

Iain Davis



# New World Order

## Many Tongues One Voice

# ***New World Order***

*Many Tongues One Voice*

*by Iain Davis*

*Copyright © 2019 by Iain Davis*

*All rights reserved. This book or any portion thereof  
may not be reproduced or used in any manner whatsoever  
without the express written permission of the publisher  
except for the use of brief quotations in a book review.*

Formatted in the United Kingdom

First Formatted, 2019

[www.in-this-together.com](http://www.in-this-together.com)

## ***Chapter 1: A Brief History of The New World Order***

If ever you mention the term 'New World Order' (NWO) people tend to look at you like you've taken leave of your senses. This is understandable because the suggestion that a hidden cartel of so called elite globalists (described more accurately as the parasite class) control the worlds economy and its political agenda is beyond imagination for most. Thankfully, for those who care to retain an open mind, there's no need to employ imagination because the historical evidence which establishes the fact is unequivocal.

The author H.G.Wells coined the phrase in [his book of the same name](#) published in 1940. Wells viewed a single world government as a solution to war. In his opinion that government should be socialist. He also believed it should be based upon a global system of human rights protections.

Over the years various individuals and political institutions have used the term to encapsulate the idea of a single, unifying system of global governance. For example, the European Commission document '[The European Union in the New World Order](#),' the transcript of a speech former EU Commission President José Manuel Barroso gave to Yale University, speaks about the New World Order as a beneficial system of global governance.

Similarly most politicians and globalist figures, who have spoken about the New World Order, refer to it in a positive light.

*“Further world progress is now possible only through the search for a consensus of all mankind, in movement toward a new world order.”*

*[Mikhail Gorbachev 1988]*

*“The world can therefore seize this opportunity to fulfil the long-held promise of a new world order ”*

*[President George H.W Bush 1991]*

*The New World Order cannot happen without U.S. participation, as we are the single most significant component. Yes, there will be a New World Order, and it will force the United States to change its perception*


*[Henry Kissinger 1994]*

*“[The] new world order that is in the making must focus on the creation of a world of democracy, peace and prosperity for all”*

*[Nelson Mandella 1994]*

When global leaders have delivered their big New World Order speeches, most of these aspirational monologues have come in response to tumultuous global events. Wars, political upheaval, financial crisis and international trade disputes etc.

On the face of it they appear to be expressing the ideals advocated within the [U.N Charter](#). Ostensibly a single system of international governance which compels every nation on earth to treat not only its own citizens but every other nation’s citizenry with respect, dignity and compassion. Which sounds like a very sensible idea. So why do some people keep banging on about the evil of the New World Order?



Firstly, the idea that any government can deliver peace and prosperity to its own citizens, let alone internationally, is an unsubstantiated hypothesis. Governments have consistently [failed to deliver equality of opportunity](#) to their people. The disparity between rich and poor is as large as it's ever been and inequality of opportunity persists.

According to research by [Credit Suisse](#), the combined wealth of the top 1% is greater than the total wealth of the rest of us put together. There are eight people who have more money than the bottom economic half of the world's population. Over the next few years [500 people](#) will pass on a combined \$2.1 trillion inheritance to their heirs. This is more money than the entire economy of India, a country of 1.3 billion people.

The economist [Thomas Pickety demonstrated](#), in the last 30 years, income growth, in real terms, for the lower half of the planet's population has been zero while the top 1% have seen their real term incomes increase by 300%. To imagine

that governments deliver peace and prosperity is without any substantiating evidence. All conflict, all injustice, social inequality, exploitation and even crime exists under the rule of government. To believe that government can or even would solve any of these problems is a blind faith.

Some nations enjoy better living standards than others but this is either a result of economic and technological development and/or [one nations exploitation of another](#) nations resources. These international disparities invariably emerge following some process of forced or coerced acquisition exercised by dominant governments at the expense of poorer governments. Either via war, colonisation, neocolonialism or simple corruption.

The average person in more affluent countries can afford some luxuries because underpaid or slave workers, somewhere else in the world, have provided the necessary raw materials or manufactured products for next to nothing. However, in times of austerity, governments never hesitate to squeeze the workers pay and conditions in their own nations, before moving on to asset strip essential services, in order to [protect bank profits](#). They can do this because they have all the power and the population has none. So called [democracy notwithstanding](#).

For those who propose a New World Order, such as Richard Haass president of the influential globalist think tanks the Council on Foreign Relations, it is the dream of a one world government led by a tightly bound clique of immensely powerful '*policy influencers*.' Those who criticise this frequently referenced idea, universally castigated as '*loony conspiracy theorists*,' it is simply global tyranny under an unelected, self appointed elite (parasites,) whose only real vision is that they are the rightful rulers of the Earth.

## The Origins of the Modern New World Order



Cecil Rhodes

In 1902 the British business man and empire builder Cecil Rhodes died having amassed a staggering personal fortune by working people to death in the gold and diamond mines of South Africa. He founded De Beers Consolidated Mining in 1888 with the financial backing of the wealthiest bankers in the world, N.M. Rothschild & Sons. Upon his death he bequeathed his own immense fortune to create a number of projects, including both public foundations and a secret society.

Rhodes created seven wills in total. His 7th is the most well know as it established the Rhodes scholarship, which supports international postgraduate studies at Oxford University. Rhodes scholars have gone on to become some of

the most powerful and influential people in the world of politics, science, medicine, business, the arts, academia, the law and the military.

However, the bulk of Rhodes' fortune was set aside to create a single, one world government, based upon the British model of empire. It would be ruled from its centre by an Anglo-American elite who would exercise their control by covertly collaborating with, and manipulating, the world's political, economic, scientific and cultural leaders.

In order to exert their covert power, the group Rhodes created had to be a secret organisation. As such, it wasn't given any formal identification. Nor was it some sort of quasi-mystical, funny handshake brigade, though many of its members were also in other secret societies which were, but rather a group by voluntary association, shared interest and a united common purpose. Membership was offered based upon power and influence. Those who joined, agreed to take action in pursuit of the society's aims. It wasn't just a talking shop. They meant business.

The constituent groups came to be known by many names. 'Milner's Kindergarten,' 'The Round Table Group,' 'the Rhodes Crowd,' 'the Times Crowd,' 'The Chatham House Crowd,' 'All Souls Group' and 'the Cliveden set' have all been names given to various organisations within this secret society over the years. It worked on the basis of 'rings within rings.' At the centre was a small group, 'the Society of the Elect,' who influenced the development and activities of its larger, working groups.

This compartmentalisation meant some society members were fully aware of the centre of power while others less so. However, all members agreed to the key objective. To establish a single global government, which some people today refer to as the 'New World Order.'



Rhodes was a white supremacist and nationalist extremist. He was a man of his time and while this is rightly considered repugnant today it should be noted that his views were shared by the majority. He believed the English 'Anglo-Saxon' culture was superior to all others and the best thing that could ever happen to a nation was English colonial rule.

Consequently, he saw imperialism as a moral virtue. Therefore, any action that promoted Anglo-U.S. imperialist expansion, no matter what harm it inflicted upon the people, was seen by Rhodes and his fellow society members as righteous. In 1877 he wrote "[Confession of Faith](#)" in which he laid out his vision:

*"I contend that we are the finest race in the world and that the more of the world we inhabit the better it is for the human race. Just fancy those parts that are at present inhabited by the most despicable specimens of human beings .....*

*.....Why should we not form a secret society with but one object the furtherance of the British Empire and the bringing of the whole uncivilised world under British rule for the recovery of the United States for the making the Anglo-Saxon race but one Empire....*

*....To forward such a scheme what a splendid help a secret society would be a society not openly acknowledged but who would work in secret for such an object.....*

*.....Let us form the same kind of society a Church for the extension of the British Empire. A society which should have members in every part of the British Empire working with one object and one idea we should have its members placed at our universities and our schools and should watch the English youth passing through their hands just one perhaps in every thousand would have the mind and feelings for such an object....*

.....For fear that death might cut me off before the time for attempting its development I leave all my worldly goods in trust to S. G. Shippard and the Secretary for the Colonies at the time of my death to try to form such a Society with such an object.”



Lord Alfred Milner

Rhodes set about creating his [elite group](#) of royalty, colonialists, soldiers, bureaucrats, industrialists, spies, bankers, historians, scientists, artists, authors, politicians and others, to attempt to rule the world. In 1891 Rhodes, W.T.Stead (influential editor and journalist), Lord Nathan Rothschild (banker, politician & Rhodes' trustee) and Reginald Baliol Brett (Lord Esher, a close friend and advisor to Queen Victoria and later King Edward VII and King George V) met to set their plan for global dominance in motion.

They immediately started their recruitment drive. They formed the '*Society of the Elect*' by inviting Lord Alfred Milner (colonial administrator and powerful policy advisor) to join them. The next group they formed, who would remain closest to the seat of power, were '*the Association of Helpers.*'

In 1902, two months after Rhodes death, the NWO formed the transatlantic '[Pilgrims Society.](#)' Rhodes aim had always been to unite the English-speaking world.

The British establishment mourned the loss of their American colony, but were also aware the British empire couldn't be maintained indefinitely purely by military force. The Pilgrims Society was established to create the '*special relationship*' between the U.S. and UK.

Today the first duty of any U.S. Ambassador to the UK is to meet with the British '*Pilgrims Society.*' Conversely, the first duty of the UK Ambassador to the U.S. is to [understand the wishes](#) of the U.S. Pilgrims Society members.

### **The New World Moves Forward**


When the Pilgrims Society was established a series of meetings took place in London in 1902 and New York in 1903. These were attended by the wealthiest individuals in U.S. and Britain and, therefore, the world.

Central banking was controlled from London, predominantly by Baron Alfred Rothschild, giving the British the monetary advantage. The Pilgrims Society set

up the Rhodes Scholarship and Rhodes Trust in the U.S. In later years notable members have included Queen Elizabeth II, Prince Philip, Prince Charles, John D. and David Rockefeller, Winston Churchill, Henry Kissinger, Margaret Thatcher, Walter Cronkite and Allen and John Foster Dulles, to name but a few.

In southern Africa Lord Alfred Milner ('Society of the Elect' & Pilgrims Society member) brought together a number of talented and ruthless young lawyers and administrators into a collective which came to be known as '[Milner's Kindergarten](#).' They worked to establish the Union of South Africa, predecessor to the current Republic of South Africa and instigator of the apartheid regime. They controlled much of the worlds diamond and gold markets.

In 1909, the Kindergarten was instrumental in the formation of the [Round Table Movement](#). They established 'Round Tables' in Canada, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand and elsewhere across the British Empire.



## Lionel Curtis

The influence and power of the individuals who form the NWO is well illustrated by Kindergarten and leading Round Table member [Lionel Curtis](#). In the face of rising German power in Europe and the increasing economic dominance of the U.S, he was chief amongst those who recognised the British military empire couldn't survive. In 1911 Lionel Curtis decided the British Empire should be transformed into an economic power called the British Commonwealth of Nations and that India should be given self-governance. India was granted independence in 1947 and the British Commonwealth of Nations established in 1948, exactly as Lionel Curtis and his [Round Table Group had decreed](#) more than 35 years earlier.

The difficulty many people have in grasping the way the NWO wield power often stems from their focus upon the long game. Their strategy isn't built upon quick profits or immediate successes. Like any well made plan they know things will go awry. But each move is a step along the path to the ultimate objective of a New World Order. It doesn't just span years but rather decades, across generations or even centuries. Inexorably moving towards the global economic and political dictatorship they are determined to create. Something they are currently very close to achieving thanks to their creation of the [climate emergency](#).

In 1910 Scottish borne U.S. industrialist Andrew Carnegie established the [Carnegie Endowment for International Peace](#) (CEIP.) Its trustees were all industrialists and financiers. Many were linked to the J.P.Morgan controlled American International Corporation (AIC,) which became the corporate giant American International Group (AIG) in 1919.

The board including Elihu Root (AIC and Carnegie lawyer), Cleveland H. Dodge (industrialist, arms manufacturer and financial backer of President Wilson), George W. Perkins (Morgan partner banker), G. J. Balch (AIC and Amsinck), R. F. Herrick (AIC), H. W. Pritchett (AIC.) Carnegie himself was the chairman of the U.S. Pilgrim Society and the CEIP was formed with a specific purpose:

*“.....dedicated to advancing cooperation between nations and promoting active international engagement by the United States.”*

The CEIP strongly influences U.S. foreign policy today, with close links to the U.S. State Department and more than a century long involvement with the U.S. political establishment. It is seen by most people (who know about it) as a force for peace through promoting international cooperation. This is an example of the duplicity of the NWO, and illustrates its standard modus operandi. By presenting the outward appearance of benevolent ‘foundations’ numerous groups like the CEIP work behind closed doors to achieve the societies geopolitical aims.

Foundations were made ‘tax exempt’ in the U.S. as ‘charitable’ organisations by the Revenue Act of 1917. This enabled the wealthiest people on Earth to fund their various social engineering projects without the need to pay any income tax. Income tax is only for the little people.

From the outset the CEIP identified how useful war could be both as a profit making exercise and also as a catalyst for social change. [Norman Dodd](#) served as chief investigator in 1953 for the U.S. Congress Special Committee on Tax Exempt Foundations. He was given access to CEIP records and what he discovered was very different from commonly held public perception. Dodd testified to the Reece Committee:

*“The trustees of the Foundation [CEIP] brought up a single question. If it is desirable to alter the life of an entire people, is there any means more efficient than war.... They discussed this question... for a year and came up with an answer: There are no known means more efficient than war, assuming the objective is altering the life of an entire people. That leads them to a question: How do we involve the United States in a war.”*

The CEIP was not formed in 1910 as a vehicle for peace. Quite the opposite. It is crucial to understand, for the NWO, war is merely a means to an end. It provides economic stimulus but also delivers huge social change. The use of war, conflict and armed insurrection are one of its primary methods to work towards the goal of one world government under the control of the corporate elite.

Once you know this, even mainstream interpretations of history render this glaringly obvious. Every significant conflict ends in a negotiated peace conference and every negotiation establishes further centralisation of power within larger regional bodies or intergovernmental organisations, consistently eroding sovereignty and consolidating power. [War is a racket](#), and [false flags](#), such as the sinking of the Lusitania which drew the U.S into WWI, are often favoured by the NWO to provide the necessary casus belli.

Following the end of WWI The NWO representatives, who formed the core of the U.S. and British delegations to Versailles, convened to create the system of international ‘think tanks’ that would enable them to rule from the shadows to this day. Under the direction of Lionel Curtis, the group of industrialists, financiers and political manipulators met to create the British Institute of International Affairs which received royal ascent to become the [Royal Institute of International Affairs](#) (RIIA) in 1920. Many ‘Pilgrims Society’ members were present at the initial Paris meeting, and the American branch was formed as the [Council on Foreign Relations](#) (CFR) in 1921, chaired by Elihu Root and funded by J.D.Rockefeller.

## **The New World Order Veil of Secrecy**

Yet, despite the continuing power of these organisations, which still shapes foreign policy and international relations today, it was the creation of the RIIA's '[Chatham House Rule](#)' in 1927, that enabled secret, undemocratic global governance to hide in plain sight. Historians have claimed the Chatham House Rule was designed to promote open dialogue among the most powerful people on the planet. We need only look at the current definition (following a couple of more recent revisions) to understand how misleading this interpretation is.

*“When a meeting, or part thereof, is held under the Chatham House Rule, participants are free to use the information received, but neither the identity nor the affiliation of the speaker(s), nor that of any other participant, may be revealed.”*

This enabled the creation of the '[Deep State Milieu](#).' A global network of power brokers who can hide in the open thanks, in no small measure, to the Chatham House Rule. Only a very few journalists and researchers attempt to break down this wall of silence. Doing so will almost certainly result in them being labelled as '*conspiracy theorists*,' a free fall career trajectory or worse.

The groups who hide behind the Chatham House Rule include the Council on Foreign Relations, the Trilateral Commission, the RIIA, the Bilderberg Group, Le Cercle and others. Many older elite societies have incorporated it into their discussion 'rules,' such as the Knights of Malta, Skull and Bones, the Pilgrims Society, Round Table groups and more. Similarly, international corporations and financial institutions use it, as do government steering committees, policy advisory boards and especially boards of directors. That this has been sold to the



public as an aid to ‘open and transparent’ decision-making is hilarious.



RIIA Think Tank – LOL.

While the rule itself isn't enforceable by law, any organisation, including government, can cite it as a matter of policy. Anyone who breaches it will face disciplinary action. When the people at the meeting, enforcing the policy, are able to buy governments that 'discipline' is not something easily ignored. No matter who you are.

Effectively it means the most powerful, wealthiest people on Earth can meet to discuss whatever plans they may have without any public scrutiny. In order to maintain this hidden agenda the MSM have to be entirely complicit, never asking difficult questions and always respecting the Chatham House rule. This they do without exception, usually because the people who own the MSM are also members of the various Deep State organisations that form the New World Order.

## **New World Order Wars**

Based upon the CEIP recognition that war is the most effective vehicle for mass social change, the NWO used their global corporations, the political parties they funded, the leading politicians they corrupted and their [international banking cartels](#) to create the economic, political and social conditions that led to WWI. Intentionally pushing the planet towards catastrophe in order to bring about their desired outcome.

