to ensure its domination endures.

To break through the system’s defensive barriers we need to arm ourselves with an energetic battering ram of such strength that nothing they try to do will stop it.

And where could we source that from?

At the start of this essay, I wrote about the way in which I have always felt bound in grief

with the victims of the Great War and how I feel the memory of their suffering is part of our collective unconscious.

I think that now is the time to use that memory, to access that deep hurt to our collective psyche and turn it into the momentum we need to bring down this odious system.

You could see it, if you like, as calling on the ghosts of the war dead to rise up and march on the gold-plated citadels of the power that slaughtered them.

Millions and millions of phantoms, joined by millions more victims of the same power's violence and exploitation across its vast putrid empire, will advance silently towards their murderers.

Their physical form will be you and me, the bodily incarnation of humankind today, but their spiritual essence will be age-old and angry.

Imbued with our knowledge of all that has been done to us, and our determination that it must never happen again, we and those who came before us will together tear down the oppressors' prison camps and counting houses so as to clear the path for a free and joyful human future.

[1] Carroll Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Time* (Reprint, New Millennium Edition, New York: Macmillan, 1966), p. 161.

- [2] Gerry Docherty and Jim Macgregor, *Hidden History: The Secret Origins of the First World War* (Edinburgh & London: Mainstream Publishing, 2013), p. 12.
- [3] https://archive.org/details/wwi_20210205
- [4] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 602.
- [5] http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Category:Rhodes_Must_Fall
- [6] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, pp. 82-83.
- [7] W.T. Stead, *The Last Will and Testament of Cecil John Rhodes*, p. 55, cit. Jim Macgregor and Gerry Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony: How the Anglo-American Establishment Deliberately Extended WWI by Three-and-a-Half Years* (Walterville, OR: Trine Day, 2018), p. 5.
- [8] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 31.
- [9] Carroll Quigley, *The Anglo-American Establishment: From Rhodes to Cliveden* (Dauphin Publications Inc, 2013), p. 135.
- [10] Quigley, *The Anglo-American Establishment*, p. 38.
- [11] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 366.
- [12] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 6.
- [13] Niall Ferguson, *The House of Rothschild: The World's Banker 1849-1999* (New York: Penguin, 2000), p. 285.
- [14] cit. Ferguson, p. 441.
- [15] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 18.
- [16] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, pp. 602-03.
- [17] J. Lee Thompson, *Forgotten Patriot* (New Jersey: Rosemount Publishing, 2007), p. 75, cit. Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 27.
- [18] Quigley, *The Anglo-American Establishment*, p. 86.
- [19] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 53.
- [20] Bruce Lockhart, *Memoirs of a British Agent*, p. 206. cit Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 469.
- [21] Paul Cudenec, *Fascism Rebranded; Exposing the Great Reset*: Winter Oak, e-book, 2021, pp. 280-284.
- [22] Klaus Schwab with Nicholas Davis, *Shaping the Future of the Fourth Industrial Revolution: A Guide to Building a Better World* (Geneva: WEF, 2018), e-book, 82%.
- [23] Schwab, 60%.
- [24] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, pp. 397-98.
- [25] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2020/12/04/rob-hopkins-transition-to-what/>
- [26] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2020/04/26/anarchists-against-freedom/>
- [27] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2021/02/10/controlling-the-left-the-impact-edgenda/>
- [28] Quigley, *The Anglo-American Establishment*, pp. 76-77.
- [29] Quigley, *The Anglo-American Establishment*, p. 167.
- [30] <http://en.wikipedia/wiki/Jan-Smuts>
- [31] Ferguson, p. 232.
- [32] Ferguson, p. 427.

- [33] Quigley, *The Anglo-American Establishment*, p. 43.
- [34] Quigley, *The Anglo-American Establishment*, p. 63.
- [35] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lionel_Curtis
- [36] <https://www.centerforhealthsecurity.org/our-work/exercises/event201/about>
- [37] <https://off-guardian.org/2020/05/22/report-eu-planning-vaccination-passport-since-2018/>
- [38] https://assembly.coe.int/CommitteeDocs/2010/20100126_Statement%20Wodarg.pdf
- [39] Milner to Violet Markham, June 1906. cit. Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 153.
- [40] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 154.
- [41] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 154.
- [42] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 155.
- [43] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, pp. 159-60.
- [44] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 158.
- [45] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 223.
- [46] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 212.
- [47] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 242.
- [48] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 227.
- [49] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 206.
- [50] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 442.
- [51] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 443.
- [52] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 184.
- [53] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 223.
- [54] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 329.
- [55] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 170.
- [56] James Lees-Milne, *The Enigmatic Edwardian: The Life of Reginald, Second Viscount Esher* (London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1986) cit. Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 377.
- [57] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 25.
- [58] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 24.
- [59] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 25.
- [60] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 7.
- [61] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 100.
- [62] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 68.
- [63] Ferguson, p. 249.
- [64] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 24.
- [65] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 24.
- [66] Ferguson, p. 251.
- [67] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 68.
- [68] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 68.
- [69] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/05/30/francis-a-pope-of-the-poor-a-pope-for-the-environment-or-a-pope-of-the-global-elite/>
- [70] *Oxford Pamphlets, 1914-1915*, cit. Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 51.
- [71] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 52.

- [72] Annette Becker, *A Companion to World War I*, pp. 237-38, cit. Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 53.
- [73] Arthur F. Winnington-Ingram, *The Potter and the Clay*, p. 229, cit. Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 54.
- [74] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 55.
- [75] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 229.
- [76] George H Nash, *Herbert Hoover The Great Humanitarian 1914-1917*, p. x, cit. Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 202.
- [77] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 202.
- [78] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 204.
- [79] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, pp. 204-05.
- [80] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 229.
- [81] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 231.
- [82] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/White_feather
- [83] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fenner_Brockway
- [84] <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-british-studies/article/abs/white-feathers-and-wounded-men-female-patriotism-and-the-memory-of-the-great-war/C876388B8CF63FACB1593CFD51FED4A5>
- [85] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 195.
- [86] <https://spartacus-educational.com/WpankhurstE.htm>
- [87] <https://avoicemen.com/feminism/pankhurst-the-white-feather-betrayal-of-history/>
- [88] <https://spartacus-educational.com/WpankhurstE.htm>
- [89] <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/5050/white-feather-girls-womens-militarism-in-uk/>
- [90] <https://avoicemen.com/feminism/pankhurst-the-white-feather-betrayal-of-history/>
- [91] <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/5050/white-feather-girls-womens-militarism-in-uk/>
- [92] <https://spartacus-educational.com/WpankhurstE.htm>
- [93] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fenner_Brockway
- [94] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 26.
- [95] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 329
- [96] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 508.
- [97] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 508.
- [98] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 165.
- [99] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 63.
- [100] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 134.
- [102] Quigley, *The Anglo-American Establishment*, pp. 100-101.
- [102] Quigley, *The Anglo-American Establishment*, p. 116.
- [103] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yPdrndaeNMg>
- [104] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 40.
- [105] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 166.
- [106] *Hansard*, House of Commons debate, 7 August 1914, vol 65, cc 2153-6, cit. Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, pp. 34-35.

- [107] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 32.
- [108] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 158.
- [109] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, pp. 387-88.
- [110] Quigley, *The Anglo-American Establishment*, p. 4.
- [111] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 186.
- [112] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, pp. 150-51.
- [113] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 190.
- [114] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 282.
- [115] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 11.
- [116] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 105.
- [117] Nicholas D'Ombain, *War Machinery and High Policy Defence Administration in Peacetime Britain, 1902-14*, p. xiii, cit. Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 21.
- [118] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 356.
- [119] Ferguson, p. 319.
- [120] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, pp. 356-57.
- [121] *New York Times*, 5 February 1921, cit. Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 358.
- [122] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 358.
- [123] <https://www.weforum.org/focus/the-great-reset>
- [124] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 66.
- [125] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 67.
- [126] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, pp. 363-64.
- [127] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 345.
- [128] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 69.
- [129] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 76.
- [130] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, pp. 291-92.
- [131] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 139.
- [132] Francis Neilson, *How Diplomats Make War* (New York: Bibliolife, 1923), p. 328, cit. Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 139.
- [133] *The First Sub-Committee of the Temporary Mixed Commission of the League of Nations*, Report A.18, 1921, p. 5 cit. Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 143.
- [134] Ferguson, p. 412.
- [135] Ferguson, pp. 412-13.
- [136] Ferguson, p. 413.
- [137] Ferguson, p. 413.
- [138] Ferguson, p. 427.
- [138] Ferguson, p. 413.
- [140] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 316.
- [141] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 328.
- [142] Major General Smedley Darlington Butler, *War is a Racket*, p. 1. cit. Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 66.
- [143] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 199.
- [144] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 200.
- [145] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 206.
- [146] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 162.

- [147] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 318.
- [148] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 390.
- [149] Quigley, *The Anglo-American Establishment*, p. 241.
- [150] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 213.
- [151] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 213.
- [152] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 161.
- [153] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, pp. 162-63.
- [154] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 45.
- [155] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 44.
- [156] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 213.
- [157] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 360.
- [158] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 375.
- [159] Lawrence E Gelfand, *Herbert Hoover, The Great War and its Aftermath, 1914-1923*, p. 48, cit. Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 484.
- [160] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 484.
- [161] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 501.
- [162] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 204.
- [163] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 204.
- [164] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, pp. 195-96.
- [165] Quigley, *The Anglo-American Establishment*, p. 198.
- [166] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 502.
- [167] Quigley, *The Anglo-American Establishment*, pp. 191-92.
- [168] <https://winteroakpress.files.wordpress.com/2021/05/the-stifled-soul-of-humankind-w.pdf>
- [169] Paul Cudenec, *The Stifled Soul of Humankind* (Sussex: Winter Oak, 2014, p. 91.
- [170] Cudenec, *Fascism Rebranded*, pp. 277-280.
- [171] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 526.
- [172] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 735.
- [173] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 225.
- [174] <https://orgrad.wordpress.com/a-z-of-thinkers/george-orwell/>
- [175] George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (Middlesex, Penguin Books, 1954), p. 215.
- [176] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2021/06/17/unleashing-the-spirit-of-life/>

FIVE THOUGHTS ON THE GLOBAL DICTATORSHIP

October 25, 2022

1. Shattering their illusions
2. A system that hates life
3. Commonwealth coincidences
4. Cloneworld
5. We are better than them!

1. Shattering their illusions

Suppose, a few days after you read this article, a group of international bankers hold a historic press conference in Basle, New York or London.

Here they announce that they are in fact the real rulers of the world, that the pretence of democratic nation-states no longer serves any purpose and that from now on we will be living under an undisguised global dictatorship intent on pushing us all, regardless of our wishes, into a worldwide transhumanist digital slave camp designed to maximise profit and control for these same bankers.

Do you think that men and women across

the world would simply shrug their shoulders, go back to work and tell themselves that they had better adapt to this New Normal?

No, they wouldn't, because however hard it is for them to currently believe that we are really living under such a system, if it were actually rubbed into their faces they would not be able to accept it: it contradicts too many of the principles which they have always understood to underlie the way our societies are run.

This is why, of course, the global dictatorship goes to such lengths to hide its existence, to maintain its illusions of democracy and self-determination, to cloak its plans for a harsh technocratic global order in soft and misleading terms like "sustainable", "inclusive" and "equitable".

This is why it angrily denounces truth-tellers as crazed "conspiracy theorists", as dangerous and anti-social enemies of the liberal democracy it pretends to represent.

And that is why, from an opposing perspective, it is so important for us to brave their smears and to reveal to as many people as possible the unpalatable reality behind the global power complex.

2. A system that hates life

I am fed up with researching the ramifications

and machinations of the finance-based global dictatorship, if I am completely honest.

It is not a spiritually-nourishing activity; instead it sickens my soul, deeply offends my ethical aesthetics of honour, justice, truthfulness and value.

Exploring and assessing the nastiness of the ruling crime gang leaves me feeling contaminated.

And it keeps me trapped on the level at which they operate: I yearn to turn my back on their corrupt and shallow world and explore instead all the timeless magic of our living that so interests me.

I want to plunge into the folklore and mythology of my ancestors and yours, searching out the currents and branches and offshoots and intertwinings that have created, over many thousands of years, the richness of our common culture, paradoxically united by its infinite diversity.

I want to feel and know and understand the way in which this wisdom grew slowly out of the soil and the hills and the plants and was spun and woven by our essential oneness with the natural world.

I want to know what it feels like to reach, feet firmly grounded in the earth, towards the sky, the sun, the stars; informed and inspired by the wisdom of our forebears; I dream of finding

the great poetry that will bring me peace in my final days.

And yet, I know full well that the time has not yet come when I can simply walk away from that other mundane work, the task of describing the detail of what has gone wrong in our contemporary society.

I know full well that the system in which we are forced to live represents an existential threat to everything that inspires me.

This system hates and fears the tangled roots of life, the sap of vitality and freedom that sends its green shoots soaring forth in search of authenticity and fulfilment.

It hates and fears the belonging, and the knowledge of belonging, that makes us strong and proud and kind and just.

It hates and fears how powerful we become when we feel the energy of the cosmos itself lighting us up from within, when our understanding and imagination pulse and glow with something which will lie forever beyond its dull comprehension.

While this system still imprisons us, I will never find peace.

3. Commonwealth coincidences

I was recently alerted [1] to the existence of an organisation called The Commonwealth Fund,

which has been calling for a Covid-19 booster campaign in the USA, spuriously claiming this would save 100,000 lives.

Why on earth is “Commonwealth” in the title of this New York “healthcare philanthropy”?

Not only is the USA not part of The Commonwealth, but The Commonwealth did not yet exist when The Commonwealth Fund was created in 1918.

This date corresponds, of course, to the end of the First World War, during which, as I have explained, a lot of people made a lot of money.

One of these was evidently The Commonwealth Fund’s founder Anna M. Harkness. [2]

Her late husband Stephen Vanderburgh Harkness had been an early investor with John D. Rockefeller and became the second-largest shareholder in Standard Oil before his death in March 1888. Anna inherited one-third of his fortune at \$50,000,000 (equivalent to \$1,507,962,963 today), consisting primarily of stock in Standard Oil. [3]

The dividends rolled in during the profitable Great War, allowing her to set up her “philanthropic” organisation.

It seems like a bit of a coincidence that this money from the oil industry was used to create a Fund which today promotes modern “healthcare” products derived from that same oil industry. [4]

It is also worth noting that those who had

carefully planned the lucrative war in the first place were part of the secretive circles who would go on to rebrand the British Empire as the “Commonwealth”, the name Harkness gave to her fund.

I know from reading Carroll Quigley that the idea of The Commonwealth was already in the air in 1918 and that influential British imperialist Lionel Curtis had decided on the name as early as 1911.

I also know that the plan was to include the United States of America within this rebranded empire and that the merger of British and American financial interests was ongoing through much of the 20th century.

A third coincidence is that the Harkness family went on to establish something called the Pilgrim Trust [5] in the UK: one of the main vehicles for the anglo-american financial conspiracy described by Quigley is the Pilgrims Society. [6]

And a fourth coincidence is that although Mrs Harkness supposedly wanted to do “something for the welfare of mankind,” [7] her organisation’s agenda was very much in line with that of the transatlantic conspirators!

As the Fund itself explains: “Almost since its founding, the Commonwealth Fund has invested in tomorrow’s leaders. Originally called Commonwealth Fund Fellowships, the Harkness

Fellowships were initiated in 1925 to advance international understanding and encourage maintenance of the ‘special relationship’ between the United States and the United Kingdom”. [8]

Yep, that’s right. Yet another one of those “young leaders” programmes with which the ruling clique grooms its obedient political puppets!

Until very recently, I would have regarded these “fellowships” as proof of US interference in British politics, as examples of American imperialism.

But now I understand that they are in fact part of the efforts to weld the two countries into part of the same supranational entity: no longer literally The Commonwealth but the larger undeclared empire of which that is part.

As I wrote in the article on the Great War, there is a direct line between British imperialism, US imperialism and globalism: they are all steps in one ruthless drive for world domination.

4. Cloneworld

I have looked at so many websites of foundations, think tanks and institutes like The Commonwealth Fund that I now have a strange feeling every time I go into one.

There is a peculiar sense of recognition and yet disconnection, as if I have visited this site

before, many times before, and yet all the detail has been swapped out for something different.

These are clone sites representing clone organisations, with the template copied and pasted again and again to fill an entire world and leave no room for anything with origins outside the global finance-based dictatorship.

The logos, the section headings, the virtue-signalling verbiage, the little key words that hint, for the insider, at the real function of the organisation – all of this is utterly empty, devoid of any real animating spirit or independent intelligence.

They are trying to do exactly the same to the real world, copying and pasting their sterile ugliness wherever they can. Motorway service stations, airport departure lounges, shopping malls, cinema complexes: everywhere in the world they look and smell the same.

There is no more place, there is no more soul, there is no more organic life. There is just their model, reproduced again and again and again and dumped on us from a great height whether we want it or not.

Welcome to Cloneworld!

5. We are better than them!

If the global dictatorship were really as intelligent as they like to think they are, none of

us would have any idea that they existed.

Their false “democratic” reality, their Spectacle,[9] would be so smooth and watertight that we could all spend our whole lives inside it without knowing any better.

We would take their representatives and their rhetoric at face value, accept their false oppositions as real ones and happily respect the limits they place around thought and expression as sensible and necessary.

But they are not that good. They are shoddy and keeping messing up, time and time again. Millions of people with no inside knowledge of their activities are able to pick them apart simply by pointing out the contradictions in the information they feed us.

In their impatience to proceed with their Great Plan, they have recently been showering us with patent absurdities, which nobody with an ounce of intelligence should be able to swallow.

When you own all the power that money can buy, and all the money that power can provide, it must be easy to become somewhat complacent.

According to your understanding of reality, you have total control of pretty much everything and everyone, so what does it matter if the narrative has a few holes in it? What is anyone actually going to do about it?

