

How the British 3 East India Company Took Over the U.S.A.

On performance to date, David Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission represents neither the interests of the United States, nor any other form of interest derived historically from industrial capitalism. The Trilateral Commission has been, to date, an aspect of foreign control over the United States, a representative of the same foreign interest against which the American Revolution was fought: The British East India Company.

I know that you, Leonid Ilyich, have been among the victims of lies about U.S. history mediated inclusively through such tainted channels as the Communist Party U.S.A. It is the commonplace lie of the twentieth-century U.S.A. "revisionist" school of historical lying, led by British agent Charles A. Beard, that Thomas Jefferson epitomizes the "true spirit" of American Revolution. The Anglo-Canadian intelligence-controlled Communist Party, which is rumored to attire itself in Thomas Jefferson suits each July 4th, inevitably faithfully regurgitates this British lie.

According to his own correspondence, Thomas Jefferson was a witting agent of influence of the British Secret Intelligence Service (SIS), working against the United States, a witting agent of Shaftesbury and Bentham. His seditious practice during the 1780s and 1790s is consistent with this literary connection. Later, as President, he destroyed the credit, banking, and military capabilities of the United States, acting substantially under the influence of a British SIS agent, Gallatin.

Let you and I tolerate no more sentimental nonsense about that treasonous, white-racialist scoundrel, Thomas Jefferson.

I have emphasized British East India Company, not Britain. This distinction is of the utmost importance for assessing the strategic situation today.

The British population and internal economy have little to do with this, except chiefly to suffer its effects. The British people, including their bleating, philistine, muddleheaded trade-union militants, are the most wretched collection of foolish, ignorant political sheep to be found in any industrialized nation. It is sometimes suspected that the intellect and morals of British subjects generally (they include no citizens) are a spiritual quality mediated through excessive consumption of boiled mutton.

There are some happy exceptions to this pathetic condition, but, alas, they are relatively very few. Britain and its people are generally, so to speak, the unkempt private barnyard of the British oligarchy.

The first requirement of any analysis of the present global strategic situation is to understand that the ascertainable objective interests of the British subjects generally, or the British nation as a whole, have almost no bearing on the perceived self-interests of the British oligarchy centered upon the City of London.

The British people lost both their citizenships and all effective direct influence over the policies of the British government with the 1660 Stuart Restoration. Having lost their political rights, they gave up their morals as well with the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688-89. From that latter charade onwards, the pathetic British subject accepted a vulgar music-hall performance called the Parliament, a degraded institution of popular entertainment per-

formed by the most cheaply bribed politicians in the world. The real government of Britain is the City of London and the associated senior ranks of the civil service, which rule Britain as those theatrical farces euphemistically called parliamentary governments come and go.

The oligarchy herds the British sheep by various means. One means is exemplified by the work of the British intelligence services, under Winston Churchill, in guiding Goering's Luftwaffe to bomb London. When this is deemed useful, the British oligarchy has the bomb dropped on London, to herd the British subjects, like the sheep they are, into desired directions.

It is accurate to describe the British East India Company as the outcome of planting of "Genoese" financial power in the City of London, and therefore to describe Britain as the oldest aristocratic families of Italy view it, as essentially a parvenu monarchy, essentially an upstart colony of the more venerable Venetian and Genoese black-nobility interest. This is no exaggeration, as I shall now demonstrate summarily.

Then, once one has understood who actually rules Britain, and by what means, one has the basis for discovering who controls David Rockefeller, and thus, who really owns the puppet-President, Jimmy Carter.

During the last period of the sixteenth century, "Genoese" financial interests, controlling the Scottish-border aristocracy and allied to the Cecil family, crushed the English allies of Giordano Bruno, with aid of Cecil family member Francis Bacon's foul corruption of the boy Essex. This secured the accession to the newly created British throne by the "Genoese"-owned James Stuart. With the 1603 Stuart accession to the throne of the United Kingdom, the "Genoese" were soon abundantly repaid for their patronage of the Cecils and James Stuart. Various branches of "Genoese" banking, including branches developed earlier in Geneva and Amsterdam, looted Britain through tax-farming: speculation in fictitious capitalization of ground-rent on a national scale.

Consistently, the wretched sodomist Francis Bacon became the embezzling Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Two crucial points are to be emphasized respecting the "Genoese" takeover of England through the Stuart succession. One side is the emergence of the British East India Company out of the "Genoese" City of London. The other is the historical significance of the introduction of empiricism by Francis Bacon.