In addition they funded the Russian revolution to ensure they retained access to future Soviet markets and secure their investment no matter who won the war. However, following the Treaty of Versailles they recognised that further work needed to be done. Therefore they continued their project to create a one world dictatorship by starting WWII.

Essentially the NWO loaned Germany the money to pay the reparations following WWI, ensuring Germany owed them, not sovereign nations, their debt. Thus placing the German economy entirely in their control. They then created industrial and manufacturing cartels within Germany, with the money administered by the banks they owned making themselves the primary beneficiaries of their own loans and further consolidating control of the German economy. Next, they used their subsidiary industrial cartels to rebuild the German military and finance the rise of the Nazis.

Once the fascists were in power, they funded their war effort against the Allied Nations who they were also financing during WWII. [They ran both sides of the war](#) from their secure headquarters in neutral Switzerland and, when WWII

ended, they used the vast profits they had made from the deaths of more than 60 million people to finance another attempt at establishing a one world government in the shape of the United Nations.

I recognise this is probably not the history you are familiar with. However, once again, the evidence which proves this to be the case is overwhelming. All of which you can [read about here](#).

Just as WWI led to the creation of the failed league of Nations so WWII led to the establishment of the United Nations. It established a framework for world government but has yet to formally supersede the sovereignty of the member nations.

The next logical step for the NWO, on its road to the global capitalist / collectivist hegemony, was to create power blocks which genuinely destroyed national sovereignty. The economic control of the failed USSR project was a reasonable attempt but war in Europe provided the NWO the perfect opportunity to take a big step forward.

For the first time they were able to create an intergovernmental organisation, centrally administered by an unelected cabal, controlled by its own central bank, which managed many of the world's richest economies. Today we call that project the European Union (EU) and the Deep State Milieu were at the heart of its creation.

Read [The New World Order and the European Union](#) to find out more.

## ***Chapter 2: New World Order War Profits***

We are told WWI started as a result of the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife in Sarajevo on June 28, 1914. In less than a month the Austro-Hungarian empire declared war on Serbia, starting a global conflict that cost 15 million lives.

Decades before WWI began, the [New World Order](#) recognised their global domination plans were jeopardised by German and Russian industrial and economic power. First and foremost Germany needed to be destroyed. However, the British establishment knew that Britain's maritime power alone wouldn't get the job done and were concerned about Germany's growing naval capability. They needed considerably larger land forces if they ever hoped to defeat the German military in a European war.



Edward VII: NWO Agent

They required the [support of both France, Russia](#) and most importantly the U.S. to be certain of defeating Germany. However, having narrowly averted a war with France in 1895 Anglo-French relationships weren't good. So King Edward VII (close confidant of Lord Esher, [Pilgrims Society](#) and NWO 'Society of the Elect' member) was dispatched to do some bridge building. In April 1904 Britain and France signed the 'Entente Cordiale' and the Anglo-Russian Entente on 31 August 1907. This was called the '[Triple Entente](#).' It was supposedly based upon trade and shared interests of empire. However, at the same time, Britain agreed a mutual security pact with France. Foreign Secretary Sir Edward Grey later referred to these as '[conversations](#).'

In order to strike a deal with Russia, Britain offered them Constantinople and exclusive control of the Black Sea Straits. Csar Nicholas II had long wanted to secure Russian control over naval access to the Mediterranean, en route to the

Southern Atlantic. However, neither the British NWO elites nor their U.S. counterparts, had any intention of allowing this. They had very different plans for Russia.

By 1910 the NWO had carefully selected and secured the compliance of politicians in each of the major political parties; they had established control of British and U.S. foreign policy, irrespective of government; they had recruited the increasingly influential press-barons into their ranks and could influence all avenues of information to create and control public opinion. Their funding of university chairs, scholarships and lecturing posts gave them a complete monopoly over the writing and teaching of history and political science. They controlled the British Foreign Office, the U.S. State Department, the British Colonial Office and were deeply embedded in the civil services of both countries. The British War Office and the Committee of Imperial Defence were theirs. They controlled the U.S. War Department and Navy Department, completely dominating the military establishment on both sides of the Atlantic.

British democracy was already a farce. A sop for the masses in order to keep them interested in something which had no practical significance, namely party politics. 'Bread and circuses.' In truth, since the mid 19th century, British politics were controlled by a small group of elite families and their chosen establishment. The sometimes brutal struggle for power was real enough, but it had nothing to do with partisan loyalties. When the Conservatives lost power on 1905, Lord Alfred Milner had already selected their Liberal Successors. Herbert Asquith (Earl), Richard Haldane (Viscount) and Sir Edward Grey were chosen by Milner. All imperialists, all establishment and all with close ties to the NWO. Grey moved into the Foreign Office and Haldane the War Office. Within two years Asquith was Prime Minister. Campbell-Bannerman's 1906 landslide Liberal election victory meant nothing to the NWO. They controlled all sides of the board.

Milner set about a concerted global propaganda campaign, ably assisted in

Britain by Viscount Northcliffe (Alfred Harmsworth,) a press baron and propagandist who brought media to the masses through his newspapers the Mail, Mirror and the Times. While Northcliffe flooded Britain with anti-German propaganda, Milner set about securing international military support from the far reaches of the empire. He convened the Colonial Conference in 1907 and heaped praise upon the Australian and New Zealand establishment, securing a fundamental reorganisation of their military, aligning them firmly to the 'mother country.' Milner also undertook a wide-ranging tour of Canada in 1908, proclaiming them a shining example of loyalty to the empire. He convened the 'Imperial Press Conference' in 1909, inviting more than 60 influential journalists, editors and press barons from across the British Empire to ensure they were of one opinion. He visited munitions and armaments factories in Manchester and the Glasgow shipyards, building the new Australian navy. All the time consistently increasing public fear of the looming German threat and extolling the glory of empire.

As Austria squared up to Serbia, adhering to the Milner Group's plan, Russia started huge troop deployments on Germany's eastern front with the full support of London and Paris. The French mobilised on Germany's Western border and, despite Kaiser Wilhelm's pleas to his cousin, Czar Nicholas II, to stand down his army, war was soon inevitable. Boxed in, Germany had little option but to mobilise their army as a defensive measure. Germany were the last major power, not the first, to mobilise in mainland Europe prior to WWI.



Sir Edward Grey

Maintaining the pretence of parliamentary democracy Sir Edward Grey told parliament that war wouldn't be declared without a parliamentary vote. However, he knew that Belgium presented the Germans their only realistic hope of outflanking the amassed French Forces. Even for Germany, a toe to toe fight with Russia was highly undesirable. The vote never came as Germany invaded Belgium, just as Milner knew they must, in August 1914. The NWO had their [war to destroy German power](#) and establish control of Europe.

The U.S. public had no desire to get involved. In 1914, President Woodrow Wilson declared U.S. neutrality. However, the NWO had already seized control of the economy through the [Federal Reserve Act](#), a year earlier, in preparation for the war. J.P.Morgan made £2.3 billion (an astronomical sum in 1913) in loans to the Allied Nations of Britain, France and Russia. The banking cartel, who owned the Fed, were heavily invested in the project to seize German power. These loans then




enabled the Allied Nations to buy arms and military equipment from the U.S. manufacturers for corporate war profits.[36]

Despite their immense wealth, the U.S. financial elite couldn't risk a German victory either. The U.S. entry into the war was required. The NWO also had plans to capitalise on social and political changes sweeping through Russia. Destabilising Russia in the short term made U.S. entry into the war even more vital. However the American electorate were largely opposed to joining what they saw as a European conflict. The will of the U.S. people needed to be changed. Therefore, in an attempt to shift U.S public opinion, the NWO elites, including Pilgrim Society member and First Lord of the Admiralty Winston Churchill arranged ostensibly a [false flag](#) attack upon the J.P Morgan owned flagship the Lusitania.

However, while the loss of American lives on the Lusitania moved public opinion the nation was still divided with a slight majority in favour of maintaining U.S neutrality. The irony that surrounds the U.S.' entry into the war in April 2017 is remarkable. British intelligence intercepted a telegram from the German Foreign Minister (Arthur Zimmerman) urging the Mexican government to fight the U.S. This was widely perceived by the American people as a British hoax. A 'conspiracy theory' in modern terms. It wasn't, Zimmerman really did send the telegram, the Mexicans were totally bemused by it, but they received it nonetheless. Woodrow Wilson consequently declared war on Germany on the 6th April 2017.

Despite the fact that Wilson was elected in 1916 promising to keep America out of the war he did everything he could to ensure the opposite. This was largely because Wilson was wholly owned by the world banking cartel. Wilson's opponent in 1916, Charles Evans Hughes, was wary of being seen as a warmonger, but a Republican victory would have certainly led to a U.S. declaration of war. Similarly, thanks in part to the duplicity of Wilson, Democrat success produced exactly the same outcome. No matter which way the U.S. electorate voted the

powerful bankers, industrialists and corporation owners of the NWO had already decided the U.S. would be involved. The wishes of the U.S. population made no difference at all. The NWO never 'loose' elections.



Prof. Carroll Quigley

Professor Carrol Quigley, who wrote the definitive exposé of the transatlantic corporate hegemony in his work ['Tragedy and Hope'](#), wasn't necessarily averse to the objectives of the NWO but rather questioned their methods, described the NWO view of party politics he wrote:

*"The argument that the two parties should represent opposed ideals and policies, one, perhaps, of the Right and the other of the Left, is a foolish idea acceptable only to the doctrinaire and academic thinkers. Instead, the two parties should be almost*

*identical, so the American people can 'throw the rascals out' at any election without leading to any profound or extreme shifts in policy."*  
[Carroll Quigly – *Tragedy and Hope* – p1247]

At the same time, April 1917, investigative journalist George Creel created the 'Committee on Public Information' (CPI,) with [public relations](#) experts Edward Bernays at the helm. They used their new psychological warfare techniques to win over public opinion, producing an almost total shift in perception. They played upon peoples emotions using slogans like *"Remember the Lusitania, it is Your Duty to Enlist Today."* Freedom of speech was curtailed, and any dissent destroyed by the Espionage Act of 2017. Section 3 of the Sedition Act 2018 outlawed any criticism of the banks. If anyone said anything which questioned or undermined investment in war bonds, bank loans, security trading or *"any thing or things, product or products, necessary or essential to the prosecution of the war,"* they could be fined and imprisoned for up to 20 years.

While the NWO's objectives are geopolitical, social and cultural they are not politically partisan. Members are drawn from both the right and the left of the political spectrum. Professor Quigley stated:[15]

*"There does exist, and has existed for a generation, an international anglophile network which operates, to some extent, in the way the radical Right believes the Communists act. In fact, this network, which we may identify as the Round Table Groups, has no aversion to cooperating with the communists, or any other group, and frequently does so."*  
[Carroll Quigly – *Tragedy and Hope* – p950]

One of the things the NWO were investing in was the Russian Revolution.[43] Both the extreme right and left of the political spectrum were, and are, collectivist. Nazis (National Socialists) and Communists alike advocated extreme

centralised political power in order to operate planned economies, through force if necessary. They both required a monopolistic control of both the economy and society, as do the NWO.

U.S. financial interests had long supported the revolutionary forces inside Russia. Wall Street tycoon Jacob Schiff (head of Kuhn, Loeb and Company) funded influential journalist George Kennan to go to Japan in 1904 to radicalise Russian P.O.W's during the Russo-Japanese war. Kennan later said he had convinced the Japanese authorities to support revolution inside Russia, and was allowed to distribute revolutionary literature and pamphlets among the P.O.W's. Upon his return Kennan was instrumental in popularising support for the revolutionaries in the U.S.

Following the February Revolution that overthrew the Russian Czar, on March 23rd 1917, a huge meeting was held in Carnegie Hall in New York to celebrate the Czar's abdication. Kennan wrote the following in the New York Times published on March 24th 1917:

*“The movement was financed by a New York banker you all know and love, and soon we received a ton and a half of Russian revolutionary propaganda. At the end of the war 50,000 Russian [Russo – Japanese P.O.W's] officers and men went back to their country ardent revolutionists. The Friends of Russian Freedom had sowed 50,000 seeds of liberty in 100 Russian regiments. I do not know how many of these officers and men were in the Petrograd fortress last week, but we do know what part the army took in the revolution.”*

During the meeting, a telegram from Jacob Schiff was read out to the cheering crowds. It read:

*“Will you say for me to those present at tonight’s meeting how deeply I regret my inability to celebrate with the Friends of Russian Freedom the actual reward of what we had hoped and striven for these long years.”*

Of course the international bankers weren’t in the least bit interested in ‘Russian freedom,’ what they wanted was access to its huge natural resources which had been tightly controlled in Czarist hands. The New York Times reported there had been a rise in Russian transaction in the London markets prior to the revolution. Barely able to contain his joy, Jacob Schiff wrote his enthusiastic support for the revolution in the NY Times. The Wall Streets bankers funding of the bolsheviks was further substantiated through the research of Professor Antony C. Sutton in his book [Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution](#).

The money behind the NWO was already global by 1917. Max Warburg ran the Warburg Banking House in Germany. Max advised the Kaiser to allow Lenin safe passage from Zurich to Petrograd in a ‘sealed train.’ In the U.S. his brother Paul protected the families interests in New York. These were both fronts for the London based banking giant N.M Rothschild & Sons.

Leon Trotsky briefly lived in New York during early 1917. He earned \$15 per week as a writer. When he left for Russia in March, he was arrested en-route in Canada with \$10,000 of U.S. gold in his possession and a passport issued by Woodrow Wilson. Paul Warburg was a close advisor of Wilson’s. London then instructed the Canadians to release Trotsky and provide him passage to Russia. The U.S. & Britain and Germany were supposedly at war, yet all three governments apparently collaborated to ensure the key revolutionaries, Lenin and Trotsky, arrived safely in Russia at the right moment.[50] Not because the people’s elected governments were working together, but because the agents of the NWO were.



W.B.Thompson

Prior to U.S. entry into the war, Czarist Russia had been extensively financed by the National City Bank, controlled by Stillman and Rockefeller interests, and the Guaranty Trust, controlled by Morgan interests. When the Bolshevik revolution came in November 1917, U.S. industrialist and financier William Boyce Thompson (a director of the Federal Reserve) had already funded and put in place an American Red Cross mission in Russia that was staffed predominantly by bankers and lawyers. The Red Cross mission, which had little to do with the Red Cross, was a front to enable the distribution of funds for the revolution. J.P. Morgan Company cabled \$1 million dollars to National City Bank in Petrograd (now Saint Petersburg) in November 1917. The only bank exempted under the Bolshevik's nationalisation decree.

Thompson left Petrograd in December, leaving his Deputy Raymond Robins in charge of the Russian mission. Thompson then set about drumming up support for the Bolsheviks. His first meeting, accompanied by Thomas Lamont (a J.P Morgan associate,) was in London with Liberal Prime Minister Lloyd George. The Prime Minister was already controlled by international arms dealer Sir Basil Zaharoff and, like most leading British politicians, founding member of the 'society of the elect' Lord Milner. Both Zaharoff and Milner supported the revolution.

Thompson and Lamont easily convinced Lloyd George that Lenin and Trotsky were essentially anti-German and that Russia was likely to become a neutral power under the Bolsheviks. The UK government's primary fear was that Germany would exploit the turmoil in Russia. The subsequent report convinced the British War Cabinet to support the Bolsheviks. Lord Milner already had an agent in Russia, Bruce Lockhart, who was instructed to covertly support the revolution. Effectively, Thompson provided diplomatic and political influence for Lenin and Trotsky among Western government and financiers.

Thomas D. Thacher (Wall Street lawyer and Russian Red Cross mission member,) who was directly employed by Thompson, sent a cable to British media baron Viscount Northcliffe outlining the propaganda he should publish:

*".....the fullest assistance should be given to the Soviet government in its efforts to organize a volunteer revolutionary army."*

All of this is totally at odds with mainstream historical interpretations, which is why it is ignored. Nonetheless, why would a Wall Street & London City banking cartel support a revolution whose stated aim was to destroy them? The big prize was German economic power and the big fear was German economic influence in Soviet Russia. Milner, Morgan, Rockefeller, Rothschild and Thompson et al.

wanted to capture Soviet markets and resources, but more importantly they wanted to stop Germany doing the same.

In 1920, H.G Wells (leading members of the Fabian Society and a founding member of the Round Table Group) spent time in Russia at the invitation of the Russian Trade Delegation. Also present was F.A. Vanderlip, president of National City Bank, and part of the 1910 Jekyll Island Group who drafted the Federal Reserve Act. Vanderlip was busy negotiating trade concessions with the Bolsheviks while Wells, remarking upon the large number of Wall Street capitalists in Russia at the time, wrote:

*“. . . Big business is by no means antipathetic to Communism. The larger big business grows the more it approximates to Collectivism. It is the upper road of the few instead of the lower road of the masses to Collectivism.”*

At the Genoa Conference in 1922, The Western Powers tentatively acknowledged the legitimacy of the Soviet Union in return for some debt restructuring. History records the Genoa Conference largely as a failure. It wasn't so for the bankers. It led to the USSR signing credit agreements with German (Weimar Republic,) French, British and U.S. private banks within 5 years.[51] Given that the bankers were opposed to German influence this seems like another failure. However, by 1922, the NWO already controlled Germany and its destiny.