It is here, I think, that we discover the importance of the other levels of thinking and

being that I discussed above, the ones that seemingly lead us away from the direct struggle against the dictatorship.

These levels of being, which take us beyond the mundane and materialist world of the money-men, are fed by the throbbing energies of life itself, which gush out all around us, whether from the branches of a tree, the rays of the sun or the spark in the eye of a happy child.

The terrain on which we can defeat the dictators is not the one on which they like to operate: the one on which their money can always buy armies of agents to quash our opposition.

Our terrain must be the lofty levels they can never touch or even see, blinkered as they are by their base and compulsive craving for power and wealth.

The terrain for our battle will be above individual self-interest; beyond their sterile world of facts, statistics and balance sheets. It will be high up in the timeless realm of principle, where the truth is set free from the shadow of lies and where justice will always manifest with the majestic inevitability of the rising sun.

We will be armed with our knowledge, of course, with our words and our brains and our presence and our collective memory.

But our main weapon will be the soaring of our hearts.

- [1] <https://twitter.com/anibinani/status/1562134018082177025>
- [2] <https://www.commonwealthfund.org/about-us>
- [3] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anna_M._Harkness
- [4] <https://twitter.com/AskMeLaterOn/status/1562454109785321478>
- [5] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stephen_V._Harkness
- [6] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pilgrims_Society
- [7] <https://centennial.commonwealthfund.org/anna-harkness.html>
- [8] <https://centennial.commonwealthfund.org/developing-leaders.html>
- [9] <https://orgrad.wordpress.com/a-z-of-thinkers/guy-debord/>

SYSTEM? WHAT SYSTEM?

November 18, 2022

The other day, while out spreading the word in the streets, one of my friends handed some of our dissident literature to a passer-by with the explanation that we were countering the lies of the system.

Although the man in question turned out to be warmly sympathetic to our cause, this remark really stumped him.

“The system?” he asked, with an expression of utter bewilderment clouding his face. “What system?”

Although this may have merely been a case of unfamiliarity with a certain terminology, I like to think that his response revealed the greatest triumph of the odious entity that now controls nearly the whole world and is currently trying to impose its Great Reset on us – it has managed to wrap itself in a cloak of invisibility!

This is not even a question of *who* exactly is behind all this: the root problem is that most people do not even realise that the system *exists*.

For them, we live in a pluralistic world.

Within the framework of something known as democracy, they picture a complex interchange of competing forces and interests resolving themselves in a status quo which we are more or less obliged to go along with.

While this misunderstanding is perhaps forgivable for those whose information comes straight from the corporate mainstream, it is also shared by those who give the impression of knowing better.

I have spoken to self-defined “anti-capitalists” whose view of “capitalism” seems very similar to that of the ruling group they claim to oppose: they see it as an agglomeration of social and economic relationships without any overriding direction or control.

To suggest otherwise, in their eyes, is to commit the grave heresy of spreading conspiracy theory.

Their imagined reality of various independent capitalists struggling against one another in a dog-eat-dog world of rugged competition – and thus being incapable of ganging together to cheat and enslave the rest of us – seems to have survived intact since the mid-1800s.

Anyone paying attention today cannot have failed to have noticed the way that multinational businesses and financial interests have converged to the point that their ownership can be traced back to a handful of concerns like

BlackRock, Vanguard and State Street – which themselves appear to be part of the same overall operation.

This same corporate/financial über-entity has also become heavily entwined with – and indeed essentially inseparable from – state bodies and international institutions.

The resulting monster is a self-concealing global public-private governance pulling the strings behind all aspects of our contemporary world.

Once you have seen past the cloak of invisibility and understood that there *is* such a thing as the system, everything else begins to make sense.

For instance, I have long despaired over the absence of an authentic philosophy or movement of resistance. All the existing off-the-peg options fall well short of what we need and even lead people in completely the wrong direction.

Why is this? Is it entirely due to the failings of the system's opponents? Is it because the arguments of those defending the system are so strong and appealing that it is not possible to express coherent disagreement?

Or is it rather that, as part of its self-advancement, the system has *deliberately* set out to ensure that there is no credible criticism of its Great Racket?

It would have to, wouldn't it, if it wanted to

remain invisible?

Its big lie – or Great Narrative [1] if you prefer – has always been that the vile world it has manufactured is inevitable, part of the necessary evolution of human history.

It projects the assumption that this “progress” towards modernity is somehow tied in with the passage of time itself. Two thousand and twenty-two years after the birth of Jesus Christ, it was *always* going to be the case that humankind lived in a world of airports, chemical factories, server farms and nuclear power stations.

This is just the *way things are*. It just happened like that. There is nothing anyone can do about it. You can't turn the clock back.

This story is, of course, not true! There are lots of ways in which the present could have shaped up. There was nothing inevitable about the industrial revolution, for a start, as I mentioned in a recent article. [2]

But it is crucial for the system that we believe this fairy tale of spontaneously self-creating modernity. Because, if we don't, it means that we realise that *somebody created it* with a specific purpose in mind, namely profit and control.

And, at that point, the system ceases to be invisible, ceases to appear random, and reveals itself to be a deliberate act of theft and

enslavement – for which specific groups of people are historically responsible.

In order to defend itself from people's awareness of what it has done and is still doing, with all the outrage and rejection that this would rightly spark, the system therefore has to destroy any opposition that calls attention to the fact that its world is not inevitable and which insists that a completely different way of living is both possible and desirable.

One of its favourite tricks, over the centuries, has been to infiltrate and take over a resistance movement, use it for its own ends, wipe out the genuinely radical elements and then use the excesses and crimes committed by its own fake-revolutionary placemen to discredit the *whole idea* of revolt against its slave-system.

“See! Look what happens when you rebel against our world!” it tells us later.

Thereafter, any dissident voices that seem to be connected to the fake-revolutionaries deployed by the system are automatically discredited and their ideas consigned to the dustbin of history.

The system is thereby able to maintain the illusion that there is no credible alternative to its noxious empire of greed.

I was reminded of this method of manipulation while reading the article placed immediately after my own in the latest issue of the French journal *brasero*. [3]

Here, Jean-Christophe Angaut and Anatole Lucet look at the early 20th century Wandervogel phenomenon in Germany. [4]

This back-to-nature youth movement is now generally associated in the public mind with the Nazis and their Hitler Youth. Indeed, the authors remark that the main website dedicated to the Wandervogel in France today is run by the extreme right.

But its origins were very different. It was, in fact, a reaction against the rapid wave of industrialisation imposed on Germany, which attracted tens of thousands of youngsters into its ranks.

Operating at a deeper level than that which we usually identify as “political”, it started out as simply a desire to escape from the increasingly artificial and restricted life of the cities in order to breathe the fresh air of the natural world.

According to Walter Laqueur it was “a form of opposition to a civilization which had little to offer to the younger generations, a protest against a lack of vitality, warmth, feeling and ideals”. [5]

It was no less than a heart-felt and instinctive rejection by young human beings of the grim modern prison of regimentation-for-exploitation that was being built around them.

Angaut and Lucet write that until the First World War the Wandervogel movement (the

name literally refers to the migration of birds) was “romantic and anarchic”. [6]

Intuitively, this new generation of Europeans channelled the aesthetics of earlier centuries, of a time when society was hardly perfect, but still organic in nature.

The name of their movement evoked both German romantic poetry and the wandering groups of the Middle Ages who passed from town to town, from country to country, perfecting their trade and their knowledge of the world.

The 20th century youngsters even initially dressed in the style of medieval itinerant scholars, with their soft hats, staffs and old-fashioned breeches.

One observer, Gerd Knoche, remarked at the time: “Wandering is to swap the slavery of human society for nature, the noise and dirt of the city for the silence and pure air of the fields, work for contemplation, job and family for new experiences, routine for the unknown, narrow limits for vast horizons. Alongside all that there is the benefit of physical exercise and a direct connection with Mother Earth”. [7]

A declaration made by the movement in 1913 also gives a good idea of the spirit behind it: “The free German youth wants to shape its life according to its own law, under its own responsibility, in conformity with its deepest truth. In all circumstances, it will be united in

the defence of this inner freedom”. [8]

While the involvement in the Wandervogel of “left-wing” Jewish intellectual Walter Benjamin [9] confirms that the Wandervogel’s origins were a long way from being Nazi, even during the Hitler regime many adherents remained true to the original libertarian ethos.

They objected to the nationalist and militarist corruption of much of the movement and, of course, to its absorption by the fascist state.

The article explains that Hans and Sophie Scholl of the White Rose underground resistance network “remained members of a banned youth organisation right up until the denunciation which led them to them being executed on February 22 1943”. [10]

Their sister Inge Scholl provided a fascinating insight into the outlook of these secret groups of youngsters who kept the original Wandervogel spirit alive in the dark years of Hitlerism.

They lived wild and free, she wrote, tasting existence as a superb adventure, an expedition into the allure of the unknown. They leapt into icy rivers at dawn, spent hours lying flat on the ground watching wild animals and birds, sang songs together around the camp fire in the evenings, to the accompaniment of guitars, banjos or balalaikas.

“Suddenly there was a wave of arrests all across Germany. This authentic survival of a

great youth movement, born at the start of the century and carrying within it such great hope, was destroyed”. [11]

This important cultural uprising against the system was in fact crushed in two stages. The first came with the Great War, an earlier Great Reset which the system deliberately used to push us further into industrial slavery.

Not only were many of that generation wiped out in the trenches, but the post-war Germany to which the rest returned was a New Normal version.

The second stage came with the Nazi regime, which represented a further acceleration of the system’s authoritarian-industrial development agenda funded by the same financiers who arranged and profited from the First World War, as Antony C. Sutton has shown. [12]

The system cannot stand us feeling free, it cannot stand us feeling part of nature, it cannot stand us having thoughts, yearnings and dreams that might lead us out of its “inclusive” industrial work camps and “smart” cities towards a future in which we are free from its sinister life-hating power.

Time and time again it twists and crushes the resistance that arises naturally in each new generation.

In the last couple of decades alone we have seen anti-globalists turned into alternative-

globalists, anarchists turned into rabid defenders of Great Reset totalitarianism, environmentalists turned into marketing agents for the fake-green “renewable” technology of the Fourth Industrial Revolution.

We will never stop falling into these traps so long as we do not see clearly what the system *is* and what it *does*.

And we are not going to manage to do that if we keep pretending that it *doesn't even exist!*

[1] <https://www.weforum.org/press/2022/01/klaus-schwab-releases-the-great-narrative-as-sequel-to-the-great-reset/>

[2] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/11/15/when-another-england-seemed-possible/>

[3] <https://www.lechappee.org/collections/brasero/brasero-ndeg2>

[4] Jean-Christophe Angaut and Anatole Lucet, ‘Wandervogel: des oisillons à contre-courant de la modernité’, *brasero; revue de contre-histoire*, numéro 2, novembre 2022 (Paris: Editions L’Echappée, 2022).

[5] Walter Laqueur, *Die deutsche Jugendbewegung: eine historische Studie* (Cologne: Wissenschaft und Politik, 1962), p. 14, cit. Angaut and Lucet, p. 123.

[6] Angaut and Lucet, p. 115

[7] Gerd Knoche, ‘Le mouvement de jeunesse allemand’, *Europe*, numéro 2, août 1930, pp. 593-604, cit. Angaut and Lucet, p. 116.

[8] Angaut and Lucet, p. 115.

[9] <https://orgrad.wordpress.com/a-z-of-thinkers/walter-benjamin/>

[10] Angaut and Lucet, p. 117.

[11] Inge Scholl, *La Rose blanche. Six Allemands contre le nazisme* (1953). (Editions de Minuit, 1995), pp. 33-36, cit. Angaut and Lucet, p. 117.

[12] Antony C Sutton, *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler* (Sudbury: Bloomfield Books, 1976). See also Paul Cudenec, *Fascism Rebranded: Exposing the Great Reset* (Winter Oak, 2021), pp. 284-290.

THE DOMINANCE OF SELF-INTEREST AND THE RULING CULT OF EVIL

December 9, 2022

I write in *The Withway* [1] about the way in which our civilization has taken a seriously wrong turn and is heading away from all that is good and proper towards the disaster of separation and destruction.

I also describe the way in which the individual can help us all rejoin the right path by becoming what the Indian metaphysician Sri Aurobindo terms “a channel for the infinite force divine”.

The inner rediscovery of witness on the highest metaphysical plane changes everything about the way we see the world around us, its light illuminating our understanding and informing our action on every level.

What I don't explore in the book is what could be happening in the minds of those individuals who are relentlessly pushing humankind *away* from the light, down the *wrong* path.

It is hard for most of us to understand how it

could be possible for fellow human beings to deliberately cause large-scale suffering, heartbreak, fear, war and misery.

I have been trying to work out what could have turned such people into what they have become.

Self-interest can, in itself, be a natural human and animal tendency, reflecting the basic need for self-preservation and survival.

But it seems to me that the problem comes with the *dominance of self-interest*, that is to say the pursuit of self-interest without any framing context of ethics or morality to limit its extent.

All ultra-wealthy groups, whether monarchs, aristocrats or financial oligarchs, had a starting point, when one of their ancestors split away from society as a whole to become richer and more powerful than those around them.

This first pioneer could well have been motivated by a sense of morality based on previous history: perhaps they felt their family had been unfairly treated by someone in power or by the community as a whole.

Their pursuit of self-interest would therefore be that of the underdog, who feels that it is justifiable to be a little ruthless or a little sneaky, to break a few little rules, in order to get their own back, to get their just rewards.

The next generation, being close to this person, would still feel that sense of vindication,

together with pride at their family's achievement.

The third generation, however, would experience the rise to riches as a *fait accompli* and their pride would harden into something more like arrogance, the belief that their status was their birthright, something they deserved simply for being who they were.

Over time, this arrogance could take the form of philosophical theories to explain and justify their superior position, whether a pseudo-religious "divine right" to rule over others or a pseudo-scientific Social Darwinism insisting that in a dog-eat-dog world it is the "fittest" dog who will survive and prosper.

They might come to see their sociopathic behaviour as a sign of superiority, of an elevated level of shrewdness, adaptation and intelligence.

At the same time, these powerful groups might try to present the maintenance and expansion of their wealth as something laudable, for the good of all.

They might rebrand their empire of exploitation as a "Commonwealth of Nations", describe their pillaging and destruction as "development", wrap up their agenda for transhumanist technoslavery in the colours of the rainbow [2] and declare it to be sustainable, inclusive and equitable.

However, I suspect that this kind of justifi-

cation for their control is for public consumption only.

While the powers-that-be undoubtedly really believe they are superior to the rest of us and thus have the right to rule over us, they cannot *really believe* that they are acting in our best interests.

If, as an insider, you are aware of the cynical way in which you and your associates trample over people's lives in order to achieve your goals, a personal sense of morality is a dangerous thing.

What happens when it becomes impossible to completely repress the inner realisation of what you are doing, when the thin shell of justification collapses and you, the insider, become aware of the utter depravity of your role in society?

What does such a person do at this point? Remove themselves from all harmful activity and try to make amends for the damage they have done?

There must be some who have taken this brave path, but it is much easier to continue your heady trip of power and prestige and to re-invent your personal sense of "morality" to match your activities.

The first step in this direction is the traditional ruling-class declaration of superiority over the ignorant and incapable masses, but this

stance also requires a certain paternalistic sense of *care* for the well-being of your peasants.

When even this last vestige of moral duty towards those “beneath” you has been swept away by the acceleration of insane social destruction, another formula is needed to internally explain and justify your actions.

I suspect that, at this stage, these people *consciously adopt an inverted sense of morality in which their wrong-doing makes sense.*

They embrace a false “religion” based on a twisted delight in doing wrong, in causing harm, in destroying and raping and murdering.

In this way, they no longer have to cope with repressed guilt, no longer have to internally face up to the consequences of their actions.

Theirs is a cult which is tailor-made for the psychopaths that they are, and that deep down they *know* full well they are.

By introducing others into their sect, and infecting them with its anti-values, they drown their own sense of personal badness in a general stinking flood of depravity.

Although this cult is born of self-interest, and holds self-interest to be a supreme end, it in fact takes its adherents beyond the pursuit of their own self-interest.

It takes them to a place of doing bad things, the worse the better, merely for the sake of it.

This inverted “spirituality” turns the practi-

tioners into upside-down versions of the seekers described by Aurobindo.

Rather than channelling the forces of light, nature, beauty, truth and life, they channel the forces of darkness, artifice, ugliness, lies and death.

Since we are still talking about human beings, it would be inaccurate to say that such persons are actually “evil”, any more than the holiest of human beings can ever become totally “good”.

But, in their submission to badness, they are allowing themselves to become channels for the negative cosmic energy sometimes known as Ahriman, sometimes as Satan.

The struggle between them and the seekers of truth therefore incarnates, *in the present time and on the human plane*, the eternal battle between the forces of life and death, otherwise known as good and evil.

It is obviously of untold importance, on every level, that we mobilise in vast numbers to join this epoch-shaping struggle.

Even if it is true that good will always ultimately defeat evil, our active participation is a necessary ingredient in the self-realisation of that apparent inevitability!

In order to play our necessary part, we are going to have to become capable of channelling the life force in the most direct and powerful way

possible.

We have to strip away all the layers of fear, doubt and misunderstanding that have been wrapped around us throughout our lives.

We have to stand tall, resolute and pure, ready to give everything that we have and everything that we are.

And, most of all, we have to shake off the dominance of self-interest that can lead us so badly astray.

[1] <https://winteroakpress.files.wordpress.com/2022/04/thewithway-w4.pdf>

[2] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2021/04/22/divide-rule-and-profit-the-intersectional-impact-racket/>

ENEMIES OF THE PEOPLE: THE ROTHSCHILDS AND THEIR CORRUPT GLOBAL EMPIRE

December 22, 2022

INTRODUCTION

“An Anarchist outrage on one of the Rothschilds is not greatly to be wondered at. In France as elsewhere they are so wealthy and hold so prominent a place that they stand out as the natural objects which Anarchists would seek to attack”.