I must, for the sake of most relevant truth, cause you, Leonid Ilyich, another twinge of pain, this time concerning the wretched creature Francis Bacon.

The ritually regurgitated British propaganda, representing Francis Bacon as in some important sense a contributor to the development of modern scientific method, is a complete falsehood. The truth is symptomized by noting Bacon's principal choice of adversary, the great scientist William Gilbert! The discoverer of the electromagnetic plasma, the most fruitful fundamental discoverer of England during the sixteenth century, is to be considered methodologically defective with respect to the fruitless, lying, embezzling sodomist, Francis Bacon! If you believe that British hoax, then be consistent: tear down the plasma physics institutions of the Soviet Union. Give up possession of the H-bomb. For to embrace Bacon's counterfeited reputation and to possess the fruits of the line of scientific method exemplified by Gilbert is utter hypocrisy.

By the time of Lord Shelbourne's seizure of power, behind the cloak of his protege William Pitt the Younger, the official of the British East India Company and the British Secret Intelligence Service (SIS) had become indistinguishably officials of "The Company." It was against this force that the American Revolution was fought earlier, and against which the political heirs of Benjamin Franklin and Lafayette have fought down to the present date.

The clearly traceable origins of this "Company" can be documented from approximately the fourth century B.C. The essential factional divisions within the course of civilization have

remained the same from then to the present time. Moreover, the oligarchical faction, running through Venice and Genoa into the British "Company" of today, has an unbroken, fully conscious political continuity from the fourth century B.C., and earlier.

The fundamental factional division of the fourth century B.C. was between a self-styled "oligarchical" or "Persian model" faction, based on the command at Rhodes, and the opposing republican center, the Academy at Athens.

The oligarchical faction was part of the Babylonian bureaucracy which had created and which controlled the Persian Empire. This force was allied principally with the cults of Thebes in both Egypt and Greece, and with the leading cult and rentier-financial institution of the Mediterranean littoral, the cult of Apollo at Delphi.

Until his timely assassination, Philip of Macedon was the chosen instrument for conducting a project known as the establishment of the Western Division of the Persian Empire. Ostensibly, because, in part, of the demonstrated inability of the Persian Empire to sustain on-rolling world conquest, the Babylon tax farmers, who controlled the empire, envisaged the creation of a Hellenized Western Division, based on Greek military technology, to rule the Mediterranean west of the Euphrates. Philip's conquest of Greece was to be the preparatory phase for this institution.

Among the agents deployed by the cult of Apollo in behalf of this oligarchical project was Aristotle. Aristotle was deployed first through the cult's prominent asset in Athens, the school of rhetoric of Isocrates, and then assigned as a Macedonian spy to penetrate the Academy at Athens. Another notable Macedonian agent in Athens was Philip's agent-provocateur Demosthenes. The equivalent of check stub records survive proving Demosthenes's connection to Philip's service.

On the republican side, the Academy at Athens was, like the mother of Alexander the Great, allied to the temple of Amon in both Egypt and Greece.

Until the matter is settled conclusively, we must suspect the convenient death of Philip—on the eve of launching the military creation of the Western Division—as the work of the priests of Amon or the Academy. Alexander, acting under the counsel of Aristotle's enemies at the Academy, took command and immediately deployed his father's forces in Asia Minor to the purpose of effecting a result directly opposite to his father's assigned purpose. The republican, city-state order prescribed by the Academy proceeded in the greatest burst of city-building ever recorded.

After Alexander's death by poisoning, Philip's Macedonian generals sought to destroy the republican effort. Ptolemy, the patron of Aristotle, emerged as the most effectively evil of that lot. Greece alone preserved for a while a republican current, until Ptolemaic Egypt dispatched Roman legions to crush that last remaining outpost of civilization.

The Roman republic, which was controlled by the cult of Apollo as available historical records show, was destroyed by the Social Wars, to the end of establishing the Roman Empire as the realization of the oligarchical Western Division of the Persian Empire, as the "Persian model" had been defined nearly four centuries earlier.