After WWI, the Paris Peace Conference at Versailles in 1919, set about dividing the spoils of war. The main focus was to cripple Germany. This was achieved by seizing German industrial capacity and imposing severe reparation payments and both economic and military restraints upon Germany. It also saw the first attempt to establish a world government, in the form of the League of Nations. Mainstream history suggests the League of Nations sprang from Point 14 of Woodrow Wilson's '14 Points.' [52] In reality Wilson didn't write them. Wilson, his



administration and his delegation to Paris, were completely dominated by the NWO financiers.

Wilson appointed Paul Warburg (vice chairman of the Federal Reserve and Rothschild representative) as his chief economic advisor at the conference, he brought banker Bernard Baruch and Edward Mandell House (his confident and economic hitman for the NWO bankers) as his personal advisory team. He didn't invite a single congressional Democrat to attend, just bankers and their entourage. Both Ray Stannard Baker, Wilson's official biographer and Charles Seymour, House's biographer, later confirmed the bankers handed Wilson his 14 points, only allowing Wilson to redraft the document using his own phraseology. The League of Nations was purely a NWO project.

By 1919, the Anglo-American banking cartel had seized total control of both U.S. and British 'democratic governments.' A power they have never relinquished. The League of Nations itself was a disaster. Sovereign national governments had just sold their populations the idea they needed to die in order to defend their countries. Convincing the survivors they now needed to give up that sovereignty was too hard a sell [even for Edward Bernays](#). However, as ever, the NWO were already planning ahead.

The Treaty of Versailles has been widely criticised by mainstream historians for creating the economic conditions that led to the rise of the National Socialists in Germany. While there is a lot of truth to this interpretation, once again, it overlooks that the Nazi's could not have established the Third Reich without the assistance of the Anglo-American international banking cartel (the NWO.) The creation of the economic circumstances within Germany during the 1920s and 30s which facilitated the building of the Wehrmacht[58] has once again been interpreted as a series of mistakes, accidents or the product of 'short-sightedness.' The consistent use of this 'reasoning,' whenever evidence emerges that reveals the bankers financing of all sides in major conflicts, tells us much

about who controls the mainstream history we read. Frankly, it's wearing very thin.

For example, the post WWII U.S. Senate hearing into 'what went wrong,' sometimes referred to as the Kilgore Committee, stated:[59]

*"The United States accidentally played an important role in the technical arming of Germany. Although the German military planners had ordered and persuaded manufacturing corporations to install modern equipment for mass production, neither the military economists nor the corporations seem to have realized to the full extent what that meant."*

Yeah, right!

Yet this is the interpretation almost universally accepted by the academic establishment. The evidence shows this was far more than an innocent mistake. It suggests the NWO banksters knew exactly who the Nazis were, assisted their rise to power, funded their war effort and profited both economically and strategically from WWII by financing both the Axis and the Allies. Let's consider the 'coincidental' string of banking cartel 'accidents' that led to the creation, funding and arming of the Nazis.

Firstly, there's the Treaty of Versailles itself which practically obliterated the German economy, largely due to the unnecessary burden of vast reparation payments. The Allies demanded annual repayment equivalent to a quarter of Germany's entire yearly export earnings. Understandably Germany couldn't meet the repayments so Belgium and France used this as an excuse to occupy the German centre of industrial production, the Ruhr. With the loss of their productive economy, the German people had no chance. This pushed the German

economy into hyperinflation and the population towards desperation and hunger. A perfect breeding ground for extremism.



J.P.Morgan

In 1924 the Allies tasked a group of bankers to restructure the German repayments. In return the Belgians and the French ceased their occupation of the Ruhr. A team led by U.S. banker Charles G. Dawes and J.P.Morgan backed industrialist Owen Young (president of the U.S. General Electric Company – GEC) created The Dawes Plan.[61] This made a series of loans, from U.S. corporate investors, to Germany. The loans were administered through the so called ‘Committee of Experts.’ Leading members of the U.S. committee delegations included J.P. Morgan, T. W. Lamont (a Morgan partner) and T. N. Perkins (a

Morgan banker.) The German committee delegations were led by Hjalmar Schacht (president of the Reichsbank – Germany’s Central Bank,) Carl Melchior (German banker) and A. Veogler (German industrialist for the steel giant Stahlwerke Vereinigte.)

The 1924 Dawes Plan required that Germany use the loans to produce exports to be used as payment. The 1928 ‘Young Plan’[62] required additional monetary repayment. German bonds were held by Wall Street financiers, who issued them to private U.S. investors, in order to make profit. Effectively Germany was mortgaged to U.S. private commercial interests.

The Dawes plan created three German industrial cartels each with boards dominated by U.S. (NWO) financiers and their representatives. Dillon- Read Co, Harris, Forbes & Co and National City Company were the primary investors. Allgemeine Elektrizitäts Gesellschaft (German General Electric – A.E.G,) Internationale Gesellschaft Farbenindustrie A.G (I.G. Farben) and Vereinigte Stahlwerke (United Steelworks) were the primary beneficiaries. Both the investment and industrial cartels were controlled by the Morgan-Rockefeller investment bankers. The New World Order again controlling all sides.

I.G Farben produced the base chemicals required for industrial production. Its economic power alone wasn’t the mechanism by which it could control pre-war and wartime German industry. Both the Weimar Republic and the Third Reich were dependant upon on it for industrial productivity. Similarly, Vereinigte Stahlwerke had a greater pig iron capacity than all other German steel producers combined.

I.G Farben and Vereinigte Stahlwerke collaborated to control the German war effort through their control of coal tar and chemical nitrogen. I.G Farben needed Vereinigte Stahlwerke’s monopoly of the coking process and Vereinigte

Stahlwerke needed I.G. Farben's chemical nitrogen. By working together between 1937 – 1938 they produced 95% of all German explosives. I.G Farben also worked closely with U.S. Standard Oil (Rockefeller owned) to produce synthetic petroleum (gasoline) both prior to and throughout WWII.

All of this was financed by Wall Street, however Morgan-Rockefeller investment interests didn't stop at controlling German heavy industry. Their subsidiaries also helped German and Nazi manufacturing. Opel, a wholly owned subsidiary of General Motors (controlled by J.P. Morgan investors) and Ford A. G. (a subsidiary of the Ford Motor Company) produced the vast majority of Nazi tanks. In fact, General Motors, Ford, General Electric, DuPont and a number of other U.S. Companies supported the Nazi war effort.

The NWO capitalists who owned these companies, represented predominantly by J.P. Morgan firm, the Rockefeller Chase Bank and the Warburg Manhattan bank (Rothschild) were intimately involved in Hitler's rise to power. For example, the directors on the I.G Farben board approved 400,000 RM loan to Hitler's political fund in 1933.

The NWO banking cartel also controlled the Western military industrial complex. Electrical plants were obviously a major target for allied bombing raids on Germany. However, facilities owned by NWO corporations International General Electric (A.E.G) and International Telephone and Telegraph (I.T.T) were avoided, as far as possible. The ones destroyed were Brown Boveri at Mannheim and Siemensstadt in Berlin, because the NWO bankers didn't own them. More than 20,000 British citizens died in London during the German 'Blitz' bombings raids. The Rockefeller owned U.S. standard Oil sold the Luftwaffe the tetraethyl lead additive that enabled their bombers to fly.



I.G.Farben HQ 1941

During the years of the Third Reich, the I.G Farben corporation grew into a monster, rapidly expanding into the world's first example of what we would today call 'Big Pharma.' It owned coal mines, power plants, banks, research units and many other commercial enterprises. As the end of WWII approached, many key records were destroyed by the Nazis. However, a post-war investigation by the U.S. War Department concluded:

*“Without I. G.’s immense productive facilities, its intense research, and vast international affiliations, Germany’s prosecution of the war would have been unthinkable and impossible.....The proof is overwhelming that I. G. Farben officials had full prior knowledge of Germany’s plan for world conquest and of each specific aggressive act later undertaken.”*

I.G Farben was a global corporation which not only responded to Nazi requests it actively promoted and initiated many Nazi projects; it acted as a Nazi global intelligence gathering network (primarily through industrial espionage) and was instrumental in the rapid development and expansion of the German military. The U.S. directors of American I.G, a wholly owned subsidiary of I.G Farben (which was itself built and owned by NWO bankers,) included C.E. Mitchell (chairman of National City Bank and the Federal Reserve Bank of New York,) Edsel B. Ford (president of Ford Motor Company,) W.C. Teagle (director of Standard Oil) and Paul Warburg (first member of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and Rothschild representative.)

I.G Farben developed, manufactured and distributed the lethal 'Zyklon B' used by the Nazis to exterminate people in their concentration camps.

An essential component of both the Dawes and Young plans was close coordination between the [central banks](#) involved in the deal. With further conflict planned, international financial relations needed to be protected. Sitting on the Young Committee, Hjalmar Schacht (Nazi financier) suggested the concept of the Bank for International Settlements (BIS) which was duly incorporated in 1930.

Throughout WWII bankers from across the world, including leading Nazi official Walther Funk, sat on its board of directors. It continued to meet, discuss and plan the post-war geopolitical reality it would control via a system of [economic punishment and reward](#). German, Japanese and Italian bankers sat next to British, Russian, French and U.S. bankers without any disagreement at all. Millions of war deaths were a practical irrelevance. Instead of buying standard government gilts the privately owned Central Banks (coordinated by the BIS) took in war bonds (wartime gilts) as securities to finance the both the Allies and the Axis. The BIS then gathered the profits from those loans after the war and divided it amongst their primary shareholders, the New World Order.

Towards the end of WWII, many politicians recognised the insidious influence of the BIS. They formally moved to dissolve it during the Bretton Woods conference in 1944. Despite the 1944 'political' agreement to end the BIS, it continued unchanged and the decision was reversed in 1948. The NWO don't care what elected politicians think.[89]

According to mainstream history all of this profit made from war and human suffering was the result of a string of unfortunate coincidences and mistakes. You are free to continue to believe this if you like.

Personally, in light of the evidence, I don't.



## **Chapter 3: The New World Order Balkanisation Business**

The Oxford English dictionary defines balkanisation as:

*[to] “Divide (a region or body) into smaller mutually hostile states or groups.”*

There are numerous examples of this process being foisted upon [targeted regions](#) and nations by global powers. In this article we will look at how the Western NATO aligned powers, most notably the U.S, UK and France have ‘balkanised’ the former Yugoslavia, Iraq and Libya. We will also consider why they do so and who benefits from the process. By doing so we may come to understand who is driving the policies that lead to the break up and subsequent economic exploitation of the victim nations.

## **Yugoslavia:**



Yugoslavia: Once a lovely place to Live.

The former nation state of Yugoslavia made a series of catastrophic mistakes. Firstly it maintained good international relations without aligning itself to either the Western or Eastern power blocks; it had reasonable economic growth and had industrialised successfully; it offered its citizens a decent living standard and gave them shares in the industries they worked in and owned; healthcare and education were free and standards were good; it had a thriving tourist industry and its trade relations were solid; it was an ethnically diverse nation with a number of different communities living in relative harmony; it wasn't free from problems but was managing them.


On the other hand, just like nearly every other nation on Earth it had significant debts. Though nowhere near as substantial as those of its European neighbours, it was in hock to the international banking cartels nonetheless. This is the case for nearly every nation state on Earth. With global national debt standing at just

over [\\$230 trillion](#), which is more than 3 times larger than the planet's GDP, national debt is almost a universal reality. This obviously begs the question who the world can possibly [owe the money](#) to?

Therefore, it goes without saying, Yugoslavia just had to be smashed to pieces and turned into a number of ethnically distinct, impoverished, mini states. It is not a conspiracy theory to suggest the balkanisation of the former Yugoslavia was something actively pursued by the U.S. and its western allies. It is a matter of historical fact.

In 1990 former head of the CIA, U.S. President George H.W Bush, convinced congress to pass the 1991 [Foreign Operations Appropriations Law](#). Following the end of the Cold War, Yugoslavia was no longer required as a buffer zone between the NATO states and their former Warsaw Pact adversaries, so its independent socialism would no longer be tolerated.

The Appropriations Law ended aid, trade and all credit agreements between Yugoslavia and the U.S. It cut of funding from the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank effectively calling in the loans. This made Yugoslavia bankrupt practically overnight. Furthermore, the legislation stipulated the U.S. would only resume credit agreements following elections in each of Yugoslavia's constituent republics; the U.S. would oversee all of them.



George Bush decided to destroy Yugoslavia and kill hundreds of thousands.

The Appropriation law also stated that only groups the U.S. State Department deemed to be 'democratic forces' would receive funding. Consequently, a number of right wing, ultra nationalists organisations emerged in the various republics as they were suddenly plunged into economic and social chaos. This led directly to the complete destabilisation of the whole region.

Between 1992 and 2001 a series of viscous conflicts and insurgencies unfolded. The horrors committed included the widespread use of 'ethnic cleansing', sectarian violence and warfare, genocide, deliberate starvation, the shelling and bombing of captive civilian populations, summary executions and war rape. Hundreds of thousands of people died, the majority during the Bosnian War between 1992 and 1995. An estimated 2.5 million refugees fled and another 2 million were internally displaced.

By creating the problems within the former Yugoslavia in the first place; by reacting to it by arming 'democratic forces' and flooding the conflict with [Islamist](#)

[extremists](#), the NATO powers were ultimately able to offer their desired 'solution' in the form of the Dayton Accords. The region was de-industrialised, the populations impoverished and set against one another. This created a lawless vacuum which today provides a European entry point for the illegal weapons, drugs and sex slave industries.


It also provides a largely unregulated environment from where arms, fighters and military equipment can be illegally shipped into war zones, such as Syria, in cases where 'certain powers' would rather keep such activity under the radar. Even better, the previously independent regional economy was made entirely reliant upon Western 'aid' and dependent nations were powerless to resist the building of the sought after Trans-Balkan oil pipeline. Corporate exploitation of the region could proceed unchecked.

This is the essential 'purpose' of balkanisation. By reducing the victim nation to rubble, western corporations benefit, not only from the procurement of arms by combatants during the conflict, but also from the loans and credit agreements established once hostilities have subsided. These loans then fund rebuilding contracts which are divvied up by compliant puppet governments, again for the profit of the corporations who usually spend billions lobbying governments to launch the conflicts that cause the destruction in the first place.

In the case of the former Yugoslavia global corporations quickly swooped in to make their money. The corporate gravy train started with 'the [Train and Equip Program](#).' This used \$500million of tax payer money, to openly funnel arms to what remained of the Bosnian army. This is just one example of the many ways societies are 'fleeced' via the direct transfer of wealth from the population to the 'elite.' U.S. 'voters' paid for the 'aid' program and the profits went directly into the pockets of the privately owned weapons manufacturers. War has always been a profitable business for the [New World Order](#).

By 1999 the EU estimated the rebuilding costs for Kosovo alone were \$4billion. This is another well practiced money spinner. Nations already destroyed by war are forced to borrow the ‘investment capital,’ at interests, so they can afford to pay international corporations to repair the infrastructure they’ve just blown up. Of course the terms of the loans and the contracts are entirely at the [banking cartel’s discretion](#) and usually involve seizing all of the target country’s natural resources. This ensures they can never afford to pay back the loans, and so become vassal states of the banks. The losers are always the people and the winners are always the venture capitalists.

### **Libya:**



Libya before and after NATO saved it.

Despite being the darling of the Western media for a few years in the mid 2000’s the Libyan dictator Colonel Gaddafi’s brutal end came following U.N Security

Council Resolution 1973 which enabled NATO (mainly British and French forces) to obliterate Libya with a carpet bombing campaign in 2011. While the former British Prime Minister [Tony Blair had schmoozed with Gadaffi](#) to grease the cogs of a £550 million Royal British / Dutch Shell gas deal with the dictatorship, what Gadaffi did next sealed his, and his country's fate.

Much like the government of the former Yugoslavia, Gadaffi tried to operate outside of the diktat of the global financial oligarchy and its [international banking cartel](#). He argued that the African Union should be free of European Union and U.S based financial control and attempted to establish an independent African Development Bank. Part of his plans included the creation of an [African gold backed currency](#) (the African Dinar) which would replace the petrodollar as the reserve currency for trading Libyan (and other African nations) oil. He proposed disentangling African trade from the Euro and the Dollar and, with significant inward investment from China already flowing into the country, Libya threatened to shift regional and potentially global financial structures.

In addition Gadaffi's control of the [Libyan oil and gas reserves](#), which are some of the best quality reserves in the world and present more than 2% of the global market, meant that global energy giants such as Exxon, ConocoPhillips and others had been forced to accept far less favourable deals than their shareholders were accustomed to, in order to simply remain in the Libyan market. With only an estimated 30% of Libyan reserves tapped, the golden egg of regaining control over Libyan energy resources was a mouth watering prospect for global corporations. When Gadaffi then made moves to create an independent reserve currency his days were undoubtedly numbered.