So wrote *The Times* in London in the summer of 1895 [1] and in this essay I argue that this state of affairs remains true today, even though my own weapon of choice is the humble written word, rather than a home-made letter bomb.

But before we go any further, there are a couple of things we need to get straight.

First of all, as an anarchist I know full well that the current toxic combination of money and power existed well before the Rothschilds played any important role in our society (see my books

The Withway and *The Stifled Soul of Human-kind*).

By 1743, and the birth of Mayer Amschel Rothschild – founder of the Frankfurt banking dynasty which was to achieve such global financial dominance – Europe had already become a modern commercial society (a *Gesellschaft* in Ferdinand Tönnies’ [2] terms).

Without this underlying condition – the weakening of healthy social cohesion and cultural values by the domination of mercantile thinking – our world could not have been taken over to such an extent by financial schemers.

I would even say that the trajectory of our civilizational descent rendered inevitable the eventual seizure of widespread control by a group *such as* the Rothschilds: the fact that it turned out to be them *in particular* was mere historical chance.

Secondly, I am well aware that the Rothschilds are Jewish and that therefore even to invoke their name and influence is regarded by some as proof of “anti-semitism”. [3]

However, the truth of the matter lies elsewhere. By focusing specifically on the Rothschilds, my aim is to *distinguish* them from the Jewish community into which, when it suits them, they tend to melt away so as to protect themselves from specific scrutiny – a concealment aided and abetted by those who refer

loosely to “Jewish” interests when they mean the Rothschilds.

I do not regard Rothschild attitudes and activities as *typically* Jewish; in so many ways they have more in common with the old European upper classes with whom they have enjoyed such a fruitful symbiotic relationship over the centuries.

Moreover, I am not singling out the Rothschilds *because* they are Jewish, but rather *in spite of* that fact.

I am painfully conscious that there are people who seem unable to distinguish between certain Jewish people in particular and Jewish people as a whole: writing this piece while attempting to give no ammunition to such elements has been a thanklessly delicate task.

It would have been a thousand times easier to have written about the Rothschilds if they had been one of Europe’s many historical Roman Catholic or Protestant banking families: nobody would have imagined for a moment that my criticisms applied to *all* or even *most* Catholics or Protestants.

But these other dynasties have not played the same central role in creating all that is worst in our contemporary world and so it is on the many sins of the Rothschilds that I am nevertheless obliged to focus, under the following headings:

- I. Amassing great wealth
- II. Putting themselves before others
- III. Profiteering from war after war
- IV. Grabbing the infrastructure
- V. Exploiting humanity, destroying nature
- VI. Corrupting political life
- VII. Using royalty
- VIII. Privatising power
- IX. Imposing global control
- X. Keeping it all secret
- XI. Switching to authoritarian mode
- XII. Dictating the future
- XIII. Enough is enough!

I. AMASSING GREAT WEALTH

“Money is the god of our time and Rothschild is his prophet” [4] wrote the Jewish-born German poet Heinrich Heine (1797-1856) and his comment reflected public opinion of his time.

In 1870 the British magazine *The Period* published a cartoon depicting Lionel Rothschild as “The Modern Croesus”, a new Rothschild “king” upon his throne of cash and bonds, lording it over lesser rulers such as the Emperor of China, the Sultan, Napoleon III, Pope William I and Queen Victoria. [5]

Ten years previously one of the family, Alfred Rothschild, had remarked that James Rothschild’s funeral in Paris was “more like that of an Emperor than of a private individual” [6] –

as perhaps was to be expected for a person who was, as Niall Ferguson notes in his invaluable account of the dynasty, “without question one of the richest men in history”. [7]

Professor Jean Bouvier, who was a specialist in banking affairs at the Université de Panthéon-Sorbonne (Paris-I), dates the Rothschilds’ financial pre-eminence to 1818, with the brothers busily building up their transnational network in Britain, France, Prussia, Russia, Austria, Spain and Italy. [8]

He says records from the time show that Rothschild total capital spiralled from 3 million francs in 1815 to 118 million in 1828: “This progression indicates absolutely extraordinary rates of profit. It also reflects the firm’s crushing superiority”. [9]

Derek Wilson writes in his study of the dynasty: “The House of Rothschild was immensely more powerful than any financial empire that had ever preceded it. It commanded vast wealth. It was international. It was independent.

“Royal governments were nervous of it because they could not control it. Popular movements were nervous of it because it was not answerable to the people. Constitutionals resented it because its influence was exercised behind the scenes – secretly”. [10]

The family’s financial and commercial links

stretched into Asia and the Americas.

As researchers Gerry Docherty and Jim Macgregor note: “The Rothschilds understood how to use their wealth to anticipate and facilitate the next market opportunity, wherever it was”. [11]

Even by the mid-nineteenth century, it was becoming difficult to assess the real extent of the Rothschild riches and operations [12] as they expanded from banking and state loans into insurance and industrialism. [13]

Accordingly there are some who imagine that what Ferguson calls this “phenomenal, unprecedented and since unmatched economic ascent” [14] has ground to a halt and that their power should now be regarded as a purely historical phenomenon.

But, in truth, what has changed is that the Rothschilds have deliberately adopted a lower profile and become almost “anonymous”, [15] as Bouvier puts it, in representing global Capital itself.

From time to time, nevertheless, we catch a brief glimpse behind the curtains of confidentiality which suggests that Ferguson’s description of them as “the richest family in all history” remains valid. [16]

In 1988, for example, Dorothy Rothschild’s UK estate was the largest estate ever probated in British history, while in 2015 Eric de

Rothschild in France sold two Rembrandt paintings for \$180 million. [17]

And the *New York Times* predicted in 2007 that a member of the young Rothschild generation, Nathaniel, “may become the richest Rothschild of them all” thanks to “bold bets in this era’s new-money investment vehicles” and the family’s traditional geopolitical foresight. [18]

The report enthuses: “The man in line to be the fifth Baron Rothschild is close to becoming a billionaire through a web of private equity investments in Ukraine”

II. PUTTING THEMSELVES BEFORE OTHERS

The Rothschilds have always evidently been proud of their family’s financial and social success and they have not been shy about building monuments to their own glory.

By the end of the 19th century, the family owned, or had built, at least 41 palaces, “of a scale and luxury perhaps unparalleled even by the richest royal families”, [19] as Wikipedia puts it.

Ferguson comments: “They were advertisements for Rothschild power, five-star hotels for influential guests, private art galleries: in short, centres for corporate hospitality”. [20]

Writing in 1836, Heine described James de Rothschild’s house in Paris as “the Versailles of the absolute sovereignty of money”. [21]

In London, Alfred Rothschild had his own personal train, a private orchestra, a circus of which he was the ringmaster and a carriage pulled by four zebras. [22]

Such was the family's status that the Metropolitan Police ensured that their carriages had right of way as they drove through the streets of London. [23]

The Rothschilds, who had achieved noble status both in Britain and in Europe, became known for their lavish entertaining and fancy high-society balls. [24]

For millions of people across Europe and North America, the 1930s meant misery, as they were plunged into desperate poverty by the Great Depression, for which the banking dynasty must bear some responsibility.

“Venal parliaments and gold-hoarding central banks bear at least some of the blame for the 1929-32 world crisis: the French Rothschilds were represented in both”, [25] comments Ferguson.

But all was hunky-dory for the family themselves, as he explains. “For Guy [de Rothschild], the 1930s meant golf, American cars, dancing at Biarritz and baccarat at Deauville. Philippe [de Rothschild] built himself a seaside villa at Arcachon, the better to entertain other men's wives, and helped his father to squander yet more money by building his own theatre in the

rue Pigalle (a suitably louche location)". [26]

Inevitably, perhaps, their ultra-rich lifestyle was increasingly accompanied by a certain sense of superiority, even arrogance.

Remarks Ferguson: "Having risen so far by their own efforts the Rothschilds considered themselves in many ways superior to the aristocracy, not least in financial terms". [27]

In France, Maurice de Rothschild stood for election using the slogan "my name is my platform" on his posters and letting voters know that governments could do nothing without his family, who were in fact "the real" finance ministry. [28]

The Rothschilds were generally indifferent, even hostile, to the little people, way below them in the social pecking order.

For instance, they argued against land reform to increase the number of small proprietors in the British Isles [29] and Natty Rothschild sneered at "the much pampered and not over-worked British workman". [30]

Alphonse de Rothschild made this unfortunate family trait even plainer when he declared in 1897: "I am sure that, generally speaking, working people are very satisfied with their lot...

"One has to distinguish between good and bad workers. Those who demand the eight hour day are the lazy, incapable ones. The others, the steady serious fathers of families, want to be able

to work long enough to provide for themselves and their family.

“But if they were all compelled to work only eight hours a day do you know what the majority of them would do? Well they would drink!... What else would you expect them to do?” [31]

Open racial and religious prejudice was very widespread in the 19th century, as the Rothschilds had themselves discovered to their cost. But they were not immune to the same failing themselves.

Alphonse de Rothschild, asked by a friend in March 1866 why he worked so hard to make more money when he was already enormously rich, replied: “Ah! You don’t know the pleasure of feeling heaps of Christians under one’s boots!”. [32]

In 1876 public opinion in Britain was outraged by the “Bulgarian atrocities” in which up to 15,000 Bulgarian Christians were killed by Turks. [33] Ferguson remarks: “By its very nature, this appeal on behalf of the Balkan Christians was of limited interest to the Rothschilds”. [34]

Indeed the family regarded the Slav nationalist cause as in contradiction to the interests of their fellow Jews and Lionel Rothschild was scathing about “all these public meetings” [35] about the plight of the Christians.

This is not to say that the Rothschilds’

relationship to other Jews was straightforward. Not only their wealth but their genealogy set them apart from the rest of European Jewry.

For many generations the family followed a policy of deliberate in-breeding, marrying not just within their own faith but within their own immediate kinship group.

Of 21 marriages involving descendants of Mayer Amschel Rothschild between 1824 and 1877, no fewer than fifteen were between his direct descendants. [36]

This meant, for instance, that when Natty Rothschild married Emma Rothschild, he was marrying the daughter of both his father's sister and his mother's brother. [37]

The mentality of the family is well illustrated by Charlotte de Rothschild's reaction on hearing of her brother's engagement to their cousin's daughter: "My good parents will certainly be pleased that he has not chosen a stranger. For us Jews, and particularly for us Rothschilds, it is better not to come into contact with other families, as it always leads to unpleasantness and costs money". [38]

The Rothschilds took on the role of leaders of the Jewish community, even "Kings of the Jews" [39] – a position later reinforced by their key role in the Balfour Declaration which paved the way for the state of Israel, with the 1917 document being addressed to, and apparently also drafted

by, the family. [40]

But, at the same time, their aristocratic and quasi-royal status, along with their vast wealth, separated them from the mass of Jewish people, with whom they had little in common and to whom they considered themselves altogether superior.

For instance, Mayer Carl Rothschild showed little empathy for his fellow Jews when he told German Chancellor Otto von Bismarck in 1875: “As for anti-semitic feeling the Jews themselves are to blame, and the present agitation must be ascribed to their arrogance, vanity and unspeakable insolence”. [41]

One group the Rothschilds particularly disliked were the *nouveaux riches* – “Jewish bankers and businessmen who had made their fortunes more recently than the Rothschilds”, [42] as Ferguson puts it.

Another was the *Ostjuden*, eastern Jews, of whom 2.5 million fled anti-semitic repression and pogroms in Russia and elsewhere from the early 1880s and sought refuge in Western Europe. [43]

The Rothschilds did not welcome the arrival of these co-religionists and actively took part in organisations which raised funds for their return to Eastern Europe or their onward emigration to South Africa, Canada or Argentina. [44]

And their strong public opposition to the Tsarist regime’s anti-Jewish policies did not

prevent them from playing a central role [45] in the Franco-Russian entente of the 1890s.

For the Rothschilds, matters of solidarity always came second to their own personal pecuniary interests, as can also be seen from their initial rejection of an approach by Viennese playwright and journalist Theodor Herzl, in the 1890s, for help in funding a new Jewish state.

He fumed that the Rothschilds were “vulgar, contemptuous, egotistical people” and “a national misfortune for the Jews”, calling for a mobilisation of the Jewish masses for “a battle against the powerful Jews”. [46]

The problem was that, as well as potentially calling into question the Rothschilds’ long-cultivated national loyalties, Herzl’s plan for a Jewish state featured proposals for controls of the banking system which did not in the least appeal to this family of financiers. [47]

Herzl was not the only prominent Jew to harshly criticise the Rothschilds. In 1839 the *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums* launched a bitter attack against the Rothschilds, accusing them of positively harming the cause of Jewish emancipation.

This Jewish newspaper wrote: “Well we know to our dismay that the repulsive attitude towards the Jews in Germany, which had almost disappeared completely at the time of the Wars of Liberation, increased with the increase in the

House of Rothschild; and that the latter's great wealth and [that of] their partners have adversely affected the Jewish cause, so that as the former grew so the latter sank all the further... We must sharply separate the Jewish cause from the whole House of Rothschild and their consorts". [48]

And in the 1870s the *Jüdische Zeitschrift* in Vienna even accused the Rothschilds of employing anti-semites in preference to Jews. [49]

The most shocking instance of Rothschild contempt for the little people of their own faith came with their reaction to the Jewish refugees fleeing the horrors of Nazi Germany.

In France, Robert de Rothschild declared in 1935: "Immigrants, like guests, must learn how to behave and not criticise too much... and if they aren't happy here, they'd do better to leave". [50]

And Victor Rothschild told a meeting of the Earl Baldwin Fund for Refugees at the Mansion House, London, in December 1938: "In spite of humanitarian feelings, we probably all agree that there is something unsatisfactory in refugees encroaching on the privacy of our country, even for relatively short periods of time". [51]

As will already be becoming clear, self-interest has always sat at the core of the Rothschild family project, with political and

cultural allegiances regarded as matters of expedience rather than articles of faith.

Nathan Rothschild is described by Ferguson as not being “the kind of man to turn down good business on ideological grounds” [52] while Anselm Rothschild, when chided for being “too devoted an Austrian”, replied that he was “far more a devoted pro-Rothschild”. [53]

Stockbroker Ernest Feydeau wrote of James de Rothschild: “He kept abreast of the slightest pieces of news – political, financial, commercial and industrial – from all quarters of the globe; he did his best to profit from these, quite instinctively, missing no opportunity for gain, no matter how small”. [54]

Bouvier explains that the Rothschilds, unhampered by ideology, had no *ethical* problem with backing any kind of regime.

“For them it was above all a matter of using political circumstances so as to extend and consolidate their network”, [55] he writes.

“The Rothschilds did not want to *run any risk*. It wasn’t political principles that they defended, but their own security”. [56]

On a personal level, this cynicism meant that they regarded even their own social ascent as a mere tool, says Ferguson. “Titles and honors were ‘part of the racket’, helpful in giving the brothers access to the corridors of power. Playing host was an uncomfortable duty, to the same

end: much of it was corporate hospitality, as we would now say". [57]

On an international level it meant they never had any qualms about backing both sides in a conflict, as Bouvier sets out in relation to the 19th century clash between Italy and imperial Austria.

"But what was it all about, other than to conduct business? Who cared whether this was with Turin or Vienna?... The Rothschilds quite naturally pursued an 'Austrian' policy in Vienna and an 'Italian' one in Turin". [58]

The rights and wrongs of the conflict were of no interest to them, he says. Their sole aim was to *profit* from the situation in as many ways as they could. [59]

III. PROFITEERING FROM WAR AFTER WAR

There was a period in the 19th century when the Rothschilds gained a certain reputation for defending the peace in Europe, but with hindsight this appears to have been yet more expediency on their part.

When their self-interest in the form of their investments required stability, they were against the disruption caused by war, but this was never a *moral* principle.

Indeed, the whole success of their dynasty was founded on the way in which they exploited

the opportunities presented to them by the wars that followed the French Revolution of 1789.

Ferguson writes that “the Rothschilds were presented with undreamed-of business opportunities by the revolutionary wars”, [60] while Bouvier defines the Rothschilds as “that family of merchants made rich by the long European war of 1792 to 1815”. [61]

According to historian Egon Caesar Corti, “it was in the profits made from war at that time that we can find the real origins of the subsequent enormous fortune of the House of Rothschild”. [62]

The Rothschilds made money out of war in a range of different ways, not all of which were entirely legal. “The disruption of established patterns of trade and banking created room for ambitious risk takers”, as Ferguson puts it. [63]

In their home city of Frankfurt they took advantage of food shortages and spiralling prices to operate on the black market and sold provisions to armies at a considerable profit. [64]

From 1808 onwards, Nathan Rothschild exported English guineas to the continent. Ferguson describes this as a “lucrative line of business” [65] and Bouvier adds that “the profits were no doubt proportionate to the risks”. [66]

British goods, including cotton fabric, sugar, indigo and tobacco, were also transported across the Channel, via the Rothschilds’ warehouses, in

defiance of Napoleon's blockade. [67]

Close to Wilhelm IX, the Elector of Hesse-Kassel, Mayer Amschel Rothschild was involved in his purchase of thousands of mercenaries to join the British-led fight against the French forces. [68]

Wars are expensive affairs and the financing has to come from somewhere.

“As the scale and cost of the conflict between France and the rest of Europe rose, so too did the borrowing needs of the combatant states”, says Ferguson. [69]

“The defeat of France in the Napoleonic Wars had been financed to a large extent by British loans and subsidies to Austria, Russia and Prussia. With their establishments in Frankfurt, London and Paris, the Rothschilds had been in a uniquely good position to facilitate these transfers”. [70]

He says that their activities at this time ushered in a new era in financial as well as political history.

“The Rothschilds stretched their credit to breaking point, sometimes losing sight altogether of their assets and liabilities, gambling everything they owned for the sake of governmental commissions, interest payments and speculative gains from exchange rate and bond yield fluctuations. In 1815 alone, Nathan's account with the British government totalled

close to £10 million, a huge sum at that time”. [71]

Particularly striking is the way in which Nathan Rothschild used funds entrusted to him by Wilhelm IX as if it was his own capital, investing in hundreds of thousands of pounds worth of British government bonds and thereby securing the proximity to the British state for which his family is still known. [72]

The Rothschilds’ network of agents across Europe also famously enabled them to be the first in London to have news of Napoleon’s final defeat at Waterloo in 1815, which, says Bouvier, perhaps enabled Nathan Rothschild to pull off a spectacular coup at the Stock Exchange. [73]

Writes Ferguson: “The Rothschilds emerged in 1815 as sterling millionaires. Almost at once, Nathan embarked on perhaps the most successful transaction of his career: a huge investment in British government bonds (consols) whereby he rode the upswing caused by the government’s postwar financial stabilization, taking his profits just before the market peaked. This was Nathan’s supreme *Meistergeschäft*, realizing profits of more than £250,000 at a stroke”. [74]

Financing wars became something of a speciality for the Rothschilds; they loaned £1 million to Brazil to fund its war with Argentina and Uruguay in 1851, for example. [75]

A couple of years later, they were back in action floating the British Government's Crimean War Loan, [76] a reflection of the near monopoly enjoyed by Rothschilds over British war finance. [77]

Their involvement in this 1853-1856 conflict torpedoed the idea that they had a vested interest in maintaining the peace.

Ferguson insists: "Far from weakening the Rothschilds' position, the Crimean War had precisely the opposite effect in that it emphatically reasserted the Rothschild houses' primacy in the field of public finance.

"Indeed, it demonstrated that the Rothschilds had for years been exaggerating the financial dangers of war. In reality, wars – and especially short wars of the sort which characterised the period from 1854 to 1871 – created financial opportunities which they, with their distinctive multinational structure, were especially well placed to exploit". [78]

As well as lending Britain a total of £26 million for the Crimean War, which was added to the £782 million existing national debt subsequent to the Napoleonic Wars, [79] they also lent money to France and Turkey. [80]

While those two powers were both British allies in that conflict against Russia, between 1859 and 1870 the Rothschilds "would find themselves repeatedly on both sides of decisive

conflicts which were to recast the map of Europe”, writes Ferguson. [81]

“The wars of the 1850s and 1860s were fought by states which were, by and large, strapped for cash; this more than anything else explains the importance of the role played by bankers in the period – and the substantial profits they could make”. [82]

He adds that their internal communications reveal that the Rothschilds “were calculating carefully to ensure that both sides in the conflict paid them for their financial services”. [83]

Ferguson stresses that it would be absurd to argue that there was no connection between the overall profitability of the period for the Rothschilds and the recurrence of military conflict.

“Far from damaging their position as the world’s leading multinational bank, the wars of the mid nineteenth-century generated unprecedented business for the Rothschilds, just as fifty years before it had been war which had set them on their way to fortune and notoriety”. [84]

I will mention later the political Rothschild-linked machinations behind the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War in 1870, but suffice to say here that they were involved with both sides and as a result their power in France and Europe was further enhanced. [85]

Having been lured into launching the war, which they lost, the French were landed with hefty reparations.

Of course, the Rothschilds were on hand to provide loans to the French state to pay off Prussia.

“It was, quite simply, the biggest financial operation of the century, and arguably the Rothschilds’ crowning achievement”, [86] writes Ferguson.

“As a percentage of GDP, French public debt was already 44 per cent in 1869, before the war, and 59 per cent in 1871, before most of the indemnity had been paid. So the total internal and external debt burden in 1871 was in the vicinity of 80 per cent of GDP”. [87]

It was an “immense risk” [88] for the Rothschilds in France to be identified with paying such large sums of money to Berlin, he adds, and it is “extraordinary” how little criticism was levelled at Alphonse de Rothschild for his “great operation”, as the family termed it. [89]

“Great racket” would be nearer the truth!

I have already described [90] the Rothschild connections to South Africa, where the Boer War of 1899-1902 was essentially a grab of gold and diamond resources for Rothschild interests including De Beers.

It is worth recalling that this conflict saw the first use of concentration camps, in which the

families of Dutch-origin settlers were shockingly imprisoned.

A few years later the Rothschilds semi-secretly helped finance the Japanese in their war against Russia in 1904-1906 and then openly loaned a further £48 million issue to help build back the post-war Japanese economy. [91]

They performed the same role on the other side of the conflict, when “Russian industry recovered spectacularly thanks to the Rothschilds and other international bankers who poured massive loans into the country”, [92] as Docherty and Macgregor note.

The Rothschilds’ role in the conspiracy to start and prolong the First World War is of utmost importance, but since I have already examined it in detail elsewhere, I will not repeat myself here.

I will simply remind readers that the Rothschilds and their associates were able to profit from the bloodbath in multiple ways – through loans to finance the war and subsequent “build back better” projects, yes, but also very directly through their heavy involvement in the arms trade.

One important player in this respect was wealthy international arms dealer Basil Zaharoff, deeply involved in both munitions and international politics at the time and “a Rothschild man”, in Docherty and Macgregor’s

words. [93]

By 1914, Zaharoff sat on the boards of Vickers and Le Nickel, both Rothschild-financed and influenced. [94]

He would no doubt have agreed with James de Rothschild, who proudly told his nephews in 1866: “In a war there is money to be made from having money”. [95]

IV. GRABBING THE INFRASTRUCTURE

Over the last 200 years the Rothschilds have systematically gained control of much of the infrastructure of the modern industrial world.

Their first big step in this direction was with the railways which changed European life and ushered in the 19th century New Normal.

As early as 1836, Salomon Rothschild was writing that the railways were going to create “completely new possibilities – industrial, commercial, political and military”. [96]

Indeed, as Professor Carroll Quigley observes, much of the impetus to industrial advance came from the railways, since these became “by far the chief purchasers of ferrous metals, coals, and petroleum products”. [97]

Railways amounted to the tentacles of a central state-commercial system reaching everywhere, extracting resources from the countryside, moving around raw materials and manufactured goods, providing rapid communi-

cation and personal mobility and, in the case of war, transporting thousands of troops to the borders.

Right from the outset, the railway companies tended to link up various aspects of this process, becoming giant multi-faceted industrial groups of the kind with which we are so familiar today. [98]

One of the biggest Rothschild rail projects was in the north of France, where their *Compagnie du chemin de fer du Nord* was at the centre of an immense industrial web, also including waterway navigation, steel and coal, and whose capital reached 1.3 billion francs by 1895. [99]

Importantly for the Rothschilds and their like, these vast continental-scale construction projects created the “need” to spend vast amounts of public money.

“The rise of financial capitalism in France, as elsewhere, was made possible by the demand for capital for railroad building”, [100] says Quigley.

Ferguson confirms that the Rothschilds played leading roles in railway finance in Austria, France and Germany: “By the middle of the century, the Rothschilds were already well on the way to building a highly profitable pan-European railway network”. [101]

They were also heavily involved in a series of

loans for railway-building in Russia, particularly in the 1870s and 1890s. [102] A 400-million-franc loan to the Russian government in 1896 even led to Alphonse de Rothschild being decorated with the Grand Cross by the czar. [103].

The adverse effect of this industrialisation on all aspects of the traditional cohesive life of the country was immense, as Quigley explains.

“The railroads had a most profound effect on Russia from every point of view, binding one-sixth of the earth’s surface into a single political unit and transforming that country’s economic, political, and social life...

“The drain of wealth from the peasants to the urban and export markets was increased, especially in the period before 1890. This process was assisted by the advent of a money economy to those rural areas which had previously been closer to a self-sufficient or a barter basis. This increased agricultural specialization and weakened handicraft activities”. [104]

The family was also involved with the Imperial Lombardo Venetian and Central Italian Railway Company, which gave the Rothschilds and their associates control of more than 600 miles of Italian railways. [105]

There were further railway acquisitions in Italy, Spain and Austria [106] as well as in present-day Slovenia and Croatia. [107]

It is hardly surprising to learn that, follow-

ing their involvement in an initial 1960s study group, Rothschild acted as advisors to the European Channel Tunnel Group which initiated the present railway link between London and Paris, their two main historical centres of activity. [108]

Having surfed the wave of railway profits, the Rothschilds turned their attention to the physical infrastructure of the money system itself – gold.

Their interests in gold mining grew rapidly at the end of the 19th century, notably in South Africa, and fitted in nicely with their gold refining and broking business. [109]

Through their vehicles such as Rio Tinto and the Exploration Company, the Rothschilds built up a vast empire of gold mines, which spread to West Australia, New Zealand, California, Mexico and Venezuela.

They reaped “substantial returns from the various mining companies”, writes Ferguson. “The profits to be made from such investments were huge”. [110]

The Rothschilds thus had an obvious vested interest in promoting the “gold standard” which became, in effect, “the global monetary system”, as Ferguson explains.

“The London and Paris houses acted as vital auxiliaries to their respective central banks, spending specie across the Channel in large

quantities at times of crisis in one or other market. This in itself was a profitable business”. [111]

The demand for gold seemed likely to remain buoyant as more and more countries adopted it as the basis for their monetary systems, [112] he adds. “Small wonder the English Rothschilds encouraged the spread of the gold standard”. [113]

The Rothschilds’ central role in this system was not concealed. After the First World War, the world market price for gold was set every morning at 11am following an auction conducted at their head office at New Court, London. [114]

One Great Leap Forward for the modern world was the electrification of our lives.

Funnily enough, the Rothschilds were on hand to profit from this development by gaining what Ferguson identifies as “a position of real power on the world copper market” [115] – copper being the principal metal required for the new electric infrastructure.

Having gained a controlling interest in the Rio Tinto copper mines in Spain in the late 1880s [116] – described by Ferguson as “an involvement which proved exceedingly profitable as world demand for copper soared” [117] – they went on to expand their copper investments elsewhere, such as in German South-West Africa.

Another Great Advance on the glorious path

of industrial progress was, of course, the growing dependence on oil and thus on plastics, pharmaceuticals, chemical fertilisers and so on.

The claim was already being made in 1890, by Hessian Reichstag Deputy Otto Böckel, that the Rothschilds had cornered the world market in oil. [118]

This tied in nicely with their control of the railway infrastructure. Docherty and Macgregor write: “The Rothschilds, behind a myriad of different company titles, constructed oil tank wagons for the railways, storage depots and refineries for the production of petrol and kerosene, and bartered with Government departments over concessions and favorable rail cargo fares”. [119]

They were notably involved in the Russian oilfields around Baku, now in Azerbaijan, where, explain Docherty and Macgregor, they “amassed vast and highly profitable investments”. [120]

I have already described, in the piece on the Great War, how the Rothschilds controlled Germany’s oil supply at the time, notably via Romania.

They have also long been close to the multinational oil entity which became known as Royal Dutch Shell.

Writes Ferguson: “The tendency was for the Rothschilds to participate in the gradual merger between Shell and Royal Dutch. The Rothschilds

took a third share of the Asiatic Petroleum Co. created by the two oil firms in 1902, and in 1911 exchanged their entire Russian operation for shares in Royal Dutch and Shell, making them the largest shareholders in each”. [121]

The Shell connection is very apparent in the Rothschilds’ story, whether in the way that Anthony de Rothschild, 3rd Lord Rothschild, directed scientific research at Royal Dutch Shell [122] or in that fact that when Edouard de Rothschild died in 1949, his estate included 720 million francs worth of shares in the same oil giant. [123]

The last piece of infrastructure I want to mention was in truth the first in the Rothschilds’ journey to power – communications.

Because the five “houses” founded by Mayer Amschel Rothschild’s five sons (represented by the five arrows in the family logo) were scattered all over Europe, a fast, secure and effective internal communications system was essential.

Before the age of telegraphs, let alone telephones, they developed a network of couriers and private ships that accepted no external passengers.

This enabled them to gain news of events elsewhere on the continent ahead of competitors and even governments.

It also brought them closer to diplomats and other government officials who came to rely on

Rothschild communications to keep ahead of the game, thereby also allowing the Rothschilds to keep abreast of what was being communicated. [124]

They adapted, of course, to changing times. Even before the Dover-Calais submarine telegraph cable had been laid in 1851, Julius Reuter wrote to the Rothschilds offering them the monopoly of its banking-related use. [125]

Reuters remains part of what we now call “the media” and the Rothschilds are certainly very present in that domain, even if the details of their involvement are only rarely made clear.

Evelyn de Rothschild, who died in November 2022, was proud of the fact that from 1972 to 1989 he was chairman of the *Economist* magazine, which he once called “probably the most independent publication in the world”. [126]

Independent of what?

Ferguson records that Rothschild also sat on the boards of Beaverbrook Newspapers and The Telegraph plc and that the Rothschilds invested in ATV, one of the first independent television companies in the UK. [127]

Quigley records that the Rothschilds’ Paribas bloc of businesses in France included both Havas and Hachette.

“Havas was a great monopolistic news agency, as well as the most important advertising agency in France. It could, and did,

suppress or spread both news and advertising. It usually supplied news reports gratis to those papers which would print the advertising copy it also provided. It received secret subsidies from the government for almost a century (a fact first revealed by Balzac)...

“Hachette had a monopoly on the distribution of periodicals and a sizable portion of the distribution of books. This monopoly could be used to kill papers which were regarded as objectionable”. [128]

The biggest and most controversial name in French media today is billionaire industrialist Vincent Bolloré, a “fervent Catholic” currently facing serious charges of corrupting government officials in Togo, Africa. [129][130]

Through his firm Vivendi he gained control of the aforementioned Havas in 2017 and controls several TV and radio channels, as well as publications such as *Paris Match* and the *Journal du Dimanche*.

Intriguingly, as a young man Bolloré worked for the Rothschilds, becoming assistant director to Edmond de Rothschild. [131]

In 2003 it emerged that he owned 300 million euros of shares in Paris Orléans, a giant holding company which in 2015 was renamed Rothschild & Co. [132]

V. EXPLOITING HUMANITY, DESTROYING NATURE

It goes without saying that the Rothschilds' profiteering exploits have not been without adverse consequences for the well-being both of human beings and of the natural world to which we belong.

For those who share their love of industrialism, such consequences might be regarded as mere "collateral damage" in the holy quest for "economic growth" – growth, in the Rothschilds' case, of their own family fortune.

Maybe they can contemplate a wrecked and diseased miner or factory worker, or a chemically-contaminated stream or river, and insist in all honesty that this was a necessary price to pay for the onward march of "development".

But there have always been those of us who object on moral grounds to the relentless steamroller of Capital that flattens and destroys everything we love about life and our world.

The Rothschilds' role in the building of railways, and the associated industrial system, exposed them to "unprecedented public criticism" in the late 19th century, records Ferguson.

"Radical and (for the first time) socialist writers began to portray them in a new and lurid light: as exploiters of 'the people', pursuing capital gains and profits at the expense of

taxpayers and ordinary travelers”. [133]

Capitalists like the Rothschilds have always regarded the mass of people – you, me and everyone we know – as mere objects, counters in their great game. The term “human capital” is still being bandied about by the family today. [134]

Accordingly, they never hesitate in uprooting vast numbers of us from our homelands and dumping us in some other part of the world.

Not only does this often supply a source of cheap labour, but it also results in populations without any sense of shared belonging or community and which are thus less likely to come together to resist the control and exploitation of the ruling class.

A very clear example of the Rothschild network’s involvement in such practices is provided by Docherty and Macgregor in their account of their South African gold mining activities at the start of the 20th century.

Rothschild associate Alfred Milner and the mine owners had a recruitment problem, with even their traditionally exploited African workers deserting them because the work was so badly paid and dangerous.

“But investor profits were good,” note the authors. Rather than increasing pay or improving conditions, they turned to China where their exploitative regard had identified a

“large source of surplus cheap labour”.

“The Chinese were lured to the South African mines with false promises and outrageous lies. They were led to understand that they would be living in pleasant garden cities where, once settled, families might join them.

“Fit and healthy applicants were selected and kept in sheds until embarkation. Then, under armed guard, they were loaded into the holds of ships for the journey.

“The first ship to sail, the 3,400-ton iron-hulled SS Ikbal, left China on 30 June 1904 with over 2,000 men crammed in the hold like a classic eighteenth-century slave ship...

“By the time it arrived in Durban, 51 men had died and their bodies dispatched overboard. The deaths proved no great loss to the organisers, however, for they had insured each man for \$125 and netted a tidy profit from the insurance company”. [135]

Once in South Africa, the men were housed in compounds beside the mines, 20 of them crammed into each hut.

They were unable to leave the compounds without a special permit and were flogged and fined for not working hard enough or for breaking the rules.

They worked for minimal wages and were forced to pay back the cost of their transportation from China.

Comments historian John Hamill: “These Chinese were brought over in the prime of life to be broken on the wheel within three years for the purpose of grinding out ever greater profits for the monsters of greed who owned them”. [136]

Monsters of greed, indeed, and there are echoes here of the prison labour that the French Rothschilds had used for their nickel mines in the Pacific colony of New Caledonia in the late 1800s. [137]

Gold mining, like all extractivism, is very noxious to the natural environment, particularly because cyanide or mercury is used to separate the precious metal from the original ore.

These substances are highly toxic to wildlife and, of course, to people – and particularly to people who spend their working lives exposed to them.

As part of their monopolising of the industrial infrastructure, the Rothschilds took control of the mercury supply they needed for their gold business and secured a long-term concession from the Spanish government for the mines at Almaden.

Writes Bouvier: “Almaden was a hell-hole. A report in 1900 stressed that the mercury fumes reduced the worker to a physically pathetic condition”. [138]

For the record, the symptoms of mercury poisoning include muscle weakness, poor

coordination, numbness in the hands and feet, skin rashes, anxiety, memory problems, and trouble speaking, hearing and seeing. [139]

It was not just gold, mercury, oil, nickel and copper from which the Rothschilds made spectacular profits.