Of course that isn't what the politicians said, nor is it how the situation was reported by the MSM. In 2008 the voting world gave a collective sigh of relief when the great hope, Barrack Obama, was selected, sorry I meant 'elected.' He was a 'good man' who came to power promising peace. He achieved the historic

feat of being the first U.S. President in history to have officially [killed people on every single day](#) of his eight years in office. His words even won him a Nobel peace prize.



Barrack Obama: He won a ‘peace prize’ and killed someone every day of his presidency.

Some of his words included accusing Muammar Gaddafi of marching his army towards Benghazi, the centre of the entirely peaceful ‘colour revolution.’ Obama claimed that when Gaddafi stated “*we will kill them like rats*” he was referring to the innocent street protestors of Benghazi. This enabled NATO to get U.N Security Council Resolution 1973 passed, authorising the ‘humanitarian’ bombing of Libya. Obama was lying through his teeth. Libyan forces were already engaged in fierce fighting with Western backed terrorist groups, like the [Libyan Islamic Fighting Group](#) (LIFG,) in the city of Misratah. Gaddafi’s rhetoric was [aimed at the terrorists](#).



It isn't really clear how the 2011 carpet bombing of Libya 'saved people.' Senior British army officer, General Sir David Richards, urged the U.N to allow NATO "to be freed from restraints that precluded attacking infrastructure targets." Screw the Geneva Convention basically. This may explain why, according to [NATO's own data](#), more than a third of their 9,700 'precision' air strikes were aimed at civilian targets, killing tens of thousands of rescued Libyans. The country was obliterated by the NATO bombing, led by Britain and France. Just like Yugoslavia and Iraq, it was rendered a failed and dysfunctional state.

All the talk of humanitarian bombing and saving Libyans was complete crap. Clearly the main focus of NATO's destruction of Libya were robbery, corporate exploitation of resources and the creation of an ISIS bridgehead from which to wage war in Iraq and Syria. You need look no further than the email exchanges of Obama's Secretary of State, Hilary Clinton, to recognise the fact. Her advisor [Sydney Blumenthal sent her an email](#) clearly outlining France's reasons for leading (with Britain) the bombing of Libya. This had come to his attention from French intelligence sources and it shows the bombing had nothing to do with saving anyone and everything to do with gold and the assertion of global dominance.

*"[the] .....quantity of gold and silver is valued at more than \$7 billion. French intelligence officers discovered this plan shortly after the current rebellion began, and this was one of the factors that influenced President Nicolas Sarkozy's decision to commit France to the attack on Libya. According to these individuals Sarkozy's plans are driven by the following issues:*

*a. A desire to gain a greater share of Libya oil production,*

*b. Increase French influence in North Africa,*

*c. Improve his internal political situation in France,*

*d. Provide the French military with an opportunity to reassert its position in the world,*

*e. Address the concern of his advisors over Qaddafi's long term plans to supplant France as the dominant power in [North Africa]"*

And, in specific reference to the gold reserves:

*"According to sensitive information available to these individuals, Qaddafi's government holds 143 tons of gold, and a similar amount in silver. During late March, 2011 these stocks were moved to SABHA (south west in the direction of the Libyan border with Niger and Chad); taken from the vaults of the Libyan Central Bank in Tripoli. This gold was accumulated prior to the current rebellion and was intended to be used to establish a pan-African currency based on the Libyan golden Dinar. This plan was designed to provide the Francophone African Countries with an alternative to the French franc(CFA)."*

In other words when the NATO powers discovered Gaddafi's plans to ditch the Franc (linked to the Euro) and create an African oil trading reserve currency, they immediately smashed the country to smithereens. Lo and behold, in what must be a first for an Islamist extremist insurgency, who fortuitously took advantage of NATO's bombing, one of the first things this loosely affiliated band of Islamist paramilitary organisations did, following the fall of the Gaddafi regime, was [form a central bank](#). They also established a national oil company which surprisingly was far more amenable to foreign investment and the involvement of global energy corporations than its predecessor under Gaddafi. Of course the new central bank also took control of the gold reserves.

Another extremely coincidentally result of NATO's carpet bombing was that the Islamist terrorists were free to organise themselves under the protection of a NATO enforced 'no fly zone.' This wasn't the only time [Western air strikes appeared to support Islamist terrorists](#). Not only was the effective creation of an ISIS safe-haven predictable, Canadian intelligence reports reveal that NATO member states were fully aware of the likely ramifications. They knew that groups linked to al Qaeda would [benefit from the air strikes](#). Which suggests the possibility it was an intended outcome, rather than simply another 'mistake.'

Similarly the British Government's 2016 Foreign Affairs [Select Committee report](#) was scathing. It stated:

*"In March 2011, the United Kingdom and France, with the support of the United States, led the international community to support an intervention in Libya to protect civilians from attacks by forces loyal to Muammar Gaddafi. This policy was not informed by accurate intelligence. In particular, the Government failed to identify that the threat to civilians was overstated and that the rebels included a significant Islamist element. By the summer of 2011, the limited intervention to protect civilians had drifted into an opportunist policy of regime change. That policy was not underpinned by a strategy to support and shape post-Gaddafi Libya. The result was political and economic collapse, inter-militia and inter-tribal warfare, humanitarian and migrant crises, widespread human rights violations, the spread of Gaddafi regime weapons across the region and the growth of ISIL in North Africa."*

Despite the harsh criticisms of the Canadian intelligence report, British Select Committee and others, the implication is always that support for the Islamists is an unfortunate byproduct military intervention. However [support for Islamist terrorist organisations](#) has been a long standing, consistent effect of Western foreign policy for many years. In addition the rise and operational [effectiveness of ISIS](#) again appeared to be a direct result of concerted policy. It stretches credulity

beyond any reasonable limit to maintain the idea that this was all simply the result of a combination of unfortunate errors.

### **Iraq:**



Iraq being saved by the U.S led coalition.

Again, in Iraq, we saw the balkanisation of a country into a war torn, dysfunctional collection of battling fiefdoms. Each engaged in struggles for supremacy against one another. This left the nation itself ripe for economic exploitation and allowed global corporations to capitalise on the mayhem. However, in the case of Iraq, there is an apparent link between the profitable failed state model of balkanisation and individuals intimately involved in the decision to launch the so called 'war on terror,' which has fine tuned balkanisation into a slick, globalist operation.

The U.S led coalition's puppet [Coalition Provisional Authority](#) (CPA) was set up as an interim Iraqi government following the U.S. 'victory' in the early summer of

2003. One of its first moves was to overturn Saddam Hussein's Ba'athist party's reliance upon economic central planning and allow foreign investment to flood into the country. With 'CPA Order 17' it decreed that all foreign investors and contractors were immune from prosecution in Iraq. It also took over the running of Development Fund for Iraq (DFI) which brought \$20billion into the country in the first year of the occupation alone. The Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund (IRRF) brought in an additional \$18billion in the same year. This meant huge reconstruction contracts for Western corporations. The accounting for this money was virtually non-existent and widespread allegations of corruption were the norm. Though, being immune from prosecution, that was of no concern to the Western corporations feasting at the trough.



Dick Cheney: Made a killing in every sense.

For example, in 2003, Kellogg Brown & Root (KBR) were offered a 'sole source

contract' to fix and operate all Iraqi oil wells. This meant they didn't need to bid for it, they were just handed the job. The value of the contract was worth an estimated \$7 billion. KBR were the construction subsidiary of the global corporation Halliburton. Vice president Dick Cheney (neocon 'hawk') had been its chief executive from 1995 to 2000. He stood down to become Vice President of the U.S.A. Cheney stated that he had no financial ties with Halliburton or KBR. None at all, apart from the \$2 million per year 'bonus' he received from them as 'deferred compensation.' He also held purchase options on Halliburton stock, whose military contract portfolio had grown as rapidly as their share price while he and his neocon chums were running the U.S. [Cheney absolutely denied any impropriety](#) or personal war profiteering. He declined to disclose his communications with Halliburton when asked to do so by Congress.

This failed state, profit model is undoubtedly what the western globalist powers (and the corporations who own them) [had in mind for Syria](#). Something which they haven't quite given up on yet. Russia and Iran's backing of the Syrian Government threw a major spanner in the works but it seems unlikely the U.S led coalition and its regional allies will give up on their balkanisation efforts without further destabilisation attempts. As evidenced by the destruction of the former Yugoslavia, Iraq and Libya this is a major revenue stream for the [global corporations who own the planet](#).

## ***Chapter 4: The New World Order Money Machine***

We've looked at how the New World Order make money out of conflict and war but what is the primary source of their growing wealth? The leading members of the NWO have historically been corporate leaders. Chief among them are the bankers, and it is through the bankers ability to create money out of nothing that the NWO can be assured of a never ending supply.

It is vital to understand that the [banksters](#) create money through lending, it did not exist until the customer agreed to take on the debt. The bank simply created it out of thin air by tapping some numbers into a computer and updating the account 'balance' of the borrower. They never physically held the money to lend in the first place, it exists only in their digital 'financial system,' not in reality. What's worse is that at least [97% of all money](#) (Fiat currency) is created this way. It is a scam.

By using the word '*bankster*' it must mean [I'm an antisemite](#) who believes in a global Jewish conspiracy to control the world's finances. This is, after all, the refrain of all those who claim any criticism of the international banking system must denote fascist tendencies. '*Bankster*' (a portmanteau of 'banker' and 'gangster') first appeared in the lexicon in the 1930's during the Pecora senate hearings investigating the 1929 Wall Street Crash. It was later popularised by the Austrian School economist, historian and political theorist Murray Rothbard. Rothbard was Jewish, as was his economist inspiration Ludwig Von Mises who was forced to flee Nazi occupation in Europe. Some have alleged that Rothbard was antisemitic because he argued for a precise definition of antisemitism and found merit in some of the ideas expressed by Charles Murray, Harry Elmer

Barnes and others. [This is nonsense.](#)

In reality, just like today, the ‘accusation’ of antisemitism was used to distract attention away from Rothbard’s economic ideas. Particularly his criticism of the Federal Reserve. As the historian [Antony C. Sutton](#) observed:

*“The persistence with which the Jewish-conspiracy myth has been pushed suggests that it may well be a deliberate device to divert attention from the real issues and the real causes.....What better way to divert attention from the real operators than by the medieval bogeyman of antisemitism?”*

This truth about money, you are not supposed to know, is that it is created virtually from nothing. Some people, we call bankers, are effectively licensed to print money (digitally.) This is legalised usury and it gives them immense power. When I say ‘banksters’ I’m not talking about your local bank teller or branch manager, nor even the rank and file executives or city floor traders, I am referring to the beneficial owners and major shareholders of the banks. In particular those who own central banks because, despite what we are told, they are privately owned.

With unlimited wealth at their fingertips the banksters form the core of the global elite as a result. They operate a kind of global ponzi scheme which, while not illegal under international law, has all the attributes of a criminal enterprise. It is not without justification that these individuals can and are referred to as banksters. It should also be noted that their influence over the judicial system is also without limit.

While the establishment they lead don’t want you to understand any of this, occasionally their representatives inadvertently let the cat out of the bag. Mervyn



King, the former governor of the Bank of England, [speaking in 2012](#) said:

*“When banks extend loans to their customers they create money by crediting money to their customers’ accounts.”*

However, once the bank has conjured the money out of thin air, the debtor (victim) still has to go and earn that equivalent amount, by selling their labour, in order to pay it back, plus interest. For every Dollar, Pound or Euro they pay back, the bank adds that to their own ‘liquidity’ and proceeds to lend at least ten times that amount out to their next victim. This means, in effect, the customers work for the banks but are never paid. The customers are the bank’s debt slaves. It is no coincidence the [etymological translation of ‘mortgage’ is ‘death pledge.’](#)

This is just the start of the banksters’ deception. Current economic theory suggests that central banks (the national banks that commercial banks use) create the money supply. This is supposedly a controlling mechanism of ‘monetary policy’ exercised by government. Theoretically the money issued by central banks, the ‘base money,’ sets a limit on the bank’s liquidity, thereby restricting the amount of money created by banks when they make loans. This is supposed to work through a monetary process called the [‘money multiplier.’](#)

If you deposit £1000 of your salary into your commercial bank account they assume you won’t need all your money in one go, the bank only keeps 10% as a reserve (in our example.) They then proceed to loan £900 of the ‘deposit’ to other people. The banks use your money as if it belongs to them (which it does.) When you check your balance and it states you’ve got £1000, the bank has already given £900 of it away, your balance are just some numbers on a screen. The bank have taken your money to make more profit for themselves.

Let's say the person who borrowed your £900 used it to buy a new TV. The TV store then deposits the £900 in their bank account. Their bank then repeats the process. It retains a reserve percentage, £90 (10%) and loans out the remaining £810. Therefore, the £1000 you earned by working has already generated £1710 (£900 + £810) of debt. This process is repeated, again and again, until your initial £1000 deposit has created £10,000 of debt in the economy. So the only money 'earned' in the 'real economy' was your initial £1000. The other £9000 is debt created by the banks for their profit.



There are three types of money. Cash is printed by permission of the central banks, i.e. The Bank of England, Federal Reserve, European Central Bank etc. It is 'sovereign money.' The second type is called 'Central Bank Reserves.' When banks transfer money between each other this is done electronically, as a function of central banking, using each banks 'Central Bank Reserves.'

For example, when you buy something online you instruct your bank to withdraw the correct amount from your account and deposit it in the sellers bank account. Commercial banks don't physically send cash to each other they just adjust their

balance sheets with the central bank. Your purchase reduces your bank's 'Central Bank Reserve' balance and the 'Central Bank Reserve' balance of the seller's commercial bank increases by the equivalent amount. 'Central Bank Reserves' are like electronic cash that only banks can use. This process of transferring money between different banks is called 'inter bank settlement.'

The third type of money is 'bank deposits.' This is your bank 'balance.' Remember this money has already been issued, in the form of credit, to other people many times over. It only exists as numbers on a computer screen, as a result of debt, and as a bank liability to you. It is a form of bank 'liability' because they theoretically owe you the equivalent cash amount, but it isn't cash itself. If you pay a bill by standing order the banks use inter bank settlement not your 'bank deposit' because that doesn't really exist as money (they've already used it to make loans.) It's just a fluctuating figure on a spreadsheet.

When you look in your bank account and it states you have £1000 'balance' but only a smaller amount 'available' this is due to the time it takes for the interbank settlement process to complete. Running this system on a national and international scale means millions of transactions occur every day. It would be unworkable if every single transaction was processed individually. So banks use 'multi-lateral net settlement.' This means many of the transactions are cancelled out.

Imagine you pay your £500 electricity bill from your Barclays account. Once you authorise the payment, it is transferred into the Lloyds account of the electricity company. However, at the same time a Lloyds customer buys a fridge and transfers £600 into the Barclays account of the store who sold it. Using the process of 'netting,' Lloyds simply pay Barclays the difference of £100 using their Central Bank Reserves. In this way millions of transactions are wiped out every day. This means the banks need only move a small percentage of the total value of all transactions.

Consequently, banks only hold a tiny fraction of customers deposits because most transactions effectively disappear during 'netting.' Just before the financial crash in 2008, the Royal Bank of Scotland had £700 billion of customers money showing in its account balances. But it only held £17 billion of reserves to settle payments. Posing the question, where did the other £683 billion of peoples earnings go? What had the RBS done with everyone's money?

When central banks create money to 'capitalise' a commercial bank the banksters don't drive an armoured vehicle, full of cash, to the bank's vault. The banksters simply increase the commercial banks Central Bank Reserves by the specified amount. Using the 'money multiplier' commercial banks retain a percentage reserve (in accordance with the 'regulations') and lend the rest of it to customers, creating both debt and additional money. Nonetheless, in theory, because each commercial bank has to retain reserves of 'base money' to meet its obligations to the central bank, the total amount of currency created by lenders is ultimately controlled by the central banks. Unfortunately, this doesn't work.


The money multiplier theory suggests that Central Banks can control the amount of money created in a couple of ways. Firstly they can change the reserve ratio commercial banks need to retain. At 10% it creates a tenfold increase in the money supply as banks create debt, at 20% a fivefold increase, 5% twenty times more and so on. The other way the Central Banks can supposedly create more money is by printing it as cash (sovereign money.) In theory if the Central Banks creates £1000 and puts that into the economy, by the time it's been through the money multiplier, it should generate no more than £10,000 of new 'base money.' However, this theory, taught to most economists, does not reflect reality.

Commercial banks don't wait for customer deposits to be paid in. They just 'assume' they will be paid. They are not responsive to the underlying drivers of the economy, they create them. Secondly many central banks don't set any reserve at all. There is no requirement for banks, in the UK for example, to retain

a minimum 'liquidity' amount of 'sovereign money' as a ratio of total lending. Instead, they can *'leverage'* it against their earnings. Banks 'earn' their money through interest on loans and speculation in the markets.

Fractional reserve banking is an idea that is hundreds of years old but, during the 1980s, thanks to the economic ideas associated with Reaganomics and Thatcherism, the banks minimum reserve levels were abandoned. They were instead required to meet the requirement laid out in the [Basel Capital Accords](#). This was the idea of the most powerful bank in the world, the privately owned [Bank for International Settlements](#) (BIS) based in Basel, Switzerland.