In building what Ferguson says “can justifiably be described as a mining empire”, [140] they were also involved in the extraction and processing of lead, silver, diamonds, rubies, [141] zinc, iron [142] and coal. [143]

In Chile their involvement in government finance was linked closely with the export of nitrates for use in fertilisers and explosives. [144]

After the First World War, their influence as the principal shareholders in Rio Tinto became even greater as the firm expanded its interests to embrace sulphur-recovery, cinder-treatment and silica gel and gained a presence everywhere from Spain and Belgium to Africa and the Americas. [145]

Adds Ferguson: “By 1928 it was operating in twenty-two different countries with a host of different interests in metallurgy and chemicals”. [146]

The family’s exploitation of natural and human resources has accelerated since the Second World War.

In the late 1950s, the French branch of the

Rothschilds played a central role in the creation of a company called COFIMER which targeted African natural resources like iron, aluminium, phosphates and uranium. [147]

In the late 1960s, their Le Nickel business “absorbed Peñarroya and various other mining companies”, [148] writes Ferguson.

The Rothschilds financed a 1950s scheme to “develop” the resource-rich Canadian province of Newfoundland via the Brinco (British Newfoundland Corporation Ltd) consortium [149] and occupy a pre-eminent position in the Australian natural resources market. [150]

In 1966 they led a large syndicate raising the first tranche of funding for a trans-Alpine pipeline between Trieste and Ingolstadt and they were involved in financing Chile’s first atomic reactor. [151]

Why spoil the story of their sparkling financial success with gripes about devastated lives and desecrated landscapes?

VI. CORRUPTING POLITICAL LIFE

“Rothschild biographers record that men of influence and statesmen in almost every country of the world were in their pay”, write Docherty and Macgregor. [152]

One of those biographers, Ferguson, sees the origins of that situation in a “hard-nosed” business rule that Mayer Amschel Rothschild

taught to his five sons.

This was, apparently: “If a high-placed person enters into a [financial] partnership with a Jew, he belongs to the Jew”. [153]

Says Ferguson: “This last piece of advice lay behind the brothers’ practice of plying politically powerful individuals with gifts, loans, investment tips and outright bribes”. [154]

The Rothschilds’ most famous historical relationship to a politician was that with Benjamin Disraeli, British Prime Minister in 1868 and from 1874 to 1880, himself a Jewish-born convert to Christianity.

He became very close to the family, in both London and Paris, during the late 1830s and 1840s. By 1846, Lionel Rothschild was “helping Disraeli speculate in French railways and later assisted him with his tangle of debts”, [155] writes Ferguson.

Following Lionel’s death in 1879, his sons replied to Disraeli’s condolences by telling him that their father “looked upon you as his ‘dearest friend’. It is hard to think of anyone who was closer to him in these later years”. [156]

This proximity raised enormous questions over Disraeli’s historic decision, in 1875, that Britain should buy nearly £4 million of shares in the Suez Canal from the Khedive of Egypt – using a loan from his financier friends. [157]

The outraged former Chancellor of the

Exchequer Sir Robert Lowe pointed out that the Rothschilds' total charges of £150,000 for a three-month loan amounted to 15 per cent per annum interest. [158]

The Rothschild-Disraeli intimacy caused some disquiet in diplomatic circles.

Foreign Secretary Lord Derby related in 1877 that the Russian ambassador to Britain felt the Rothschilds were "acquainted with everything that goes on... even more so than the ministers: he is convinced that they are in daily communication with the Premier, hear all that passes, & use it for their own purposes. From other sources I am certain that the leakage of cabinet secrets, of which we have so often complained, is mainly in that quarter". [159]

But the Rothschilds enjoyed other, less publicised, relationships with leading British politicians, such as Robert Cecil, Lord Salisbury, whose life is described by Quigley as exemplifying the penetration of public life by the Rothschild-related Anglo-American Establishment. [160]

The Prime Minister was also famed for his nepotism, [161] to the extent that the English colloquial term "Bob's your uncle" refers to the way that his nephew and chief assistant Alfred Balfour was seamlessly installed as his successor in 1902.

The first thing Salisbury did after forming a

new minority administration in the summer of 1885 was, on the subject of lucrative Egyptian bond issues, to announce that he was “entrusting the issue of the English portion of the Loan to the agency of N.M. Rothschild, because that firm is one with the Houses of the same name in Paris and Frankfurt and is in similar relations with the House of Bleichroeder in Berlin”. [162]

No wonder that the Rothschilds “fervently wished Salisbury to remain in power at the end of 1885”, [163] as Ferguson records.

That same year Salisbury appointed, as Secretary of State for India, a politician by the name of Randolph Churchill, father of Winston.

This, notes Ferguson, “seemed to herald a blossoming of the Rothschilds’ interest in India”. [164]

While planning the issue of a loan for the Indian Midland Railway, Churchill specifically told the Viceroy, Lord Duffering: “When the loan is brought out I shall fight a great battle against [Bertram] Currie to place it in the hands of the Rothschilds”. [165]

Churchill also approved the annexation of Burma on 1 January 1886, thus allowing the Rothschilds to issue their immensely successful shareholding in the Burma ruby mines. [166]

Can there be any possible connection here to the fact that on his death from syphilis, it transpired that Churchill owed an astonishing

£66,902 debt to the Rothschilds, which would amount today to around £5.5 million? [167]

Like father, like son, so they say, and much-celebrated 20th century British Prime Minister Winston Churchill also had ties to the Rothschild family.

Jimmy Rothschild was one of those who donated towards the purchase of the cash-strapped Churchill's house at Chartwell in 1946 to allow him to go on living there [168] and Ferguson describes the Rothschilds' aforementioned involvement in the 1950s Newfoundland development project as "probably the most important financial opportunity generated by the bank's continuing links with Winston Churchill". [169]

Indeed the site of the massive hydroelectric plant that was the result of the Brinco project was later renamed "Churchill Falls".

Lord Rosebery, a British Foreign Secretary who became Prime Minister in 1894, was so close to the Rothschilds that he actually married one of them. [170]

The Rothschilds had established, throughout the 19th century, their tradition of influencing politicians of both main political parties, inviting them to dine with them and lavishing them with generosity at their mansions or in private clubs.

Says Ferguson: "It was in this milieu that many of the most important political decisions of

the period were taken". [171]

Rothschild involvement in British political decision-making was still evident in *much* more recent times, as will see a little later...

The overall story of the Rothschilds' corruption of political life in Europe can be traced back well over 200 years to "Mayer Amschel's financial influence over Napoleon's henchman in the Rhineland, Karl von Dalberg", [172] says Ferguson.

Initially, before their influence on power was fully established, they risked facing judicial consequences for their activities. The police in Austria were involved in investigating an 1820 loan of 20 million florins to their government by the Rothschilds and their associates, for which the bankers were to be repaid 36 million. [173]

The police report noted that a minister and other officials had been "bribed" by Salomon Rothschild and commented that the affair amounted to a "worse than contemptible" treatment of the public. [174]

One of many politicians whose private finances had been bolstered by Rothschild loans was Klemens Metternich, Chancellor of Austria from 1821 to 1848. [175]

Having "taken soup" with Amschel Rothschild in 1821, he began a "a long and mutually beneficial friendship" with the family, explains Ferguson.

“They attended to his private finances (often on preferential terms) and acted as a swift and secret channel of diplomatic communication; he in turn provided them with sensitive political news and gave them a privileged position not only in Habsburg finances but in Austrian society”. [176]

But, apart from Britain, it is in France that the Rothschilds have enjoyed the most visible influence on politicians, often with disastrous consequences for the country.

Take the Duc de Gramont, who was appointed as French Foreign Minister in May 1870. He essentially stoked war with Prussia through a “highly inflammatory declaration” and gave a “distorted” version of the truth to elected representatives, [177] which reminds me, for one, of the notorious “dodgy dossier” that was used to justify UK involvement in the invasion of Iraq in 2003.

Since, as we have seen, the Rothschilds’ role in France and Europe was to be enhanced by the conflict, we can well understand why Alphonse de Rothschild had declared himself “delighted” by Gramont’s appointment to the post. [178]

Adds Ferguson: “The fact that the Duke’s son later married a Rothschild (Mayer Carl’s daughter Margaretha) raises the possibility that he was already a family friend”. [179]

The leading role in post-war French repara-

tions to Prussia was played by politician Léon Say, described by Bouvier as a “Rothschilds man, their representative in parliaments and governments”. [180]

Thanks to his work in arranging the details of these finances, the Rothschilds earned the impressive sum of a million francs in commission. [181]

Leaping forward, we see a similar scenario in the period following the Second World War when, as Quigley relates, René Mayer, “active head of the Rothschild family interests” became Minister of Finance. [182]

Georges Pompidou, director general of the Banque Rothschild, ran President General de Gaulle’s staff office for six months before returning to the bank [183] after the constitution had been revised to allow more presidential power over elected representatives.

He later went back into politics as de Gaulle’s second Prime Minister between 1962 and 1968. [184]

More recently still, in 2017 former Rothschild banker Emmanuel Macron became President in time for the Great Reset.

Macron, explains one 2021 newspaper report, “spent four years as a deal maker at the bank and is considered a protégé of Baron David de Rothschild”. [185]

VII. USING ROYALTY

As we have seen, the Rothschilds came to regard themselves as being at the very top of the social ladder, second to nobody, and Charlotte Rothschild even used the term “royal family” to describe her own kin. [186]

They quickly established financial relationships with various “other” royal families and soon “most of the royalty of Europe was under their influence”, say Docherty and Macgregor. [187]

Their communications network, amounting to an express postal service, was also appreciated by kings, queens and princes across the continent. [188]

The Rothschilds were particularly close to the Saxe-Coburg dynasty, later rebranded “Windsor” in the UK to sound less foreign.

One of their early clients was a German prince, Leopold of Saxe-Coburg, who went on to become monarch of the new state of Belgium which was founded in 1830, an arrangement which, says Ferguson, the Rothschilds found “congenial”. [189]

But it was the British monarchy to which the Rothschilds became most importantly close, starting with the personal loans they made to Leopold of Saxe-Coburg’s father-in-law, King George IV, infamous for his profligate ways as Prince Regent and who sat on the British throne

between 1820 and 1830. [190]

Queen Victoria's husband, Prince Albert, was another Saxe-Coburg targeted by the Rothschilds.

Lionel Rothschild of N.M Rothschild & Co in London promoted the family interests by befriending Albert, whose chronic shortage of money provided easy access to his patronage. [191]

Ferguson reveals that 1847 correspondence shows discussion of a Rothschild loan just days before Albert bought the lease of Balmoral Castle and its 10,000-acre estate. [192]

The Rothschild-Albert relationship involved "serious financial dealings", he adds. "In 1847 the Rothschilds gave Albert's impecunious Bavarian relative Prince Ludwig von Oettingen-Wallerstein a £3,000 loan which Albert personally guaranteed; he thus became the debtor when Prince Oettingen defaulted after a year". [193]

In time, Queen Victoria joined her husband in becoming close to the Rothschild family, as of course did their son, the future King Edward VII, as I set out in the First World War essay.

Docherty and Macgregor explain that the Rothschilds "covered the heir to the throne's massive gambling debts and ensured that he was accustomed to a standard of luxury well beyond his means". [194]

There is no reason to think that these intimate private connections between the Rothschilds and the British monarchy have ever ceased.

Indeed, on the death of Evelyn de Rothschild in November 2022, it was reported that he had “counted Queen Elizabeth II among those who sought his financial advice” and had been knighted by her in 1989. [195]

The current King Charles III also has links to Rothschild circles, as I set out in a previous article, [196] with one of the vice-presidents of his Business in the Community network being Mark Weinberg, co-founder of J. Rothschild Assurance, which later became St James’s Place.

And, of course, there is *that* photo of Evelyn de Rothschild pointing a finger at Charles’ chest in a somewhat superior manner.

It is perhaps not *entirely* coincidental that Charles was chosen in 2020 to officially launch the so-called Great Reset whose agenda, as we will see, is so close to that of the Rothschilds.

VIII. PRIVATISING POWER

Probably the most important infrastructure over which the Rothschilds have been able to seize control is that of governance and what used to be the public sector.

That much was already evident more than a century ago, in 1909, when future British Prime

Minister David Lloyd George, in his earlier radical phase, asked: “Now, really, I should I like to know, is Lord Rothschild the dictator of this country?” [197]

The Rothschilds’ deliberate targeting of governments can, like their control of individual politicians, be traced back to patriarch Mayer Amschel Rothschild’s hard-nosed business rules.

He told his sons: “It is better to deal with a government in difficulties than with one that has luck on its side”. [198]

A country with financial problems was “a natural target for Rothschild financial penetration”, [199] says Ferguson. As we have seen, expensive wars create governments in need of loans, and so do sustainably endless waves of costly infrastructure “development”.

Governments crippled with debt also find themselves “in difficulties” and thus in aid of further “help” from those brought them to that point.

Bouvier says the first “direct” loan by the Rothschilds to a government, that is to say with their own money, was to Denmark in 1810. [200]

The creation of Greece and Belgium as new states was literally underwritten by Rothschild finance in the forms of loans guaranteed by the great powers and floated by the family. [201]

And Ferguson writes that by the end of the 1850s “the Rothschilds had reaffirmed their

position as Europe's pre-eminent lender to governments. Britain, France, Turkey, Austria and Prussia had all issued bonds through one or more of the Rothschild houses". [202]

In the 12 years from 1895 to 1907 alone, it is estimated that the Rothschilds loaned nearly \$450,000,000 (\$13,350,000,000 adjusted to inflation in 2022) to European governments. [203]

In France, following defeat against Prussia the Rothschilds were involved in a series of massive loans to the government, as well as to the city of Paris: Bouvier estimates that the profit they made from these loans in 1871 and 1872 alone was in the order of 75 million francs. [204]

Debts provide financiers not just with profit, but also with control. Ferguson notes: "A government that did not borrow money was a government the Rothschilds could advise, but not pressurise". [205]

Thus the family maintained what he describes as "a unique influence over French foreign policy and European international relations in general". [206]

Governments which declined to submit to this unique influence could easily be taught the error of their ways.

An interesting example is what happened when Léon Gambetta became Prime Minister of

France in November 1881.

Alphonse de Rothschild assembled tame journalists in December to warn them that Gambetta aimed to tamper with government bonds with which the Rothschilds were involved and to embark on some kind of railway nationalisation. He told them: “I want an all-out campaign; it is necessary to demolish Gambetta before he demolishes us”. [207]

The increasingly beleaguered Gambetta was forced to resign the very next month, January 1882, after a disastrous collapse on the stock exchange.

The police chief in Paris took an interest in these goings-on, noting that “it is generally admitted that Monsieur Rothschild dominates the market”. [208]

In the post-Gambetta administration the new finance minister was Léon Say, the “Rothschild man” I have already mentioned. Not only was the rail nationalisation idea dropped, but in 1883 the position of the big rail companies was even legally consolidated. [209]

The Rothschilds were early enthusiasts for the public-private partnership agenda later favoured by such luminaries as Benito Mussolini, Adolf Hitler and Klaus Schwab.

As such, the idea of privatising assets previously owned by the state has long appealed to them and they were suggesting the sell-off of

railways as a way for European states to raise cash as early as 1865. [210]

But in the UK in the 1980s privatisation became, as Ferguson details, “one of the bank’s most important areas of activity”. [211]

He identifies this involvement as beginning with Victor Rothschild’s role as the head of Prime Minister Edward Heath’s Central Policy Review Staff “think tank” between 1970 and 1973.

“This may partly explain why in July 1971 the Heath government entrusted N.M. Rothschild with the sale of the Industrial Reorganisation Corporation”. [212]

Then in August 1976 Miles Emley was seconded from the Rothschilds’ bank to advise Labour Party minister Tony Benn as the Department of Energy began to sell its stakes in the North Sea oil fields. [213]

But privatisation really took off under the premiership of Margaret Thatcher.

One of the main architects of the programme was John Redwood, who set out the agenda in his 1980 book *Public Enterprise in Crisis*.

He was working at the time for the N.M. Rothschild Equity Research Team and, though he left to join Mrs Thatcher’s Downing Street Policy Unit in 1983, he returned to the Rothschilds three years later as director of overseas privatisation.

Ferguson writes: “He and Michael Richard-

son, who joined N.M. Rothschild from the stockbrokers Cazenove in 1981, can (and do) claim much of the credit for turning the idea of privatisation into a political reality, though the firm's involvement predated their arrival". [214]

An obituary of Evelyn de Rothschild sheds more light on this period: "His friendship with Margaret Thatcher – British prime minister from 1979 to 1990 – helped the bank win the job of lead underwriter in the sales of shares in state-owned companies such as British Gas Plc and British Petroleum Plc". [215]

Ferguson relates that in February 1982 N.M. Rothschild handled the sell-off of high technology company Amersham International – "the first time a wholly government-owned concern had been floated on the stock market" [216] – and during the BNOC (Britoil) sale in that same year "it did not go unnoticed that the head of Britoil was a former N.M. Rothschild director (Philip Shelbourne)". [217]

N.M. Rothschild scored what Ferguson describes as its "biggest success" in this context when it won the contract in 1986 to advise British Gas on its £6 billion sell-off, famously advertised as some kind of move towards a share-owning democracy. [218]

The firm's interventions did not entirely escape criticism and it was taken to task by the National Audit Office for advising the govern-

ment to sell the Royal Ordinance to British Aerospace in 1985 at a bargain price. [219]

But its role continued and it was also involved in the sell-offs of BP, as we have seen, and of British Steel, British Coal, the twelve regional electricity boards and ten water authorities. [220]

Ferguson writes that it is “inconceivable” that a programme as drastic as privatisation could have been implemented without close contact between the government and the City – and in particular with the Rothschild HQ at New Court.