Whereas true fractional reserve banking required banks to hold a minimum reserve amount of 'sovereign money' and Central Bank Reserves, the Basel Accords set much lower requirements. The reserve percentage was reduced to 8% by the Basel-I agreement, but even this didn't have to be sovereign money issued by central banks. Commercial banks could instead buy government bonds (called 'gilts' – effectively shares in a nation's economic productivity) and use them as liquidity. Previously only central banks could do this. Lending, creating money out of thin air, became even easier for commercial banks. Instead of creating 90% of the money in the economy the privately owned banks could now create at least 92% of all [Fiat currency](#).



This increase in the money supply didn't mean the population were universally better off. [Far from it](#). The 1980s and 90s saw a marked growth in inequality. Largely due to rapid inflation, the poor saw no improvement at all, and the period was characterised by chronic unemployment and under-investment in essential infrastructure.

The middle class saw their relative share of wealth stagnate and start to decline as the new century began. All the economic growth resided in the top 5% of income earners, the so called 'Yuppies' (young urban professionals,) who were mainly investors and market speculators. They created the wealth by burdening the rest of society with crippling debt, while amassing increasing, personal fortunes.

The other 'upwardly mobile' sector was the construction industry, who profited from the mortgage debt of home-owners (assisted by government policies to encourage home ownership.) This caused the rapid expansion of an ultimately catastrophic housing price bubble. As credit started spiraling out of control, government was completely powerless to do anything about. They were not in control of the money supply, the banksters were.

The wild speculation of investors, fueled by virtually free money created by the banksters, inevitably led to a financial crash. Banks had taken mortgages and bundled them together as 'mortgage backed securities.' These bundles of mortgages were a type of financial product called '[derivatives](#).' The commercial banks sold these derivatives and, in doing so, removed the mortgage 'liabilities' off their accounts and onto those of the derivative buyer's. This freed up additional liquidity for commercial banks, because their liabilities dropped in comparison to their assets. So they increased the money supply even further by creating more debt.

These mortgage derivatives were supposedly based upon legally binding mortgage agreements and, due to the high interest returns built into the mortgage contracts, were attractive investments for people who manage pension funds, investment portfolios and [hedge funds](#). The problem was, huge numbers of these mortgages were mis-sold, by the banksters, to people who couldn't afford them. No matter what the law says, if you owe twenty times your annual salary, paying it back isn't an option for most people.

Starting in the U.S. in 2006, investors began to realise that mortgage backed securities were worth far less than the banks had told them. The banks had been handing out mortgages, regardless of anyone's ability to repay. Market confidence plummeted as people understood the banks had ripped them off. This caused runs on the banks as millions of people tried to withdraw their money. When RBS customers demanded theirs back, they realised the bank had already spent it by mis-selling worthless derivatives and wild speculations in the financial markets, which they had also just played a part in bankrupting.

RBS weren't alone, their situation was symptomatic of a disease infecting the entire banking system. However, because banks have the power to create the money in the economy, they simply told the governments to bail them out. Instead of pumping currency into the economy they sucked it dry. Government

were not in charge of the decision-making. Banks ordered them to tax their populations to protect their failed businesses. They also told them to create more money by using the central banks to produce more in a process called 'quantitative easing.' All of this money was created as national debt. The banks claimed it as their own and carried on business as usual.

If you doubt that banksters were in charge of government you only need to see how so called 'government' have responded since the banks caused the last global recession. Having recapitalised the banks with tax payers' hard-earned money, forcing millions into faux austerity, you would think, if governments were in charge, measures would have been taken to protect the economy against this happening again. There is no doubt that politicians knew full well what happened. Speaking in 2016 the UK Chancellor of the Exchequer George Osborne said:

*"The last time Britain faced an economic shock the banks were at the heart of the problem."*

This was certainly the case. However, he then added:

*"Thanks to the hard work of rebuilding the banks, making them stronger and safer, and the arrival of new challenger banks – banks and building societies are now part of the solution. The government gave the Bank of England new counter-cyclical capital buffer powers to support lending in the financial system in the good times and bad."*

In response to the financial crisis, in 2011, the banksters who own the Bank for International Settlements decided the best thing they could do was make it easier for themselves to create more money and more debt. The Basel III accord decreed



that banks needed to retain just 3% liquidity against their liabilities. Not only was this reduced to 3%, banks could include their projected profits as assets. Therefore, if the interest on a loan was more than 3% (and they always are,) they don't need any real 'liquidity' to create as much debt as they liked. They now have the power to create at least [97% of all money in the economy](#), purely as debt. Governments around the world have no say in the matter.

In response to this, in the UK, the Bank of England announced that they would require banks to reserve an additional 0.5% of capital. This was the 'counter cyclical buffer' Osborne referred to. In July 2017 the Financial Policy Committee of the Bank of England decided not to bother after all, and scrapped the idea.

[Derivatives](#) are 'financial products.' They are a type of financial 'security' based upon the value of an underlying asset. They are contractual, backed by international commercial law, and the price of the derivative depends upon the value of the assets it contains. For example, 'mortgage backed securities' were derivatives that were each worth the collective value of the mortgage agreements bundled together within them. However, bundling mortgages together isn't the only type of derivative. Stocks, bonds, commodities, currencies and other financial 'assets' are also used to create derivatives. These can then be traded on the exchanges in the financial markets.

Currently the worldwide derivatives market, you know, the thing that destroyed the world economy in 2007, is worth an estimated \$1.2 quadrillion, that's more than 10 times the size of the planet's Gross Domestic Product (GDP). This means, if you added up everything the world produces in a year, including all the bank deposits of all the people on earth, it would add up to 10% of the amount of money that bankers have invested in 'financial derivatives.' Some economists have argued this is an exaggerated calculation. [It's only about \\$550 trillion](#), according to the BIS, so only 5 times larger than the planet's GDP. Phew! That's OK then. In the UK alone, in 2015, the [UK's real debt stood at £15.8 trillion](#), more

than 8 times the size of the entire UK economy.

It gets worse.



The money we use is called Fiat currency. This means ‘let it be done’ and signifies that money is created by law. It is supposedly a function of government which they administer through the process of central banking. This is certainly the impression given by academia and the one most economists learn when they go to educational institutions which usually receive funding from huge philanthropic foundations such as the ‘Carnegie Foundation.’ The banks in other words.

Economic text books provide all sorts of complicated justifications to reinforce their view that Central Banking is a government led activity carried out in the public interest. However, as Einstein allegedly warned:

*“If you can’t explain it simply, you don’t understand it well enough.”*

Two highly influential economist's text books are 'Economics,' edited in 2009, by [Krugman and Wells \(K&W\)](#) and the 2011 edition of a book of the same name by [Mankiw and Taylor \(M&T.\)](#) Neither of them reference the fact that commercial banks create 97% of all money. Rather than address this issue, they offer all sorts of convoluted 'work arounds' which appear to deliberately avoid discussing the subject. They are also at pains to assert that central banks are somehow institutions of government. This is absolutely wrong.

Central banks are privately owned. You are simply deceived into imagining otherwise, though since the financial crash of 2007 more have come to recognise the reality.

In reference to the U.S. Federal Reserve bank (the Fed) K&W state:

*"...the legal status of the Fed is unusual: It is not exactly part of the U.S. government, but it is not really a private institution either."*

This is certainly 'unusual.' Terms like 'not exactly' and 'not really' mean nothing, and seem strangely out of place in a supposedly definitive text book. K&W appear unwilling to be specific, leaving budding economists none the wiser about the reality. However, they offer clues by stating that the Fed's board of directors are, *"from the local banking and business community."* They later qualify this statement by saying:

*".....the effect of this complex structure is to create an institution that is ultimately accountable to the voting public, because the Board of Governors is chosen by the president and confirmed by the Senate."*

This is highly misleading. Firstly it isn't a complex situation, it is really very

straightforward. Two thirds of the Fed's board of directors are selected by privately owned commercial banks and the other third, represented by the Board of Governors, though 'chosen' by the Senate (who the banksters spend billions funding and lobbying,) are also largely commercial bankers. The truth is [the Fed is controlled by private commercial banks](#) not the other way around, as suggested by K&W.

While extremely reluctant to even discuss how money is created, which is itself incredible given that these texts are supposedly about economics, both K&W and M&T insist that currency is created by central banks via the money multiplier. They both state that money is only created because central banks and customers 'deposit' money in commercial banks. By clinging to the false notion that banks need deposits, before they can create money, they suggest that commercial banks are merely 'intermediaries' in the creation of money, which is ultimately controlled by the central banks through issuing 'sovereign money.'

This is the opposite of the reality. Commercial banksters create money (at least 97% of it) by making loans, producing debt. Human beings then sell their labour, provide services, manufacture and trade goods, to work off the debt. Even if you have never taken a loan in your life, the money you earn is 97% debt based. It is all someone's debt. Without debt, it simply wouldn't exist. The economic text books also completely obfuscate the fact that central banks are also owned by private individuals. We don't have a monetary system we have a privately owned debt system controlled by banksters.

[Speaking in 2012 Jens Weidmann](#) (then president of the Deutsche Bundesbank – German Central Bank) argued that central banks were created by governments to create Fiat currency in order to fund government expenditure. He warned of the danger of government controlled central banks mismanaging the monetary system:

*“If we look back in history, we see that government-owned central banks were often created with the purpose of giving those governing the country free access to seemingly unlimited financial means.”*

At the same meeting of the ‘Institute for Bank-Historical Research’ in Frankfurt, a chief economist for the European Central Bank and Bundesbank, Otmar Issing, also spoke about ‘currency’ creation. He was discussing the idea of economist Friedrich August von Hayek that central banks should be disbanded and commercial banks allowed to issue currency in competition with each other. Like Weidmann, Issing completely avoided any reference at all to the fact that commercial banksters were already creating money. Furthermore, he maintained that central banking was essentially a function of government. This simply isn’t true.



In 1694 the Bank of England (BoE) was founded. It established the modern model of central banking still used today, though the first ever central bank was the Rothschild owned [Amsterdam Exchange Bank](#) formed in 1609. The bank took

gilts (government bonds) from the British government as 'securities' and issued currency in exchange.

This money was issued as a loan, fully repayable plus interest. Consequently, the government had to pay the BofE back all the money created by the central bank, plus interest at a rate stipulated by the individuals who owned the BofE. The only money governments have access to comes through taxation. So, when 'sovereign money' (cash) is created by central banks it exists as government debt secured by gilts. All money, even sovereign money, is debt.

[The Bank of England](#) was privately owned by its shareholders until 1946 when it was supposedly '*nationalised*' (taken into government ownership.) We are asked to believe that immensely wealthy individuals, who had the power to create all money, simply gave this power up to the government. This arrangement was little more than a transparent subterfuge to hide the fact that the BofE remained in private control.

Following WWII the British Government was practically broke and owed huge debts to U.S financiers. It certainly didn't have the capital to buy out the BofE. In order to 'buy' the bank the government were forced to issue bonds (gilts) to the shareholders in return for BofE shares. In theory this meant that the British Government could now receive a profit from issuing of Fiat currency (to itself) in exchange for more gilts. While the government were now the major shareholders of the BofE they were even deeper in debt to the former shareholders who still sat on the BofE board and still controlled the money supply. As these same people were also holding onto massive amounts of gilts, they now practically owned the UK economy. To give you some idea how preposterous the notion that the British Government 'own' the BofE is, you need look no further than the [BofE's own website](#) which states:

*“When the Bank was nationalised in 1946, it meant that it was now owned by the Government rather than by private stockholders. This gave the Government the power to appoint the Bank’s governors and directors, and to issue directions to the Bank. To date, the Government’s power to issue directions has not been used.”*

In other words the BofE has continued to operate its business without any interference from the British Government at all. In 1977 the BofE set up a wholly owned subsidiary private company called the Bank of England Nominees limited (BOEN Ltd.) Unlike every other private limited company in Britain, BOEN was uniquely protected by the [Official Secrets Act](#). It issued 100 shares to unnamed individuals which they purchased for £1 each. All other companies have to register with ‘Companies House’ and disclose their beneficial ownership (who owns them.) In 1976, then British Secretary of State for Trade, Edmund Dell, exempted BOEN from this requirement. You were simply not permitted to know who owned the Bank of England, but it wasn’t the British ‘elected government.’

Responding to researchers Freedom of Information requests about who owned BOEN the BofE wrote:

*“BOEN acts as a nominee company to hold securities on behalf of certain customers. It is a private limited company, incorporated in England and Wales.”*

‘Holding securities,’ and issuing sovereign money in return, is the primary business model of the BofE. Those ‘securities’ are government gilts. The BOEN articles of association stated its role was:

*“To act as Nominee or agent or attorney either solely or jointly with others, for any person or person’s, partnership, company, corporation, government, state, organisation, sovereign, province, authority, or public body, or any group or*

*association of them....”*

Following question in the British Houses of Parliament about BOEN, in 1977 Secretary of State Clinton Davis stated:

*“They will hold securities as nominee only on behalf of Heads of State and their immediate family, Governments, official bodies controlled or closely related to Governments, and international organisations formed by Governments or official bodies.”*

Therefore BOEN was a privately owned company that held government securities, on behalf of Heads of State and others, and acted as the government’s ‘agent’ within the business of the Bank of England. It’s supposed share value was £100. These were the same families who received the gilts in 1946 when the bank was supposedly nationalised. The ‘business’ of the Bank of England is to issue Fiat currency to both the government (in exchange for the gilts held by BOEN) and to privately owned commercial banks.

It is pointless to speculate who the BOEN shareholders were, though many did, because we were all barred from this information in our free and open democracy. The important issue is to understand that the act of creating sovereign money remained a privately owned, commercial enterprise.

BOEN was officially dissolved in 2017. This followed a change in the exemption it held under Sec 796 of the Companies Act 2006. As a consequence it was compelled to publish its full accounts, like all other companies. According to [BOEN accounts](#) it has carried out no business at all, traded nothing, returned no profit or loss and was entirely dormant for the 41 years of its existence.



While dormant companies aren't unusual, it is rather silly to believe that a company set up to hold government bonds on behalf of some of the richest people on Earth would never engage in the business for which it was established. Rather like the 'nationalisation' of the BofE in 1946, we are again asked to accept that, given this immense financial power, those who held it did nothing with it and made no profit at all. Presumably because they either couldn't be bothered or were squeamish about abusing their unimaginable wealth and influence. Unsurprisingly the BofE was granted full independence from government in 1997, though seeing as government has never used its supposed influence, you might ask independence from what?

Professor Carrol Quigley, in his influential work '[Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Time](#),' wrote:

*"The power of the Bank Of England and of its governor was admitted by most qualified observers. In January 1924, Reginald McKenna, who had been Chancellor Of The Exchequer in 1915-1916, as Chairman of the Board of The Midland Bank, told its stockholder: 'I am afraid the ordinary citizen will not like to be told that the banks can, and do, create money...And they who control the credit of the nation direct the policy of Governments and hold in the hollow in their hands the destiny of the people'....."*

Quigley also noted:

*".....the powers of financial capitalism had another far-reaching aim, nothing less than to create a world system of financial control in private hands able to dominate the political system of each country to the economy of the world as a whole."*

When 'Tragedy and Hope' was first published, the publisher was quickly bought

out and all the original plates and copies were destroyed. Book burning in action. Thankfully it was too late. Enough copies had already been sold and it still exists today. The importance of Tragedy and Hope cannot be overestimated. Quigley was an insider who was granted access to the inner workings of the elite as their chosen biographer. The book he wrote, at more than 1500 pages, revealed far more than his subjects desired. It takes some getting through, but if you are interested, there is a much easier to read, accurate summary called [Tragedy and Hope 101](#).

The Federal Reserve Bank of the United States is also privately owned. In 1910 a group of influential bankers including representatives from the Rockefeller, Warburg, JP Morgan and Kuhn, Loeb & Company and other private corporate interests met on Jekyll Island in Georgia where they agreed how the U.S. economy would be run. They used their immense power to ensure the U.S. government passed the [Federal Reserve Act of 1913](#) which was strongly advocated by their front man, Sen. Nelson Aldrich. Their ability to create money, by holding government bonds as securities before issuing money as government debt, is one side of a two-sided coin. In order to pay back the loan the U.S. government needed to generate income. It is no coincidence that 1913 was also the same year U.S. government created [universal income tax](#).

To this day, the twelve regional Federal Reserve Banks, which are in charge of regulating banks, are owned and governed by their privately owned member banks.

Colonel Ely Garrison was a close associate of both Presidents Roosevelt and Wilson. Talking about the creation of the [Federal reserve](#) he stated:

*“Paul Warburg was the man who got the Federal Reserve Act together after the Aldrich Plan aroused such nationwide resentment and opposition. The mastermind*

*of both plans was Baron Alfred Rothschild of London.”*

Woodrow Wilson recognised the huge mistake he had presided over. He saw that giving a small clique of individuals the power to create money made them powerful beyond all measure. He recognised the inherent danger, unfortunately he seemed powerless to stop it, he wrote:

*“A great industrial nation is controlled by its system of credit. Our system of credit is privately concentrated. The growth of the nation, therefore, and all our activities are in the hands of a few men...”*

[Woodrow Wilson – The New Freedom]

*“We have come to be one of the worst ruled, one of the most completely controlled and dominated, governments in the civilized world – no longer a government by free opinion, no longer a government by conviction and the vote of the majority, but a government by the opinion and the duress of small groups of dominant men.”*

[Woodrow Wilson – Benevolence, or Justice?]