“After Margaret Thatcher’s deposition in 1990, political support for the Conservative government dwindled rapidly; and the links between New Court and Westminster inevitably became the target of fresh Opposition criticism”. [221]

In the post-1992 administration, not only Redwood but also Chancellor Norman Lamont and junior minister Tony Nelson were former N.M. Rothschild employees, he notes.

“But it was the appointment of former ministers (and senior civil servants) to positions at New Court which prompted the most public comment”. [222]

Peter Walker, the former Secretary of State for Wales, became a non-executive director of the bank’s Welsh subsidiary and of Smith New

Court, Norman Lamont joined the N.M. Rothschild board after being replaced as Chancellor in 1993 and so did Lord Wakeham, the former Energy Secretary who had earlier commissioned N.M. Rothschild to assess the viability (and potential for privatisation) of British Coal. [223]

The Rothschilds have subsequently been involved in the privatisation of British Rail and Northern Ireland Electricity, and advised the British government on the sale of housing association loans and student loans. [224]

And their enabling of privatisation has not been confined to Britain: in 1988 alone, the bank handled eleven privatisations in eight different countries. [225]

In 1996-7 it advised the Brazilian government on the sale of its stake in the Companhia Vale do Rio Doce iron ore mines, Zambia on the privatisation of its copper industry and Germany on the £6 billion flotation of Deutsche Telekom. It later did the same thing for the Australian Telstra. [226]

What all this amounted to, says Ferguson, was a manoeuvre of historical proportions, an “immense transfer of assets from the public to the private sector”. [227].

IX. IMPOSING GLOBAL CONTROL

The principal historical vehicle for the Rothschilds' acquisition of enormous global power was European imperialism and in particular the dominant British variety.

Private financial gain was always the motivating force behind colonialism – “the profits of overseas expansion unquestionably flowed to a relatively small elite of investors”, [228] remarks Ferguson.

“Late-nineteenth-century imperialism was the political accompaniment to an economic process similar to the ‘globalisation’ of the late twentieth century. As leading members of that elite of imperial investors, the Rothschilds’ role in British imperialism was substantial”. [229]

As he adds, the Rothschilds relied on the physical and legal infrastructures of empires like those of Britain and France to enable and impose their exploitation: “It is hard to imagine their investments in Burmese ruby mines or New Caledonian nickel mines in the absence of direct European control”. [230]

Various euphemisms have been used over the years to describe the violence with which this pillaging was enforced.

The Rothschilds played a key part in the British occupation of Egypt, from which they profited in multiple ways, including the lucrative Suez loan and speculation on Egyptian bonds.

[231]

In the 1880s, when British warships bombarded Alexandria after riots had broken out in the Egyptian city, Alphonse de Rothschild wrote enthusiastically of the establishment of “law and order”. [232]

In 1893 Arthur de Rothschild described the use of murderous force against the Matabele people of southern Africa as “a sharp engagement... 100 of them having been killed, whilst there was, I am happy to say, hardly a single casualty on our side”.

The main interest for him was that this had resulted in what he called “a little spurt in the shares” of his family’s business. [233]

The deadliest weapon used by the British Empire to impose its rule in Matabeleland and elsewhere was the automatic gun produced by Maxim-Nordenfelt, famously cited by writer Hilaire Belloc as the key to European hegemony. [234]

Helpfully, recounts Ferguson, the Rothschilds retained a substantial shareholding in the new Maxim-Nordenfelt company and exerted a direct influence over the firm’s management.

“If late nineteenth-century imperialism had its ‘military-industrial complex’ the Rothschilds were unquestionably part of it”. [235]

The Rothschilds were intimately involved in all aspects of British imperialism, whether in

encouraging British intervention in Sudan, [236] issuing £6.4 million worth of Indian railway shares, [237] securing a highly lucrative ruby mining concession from the British government following the annexation of Burma, [238] or sending a trusted agent to Australia for the gold rush. [239]

They benefited from the British annexation of Hong Kong, which opened up possibilities of trade with China and by 1853 they were in correspondence with a Shanghai-based merchant firm to whom they made regular shipments of silver from Mexico and Europe. [240]

In the second half of the twentieth century they were still working closely with the rebranded empire, with N.M. Rothschild participating in an issue of debentures for the Commonwealth Development Finance Co in 1963. [241]

But Rothschild interests always went further than the limits of the official British domains and they were important participants in creating what is sometimes known as the informal empire, which included Latin America.

Quigley writes about the process of commercialization and incipient industrialization of Latin American society which “was largely a consequence of foreign investments, which introduced railroads, tram lines, faster communications, large-scale mining, some

processing of raw materials, the introduction of electricity, waterworks, telephones, and other public utilities and the beginnings of efforts to produce supplies for these new activities”. [242]

Brazil was a particular sphere of Rothschild exploitation from the 1820s onwards, [243] with the coffee trade [244] forming an important aspect of their involvement.

Rapidly following the aforementioned 1851 war loan came the “need” to finance the rapid growth of the country’s railway network, which sparked a £1.8 million loan from the Rothschilds.

“It was just the beginning of an exceptionally monogamous financial relationship between the Brazilian government and the London house which, between 1852 and 1914, generated bond issues worth no less than £142 million”, [245] writes Ferguson. “Plainly, the Rothschilds had substantial financial leverage over Brazil”. [246]

During the First World War, the US ambassador in Brazil commented that “the Rothschilds have so mortgaged Brazil’s financial future that... they will place every obstacle in the way of her entering into banking relations with any other house other than their own”. [247]

The centralising of economic and political power suits the interests of global capitalists like the Rothschilds and so they were enthusiastic builders of what has been variously called the Common Market, the EEC and the EU.

Guy de Rothschild became known as “EEC banker Rothschild” [248] and the family was behind the plan for a new transnational currency called the “eurco” (“European Composite Unit”), based on the values of nine major European currencies, the forerunner of the later ecu and now the euro. [249]

In their drive for globalisation, the Rothschilds have, among very many activities, developed the Eurobond market, [250] raised millions for the Inter-American Development Bank, [251] arranged “Eurodollar” bond issues for Japanese companies, [252] and floated loans for the Philippines and South Korea. [253]

Ferguson comments that the Rothschilds have always had a vested financial interest in “the continuation and expansion of a global economic system in which capital, goods and indeed people could move as freely and as securely as possible”. [254]

X. KEEPING IT ALL SECRET

While the 19th century Rothschilds wanted everybody to know exactly how rich and powerful they had become, their 21st century descendants tend to keep a low profile and understate their role.

This, I suspect, is because if the true extent of their phenomenal wealth and power were generally known, it would spark worldwide

outrage and anger.

Quigley writes that merchant bankers, also known as international bankers, private bankers or investment bankers, are generally “devoted to secrecy and the secret use of financial influence in political life”. [255]

A certain degree of deceit formed part of the Rothschild *modus operandi* right from the word ‘go’.

How else would they have survived the police investigation into their handling of Wilhelm IX’s money under the 1790s French occupation [256] or been able to use his funds in London to found their own financial empire? [257]

Why else would Natty Rothschild have warned Cecil Rhodes to be “careful” about what he said in public about the Boer War through fear that some might “lay the blame for what has taken place on the shoulders of capitalists and those interested in South African Mining”? [258]

Sometimes we can identify particular acts of concealment, such as the disappearance of evidence concerning Disraeli’s financial dealings with the family [259] and the destruction of Natty Rothschild’s correspondence after his death, which left Ferguson wondering “how much of the Rothschilds’ political role remains irrevocably hidden from posterity”. [260]

But there is a general fog around the Roths-

childs' activities which arises historically from the very structure of their family business, run as a private – and thus secret – partnership. [261]

Quigley notes that such private status ensured “the maximum of anonymity and secrecy to persons of tremendous public power who dreaded public knowledge of their activities”. [262]

“In return for flotations of securities of industry, they took seats on the boards of directors of industrial firms as they had already done on commercial banks, savings banks, insurance firms and finance companies.

“From these lesser institutions they funneled capital to enterprises which yielded control and away from those who resisted. These firms were controlled through interlocking directorships, holding companies and lesser banks”. [263]

The multiplication of financial entities that have borne or still bear the Rothschild name is, in itself, bewildering – these include N.M. Rothschild, Rothschilds Continuation Holdings AG, de Rothschild Frères, Banque Rothschild, Edmond de Rothschild, Rothschild Intercontinental Bank, Rothschild Asset Management, Rothschild Incorporated, Rothschild North America, Rothschild Canada, Rothschild Europe, Rothschild GmbH, Rothschild Italia SpA, Rothschild España SA and Rothschild offices in

Argentina, Bermuda, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, the Czech Republic, Indonesia, the Isle of Man, Japan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Russia, South Africa and Zimbabwe. [264]

There is also Concordia BV, the parent company of Rothschilds Continuation Holdings AG, [265] and the St. James's Place Group, originally the J. Rothschild Assurance Group, which since 1999 has had an office in Beijing. [266]

And a very important current entity is RIT Capital Partners plc, formerly Rothschild Investment Trust, which boasts that it is “now one of the UK's largest investment trusts, with a market capitalisation of over £4 billion”. [267]

But a Rothschild reality often hides behind a completely different name, thanks to the way they have systematically expanded their control.

Docherty and Macgregor explain: “They would rescue ailing banks or industrial conglomerates with large injections of cash, take control and use them as fronts”. [268]

“In most of their business organization, they operated a complex and sophisticated network of interlocking front companies and trusts which concealed not just the true extent of their ownership of key industries, but their unrivaled power over nations”. [269]

There is thus a vast entanglement of busi-

nesses over which the Rothschilds hold some kind of decisive influence or control.

Bouvier writes: “The way in which the firm had a role or an interest in these companies was not identical in each case. They made use of a range of diverse financing techniques”. [270]

Financial researcher Jean-Jacques Lauredon describes the result as a “maze” which he speculates has been deliberately contrived to be as complicated as possible. [271]

There was also money to be made out of such manoeuvres, Quigley adds, with financial capitalists discovering that they could not only make killings out of the issuing of securities, they could also make killings out of the bankruptcy of corporations, through the fees and commissions of reorganization.

“A very pleasant cycle of flotation, bankruptcy, flotation, bankruptcy, began to be practiced by these financial capitalists. The more excessive the flotation, the greater the profits, and the more imminent the bankruptcy. The more frequent the bankruptcy, the greater the profits of reorganization and the sooner the opportunity of another excessive flotation with its accompanying profits”. [272]

In addition to the likes of Paribas in France, which is generally known to be a Rothschild entity, [273] other banks historically identified as “fronts” for the Rothschilds include Warburg,

[274] Bleichröder, [275] Credit-Anstalt, [276] Disconto, [277] Kuhn, Loeb & Co, [278] and Barings. [279]

Further confusion is caused by the Rothschilds' long-term use of representatives or agents within various companies, observing and guiding in a way that is invisible from the outside. [280]

The Rothschilds appear to have been particularly keen to hide the extent of their involvement in the oil industry.

As we have seen, they are very close to Royal Dutch Shell and Docherty and Macgregor write that they “were to be found in every aspect of European oil, quietly amassing a monopoly” [281] behind a “bewildering flurry of name changes, of company amalgamations, of buy-outs and stock holdings, of new donations and aggressive take-overs”. [282]

As far as the USA is concerned, many questions have been asked about the precise nature of their relationship with Standard Oil and the Rockefeller dynasty.

The two ultra-rich families were holding secret talks about collaboration as early as 1892.

Docherty and Macgregor relate: “Standard Oil’s chief spokesman, John Archbold, reported directly to Rockefeller that they had quickly reached a tentative agreement, but stressed that ‘it was thought desirable on both sides that the matter be kept confidential’...

“Much of the great rivalry between Rothschild and Rockefeller was a convenient facade, though both would have the world believe otherwise”. [283]

Financial strategist Jacob Schiff of Kuhn, Loeb & Co, a Rothschild agent, [284] became the financial strategist for Rockefeller’s Standard Oil, which was then refining about 90 per cent of all crude oil in the United States. [285]

But we have to consider a third important player in order to complete the picture of the reach of the Rothschilds’ power in the USA and indeed across the world.

As I explained in a previous article, J.P. Morgan, although it appears to be a completely separate concern, has for a long time been a front for the Rothschilds.

And, Quigley points out, “the Rockefeller group, which was really a monopoly capitalist organisation investing only its own profits, functioned as a financial capitalist unit in close co-operation with Morgan”. [286]

So, as a result, explain Docherty and Macgregor, “Morgan, Schiff and Rockefeller, the three leading players on Wall Street, had settled into a cosy cartel, behind which the House of Rothschild remained hidden but retained immense influence and power”. [287]

The major victory of this cartel was to push the USA into creating the Federal Reserve, a

central bank which, like those already existing in Europe, was not controlled by the government on behalf of the people but by the bankers themselves in their own self-interest.

The so-called “need” for this entity was deliberately created in the form of a banking crisis in 1907, a financial panic which, remark Docherty and Macgregor, was “a colossal fraud” [288] and “ran like a true Rothschild scam, orchestrated by Morgan”. [289]

Indeed John Pierpoint Morgan, who stepped forward to save the day by providing the “solution” of a central bank, was duly hailed by the Rothschilds as “a man of wonderful resources” worthy of “admiration and respect”. [290]

With this important step achieved, the Rothschilds’ cartel went about building a vast global infrastructure of financial, political, cultural, academic, scientific and “philanthropic” institutions and foundations.

I touched on this process in the Great War article, which looks at the origins of Chatham House in the UK and the Council on Foreign Relations in the USA, but they are just the tip of the iceberg.

Quigley writes of multiple international networks “organized by the same people for the same motives... the financing came from the same international banking groups and their

subsidiary commercial and industrial firms”. [291]

Over the decades this has created “a multi-level political hierarchy”, he says. “In this hierarchy, the top level is held by the United Nations and its associated functional bodies, such as the World Health Organization, UNESCO, the Food and Agricultural Organization, the ILO, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the International Court of Justice, and others”. [292]

If he had been writing today, he would probably have added the World Economic Forum to that list, albeit perhaps at a slightly lower level.

Such institutional power is integrated with the corporate control built up by the Rothschilds over the last 200 years.

This is now on such a scale that it defies detailed description. Laurendon was already writing in the 1960s: “It is no longer possible to completely study the Rothschilds’ ‘zone of influence’ because page could be added to page. It is considerable and continues to expand”. [293]

What of the situation today?

Recent research into the ultimate ownership of international financial and business power has identified BlackRock, State Street and Vanguard as being at the heart of an interlocking network of global holding companies. [294]

Writes Dr Joseph Mercola: “While it would take time to sift through all of Vanguard’s funds to identify individual shareholders, and therefore owners of Vanguard, a quick look-see suggests Rothschild Investment Corp. and the Edmond de Rothschild Holding are two such stakeholders”. [295]

The combination of institutional and financial power that appears to be wielded by the Rothschilds today would certainly explain the full-spectrum ubiquity of the “Great Reset” agenda currently being imposed on us.

Because of the Rothschilds’ obsessive concealment of their activity, the historian can sometimes only “guess” the extent of their role, as Bouvier says. [296]

But deceit on this gargantuan scale is a dangerous game. If the truth about the unacceptable and totally undemocratic power and influence of the Rothschilds ever becomes widely known, the layers of secrecy with which they have long covered their traces will surely only fuel the severity of the inevitable reaction against them.

XI. SWITCHING TO AUTHORITARIAN MODE

There is an undeniable *nastiness* about the Rothschild dynasty which is something they seem to have deliberately nurtured.

Yet another of the famous “hard-nosed

business rules” that Mayer Amschel Rothschild taught his sons was: “If you can’t make yourself loved, make yourself feared”. [297]

The freedom and well-being of anyone other than themselves has simply never been any kind of priority.

As James de Rothschild declared in a letter to his children in January 1867: “Finances cannot progress without liberties, but even less with too many”. [298]

It was this mindset, so typical of the European ruling classes, that led them in the 19th century to give their backing to what Bouvier calls “the forces of the Counter-Revolution”. [299]

He adds: “Everywhere they helped to provide money to absolute monarchies and prince-tyrants in difficulties”. [300]

Ferguson describes how in the 1820s the Rothschilds bankrolled the restoration of aristocratic power.

“They enabled Austria, Prussia and Russia – the members of the Holy Alliance – as well as the restored Bourbons in France, to issue bonds at rates of interest only Britain and Holland had previously been able to enjoy.

“In that this made it easier for Prince Metternich to ‘police’ Europe – notably when Austria and France intervened to restore the Bourbon regimes in Naples and Spain – there was truth in the jibe that the Rothschilds were the ‘chief ally

of the Holy Alliance’.” [301]

In particular they funded Metternich in his attempts to crush the Italian liberal and nationalist movement against tyrannical Austro-Hungarian imperial rule. [302]

This same preference for centralised authority led them to pull away from their Egyptian investments when they feared British control was slipping in the face of resurgent Egyptian nationalism. [303]

It was also behind their opposition to the idea that the imperial capital, London, might give Ireland “home rule” in the form of some kind of devolved legislature and government.

This, says Ferguson, “seemed to threaten the integrity of the United Kingdom and to imply a general decentralisation of power throughout the Empire”. [304]

The Rothschilds’ “political” position never really amounted to anything more than supporting anything that aided their profits and opposing anything that got in the way of them.

While often in favour of increased government spending – on armaments or any other products in which they had a vested interest – they have always been hostile to taxes which might adversely affect their own wealth.

Ferguson writes: “The Rothschilds shared that violent aversion, so widespread among the rich of the period, to any increases in direct

taxation – especially those motivated by a desire to improve working class living standards.

“The Rothschild argument was that ‘capital’ must be left free from taxation in order to accumulate; only then could economic growth, increased employment and higher wages be expected”. [305]

This hostility to any kind of economic justice led them even to reject the moderately “radical” wing of the Liberal Party in late 19th century Britain.

Ferdinand Rothschild wrote in a letter that this tendency amounted to “stimulating an unhealthy desire for social and pecuniary equality the disastrous results of which have been only too well illustrated in France”. [306]

It was indeed in France that the Rothschilds first had to face up the fact that they would have to adapt their authoritarian royalist “politics” to embrace republican governments.

But they drew a line between “moderate” republicans with whom they could work and radical or “red” republicans who presented a threat to their interests. [307]

As we have seen, railways played a crucial role in the Rothschilds’ 19th century expansion, especially in the form of their giant Nord rail-industrial complex in France.

Following strikes by French railworkers in 1847, revolution broke out in February 1848 and

the insurgents knew full well who their enemies were.

The railways were seen a symbols of the new industrial economy and the wealth of those who were profiting from its exploitative domination.

Numerous arson and sabotage attacks were carried out on railway infrastructure, those of Nord in particular [308] – a section of the line near Paris suffered more than a million francs of damage – and a Rothschild chateau in the Parisian suburbs was set on fire. [309]

Eventually “order” was restored and it was business as usual for the Rothschild railways.

Bouvier remarks that historians know nothing about the role of James de Rothschild in these events, adding: “We can only guess his position: the defence of his own interests”. [310]

The Rothschilds were very hostile to any proposed nationalisation of railways, as already mentioned, condemning the very notion as “socialism”.

Remarks Ferguson: “As in England, ‘socialism’ became a shorthand for any threatened state intrusion on hitherto unrestricted property rights”. [311]

“In 1892 Edmond [de Rothschild] wrote with alarm of the increasingly vocal socialist attacks on the ‘plutocracy’ and warned of impending ‘anarchy’, while Alphonse predicted that the ‘socialist epidemic’ would be more ‘dangerous’ in

France than in England”. [312]

In 1924 Edouard de Rothschild openly criticised the left-wing French government for what he saw as its soft line towards striking railway workers and what he regarded as excessive public sector pay settlements. [313]

We know that the attacks against their empire in 1848 were very much on the Rothschilds’ minds when revolt again broke out in Paris in 1871. [314]

The story of the crushing of the Commune is a good illustration of the Rothschilds’ historical complicity with any extreme state violence that furthers their own ends.

They saw the uprising coming in advance, in August 1870, with Alphonse de Rothschild warning in internal correspondence that France risked becoming “a hotbed of anarchy”. [315]

He initially hoped to deal with the threat of insurrection by means of controlled opposition, “moderate” republican leaders “who under the present circumstances could be called on to exercise an influence on events” and who had personally reassured him of their commitment to maintaining “order”. [316]

But when that didn’t work, it was time to take off the velvet gloves.

Alphonse did not hide his hatred of the “dangerous classes” of Paris that had dared to challenge the capitalist system from which his

family profited so handsomely.

The state had to “get rid of all those vermin, veritable gallows fodder who constantly threaten society”, he fumed. “Purge France and the world of all those rogues”. [317]

In the Bloody Week which followed in May 1871, some 20,000 people died, around half of them rebels who were lined up and shot in improvised “abattoirs” at the orders of the army commanders. [318]

In the light of these attitudes, it is not surprising to see Rothschild links to violent authoritarianism in the 20th century.

Support for the Bolshevik seizure of power in Russia may appear to place them on the side of the “socialism” they had always opposed, but as eye-witnesses like the Russian anarchist Voline were at pains to point out, the event in fact amounted to a counter-revolution against the threat of an authentic people’s revolt.

The involvement in the Bolshevik coup of Rothschild associates, including that great British believer in the “highly-organised state”, Alfred Milner, [319] is well documented in Professor Antony C. Sutton’s brilliantly-researched book *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*. [320]

Another important player was banker William Boyd Thompson, who in 1914 had become the first full-term director of the Federal

Reserve Bank of New York.

Thompson, explains Sutton, “became an ardent supporter of the Bolsheviks, bequeathing a surviving symbol of this support – a laudatory pamphlet in Russian, *Pravda o Rossii i Bol'shevikakh*“ . [321]

Docherty and Macgregor explain that Thompson was “a loyal Morgan man” and stress that J.P. Morgan and the entire Morgan Empire were “very firmly connected to Rothschild influence”. [322]

They add: “Writing in 1974, Professor Sutton was clearly unaware that virtually the entire international banking cabal was linked through a complex chain that led back to the Rothschilds in London and Paris”. [323]

In addition to its role in suppressing real people power, the Soviet New Normal benefited Rothschild interests by pushing massive industrialisation, including electrification dependent on their copper supplies, and by forcing peasants off the land and into factories in a manner typical of each of the industrial so-called “revolutions”.

Anyone who imagines that all this proves that the Rothschilds are “communists” is totally missing the point. Their only ideology is profit and they will back whatever force might serve that self-interest, regardless of ethical, political or cultural considerations.

The Rothschilds are not ideologically Fascists or National Socialists either, but this did not stop their vast financial empire from funding Benito Mussolini and Adolf Hitler's regimes.

What better way of ensuring "order" and sustainable prosperity for themselves than by banning troublesome trade unions and left-wing political opposition, sourcing prison camp labour for private gain, embarking on massive industrial and military spending and remodelling human life to answer the needs of their greed machine?

Sutton notes that Thomas W. Lamont, head of the J.P. Morgan banking network, served as something of a business consultant for the government of Fascist Italy and secured a \$100 million loan for Mussolini in 1926 at a particularly crucial time for the dictator. [324]

In his book focusing on Germany, Sutton identifies "American companies associated with the Morgan-Rockefeller international investment bankers" as being intimately involved with the growth of Nazi industry – "those firms controlled through the handful of financial houses, the Federal Reserve Bank system, the Bank for International Settlements, and their continuing international cooperative arrangements and cartels which attempt to control the course of world politics and economics". [325]

He says the Nazis were funded by industrial

networks involved in chemicals, automobiles, electricity, telecommunications and oil. [326]

Rothschilds associates Paul M. Warburg, a director of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and his brother Max Warburg held directorships with I.G. Farben, the massive industrial complex at the heart of the Nazi regime [327] which “produced 95% of German poison gas”, [328] including that which was to be put to such horrifying use in the concentration camps.

As to why the Rothschilds would want to have financial links to regimes which appeared to be diametrically opposed to their ethno-cultural affiliations, we have to bear in mind, once again, that their *own family’s finances* are always their overwhelming priority.

We might also consider Quigley’s definition of the phenomenon in question, which has certain uncanny echoes in the 2020s.

“Fascism is the adoption by the vested interests in a society of an authoritarian form of government in order to maintain their vested interests and prevent the reform of the society”. [329]

XII. DICTATING THE FUTURE

Without going so far as to pin the blame for the current techno-authoritarian agenda of the so-called Great Reset entirely on the Rothschilds, it

is possible to state quite categorically that they are fully *aligned* with it.

The Rothschilds are, for instance, involved in impact investment, the insidious means by which speculators aim to turn human lives into digital commodities, both through the Asset Management division of Rothschild & Co, with its “social impact investment fund”, [330] and via their St James’s Place Charitable Foundation. [331]

And historical loan-based links between the Rothschilds and the papacy (the 1906 *Jewish Encyclopedia* described the Rothschilds as “the guardians of the papal treasure” [332]) were reinforced in 2020 with the partnership [333] between the Vatican and Lady Lynn Forester de Rothschild’s [334] Coalition for Inclusive Capitalism, which very much shares the Davos worldview.

The gold and diamonds of southern Africa provided an important boost to Rothschild wealth more than 100 years ago and since the 1950s they have again been focusing on the potential profits to be extracted from that continent.

In 1957 Guy de Rothschild gave a speech announcing that the Rothschilds were playing an active part in the COFIMER project involving mining and energy interests in Africa.

He added: “You will know that immense natural resources in western and equatorial

Africa, in Madagascar and in the Sahara will shortly be subject to exploitation, thanks to some very significant financial creations in which our partners, both European and American, will be participating”. [335]

This interest led to Edmond de Rothschild becoming the key player behind the World Conservation Bank, [336] later renamed Global Environment Facility (GEF), the moving force behind the current fake-green conservation movement trying to throw African pastoralists off their land in the name of “protecting wildlife”. [337]

The Corbett Report explains that the idea for an international “conservation” bank had been around for some time before France put forward a formal proposal at a joint ministerial meeting of the IMF in 1989. [338]

“The project was put under the umbrella of the World Bank and by 1991 the World Conservation Bank was formally established”.

It adds that the GEF has made and co-financed tens of billions of dollars worth of grants and “is the funding mechanism for five different UN conventions, including the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change”.

As well as establishing so-called “protected areas” it has funded Chinese companies producing solar cells and wind farm technology.

Biotech and the associated transhumanist

movement are a central part of the global agenda built around the UN Sustainable Development Goals, impact investment and the digital concentration camps known as smart cities.

A very significant pioneer in this domain was Victor Rothschild, who worked for MI5 and for Royal Dutch Shell as well as for N. M. Rothschild & Sons.

According to the Rothschild archives, he was “a valued adviser on intelligence and science to both Conservative and Labour Governments” and even in his senior years worked as a security adviser to Rothschild friend Margaret Thatcher. [339]

They add: “In 1981, Victor established Biotechnology Investments Limited which became one of Europe’s leading specialist biotech investment companies”.

A news report from 1999 states: “Two of the largest biotechnology investment groups in the UK are negotiating a merger. Biotechnology Investments Limited (BIL; London) and International Biotechnology Trust (IBT; London) – both divisions of Rothschilds (London) – are looking to broaden their investment portfolios by merging”. [340]

The Rothschilds’ IBT says on its website that it “offers investors access to the fast-growing biotechnology sector” [341] and that it is managed by an associated entity called SV

Health Managers LLP – “We seek breakthroughs that have the power to change the lives of millions”. [342]

Predictably, in view of the Rothschilds’ intimacy with UK governments, their biotech firms were involved in the country’s “response” to Covid.

IBT proudly relates that its investment manager Kate Bingham, who is also a managing partner of SV Health Managers, was in May 2020 “appointed Chair of the UK Vaccine Taskforce reporting to the Prime Minister to lead UK efforts to find and manufacture a COVID-19 vaccine on a six month engagement stepping down as Chair in December 2020.

“On December 8th 2020 the UK started COVID-19 vaccinations – the first Western country to do so. She was awarded a DBE in the Queen’s Birthday Honours in June 2021 for services to the procurement, manufacture and distribution of COVID-19 vaccines”. [343]

There was some controversy around Bingham, not least the less-than-transparent recruitment process that landed her this crucial role.

The Observer reported at the time: “As Kate Bingham, chair of the vaccine taskforce, came under sustained scrutiny over the £670,000 budget she had allocated for public relations consultants, attention switched from her

suitability for the role to her connections to the Conservative government.

“Managing partner of a private equity firm, SV Health Investors, involved for 30 years in pharmaceutical investment, she is also married to a Tory MP, Jesse Norman, who was at Eton at the same time as Johnson, and she went to private school with Rachel Johnson, the prime minister’s sister”. [344]

Rothschild employee Bingham, a self-declared “venture capitalist”, [345] has been back in the news more recently.

She was quoted by *The Guardian* on November 30 2022 as warning that the UK was “not in a significantly better place to deal with a new pandemic”. [346]

The report credits Bingham with “putting the UK on the front foot for early deployment of vaccines during the pandemic” and says she is calling for an “expert leader” to coordinate the country’s future vaccine policies.

It doesn’t specify whether she has herself in mind!

The most blatant embrace of the Great Reset by a Rothschild concern probably comes from the Edmond de Rothschild entity which is based in Geneva, Switzerland, but boasts a “global presence”, with offices in Belgium, France, Germany, the UK, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Monaco, Portugal, Spain, the Netherlands and

the United Arab Emirates. [347]

It uses the same pompous tone deployed by Klaus Schwab of the WEF, also coincidentally based in Switzerland with a global presence, when it declares: “We are bold builders of the future”.

It adds, tellingly: “At Edmond de Rothschild, we believe that wealth is what tomorrow can be made of”. [348]

The Swiss-based Rothschilds happily endorse the whole Fourth Industrial Revolution circus in the form of “Farming 4.0”, [349] “Digital Lifestyle”, [350] “Cybersecurity” [351] and “Sustainable Governance”. [352]

They are also very interested, as already mentioned, in “human capital” and when Ariane Rothschild took over the group in 2015 she reinforced its impact investment strategy. [353]

In her message to the group’s 2021 Annual Report, we learn that it has established a strategic partnership in the realm of “innovative food”, technology linked to “alternative proteins”, new agricultural systems and the creation of “digital solutions” to nutrition. [354]

Referring, in good Schwabian style, to the “deep and irreversible impact that the pandemic has had on our ways of living”, Rothschild assures investment clients that she and her team will remain a step ahead of “the major growth tendencies of tomorrow”.

XIII. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!

The Rothschilds have, as I have shown, amassed vast wealth at the expense of the rest of us, consistently put themselves before others, profiteered from war after war, grabbed hold of industrial infrastructure, exploited humanity, destroyed nature, corrupted political life, used royalty for their own purposes, privatised the public sector, imposed their global control in a secretive manner and now imagine that they can dictate our future, confining us to a miserable and denatured state of techno-totalitarian slavery.

Enough is enough! How can it be possible for this single family and their associates, these enemies of the people, to get away with ruining the lives of billions of human beings?

We desperately need to shake free from their vile domination. But how?

There will no doubt be some who would like to see authorities across the world investigate every last corner of the Rothschild empire, close down all corruption and malpractice and ensure that those involved in wrong-doing are prosecuted and permanently stripped of assets and power.

However, since the “authorities” pretty much everywhere appear to be under the direct or indirect control of that same empire, I’m not sure how that is going to happen!

Grassroots popular resistance is going to be needed, though it will probably have to be combined with, or provoke, some kind of internal rupture and crumbling within the system.

This would involve some of those who have until now been working on the side of the empire (while maybe imagining they are loyally serving their country or some noble political cause) switching to the side of free humanity.

After this has happened, it would then be essential to rethink the way our societies are structured and imagined, to cure the underlying social disease which, as I outlined at the start of this piece, made our society weak enough to be taken over by a ruthless clique.

Perhaps, in fact, it is essential to think about this *right now*?

Perhaps it is precisely by discussing what has gone so wrong with this “modern world”, and the alternative ways in which we could live, that we might inspire current agents of the empire to break from its ranks and join our uprising?

I would encourage readers to take a look at the accumulated wisdom of the 90-plus thinkers featured on the Organic Radicals site, [355] which aims to start the crucial conversation about where humankind can go from here.

Those who are still hung up about the Rothschilds being Jewish might want to take a careful look at the profiles of the likes of Emma

Goldman, Gustav Landauer, Walter Benjamin, Martin Buber, Herbert Marcuse, Leopold Kohr and Fredy Perlman.

All of these thinkers have transmitted a powerful vision which flies completely in the face of the odious global regime constructed by their self-appointed “royal family”.

On a personal note, I should say that I did not lightly take the decision to write and publish this essay.

I did not initially set out to investigate the Rothschilds in particular, but their name and their connections just kept cropping up time and time again in my research until I felt obliged to look a little closer.

Having discovered the information presented here (which is very far from being comprehensive!) I felt it would have been a sin of omission, even of downright cowardice, not to have sought to share it with a wider public.

In times when the truth is actively repressed, any of us who acquire relevant knowledge have a duty to pass it on and, moreover, to act upon it according to our own deepest conscience.

At the very least we might win the freedom to discuss the historical and contemporary role of the Rothschilds without fear of censorship or recrimination.

And this is but a necessary stepping-stone to

gaining the greater freedom of which they and their ruling-class predecessors have deprived us for far too long now – to be what we are meant to be, to live how we wish to live, to decide amongst ourselves what kind of future we want to give our children and our children’s children.

The vision of this potential freedom is something that can inspire us all to rise to new levels in our fight against the tyranny of a tiny clan of power-craving sociopaths.

The celebrated French historian Jules Michelet wrote in his *Journal* in 1842 that the Rothschilds knew everyone of importance in Europe and everything that was going on everywhere.

But, he added: “There is only one thing that they never foresee and that is self-sacrifice. They will never guess, for example, that in Paris there are 10,000 people ready to die for an idea”. [356]

[1] Niall Ferguson, *The House of Rothschild: The World’s Greatest Banker 1849-1998* (New York: Penguin, 2000), p. 271.

[2] orgrad.wordpress.com/ferdinand-tonnies/

[3] www.express.co.uk/news/uk/1209862/labour-news-jeremy-corbryn-antisemitism-andrew-neil-interview-rothschild-conspiracy-spt

[4] Heinrich Heine, cit. Ferguson, p. xxiv.

[5] ‘The Modern Croesus’, *The Period*, July 5, 1870, see Ferguson. p. 159.

[6] Ferguson, p. 155.

[7] Ferguson, p. 156.

[8] Jean Bouvier, *Les Rothschild* (Brussels: Editions Complexe, 1983), p. 70.

[9] Bouvier, p. 90.