Nearly all central banks, across the planet, operate on the same principle. More importantly, they are controlled by the same tiny clique of people, something we'll discuss shortly. The intimate relationship between commercial banks, corporate investors and central banks is clear. Government are powerless to influence their decision-making.



Woodrow Wilson

For example, following the global financial crisis in 2007, in the European Union, two global financial institutions, The European Central Bank (ECB) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) formed a policy making body with the EU Commission. This was commonly referred to as the ‘Troika.’

The Troika decided to enforce brutal austerity measures upon the people of Europe, with the worst effects felt in Greece, Portugal and Ireland. These countries saw their economies ripped apart. Not because the people had mismanaged their affairs but because their governments owed enormous debts to the ECB.

The EU Commission’s only role in this was to rubber stamp the policies dictated to them by the ECB and the IMF. The ECB is completely independent of government, and the IMF is headed by the [financially negligent criminal, Christine Lagarde](#). Of the three, the ECB is the only one with the power to create money. Both the IMF and the EU Commission did whatever the ECB told them.

European people suffered appalling hardship, but they were utterly irrelevant. All that mattered was that the banks, who had lost all the money in the first place, remained profitable. The people were expendable, mere ‘collateral damage,’ as the ECB ignored even the pretence of democratic government and economically ravaged nation states, [irrespective of the will of the people](#).

In order to understand the absolute synergy between commercial and central banks you need only look at the secretive cabal of bankers who drive global economic policy. Among these are the ‘Group of Thirty’ (G30.) Their website states:

*“Established in 1978, is a private, nonprofit, international body composed of very senior representatives of the private and public sectors and academia. It aims to deepen understanding of international economic and financial issues, and to explore the international repercussions of decisions taken in the public and private sectors.”*

Their discussions are held in private and their lobbying power is limitless. Recently the European Union questioned ECB president Mario Draghi’s long-standing membership of this secretive group. He remains a member. A look at their 2013 membership gives us a glimpse of a few of the people who truly run the planet, and their ties to both central and commercial banking:

Mario Draghi (President of the ECB, formerly Goldman Sachs), Mark Carney (President of the Bank of Canada – from July 2013 of the Bank of England – formerly Goldman Sachs), William Dudley (President of the New York Fed, formerly Goldman Sachs), Gerald Carrigan (Goldman Sachs, formerly President of the New York Fed), Axel Weber (UBS, formerly President of Deutsche Bundesbank), Jacob Frenkel (JP Morgan Chase, formerly Governor of the Bank of Israel), Paul Volcker (former Fed – Chairman), Jean Claude Trichet (former


President of the ECB), Leszek Balcerowicz (former Governor of the National Bank of Poland), Jaime Caruana (General Manager of the Bank for International Settlements and former Governor of the Bank of Spain), Guillermo de la Dehesa Romero (Santander, formerly Deputy Director of the Bank of Spain), Roger Ferguson (TIA A-CREF, formerly Swiss Re and formerly Vice-Chairman of the Fed), Stanley Fisher (Governor of the Bank of Israel, formerly IMF and formerly Citigroup), Arminio Fraga Neto (Gavea Investimentos, formerly Governor of the Central Bank of Brazil), Philipp Hildebrand (Blackrock, formerly Chairman of the Swiss National Bank), Mervyn King (Governor of the Bank of England until June 2013), Guillermo Ortiz (Grupo Financiero Banorte; formerly Governor of the Bank of Mexico), Masaaki Shirakawa (Governor of the Bank of Japan), Yutaka Yamaguchi (former Deputy Governor of Bank of Japan) and Zhou Xiaochuan (Governor of the People's Bank of China).

The Bank for International Settlements (BIS) acts as a clearing house for central banks. It provides the same kind of service to central banks they provide for their 'commercial' counterparts. It is undoubtedly the most powerful financial institution on Earth. 75% Of its stock (because it is a private limited company) is owned by central banks. However, seeing as these are privately owned, that means individual private ownership of the BIS. The other 25% is owned by commercial banks and individuals. Commercial banks are also privately owned. A very small group of [private investors own the BIS](#) which effectively controls all the money on Earth.

In 1992 the media commentator and Clinton election campaign manager, James Carville, came up with the phrase '[the economy, stupid](#)' as one of the campaigns main sound-bites. This has become the widely paraphrased saying, 'it's the economy, stupid.' This is used to illustrate the point that, in modern political terms, the economy means everything.

The individuals who own both commercial and central banks have the power to

create money out of the ether. They can make as much as they want to give themselves. They control all debt, all economies and virtually all governments. Everything on the planet, with a monetary value, is owned by this tiny cabal. Only they can create or destroy money and all money is a debt owed to them. As long as our current monetary system continues without reform, this gives them unimaginable, unlimited economic and political power.



They are the same tiny elite who own the [147 corporations that control the global productive economy](#). If you ever wonder who the World owes its [estimated \\$233 trillion](#) debt to, it's the same junta of corporate financiers. They also own all the world's [mainstream media corporations](#) and control the entire MSM news agenda.

A [recent article](#), by the Independent's economics editor Ben Chu, tried to offer the mainstream, apologist explanation for all this. Reading it reveals the nonsense that passes for modern economic and monetary theory. In reference to the \$233 trillion global debt, Chu states that "*debt is a form of wealth.*" This is true, in fact debt is the only kind of wealth because all money is debt. When considering 'who' this money is owed to Chu writes:

*“..’Us’ is the short answer. Every financial liability, which includes debt, has a corresponding financial asset. And all those financial assets are ultimately owned by someone. If you put your money in a bank account the bank is likely to loan the cash out to someone else to buy a house: your financial asset thus becomes someone else’s financial liability.”*

This is either a damnable lie or economic illiteracy, perhaps a product of that which Mr Chu has been told to believe. The money multiplier is a standard monetary principle known to all economists and yet Ben Chu doesn’t tell you that banks don’t just lend ‘your’ money. Even with a fractional reserve ratio of 3%, they lend it thirty times over at least. He then attempts to explain the global economy while studiously ignoring any further reference to banking. As if banking, or even money itself, were entirely irrelevant to economics. Of course if he had referred to it he would almost certainly have been accused of [anti-Semitism](#). Inevitably he ties himself up in some bewildering knots.

He states that governments:

*“.....borrow money in a currency they themselves print, meaning that, in extremis, they can ensure lenders are paid back by printing money.”*

Posing the obvious question, if this is true, why is there any national debt? Why don’t governments just ‘pay back’ whoever they borrowed it off by printing more money? Of course, this is complete crap.

If you increase the supply of anything you decrease its unitary value for a start. Even if we accept the economic orthodoxy regarding central banking, clearly governments don’t just print money. They trade gilts for capital. The central banks hold the gilts as securities on loans they make to the government in the



form of 'sovereign money'. This makes absolutely no sense at all if the government itself 'owns' the central bank. Why would the central banks need any security? What value do government bonds have to central banks if they are 'owned' by the government?

This would be like holding your own wrist watch as security against yourself before you used your own money to buy something. If you then lost your job, and were unable to replenish your own purse, your alter ego, because you borrowed the money from yourself, could then sell your own watch in order to recover the money you can no longer repay yourself. Obviously only your 'other self' would then have any money so presumably, if you then needed more, you would have to offer your wedding ring as additional security to yourself before you could give yourself your own money.

I labour the point, but I hope you can see what a total load of claptrap the Independent's economics editor was peddling. He can only have been compelled into writing this nonsensical drivel for one of two reasons. Either he genuinely didn't understand anything at all about banking, highly unlikely in my view, or he was desperately attempting to create a narrative that excluded banking and the monetary system as the cause of global debt.

Yet, despite the fact the idea of government ownership of central banks is completely illogical, it is the common view expressed by most economists. Mr Chu then compounded his own confusion, and that of the readers, by saying:

*Governments, it is true, can still over borrow and run into a funding crisis."*

How? How can government over borrow from itself? Why does it need to borrow anything if it issues money to itself in the first place. How does borrowing from

yourself work?

This is this fundamental dichotomy that lies at the heart of all accepted economic, and particularly monetary, theory. Government simply cannot be both the borrower and the 'lender of last resort.' The answer to this conundrum, far from being the complex web of flawed equations and intricate narratives offered by mainstream economists, is very, very simple.

Governments do not own central banks. From a purely historical perspective this is glaringly obvious, yet it is the idea which cannot speak its name. It is the ultimate economic taboo. Any economist who dares to even suggest it will become a pariah. A zealot, an idiot, a '*conspiracy theorist*.' The bankers who really own central banks are the same people who are the major shareholders of all the commercial banks. If this is all starting to sound like a giant, though legal, fraud, it's because that is precisely what it is.

We are given to understand that fractional reserve banking and Fiat currency is somehow necessary. That without it, the world would collapse. The only thing that would collapse is the current system that benefits a tiny elite at the expense of everyone else. There are plenty of alternative economic, political and monetary systems. The '[Bradbury Pound](#)' for example. It is certainly not beyond us to establish much better ways run our economy and our society. What the current system delivers is essentially [feudalism](#) on a global scale.

Only by thinking about these issues can we ever have any hope of resolving the world's problems. Unfortunately the global elite, who own and control everything, are determined to ensure that we don't. This is why, if you even mention the subject, you will be accused of [anti-Semitism](#). It is a discussion we are not allowed to have and an opinion we are not allowed to hold.

No national economy can ever free itself from debt because Fiat currency is debt. When the money earned is returned to commercial banks, as deposits, it simply becomes their 'liability.' Nothing more than a theoretical concept, as clearly demonstrated by RBS. This effectively removes that money from the economy. Similarly, if the world's governments ever paid off their national debts to the privately owned central banks, the money, under our current monetary system, would cease to exist. Causing a horrendous, [global deflationary spiral](#).

Meanwhile, 'the banksters' have created an alternative economy, the derivatives market, that dwarfs the one the rest of us live in. Having financially outgrown the world's productive economy, this enables them to consolidate even more wealth and power.

There is nothing beyond their reach. They order all governments and exert control through the unseen '[Deep State](#)' that uses a network of military, intelligence, political, bureaucratic and media 'assets' who determine policy and most major world events. They finance all sides in most wars for their own profit; they financially back popular movements and revolutions to achieve their geostrategic objectives; they [destabilise states](#), as and when they see fit, to give the corporations they own access to that nations resources.

They use mass manipulation techniques to deliver whatever '[public opinion](#)' they desire. Their discussions are held in secret and rarely emerge into the public domain; all political parties, that have any realistic chance of forming a government, are financed by the corporations owned by the banksters; they use their immense power to create and destroy 'single issue' parties and lobby groups, as they wish.

They have compartmentalised the planet and devolve power only to their chosen acolytes who can be removed at any time of their choosing. If our elected leaders

weren't under their control, either by consent or coercion, we would never be offered them as an electoral choice.

Every time you vote you are merely perpetuating this system of global hegemony, which you can neither influence nor end through the ballot box. Whoever you elect you will get [the government](#) and they are not who you think they are. In order to be able to talk about this unseen government we need to give them a name. Let's use the one their representatives have frequently mentioned.


Meet your real government, we might call them the [New World Order](#).

## ***Chapter 5: The New World Order Controlled Narrative***

With all this unlimited money resources are not a problem for the New World Order. All they need to do now to achieve their objective is control what people think. But that seems easier said than done. Luckily for the NWO it is, in fact, incredibly easy. It is by looking at the modern history of propoganda that we can clearly see how this mechanism works. We call it Public Relations.

As the race to shut down freedom of speech surges ahead, the UK government has created the [‘National Security Communications Unit’](#) (NSCR) to ‘tackle fake news and disinformation.’ The NSCR is formed from representatives of the intelligence and security agencies, external experts in cybersecurity, communications and public relations. For reasons we are about to explore, it is the inclusion of public relations ‘experts’ which is perhaps the greatest cause for alarm.

In 1928 an Austrian American called Edward Bernays wrote a book entitled [‘Propaganda.’](#) You may never have heard of Bernays, but he was undoubtedly one of the most influential men of the 20th century. His profound impact upon all our lives cannot be underestimated. Bernays literally shaped the development of 20th century U.S. society. Not because he was a politician or political advisor like [Brzezinski](#), but because he was a brilliant confidence trickster.



Sigmund Freud

[Bernays](#) was the nephew of [Sigmund Freud](#), the man who developed psychoanalysis. He was quite close to his uncle in his youth and spent many summers walking and chatting with Freud during regular trips to Vienna. Bernays listened to his uncle and absorbed his ideas and theories. Freud taught Bernays his view regarding why humans think the way they do and how their thoughts impacted upon their behaviour. Freud considered that human behaviour was driven by deep-rooted primal instincts, not rationality. He thought sexual drives and aggression were the fundamental forces that shaped individual personality. While Freud was focused upon developing a treatment model for patients Bernays took his uncles ideas and applied them to crowd psychology. He realised that he could manipulate and control huge numbers of people by appealing to their base instincts.

Before Bernays, advertisers tried to sell products by highlighting their function.

For example, a car was just a vehicle to get you from one place to another. Advertisers would petition people's rational minds by explaining why the car they were selling was faster, more efficient or offered greater comfort than their competitors. Bernays revolutionised advertising. Rather than explain the practical uses of a product he used association to appeal to the what Freud called '*the id.*'

Freud believed the id responded to pleasure and constantly sought instant gratification without rational conscience or morality; the superego reflected the morality we learn from our parents and society, it acted as a restraint upon the powerful urges of the id; he believed the ego was the rational part of the psyche, developing in response to our knowledge of reality. It acted as a balance between the impulses of the id and the suppressive morality of the superego, enabling human being to pursue their desires while still functioning as part of society. He saw the ego as amoral, its sole purpose being to rationally plan how we can achieve the gratification the id desires, while avoiding the potentially dangerous reality of social disapproval.

Instead of selling the product itself, Bernays sold the idea of how the product would fulfill your desires. He understood that he could sell people anything, not because they needed it, but because he could convince them they wanted it by manipulating them on an unconscious, instinctive level.

For example, the American Tobacco Company (ATC) approached Bernays because they were unable to reach half of their potential market. The patriarchal social norms of 1920s America meant women were dissuaded from smoking in public because men deemed it socially unacceptable. Consequently, smoking uptake among women was much lower than among men. Bernays realised he could manipulate both women and men to remove this social barrier by appealing to their desires.

The Easter day parade in New York was a huge annual event reported across the nation. Bernays employed a group of attractive young women to join the parade. On his given signal they all lit cigarettes and openly smoked in public. He knew this would cause public uproar and the MSM would react strongly. So Bernays prepared one of the world's first 'sound-bites.'

He convened a press conference and, rather than refer to the cigarettes as 'cigarettes' he told his representatives to refer to them as '*torches of freedom.*' He established them as a symbol of women's emancipation while, at the same time, appealing to men's carnal desires, making cigarettes a symbol of female sexuality, overpowering men's prejudices. The product was practically irrelevant. It was the effect of the symbolism that mattered. He effectively changed society through the process of hidden manipulation of the media.



Emancipation Via Addiction



'Torches of freedom,' as we would say today, went viral. ATC's sales soared as women across America took up smoking and became addicted to nicotine to prove they were free.

Bernays recognised that you did not need to overtly advertise a product if you could manipulate the 'news' to deliver a behaviour changing message. People are automatically more sceptical of advertising, most understand that they are being sold something. However, if you could deliver your message as 'news' people were preconditioned to accept this as factual information and were much more likely to act upon it.

He employed 'third party authorities' to sway public opinion. He would convince academics, scientists, movie stars and entertainers to say whatever he wished. Often simply by paying them.

He coerced the medical profession to issue 'study reports' to journalists claiming that eating a hearty breakfast was essential, thereby selling a lot more bacon for his client. He also convinced dentists to extol the virtues of Fluoride for oral hygiene. Despite the fact that Fluoride was a highly toxic industrial waste product which caused a range of [neurological and other health problems](#), Bernays used 'expert opinion' to sell it to the public.

He realised the leaders of society could be co-opted to convince the public to accept anything, no matter how harmful, because they 'wanted' to believe what their leaders told them. The id fears harm and WWI and the social upheavals of the time demonstrated how dangerous the world was. Therefore, people were emotionally compelled to desire the protection of a benevolent state, not because

it existed in reality, but rather as a psychological defence mechanism against violent chaos and the fears it induced.

Another of Bernays strategy was the 'tie in' or 'tie up.' He coordinated seemingly unrelated strands of the media, each subtly linked, driving public opinion towards his intended outcome. The world's first marketing funnel.

In 1928 the Dodge brothers wanted to sell a new car model. Bernays secured the services of silent movie star Charlie Chaplin. The public had never heard Chaplin speak, so his announced appearance on the sponsored 'Dodge Hour' radio show was a big draw.