- [10] Derek Wilson, *Rothschild: The Wealth and Power of a Dynasty* (London: Simon & Schuster, 1988), pp. 98-99, cit. Gerry Docherty and Jim Macgregor, *Hidden History: The Secret Origins of the First World War* (Edinburgh & London: Mainstream Publishing, 2013), p. 22.
- [11] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 23.
- [12] Bouvier, p. 90.
- [13] Bouvier, p. 53.
- [14] Ferguson, p. xxi.
- [15] Bouvier, p. 342.
- [16] Ferguson, p. xxiii.
- [17] <https://jweekly.com/2021/02/01/who-are-the-rothschilds-today-heres-the-long-non-laser-filled-answer/>
- [18] <https://www.nytimes.com/2007/03/09/business/09rothschild.html>
- [19] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rothschild_family
- [20] Ferguson, p. 47.
- [21] Bouvier, p. 276.
- [22] Bouvier, p. 277.
- [23] Virginia Cowles, *The Rothschilds: A Family of Fortune* (London: Future Publications Ltd, 1973), p. 153, cit. Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 22.
- [24] <https://therake.com/stories/icons/party-animals-the-rothschild-surrealist-ball/0>
- [25] Ferguson, p. 464.
- [26] Ferguson, p. 467.
- [27] Ferguson, p. 250.
- [28] Ferguson, p. 463.
- [29] Ferguson, p. 427.
- [30] Ferguson, p. 426.
- [31] Ferguson, p. 337.
- [32] Ferguson, p. 228.
- [33] Ferguson, p. 305.
- [34] Ferguson, p. 306.
- [35] Ferguson, p. 306.
- [36] Ferguson, p. xxvi.
- [37] Ferguson, p. 244.
- [38] Ferguson, p. 12.
- [39] Ferguson, p. 252.
- [40] Jim Macgregor and Gerry Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony: How the Anglo-American Establishment Deliberately Extended WWI by Three-and-a-Half Years* (Walterville, OR: Trine Day, 2018), pp.

400-401.

- [41] Ferguson, p. 271.
- [42] Ferguson, pp. 271-72.
- [43] Ferguson, p. 272.
- [44] Ferguson, pp. 278-79.
- [45] Ferguson, p. 409.
- [46] Ferguson, p. 280.
- [47] Ferguson, pp. 281-82.
- [48] Ferguson, p. 21.
- [49] Ferguson, p. 262.
- [50] Ferguson, p. 474.
- [51] Ferguson, p. 473.
- [52] Ferguson, p. xxiii.
- [53] Ferguson, p. 149.
- [54] Ferguson, p. 57.
- [55] Bouvier, p. 70.
- [56] Bouvier, p. 79.
- [57] Ferguson, p. xxv.
- [58] Bouvier, p. 193.
- [59] Bouvier, p. 193.
- [60] Ferguson, p. xxi.
- [61] Bouvier, p. 14.
- [62] Egon Caesar Corti, *Les Rothschild*, volume 1 (Paris: Payot, 1929) p. 31, cit. Bouvier, p. 23.
- [63] Ferguson, p. xxii.
- [64] Bouvier, p. 23.
- [65] Ferguson, p. xxii.
- [66] Bouvier, p. 41.
- [67] Bouvier, p. 34.
- [68] Bouvier, p. 25.
- [69] Ferguson, p. xxi.
- [70] Ferguson, p. 455.
- [71] Ferguson, p. xxiii.
- [72] Ferguson, p. xxii.
- [73] Bouvier, p. 46.
- [74] Ferguson, p. xxiii.
- [75] Ferguson, p. 68.
- [76] Ferguson, p. 40.
- [77] Ferguson, p. 73.
- [78] Ferguson, p. 72.
- [79] Ferguson, p. 73.
- [80] Ferguson, p. 75.

- [81] Ferguson, p. 89.
- [82] Ferguson, p. 94.
- [83] Ferguson, p. 98.
- [84] Ferguson, p. 94.
- [85] Ferguson, p. 190.
- [86] Ferguson, p. 205.
- [87] Ferguson, p. 205.
- [88] Ferguson, p. 209.
- [89] Ferguson, pp. 211.
- [90] Paul Cudenec, 'A Crime against humanity: the Great Reset of 1914-18', winteroak.org.uk, October 2022.
- [91] Takahashi Korekiyo, *The Rothschilds and the Russo-Japanese War, 1904-06*), pp. 20-21 cit. Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 93.
- [92] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 442.
- [93] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 331.
- [94] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 331.
- [95] Ferguson, p. 149.
- [96] *Mémoire de Salomon Rothschild*, 20 February 1836, cit. Bouvier, p. 109.
- [97] Carroll Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Time* (Reprint, New Millennium Edition, New York: Macmillan, 1966), p. 61.
- [98] Bouvier, p. 137.
- [99] Bouvier, p. 251.
- [100] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 327.
- [101] Ferguson, p. xxix.
- [102] Bouvier, p. 273.
- [103] Ferguson, p. 382.
- [104] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 60.
- [105] Ferguson, p. 87.
- [106] Bouvier, pp. 188-89.
- [107] Ferguson, p. 88.
- [108] Ferguson, p. 486.
- [109] Ferguson, p. 348.
- [110] Ferguson, p. 352.
- [111] Ferguson, p. 349.
- [112] Ferguson, p. 353.
- [113] Ferguson, p. 353.
- [114] Ferguson, p. 462.
- [115] Ferguson, p. 354.
- [116] Ferguson, p. 353.

- [117] Ferguson, p. 168.
- [118] Ferguson, p. 261.
- [119] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 293.
- [120] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 290.
- [121] Ferguson, p. 355.
- [122] Ferguson, p. 481.
- [123] Jean-Jacques Laurendon, Bouvier, p. 315.
- [124] Bouvier, p. 52.
- [125] Ferguson, p. 64.
- [126] <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2022-11-08/evelyn-de-rothschild-london-head-of-banking-dynasty-dies-at-91>
- [127] Ferguson, p. 485.
- [128] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, pp. 330-31.
- [129] <https://www.dhnet.be/dernieres-depeches/afp/2014/06/24/financier-habile-vincent-bollere-a-bati-un-empire-tres-diversifie-HJ6DAE2BONDSPK2COO3YM7E4F4>[130]
<https://archive.wikiwix.com/cache/index2.php?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.mediapart.fr%2Fjournal%2Finternational%2F190122%2Fcorruption-en-afrique-le-protocole-bollere#federation=archive.wikiwix.com&tab=url>
- [131] <https://www.dhnet.be/dernieres-depeches/afp/2014/06/24/financier-habile-vincent-bollere-a-bati-un-empire-tres-diversifie-HJ6DAE2BONDSPK2COO3YM7E4F4>
- [132] <https://www.lesechos.fr/2003/08/vincent-bollere-detient-une-participation-dans-la-maison-rothschild-670683>
- [133] Ferguson, p. xxix.
- [134] <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/edmond-de-rothschild-megatrends-human-capital-october->
- [135] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 52.
- [136] John Hamill, *The Strange Career of Mr Hoover Under Two Flags* (New York: William Faro, 1931), p. 165, cit. Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 53.
- [137] Bouvier, p. 257.
- [138] Bouvier, p. 256.
- [139] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mercury_poisoning
- [140] Ferguson, p. 351.
- [141] Ferguson, pp. 354-56.
- [142] Bouvier, p. 255.
- [143] Bouvier, p. 109.

- [144] Ferguson, p. 461.
- [145] Ferguson, p. 461.
- [146] Ferguson, p. 524.
- [147] Laurendon, Bouvier, p. 327.
- [148] Ferguson, p. 487.
- [149] Ferguson, p. 482.
- [150] Ferguson, p. 485.
- [151] Ferguson, p. 485.
- [152] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 473.
- [153] Ferguson, p. xxii.
- [154] Ferguson, p. xxii.
- [155] Ferguson, p. 28.
- [156] Ferguson, p. 322.
- [157] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 84.
- [158] Ferguson, p. 301.
- [159] Ferguson, p. 307.
- [160] Carroll Quigley, *The Anglo-American Establishment: From Rhodes to Cliveden* (Dauphin Publications Inc, 2013), p. 15.
- [161] Quigley, *The Anglo-American Establishment*, p. 15.
- [162] Ferguson, p. 315.
- [163] Ferguson, p. 325.
- [164] Ferguson, p. 332.
- [165] Ferguson, p. 332.
- [166] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 24.
- [167] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 25.
- [168] Ferguson, p. 525.
- [169] Ferguson, p. 482.
- [170] Ferguson, p. 333.
- [171] Ferguson, p. 319.
- [172] Ferguson, p. xxi.
- [173] Bouvier, p. 73.
- [174] Bouvier, p. 73.
- [175] Ferguson, p. xxiii.
- [176] Ferguson, p. 120.
- [177] Ferguson, pp. 192-93.
- [178] Ferguson, p. 190.
- [179] Ferguson, p. 190.
- [180] Bouvier, p. 206.
- [181] Bouvier, pp. 210-211.
- [182] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 332.
- [183] Ferguson, p. 488.
- [184] Ferguson, p. 488.

- [185] *The Jewish News of Northern California*, <https://jweekly.com/2021/02/01/who-are-the-rothschilds-today-heres-the-long-non-laser-filled-answer/>
- [186] Ferguson, p. 251.
- [187] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 473.
- [188] Ferguson, p. xxvii.
- [189] Ferguson, p. xxvi.
- [190] Ferguson, p. xxiii.
- [191] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 24.
- [192] Ferguson, pp. 37-38.
- [193] Ferguson, p. 37.
- [194] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 24.
- [195] <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2022-11-08/evelyn-de-rothschild-london-head-of-banking-dynasty-dies-at-91>
- [196] Paul Cudenec, 'Charles' empire: the royal reset riddle', winteroak.org.uk, April 2022.
- [197] Ferguson, p. 428.
- [198] Ferguson, p. xxii.
- [199] Ferguson, p. 80.
- [200] Bouvier, p. 35.
- [201] Ferguson, p. xxvii.
- [202] Ferguson, p. 79.
- [203] https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn85058245/1907-03-21/ed-1/seq-5/print/image_681x648_from_1361%2C4839_to_3498%2C6874/
- [204] Bouvier, p. 220.
- [205] Ferguson, p. 115.
- [206] Ferguson, p. 156.
- [207] Ferguson, p. 337.
- [208] *Archives de la préfecture de police de la Seine*, dossier Ba, 90, cit. Bouvier, p. 228.
- [209] Bouvier, pp. 227-28.
- [210] Ferguson, p. 130.
- [211] Ferguson, p. 491.
- [212] Ferguson, p. 491.
- [213] Ferguson, p. 491.
- [214] Ferguson, pp. 491-92.
- [215] <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2022-11-08/evelyn-de-rothschild-london-head-of-banking-dynasty-dies-at-91>
- [216] Ferguson, p. 492.
- [217] Ferguson, p. 492.

- [218] Ferguson, p. 492.
[219] Ferguson, p. 492.
[220] Ferguson, pp. 492-94.
[221] Ferguson, p. 493.
[222] Ferguson, p. 493.
[223] Ferguson, p. 493.
[224] Ferguson, p. 493.
[225] Ferguson, p. 494.
[226] Ferguson, p. 494.
[227] Ferguson, p. 494.
[228] Ferguson, p. 289.
[229] Ferguson, p. 291.
[230] Ferguson, p. 294.
[231] Ferguson, p. 301.
[232] Ferguson, pp. 312-13.
[233] Ferguson, p. 361.
[234] Ferguson, p. 413.
[235] Ferguson, p. 413.
[236] Ferguson, p. 315.
[237] Ferguson, p. 331.
[238] Ferguson, p. 354.
[239] Ferguson, p. 69.
[240] Ferguson, pp. 68-69.
[241] Ferguson, p. 483.
[242] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 713.
[243] Ferguson, p. 461.
[244] <http://lasa-2.univ.pitt.edu/LARR/prot/fulltext/vol40no1/Shaw.pdf>
[245] Ferguson, p. 68.
[246] Ferguson, p. 346.
[247] Ferguson, p. 460.
[248] Ferguson, p. 486.
[249] Ferguson, p. 486.
[250] Ferguson, p. 485.
[251] Ferguson, p. 485.
[252] Ferguson, p. 485.
[253] Ferguson, p. 489.
[254] Ferguson, p. 294.
[255] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 34.
[256] Ferguson, p. xxii.
[257] Bouvier, p. 39.
[258] Ferguson, p. 366.

- [259] Ferguson, p. 522.
- [260] Ferguson, p. 319.
- [261] Ferguson, p. xxviii.
- [262] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 34.
- [263] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 40.
- [264] Ferguson, pp. 484-98.
- [265] https://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php/Concordia_BV
- [266] <https://www.sjp.co.uk/about-us/our-heritage>
- [267] <https://www.ritcap.com/our-history>
- [268] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 23.
- [269] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 294.
- [270] Bouvier, p. 255.
- [271] Laurendon, Bouvier, p. 337.
- [272] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 212.
- [273] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 330.
- [274] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 474.
- [275] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 293.
- [276] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 214.
- [277] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 292.
- [278] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 474.
- [279] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 214.
- [280] Bouvier, p. 258.
- [281] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 293.
- [282] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 294.
- [283] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 291.
- [284] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 216.
- [285] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 215.
- [286] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 334.
- [287] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 216.
- [288] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 219.
- [289] Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, p. 218.
- [290] "The Crisis of 1907", pamphlet taken from the *Boston Post*, 17 October 1907, p. 11, cit. Docherty and Macgregor, *Hidden History*, pp. 217-18.
- [291] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 604.
- [292] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 772.
- [293] Laurendon, Bouvier, p. 325.
- [294] www.organicconsumers.org/news/who-owns-world-blackrock-and-vanguard
- [295] <https://childrenshealthdefense.org/defender/blackrock-vanguard-own-big-pharma>

- [296] Bouvier, p. 187.
- [297] Ferguson, p. xxii.
- [298] Ferguson, p. 161.
- [299] Bouvier, p. 70.
- [300] Bouvier, p. 70.
- [301] Ferguson, p. xxiii.
- [302] Bouvier, p. 74.
- [303] Ferguson, p. 316.
- [304] Ferguson, pp. 327-28.
- [305] Ferguson, p. 276.
- [306] Ferguson, p. 327.
- [307] Ferguson, p. 336.
- [308] Bouvier, p. 137.
- [309] Bouvier, p. 142.
- [310] Bouvier, p. 143.
- [311] Ferguson, p. 336.
- [312] Ferguson, p. 337.
- [313] Ferguson, p. 463.
- [314] Ferguson, p. 197.
- [315] Ferguson, p. 201.
- [316] Ferguson, p. 198.
- [317] Ferguson, p. 210.
- [318] Ferguson, p. 210.
- [319] Cudeneac, 'A crime against humanity'.
- [320] Antony C. Sutton, *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution* (Surrey: Clairview Books, 2016) (1974), p. 93.
- [321] Sutton, *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*, p. 90.
- [322] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 474.
- [323] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 474.
- [324] Sutton, *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*, p. 174.
- [325] Antony C. Sutton, *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler* (Sudbury: Bloomfield Books, 1976), pp. 31-32.
- [326] Sutton, *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler*, pp. 110-111.
- [327] Sutton, *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler*, pp. 109-110.
- [328] Sutton, *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler*, p. 36.
- [329] Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 347.
- [330] <https://am.fr.rothschildandco.com/en/news/our-vision-of-impact-investing/>
- [331] <https://www.sjpfoundation.co.uk/our-impact>
- [332] <https://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/12909-rothschild>
- [333] <https://www.reutersevents.com/sustainability/lady-de-rothschilds-road-vatican>

[334]
https://twitter.com/maatuska_t/status/1514570641915232258

[335] Laurendon, Bouvier, p. 321.

[336] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r8c-NKjOOA0&t=1755s>

[337] nodealfornature.wixsite.com/info

[338] <https://www.minds.com/CorbettReport/blog/the-second-most-important-bank-you-ve-never-heard-of-1181240989692674048>

[339]
<https://family.rothschildarchive.org/people/124-nathaniel-mayer-victor-rothschild-1910-1990>

[340]
https://www.nature.com/articles/nbt0199_8c

[341] <https://ibtplc.com/>

[342] <https://svhealthinvestors.com/biotechnology>

[343] <https://ibtplc.com/about/kate-bingham>

[344]
<https://web.archive.org/web/20201115124803/https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/nov/15/chumocracy-covid-revealed-shape-tory-establishment>

[345]
https://find-and-update.company-information.service.gov.uk/officers/gc9huYFymgp3ZNRu_fV_rUopBkk/appointments

[346]
<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2022/nov/30/former-vaccines-chief-sounds-warning-about-uk-pandemic-readiness>

[347]
<https://www.edmond-de-rothschild.com/en/our-global-presence>

[348]
https://www.linkedin.com/company/edmond-de-rothschild?trk=pulse-article_main-author-card
[youtube.com/watch?v=6yiFcN-xEC0](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6yiFcN-xEC0)

[349]
<https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/edmond-de-rothschild-megatrends-farming-40-november->

[350]
<https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/edmond-de-rothschild-megatrends-digital-lifestyle->

[351]
<https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/edmond-de-rothschild-megatrends-cybersecurity-november->

[352]
<https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/edmond-de-rothschild-megatrends->

sustainable-governance-

[353]

https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ariane_de_Rothschild

[354] Translated from the French-language document.

[https://www.edmond-de-](https://www.edmond-de-rothschild.com/SiteCollectionDocuments/Rapport-annuel/Switzerland1/FR/Rapport%20annuel%202021.pdf)

[rothschild.com/SiteCollectionDocuments/Rapport-annuel/Switzerland1/FR/Rapport%20annuel%202021.pdf](https://www.edmond-de-rothschild.com/SiteCollectionDocuments/Rapport-annuel/Switzerland1/FR/Rapport%20annuel%202021.pdf)

[355] orgrad.wordpress.com

[356] Jules Michelet, *Journal*, 21 July 1842, cit. Bouvier, p. 114.

Also by Paul Cudenec

NON-FICTION

The Anarchist Revelation: Being What We're Meant to Be (2013)

Antibodies, Anarchangels and Other Essays (2013)

The Stifled Soul of Humankind (2014)

Forms of Freedom (2015)

Nature, Essence and Anarchy (2016)

The Green One (2017)

Fascism Rebranded: Exposing the Great Reset (e-book only, 2021)

The Withway (2022)

FICTION

The Fakir of Florence: A Novel in Three Layers (2016)

No Such Place as Asha: An Extremist Novel (2019)

Enemies of the Modern World: A Triptych of Novellas (2021)

All these titles are available to download for free via the Winter Oak website at www.winteroak.org.uk. To get in touch with Winter Oak email winteroak@greenmail.net or follow @winteroakpress on Twitter.