In order to maximise the audience, rather than simply advertise it, Bernays took out a large insurance policy against Chaplin being rendered speechless as a result of stage fright. This was not a genuine risk, Chaplin could speak perfectly well in interviews. Bernays then promoted the 'story' of the insurance coverage to the news media. Once reported as news by the MSM, this raised baseless public expectations that Chaplin might have some sort of nervous breakdown on live national radio. Even people who didn't like Chaplin tuned in to be told how great the new Dodge was.

He understood how to coordinate different media strategies to impact upon peoples primal emotions. By manipulating their underlying desires and fears he could shape public opinion. Bernays believed that the ego, if alerted, would act as a rational defence mechanism against this manipulation. Therefore, it was essential the public didn't realise they were being manipulated. He called this process the '*engineering of consent.*' Today we call this [social engineering](#). Bernays wrote:

*“If we understand the mechanism and motives of the group mind is it not possible to control and regiment the masses according to our will without their knowing about it?”*

[Edward Bernays – [Propaganda](#) Ch4 par’1]

Bernays ideas about ‘manipulation of the masses’ were hugely influential and soon came to the attention of the [economic and political elite](#), not just in the U.S. but across the world. Following the rapid expansion of manufacturing during WWI, once the war ended, U.S. corporations were left with idle industrial capacity. Generally American workers bought what they needed from their savings. However, their low pay meant they rarely bought luxury items. The ravages of war had hit export markets hard, so the corporations faced a demand problem. The corporate elite needed to stimulate the U.S. domestic market. Bernays methods offered a potential solution. In 1927 Lehman Brothers banker [Paul Mazur wrote](#):

*“We must shift America from a needs, to a desires culture, People must be trained to desire, to want new things even before the old had been entirely consumed. We must shape a new mentality in America. Man’s desires must overshadow his needs.”*

They turned to Bernays and he used his psychological manipulation techniques to change Americans. He employed psychologists to issue fake reports that linked products to self-expression and then fed them to the MSM; he marketed cars, not as vehicles, but as symbols of male virility; using ‘tie up,’ he began product placement in films, employed celebrities to be seen using products and placed stories about famous film stars using the new manufactured goods in glossy magazines and news articles.

Rather than simply pay their workers more money the [bankers and corporation owners](#) extended financial credit and loans to Americans, ensuring they would both buy the products they desired and pay more than the purchase price back to the banks. As WWII loomed the corporations and Edward Bernays had already started the process of turning working American citizens into debt laden consumers.



Nazis used Bernay's techniques.

[Reportedly](#) Bernays was alarmed when journalist Karl von Weigand told him that Nazi propagandist, Joseph Goebbels, had adopted many of his ideas. Bernays was Jewish and his uncle had to flee to London to escape Nazi persecution, so Bernays was no friend of the German fascists. Unfortunately that didn't stop Goebbels employing Bernays' ideas. Many of his statements could have been uttered by Bernays himself:

*“Propaganda works best when those who are being manipulated are confident they are acting on their own free will.”*

[Joseph Goebbels]

Whether Bernays was upset on personal or moral grounds, or whether he was simply concerned association with the Nazis could harm his business, is not clear. Bernays was reportedly an unpleasant man. His daughter later told how he considered the public, and anyone who disagreed with him, stupid.

Bernays saw himself as far more than an advertiser. He considered himself a ‘public relations counsel,’ an expert, and his work spawned the rapid expansion of the PR industry. In 2006 Harold Burson, the founder of the PR firm Burson-Marsteller, reported his meeting with Bernays:

*“Bernays thought that he could control public opinion. His methodology, of course, was fundamental. Most of the things we do today were identified by Bernays 80 years ago. He had brilliant ideas. I met him a few times, but didn’t like him. He was one of the most egocentric people I have ever met.”*

With a select client list of political leaders, corporate giants, global financiers, leading industrialists, media moguls and think tanks, Bernays was part of a small group of elites who believed [society needed them to control it](#). They saw it as their duty to quell the animalistic urges of the masses. Under their management, by using Bernays methods, in conjunction with emerging communication technologies like television, they intended to shape nation states into a [global, technocratic society](#) of their design. One which, above all else, would protect and enhance their power and wealth. As the engineers of the technocracy they saw themselves as the most vital part of n humanity and others

as expendable.

*“As civilization has become more complex, and as the need for invisible government has been increasingly demonstrated, the technical means have been invented and developed by which opinion may be regimented.”*

[Edward Bernays – [Propaganda](#) Ch1 par'10]

Public Relations is the practice of managing the flow of information about an individual or organisation. Bernays competitor, often cited alongside him as the founder of modern public relations was, [Ivy Ledbetter Lee](#). Like Bernays, he too was an influential member of the emerging oligarchy with numerous wealthy and powerful clients. In the early 20th century the Rockefeller family business had an image problem. Everyone hated them.

They were widely seen as an evil empire of oil tycoon bankers whose tentacles reached across the U.S. and world economy, suffocating and crushing smaller businesses while exploiting their workers and customers. In April 1914 in Ludlow, Colorado the National Guard attacked a large family encampment of striking miners, killing more than 20 including women and children. Already disliked, the mining operation's owner, John D Rockefeller, was blamed by the public for the '[Ludlow Massacre](#),' making him arguably the most despised person in America.



Ivy Ledbetter Lee

Ivy Lee turned his image around. He convinced Rockefeller, who fiercely guarded his privacy, to meet with the miners families and listen to their concerns while using the mainstream media to relentlessly publicise their meetings as ‘news.’ He suggested that Rockefeller family use philanthropy to be ‘seen’ to do good works. The Rockefeller’s also recognised that they could exploit their philanthropic foundations and trusts to corner whole sectors of society and set about changing U.S. education and medicine in order to control these markets.

Ivy Lee set up a series of publicity stunts where J.D. Rockefeller was seen handing out dimes to people, especially children, using the media to promote the stunt as a symbol of Rockefeller philanthropy. It worked, by the mid 1920s J.D was seen as a great social reformer and leading light of U.S. civil society, despite his responsibility for ordering the brutal murders of striking miners and their families. The Rockefeller brand was transformed and J.D always carried a bag of

freshly minted dimes with him.

However, it was Bernays techniques of engineering mass consent that were of greater interest to the government, the military and the intelligence agencies, the Rockefeller's and other globalists. During WWI Bernays was a leading member of the 'Committee on Public Information' who successfully turned a sceptical U.S. public towards supporting the war effort. He refined and perfected his techniques of psychological mass manipulation to develop the modern concept of propaganda. Bernays demonstrated he could manipulate entire nations using nothing more than information, orchestrated events and media manipulation.

During the early 1950s, as the Cold War between East and West intensified, the CIA employed Bernays as part of [Operation PBSuccess](#). This was a branch of the larger [Operation Mockingbird](#) which was already strongly influenced by Bernays' ideas.

The U.S. based [United Fruit Company](#) (UFC) were a neocolonialist corporation who had economically exploited a number of developing countries and operated monopolies in Central American nations, including Guatemala. They had exerted feudal rule over the country by installing a succession of compliant, puppet dictators. In 1951, as part of the ongoing Guatemalan revolution, which started in 1944, Guatemala's democratically elected socialist President, Jacobo Árbenz, instigated land reforms which saw the redistribution of farmland from U.S. corporate ownership to the people.

John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State under President Eisenhower, and his brother Allen Dulles, director of the CIA, had a long-standing relationship with UFC. John's law firm, Sullivan & Cromwell, represented UFC and Allen sat on the UFC board of directors. UFC were also one of Bernays' clients. Arbenz' land reforms impacted upon their profits.



In 1953 the CIA authorised Operation PBSuccess led by CIA operative Howard Hunt, who would later go on to be one of the Watergate burglars. The U.S. administration didn't want to be implicated so the CIA armed trained and equipped a paramilitary group, led by Carlos Castillo Armas, as their proxy, in order to maintain U.S. plausible deniability. Hunt stated:

*“What we wanted to do was have a terror campaign. To terrify Arbenz particularly and terrify his troops. Much as the German Stuka bombers terrified the population of Holland, Belgium and Poland at the onset of WWII.”*



Guatemala City 1954.

In 1954 Armas launched his military operation. It was a complete flop. His relatively small force of just 480 men were easily repelled by the Guatemalan

military, police and angry civilians in armed militias. However, the CIA assisted the coup attempt and flew a number of [bombing raids in unmarked planes](#). Again with little military success.

Nonetheless, Arbenz was forced to resign when his military suddenly refused to fight. They laid down their arms because they had become convinced the U.S. were about to launch a full scale military invasion of the country. All thanks to the public relations skills of Edward Bernays.

The U.S. administration's links to the UFC were a source of speculation about possible corruption in U.S. politics. This made it extremely difficult for the government to convince a sceptical American public that Arbenz had to go. When the CIA first brought their problem to Bernays he realised he could exploit the underlying fears of both the U.S. and Guatemalan people by creating a false narrative that would build the political momentum to facilitate the coup.

He knew he had to remove the toxic UFC brand from the equation. So he created a fake news agency called the Middle American Information Bureau. Arbenz was a democratic socialist with no ties to the Soviet Union and held no communist affiliations. However, Bernays Information Bureau started a flood of press releases and leaked false documents, based upon [dubious CIA intelligence reports](#), that alleged the Arbenz was working with the USSR to establish military bases in Guatamala, from where they could launch an attack against the U.S. mainland.

Bernays flew a group of leading American journalists to Guatamala City where he wined, dined and entertained them. While there, they interviewed a number of hand-picked Guatemalan politicians who Bernays had primed to allege that Arbenz was a dangerous communist backed by Moscow. The trip also coincided with a violent protest against the U.S. in the city.

While there is no clear evidence, many UFC employees suspected that Bernays was behind the riots. Regardless, sufficiently convinced, the journalists were flown back to the U.S. where they added to the torrent of anti-Arbenz propaganda. Constantly fed this disinformation, via the Operation Mockingbird media, the American public were bombarded by a centrally controlled MSM psychological warfare operation.

At the same time President Eisenhower's administration started publicly denouncing the Guatemalan government. With the UFC issue all but forgotten, acting on Bernays advice, The U.S. administration were free to use the propaganda he created to denounce the Guatemalan 'regime.' At the Inter American Conference John Dulles threatened economic sanctions and the withdrawal of U.S. non interventionism commitments unless other Central and South American countries agreed to sign a deceleration to stop Soviet expansionism in central and South America. Another deception that played upon peoples irrational fears.

The U.S. public were terrified. Convinced the Soviets were intent upon establishing a potential nuclear military presence only 200 miles from their shores, they clamoured for '[regime change](#)' in Guatamala. This had an even greater impact in Guatamala. Convinced a U.S. invasion was imminent, despite the largely ineffectual attempt at a military coup, Bernays had destroyed the Guatemalan military's confidence to such an extent they turned their backs on a popular leader who was improving the nations fortunes.

The U.S. claimed a victory for democracy over communism, installed their puppet Carlos Castillo Armas as president and UFC profits started flowing again. However, the coup also propelled Guatamala into four decades of political chaos. A series of U.S. backed dictators fought a string of vicious counter insurgencies as the Guatemalan people struggled to reassert their primacy over a corrupt political and military establishment. An estimated [140,000 people were killed](#).

Once again Bernays had demonstrated the devastating power of his ideas. He proved his techniques were the most formidable and effective form of psychological warfare ever devised. He could literally topple nation states by exploiting human beings' deepest fears, using nothing more than the mainstream media and some carefully staged events.

Providing his victims, the public, didn't know who was controlling them or how they were being manipulated, they were defenceless in the face of his 'genius.' Something which apparently gave him an immense sense of personal gratification.

Bernays had demonstrated to his tiny clique of elite, corporate clients that public relations could facilitate whatever social, economic, political or military objective they required. All they needed to do was exert their [unimaginable economic might](#), deploy their political and military assets and his strategies could control the public and ensure their compliance. He could even convince the people to commit acts of mass self harm.

In 2016 the worldwide PR industry was worth [an estimated \\$14 billion](#) annually. While some of this income still comes from convincing people to buy stuff they don't need, as we have discussed, PR firms frequently work closely with government and the intelligence agencies. They collaborate on a range of 'projects' designed to deliver the mass manipulation their clients demand. The UK government's plans to involve them in the NSCR '[Ministry of Truth](#)' reveals much about the intended purpose of this organisation.



You think this is an accident?

Bernays ideas have been adapted and perfected to the point where we are now perilously close to a [one world government controlled by a financial elite](#). Most of us have absolutely no idea what's going on. Distracted by the latest football scores or riveting programs about someone making a cake, we are hopelessly divorced from reality. Even though we know, for a fact, that our governments lie to us about the reasons for war, as evidenced by false Iraq WMD claims, we can easily be convinced to accept the next '*reason*' we're given, without question. The minority who are aware of the manipulation are marginalised and ignored.

Bernays established that fear was the key. Keep the people frightened, and they will turn to their government both for reassurance and protection. All the while, completely oblivious of the fact that, more often than not, it is their own government who are causing the unnecessary anxiety in the first place.

Once again, we are being 'told' there is a reason to start a war. On this occasion in Syria, and this time, with an extremely dangerous foe. One that could potentially engage in a global conflict with the U.S. led coalition, especially if

Russia, Iran and China join forces, which is a distinct possibility. Just as the false WMD claims led us to war in Iraq we are now being led to war on [unsubstantiated claims of chemical weapons attacks](#).

Following the WMD debacle The MSM apologised for letting everyone down and declared they would never do so again. Fifteen years later, they are still using the ideas inspired by Bernays' to manipulate the public into supporting unjustified military intervention in Syria.

Now that you have at least considered this possibility, I really hope you will find out more yourself. Because Bernays' words, written 90 years ago, are as true today as they were then.

*“The conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organized habits and opinions of the masses is an important element in democratic society. Those who manipulate this unseen mechanism of society constitute an invisible government which is the true ruling power of our country. We are governed, our minds are molded, our tastes formed, our ideas suggested, largely by men we have never heard of.”*

[Edward Bernays: – Propaganda Ch1 par'1]

## **Chapter 6: The New World Order Love It When A Plan Comes Together**

Speaking at the [Munich Security Conference](#) about EU Defence Union and the recent completion of military unification, the European Union High Representative (the de-facto EU Defence Minister) Federica Mogherini stated the EU's commitment to the New World Order (NWO.)

*“The Europe of defence is now a reality with solid foundations and this is our contribution, the contribution of the European Union to the security of our citizens first and foremost, but it is also our commitment to a more cooperative, multilateral new world order.”*

Whenever leading statesmen and women use the phrase ‘NWO’ they are commonly referring to a system of global government first envisaged by the various [Rhodes ‘Round Table’ groups](#). Numerous globalist think tanks such as the Bilderberg Group, The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), The European CFR, Le Cercle and others have used the term in the same way. Many of the policies we see today have originated from such think tanks. That is their purpose after all. We can see the influence both of these think tanks and their commitment to the New World Order, throughout the history of the development of the European Union.

The [accepted history of the EU](#) is accurate, but only tells one part of its creation story. Most people accept, following WWII, there was a widespread political will to safeguard Europe against ever facing another internal, international war. The

1948 Hague Conference led to the Creation of the 'European Movement International' based upon a network of trade deals. In 1952 the 'European Coal and Steel Community' (ECSC) formed. The leading individuals driving the project forward included the 'Founding Fathers of the European Union' (Alcide De Gasperi, Jean Monnet, Robert Schuman, and Paul-Henri Spaak.)



Jean Monnet: A Founding Father of the EU.

The 1957 Treaty of Rome created the European Economic Community (EEC). More countries joined, and in 1986 the EEC started waving its own flag. In 1992 the Maastricht Treaty formed the forerunner of the EU, the European Community, and established the timetable for a single European currency (the Euro.) Economic and monetary union was completed in 1998 with the principle of a European Central Bank firmly established. The Euro duly arrived in 2002. In 2007 the Lisbon Treaty formally ratified the EU. This period of European political history is commonly referred to as the 'European Project,' which continues to this day.



However, this is only a partial chronicle. Most people, especially those who support it, are unaware of the other strand of the European Union's history. Perhaps if they did know more about it, they would be less enthusiastic supporters. However, this is a closely guarded history, anyone who mentions it is immediately castigated as a 'conspiracy theorists' or '[anti-Semite](#).' Historians have consistently dithered over discussing the power structure driving the 'European Project' forward. Namely, [the NWO](#) and its Deep State Milieu.

In [August 1944 at the Hotel Maison Rouge](#) (the Red House) in Strasbourg, the first of a series of meetings between the leading NWO backed German industrialists and the Nazis convened to discuss the continuation of the Third Reich's economic power. The meeting was chaired by SS Obergruppenfuhrer Scheid. Executives from Volkswagen, Krupp Steel, Brown-Boveri, Messerschmidt, Zeiss, BMW, Leica and others were ordered to establish overseas operations to finance a future covert Nazi project. Primarily this meant laundering money from a vast European based slush fund through U.S. investors. The 'Red House' was also the name the Nazis gave to the first gas chamber built at Auschwitz II-Birkenau. It isn't clear if the chosen venue for the meeting was a deliberate Nazi perversion.




Hotel Maison rouge Strasbourg

The content of the discussions were revealed by [U.S. Military Intelligence Report EW-pa 128](#) (the Red House Report.) Of course supporters of the EU have claimed it to be a forgery, conspiracy nonsense and so forth. However, they haven't offered any evidence to back this claim up. The document first came to light in 2009, but we can be reasonably certain it predates 1972 because former British Intelligence officer and author [Frederick Forsyth](#) cited it as the inspiration for his novel 'The Odessa File.' Forsyth stated he had first seen a copy of the document thanks to 'friends in low places.'


The report revealed the Nazis knew the military campaign was probably lost, and were preparing for a post-war [Fourth Reich](#) based upon covert government and economic control. The Nazis intended to use the immense fortune they had seized to establish themselves as a hidden economic power with front organisations managing their portfolio from within the Swiss banking cartel. Their plan was to administer a European system of financial punishment and reward from which the corporations could make huge profits. All the investors and industrialists had to do was adhere to the Fourth Reich's economic policies and commit themselves to its continuance. Scheid stated that a *"German Empire can be created after the defeat."*

In return the Fourth Reich would not only provide investment capital but would also share its advanced weapon and industrial technology for further corporate profit. The Nazis recognised their most prominent leaders would face post-war trials but, by switching to economic rather than military warfare, they believed German pre-eminence in Europe could soon be re-established.



Odd don't you think?

Coincidentally the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe was established in 1949 in Strasbourg. Its current incarnation, the Louise Weiss building, was completed in 1999. It looks remarkably like Pieter Bruegel the Elder's 1563 painting 'The Tower of Babel.' The mythical Tower of Babel was constructed following a great cataclysm by the tyrant King Nimrod to unite all humanity under his despotic rule. A peculiar design choice for a supposedly democratic institution.



### Conspiracy Theory?

According to the people who think the EU is a splendid idea, this rather obvious occult symbolism is just another 'unfortunate coincidence' and anyone who can see the similarity, which they can't, must be a loony 'conspiracy theorist.' Clearly this means the EU hierarchy are 'loony conspiracy theorists' because they used Brueghel's depiction in their official promotional poster called 'Europe: Many Tongues One Voice.' They even adorned their propaganda with inverted pentagrams to really hammer home the point.

In 1950 Robert Schuman delivered his 'Declaration' effectively creating the principle of supranational European government. A year later the Treaty of Paris formed the ECSC. The idea was to pool coal and steel production in order to create a heavy industry cartel that would effectively mete out economic growth to European states. This was suspiciously similar to the function of the I.G. Farben – Vereinigte Stahlwerke cartel which powered the Third Reich's industrialisation and economic revival. This isn't surprising given that it was exactly the same idea with the same people behind it. The front men had changed, but other than that it was business as usual.

In 1952 Jean Monnet (the father of the European Union) was a founding member a secretive '[Deep State](#)' transatlantic think tank called '[Le Cercle](#).' Sometimes referred to as the Cercle Pinay, after leading member Antoine Pinay (President of France 1952 – 1953 and signatory to the Treaty of Rome.) Monnet was soon joined in Le Cercle by fellow 'EU founding father' Robert Schumann. It's primary objective was to cement Franco-German relations and promote European relations with the U.S. Le Cercle described itself as:

*“.....an informal group of European and American professionals – politicians, retired Ambassadors, former Generals, lawyers, bankers and active participants in banking, oil, shipping, publishing and trading companies – who are interested in preserving a positive Atlantic dialogue.”*

Its U.S. membership has included David Rockefeller, Henry Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski and the newly announced U.S. National Security Adviser John Bolton. Fiercely right wing, most of the neocons behind the war on terror have been members including Rumsfeld, Perle and Wolfowitz. A number of the groups members, such as former British Chancellor of the Exchequer Norman Lamont, have been involved in various arms scandals and [alleged political subversion](#) of left wing governments and parties across Europe and beyond. This included attempts to destabilise the British Labour Government of Harold Wilson. They fought hard to maintain the Cold War, and vociferously support the 'war on terror.'



Operation 40: suspected CIA hit squad.

From the outset Le Cercle had close ties to both European and U.S. intelligence agencies. Many senior agents have been members of Le Cercle. For example, Donald Jameson was a CIA station chief who undertook numerous covert operations against the Soviet Union during the Cold War and was a handler for Russian defectors. William Casey, former director of the CIA, who pushed the Pakistan ISI to increase [funding for Saudi Wahhabis](#), was also a member. Ted Shackley, CIA station chief and member of the hit squad '[Operation 40](#),' who many suspect of involvement in the Kennedy assassination, served as the U.S. chairman of Le Cercle until 2012.

It was the CIA and U.S. 'Deep State' politicians who instigated the European Project, formally proposed by Monnet, Schuman and others later. The U.S. wanted a European Union to act as counterbalance to Soviet power and to support NATO policy. In 1947 President Truman threatened to cut European

post-war aid unless the French welcomed Germany into the heart of the European establishment. In July 1950 U.S. General William J Donovan, head of the OSS (forerunner to the CIA,) instructed European Deep State operatives, such as Monnet, Schuman and Pinay, to work to [create a European Parliament](#). Two years later the first meeting of Le Cercle was organised by Pinay's close associate, the lawyer and intelligence officer Jean Violet.

The CIA used the '[American Committee for a United Europe](#)' (ACUE) to funnel funds from the Rockefeller (Le Cercle member) and Ford Foundations to finance the creation of, what became, the EU. In 1954 another leading light of the European Project, Josef Retinger, called a secret meeting at the Bilderberg Hotel in Oosterbeek, in the Netherlands. Retinger established the Bilderberg Group with Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, who was subsequently caught taking bribes from arms dealers during [Lockheed scandal in 1976](#).

The [Bilderberg Group](#) is perhaps the most well-known of the various organisations that form the management structure of the 'Deep State.' They are part of the hidden system of global government who control the world's military, intelligence, economic, political and cultural establishment. Delegates are selected to attend group meetings where senior Bilderberg members instruct them. Bill Clinton, Margaret Thatcher and Tony Blair are among the many political leaders who have achieved party leadership following their attendance of a Bilderberg Meeting. It would appear to be a prerequisite for high office.

When Bilderberg [steering committee member Dennis Healey](#) (former British Labour Chancellor of the Exchequer) invited Margaret Thatcher to attend Bilderberg in 1975 he recalled:

*".....the next day she suddenly stood up and launched into a three-minute Thatcher special. I can't remember the topic, but you can imagine. The room was*

*stunned. Here's something for your conspiracy theorists. As a result of that speech, David Rockefeller and Henry Kissinger and the other Americans fell in love with her. They brought her over to America, took her around in limousines, and introduced her to everyone."*

Healey's off-hand brevity about 'conspiracy theory' belies the reality of the Bilderberg Group. For many years they were able to keep their existence entirely secret, mainly because their members own the mainstream media. They were mentioned in a 1955 article in the German paper Der Spiegel and again in a French TV news feature in 1977. Otherwise, until their full exposure by internet researchers during the first decade of the 21st century, there was a complete media blackout. Once the evidence of their existence was undeniable, they launched their [extremely spars website](#) in 2009. Even so, their decisions are still largely ignored by the MSM. There is no doubt that without their exposure by 'conspiracy theorists' they would have remained a covert Deep State group to this day.

The Bilderberg website states that they are simply an informal gathering of American and European royalty, bankers, politicians, corporation owners, media moguls, industrialists and so on. Giving the impression that they make no decisions, but rather use it as an opportunity to discuss ideas, stay in a nice hotel, relax and get to know each other. Their website states:

*"The Bilderberg Meeting is an annual meeting designed to foster dialogue between Europe and North America. Bilderberg was established in 1954 as a forum for informal discussions, bringing together individuals who share an active interest in affairs relevant to the relationship between Europe and Northern America. The meeting has one main goal: to foster discussion and dialogue. There is no desired outcome, there is no closing statement, there are no resolutions proposed or votes taken."*



With a couple of exceptions, since 1954, they have held annual meetings of no more than about 150 delegates and tend to alternate venues between Europe and the U.S. The Steering committee organise the meetings and longer serving steering committee members possibly become part of the inner ‘advisory group,’ though any mention of this was dropped in 2002. The delegates discussions come under [the Chatham House Rule](#). Many serving, democratically elected politicians attend, but we are barred from knowing what they discuss with the wealthiest people on Earth. They leave their so called ‘representation’ at the door.

The consistent focus upon reinforcing the transatlantic partnership can clearly be traced back to Cecil Rhodes. The Round Table Movement, Pilgrims Society, Le Cercle, Bilderberg and many other hidden groups and societies that form the ‘Deep State Milieu,’ all share the same objective. As Bilderberg’s own website states:

*“.....from trade to jobs, from monetary policy to investment and from ecological challenges to the task of promoting international security. In the context of a globalised world, it is hard to think of any issue in either Europe or North America that could be tackled unilaterally.”*

It is a notable indicator of future of global power structures that Bilderberg invited their first Chinese delegates in 2011. The claimed notion that they are little more than a discussion group is not supported by the evidence. It clearly indicates the Bilderberg Group has been instrumental in forming global policy since its inception. They were central to the creation of the European Union. This makes a mockery of the notion that we live in democracies or that the EU is a democratic institution. We are ruled by people we don’t elect. It’s as simple as that.



The Euro: Planned 50 years before its creation by Bilderberg.

At the 1955 Bilderberg Meeting at Sonnenbichl, Germany, the group decided upon the future development of the European Union. Key to their plan, as discussed at the Red House 11 years earlier, was German reintegration and economic development. They also proposed the establishment of a common market and creation of a single European currency. [Leaked papers from the meeting](#) reveal how ‘insignificant’ Bilderberg discussion really are. In 1955 the Bilderberg group stated there was:

“[a] Pressing need to bring the German people, together with the other peoples of Europe, into a common market.”

Further statements included:

*“.....our [the Bilderberg Group] common responsibility to arrive in the shortest possible time at the highest degree of integration, beginning with a common European market.....tariff walls surrounding this common market should certainly not be higher and should possibly be lower than the average of the existing tariffs.....It might be better to proceed through the development of a common market by treaty rather than by the creation of new high authorities.....A European speaker expressed concern about the need to achieve a common currency, and indicated that in his view this necessarily implied the creation of a central political authority.....A United States participant confirmed that the United States had not weakened in its enthusiastic support for the idea of integration”*

European Union acolytes have been keen to point out that many of these ideas had already been openly discussed elsewhere, prior to the 1955 Bilderberg meeting. They need to provide some evidence to substantiate this view. It is notable that Bilderberg Group saw the ‘common market’ as the forerunner to complete European integration prior to the 1957 Treaty of Rome. This established the ‘common market’ but made no reference to the *“highest degree of integration”* which wouldn’t arrive for another 50 years. Nor was there any open discussion of a single European currency or *“central political authority.”* Again these concepts only slowly emerged publicly in the years after the 1955 Bilderberg meeting.

In 2009 Bilderberg Chairman [Etienne Davignon](#) revealed, not only the Bilderberg Group’s determination to forge ahead with the European Project no matter what, but also its total disregard for the sovereignty of nations and the people of Europe. Speaking about Europe’s response to the 2008 financial crash, which the bankers at the heart of the Bilderberg Group caused, he said the Bilderbergers would *“improve understanding”* on future action. He then told reporters the group could do this in the same way they helped create the Euro in the 1990s. In a moment of jaw dropping arrogance, in reference to nations whose populations had previously indicated their desire to leave the EU (notably the people of the Republic of Ireland, France and the Netherlands) he said:

*“why do we have to care about them?”*

Why indeed? Clearly the ‘will of the people’ means nothing to aristocratic elitists like former Bilderberg chairman Etienne Davignon. Much as it has always been. Between 2005 and 2007 the Irish, French and Dutch people objected to the proposed EU Constitution. The Irish referendum didn’t happen because the French and Dutch referendums had already brought a halt to the ratification process, but all the indications were of a significant Irish rejection. There was also stiff opposition to ‘the highest degree of integration’ among the people of the UK, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Poland and Portugal, whom also had proposed referendums cancelled, and were completely ignored by the European federalists. The ‘no votes’ of French and the Dutch, convinced the EU elite to completely abandon troublesome democracy.



Valéry Giscard d'Estaing

Bilderberg member Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, president of the [European Convention](#) whose comical pretensions were to improve 'democracy and transparency,' decided that only the leaders of the 25 member states needed to be consulted to ratify the required 'treaties.' Just as the Bilderberg Group decided in 1955. Recognising the need for the 25 leaders to sell the new idea to their various parliaments and national assemblies, d'Estaing was among the Bilderbergers who decreed that subterfuge would be necessary. So they constructed a deliberately opaque 'Lisbon Treaty' (and charter) to move towards the completion of their European project. [Speaking to Le Monde](#) in 2007 d'Estaing said:

*"The latest brainwave is to preserve part of the innovations of the constitutional treaty, but hide them by breaking them up into several texts. The most innovative provisions would become simple amendments to the treaties of Maastricht and Nice. The technical improvements would be regrouped in a colourless, harmless treaty. The texts would be sent to national parliaments, which would vote separately. Thus public opinion would be led to adopt, without knowing it, the provisions that we dare not present directly."*

*[Valéry Giscard d'Estaing]*

He then attempted to distance himself from his own statements by claiming the 'brainwave' was unworthy of the 'challenge at stake.' His stated fear was that it would:

*".....confirm European citizens in the idea that the construction of Europe is organised behind their backs by lawyers and diplomats."*

He need not have concerned himself. The people weren't asked anyway. The

Lisbon Treaty, containing the clauses paving the way for a centrally controlled European superstate, with its own fully functioning central bank, was ratified by 59 people, creating the EU on December 13th 2007. This was entirely consistent with the plan suggested 52 years earlier by the Bilderberg Group.

Due to the apparent dichotomy between capitalism and communism, historians have consistently viewed late 19th to late 20th century history through the narrow confines of this ideological conflict. What they have failed to recognise is that unrestrained economic globalisation provides the conditions for 'capitalist collectivism' to thrive. In France they call it 'capitalisme sauvage' (rampant capitalism,) but even this doesn't fully acknowledge its globalist nature. The post WWII period has seen it proliferate on a monumental scale, thanks to the monetary system. The bank bailouts in 2010 were not the product of socialism, fascism, democracy, communism or any other form of accepted socio-economic or political ideology. They were founded in the principles of 'capitalist collectivism,' something which we don't yet have a name for. Sun Tzu was right when he observed:

*"If ignorant both of your enemy and yourself, you are certain to be in peril."*

It seems likely that exposure has reduced the influence of the Bilderberg group, as a decision making body, to a certain degree. However, they are only one part of the Deep State Milieu and there are other groups such as Le Cercle, the CFR and the RIIA who continue the NWO's work. In 2017 the current president of the CFR, Bilderberg member Richard Haas, spelt out its evolving vision for what he called World Order 2.0 in his book '[A world In Disarray:](#)'

*".....in a globalized world, a global operating system premised solely on respect for sovereignty – call it World Order 1.0 – has become increasingly inadequate. Little stays local anymore. Just about anyone and anything, from tourists,*

*terrorists, and refugees to e-mails, diseases, dollars, and greenhouse gases, can reach almost anywhere. The result is that what goes on inside a country can no longer be the concern of that country alone. Today's realities call for an updated operating system—World Order 2.0 – based on “sovereign obligation,” the notion that sovereign states have not just rights but also obligations to others.”*



Richard Haas: CFR president and exponent of NWO 2.0

Dressed in the faux respectability of the seemingly concerned global citizen, Haas was suggesting that a nation's independence and sovereignty should no longer be respected. If the NWO decide a country isn't meeting its demands, that provides cause to destroy it. He has written a manifesto for centrally controlled global government with unelected, hidden policy makers, like himself, acting as its [‘Society of the Elect.’](#) We have discussed how, through manipulation and

deceit, the power mad tyrants of the NWO play out their deadly game. Their representatives, like Haass, are smiling sweetly, offering you a better future under the benevolent dictatorship of 'World Order 2.0.'

The EU represents the first, practically completed, phase of the NWO model of global hegemony. The offer of an 'ordered' world may seem enticing. However it is the violence of the 'war on terror,' the [brutal destabilisation of nations](#), the enforced austerity of [international banking cartels](#), forced population shifts, the militarisation of a police state, mass surveillance, restricted access to information, total economic control in a cashless society, terrorist attacks as part of an ongoing '[strategy of tension](#),' and drone strikes upon civilian 'targets' that defines the true nature of their offer.

The most comprehensive deception played upon us is that we were convinced to ignore something which, in our hearts, we have always known to be true. Through years of indoctrination and 'education' we have forgotten that authoritarian power still exists in democracies. We are now all convinced that it is we, the people, who are in charge of our own destinies. We actually believe the governments we elect serve us, despite the fact there is no evidence to substantiate this belief.

Regardless of all our wars and revolutions, a tiny group of people have more money and power than the rest of the world put together. These are the tiny clique of people at the very top of the richest 1% of humanity. They aren't the frequently blamed 1%, most of these people are just as powerless as the rest of us, they are the 0.001%. Money is power and they have an unlimited supply.

The EU is and always has been, their project. We, the people, are simply expendable pawns in their continuing strategy of global tension.



So the next time someone laughs when you mention the New World Order hopefully you will be able to use the information in this book and tell them exactly why they really shouldn't be laughing.