The battle against oligarchism emerged centered around the Neoplatonic forces of Rabbi Philo Judaeus and Apostolic Christianity, becoming later the Augustinian current of the western region of the shattered empire. This Augustinian city-builder current reached a culminating point of inflection in the work of Charlemagne and Alcuin, and in the alliance of Charlemagne to the great Arab Renaissance of the Baghdad Caliphate.

Yet, throughout this Neoplatonic insurgency, in both Byzantium and in Rome, the evil families of the Ptolemaic and Roman imperial cult of Isis repeatedly resurged, soon enough consolidating themselves inclusively around the Isis cult known as the Hospitalers. These consciously oligarchical families maintained their Western bastions among the land-owning old oligarchy of Rome and the city Of Venice. Genoa emerged as a new center of this

oligarchical black nobility—as it has been known since the emergence of the "black Guelph" faction at the close of the thirteenth century.

During the last decades of the thirteenth century these oligarchical families introduced the writings of Aristotle to Western Europe, launching the Aristotelian inquisition chiefly against that Neoplatonism which had been Apostolic Christian method since the opening passages of the Gospel of Saint John. Prominently attacked also was the greatest Persian scientist of the Arab Renaissance, Avicenna (ibn Sina), whose memory we celebrate this year.

This oligarchical reaction accompanying the reintroduction of the evil hoaxster Aristotle was part of the attack on scientific and technological progress which had been consistent oligarchical doctrine since earlier than the productions of the bucolic cultist Hesiod.

The complementary feature of this Aristotelian oligarchical reaction was the savage imposition of "Friedmanite" fascist doctrine, an assault led by such "black Guelph" bankers of the "Genoese" faction as the notorious Bardi and Peruzzi. In the devolution which ensued from this outburst of medieval "Friedmanite" fascism, half of the parishes of Europe disappeared in the course of a "new dark age" culminating in the savage blows of the bubonic epidemic upon a weakened residue of the mid-thirteenth-century population of Europe. France did not reach mid-thirteenth-century levels of population until the eighteenth century.

Out of this hellish "new dark age," relative handfuls, exemplified by Dante Alighieri, conceived of the transformation of brutish, illiterate common dialects of Europe into a collection of literate languages, languages capable, in the later words of the poet Shelley, of communicating "profound and impassioned conceptions respecting man and nature." The peoples elevated to qualities of citizenship by transformed literate languages must constitute republican self-government premised on the domains of such transformed languages.

Out of the hell of the "black Guelph's" "new dark age," emerged the Neoplatonic Golden Renaissance—against Aristotelian oligarchical reaction. Despite the defeats of Dante's plan within Renaissance Italy itself, the Neoplatonic Golden Renaissance produced the first modern nation-state under Louis XI in France, and subsequently under Henry VII in Tudor England. In the sixteenth century, the Erasmians of France and England formed the republican Commonwealth Party of Europe, known in France otherwise as *les politique*.

The republicans are dedicated to scientific and technological progress, both to enable mankind to survive by the only method suitable for this, and also to make the practical basis for relationship of one person to another the development of those creative-mental potentialities which distinguish man from mere beasts, and distinguish them in practice from the irrational bestiality of a zero technological growth, oligarchical order.

The consistent economic policy of the oligarchists, over thousands of years to date, has been the suppression of scientific and technological progress, and the looting of society through either simple ground-rent exploitation ("feudalism") or the rentier form of spiraling income from capitalist ground-rent in the form of debt.

Rightly did Mrs. Margaret Thatcher state that she represented something "older than capitalism."

It was this oligarchical interest, the "Genoese," who took over lowland Scotland from the time of their protege Robert Bruce. Thus, during the sixteenth century, the "Genoese" penetrated England by two routes. One route was relatively direct, via Genoese bankers such as the Pallavicini, based in London. To the north, the Scottish border represented what became a prototype of present-day, unregulated "offshore" financial interest. Hence, the importance of Edinburgh in the history of SIS. Hence, the importance of Scottish financial interests in the British East India Company, its orbit, and in the two-century-old British control of an international drug traffic now exceeding \$200 billion annually.

Let us pass over the intervening history, and go directly to the 1938-1950 period, during which the "Company" successfully took control of the crucial levers of power of the United States.

During the period beginning 1938, the British SIS launched a special project known as the Beaverbrook-sponsored "Special Operations Executive," or simply "SOE." The true, longer-range objective of the SOE was, as former World War I British foreign intelligence chief H. G. Wells gloated at that time, to fulfill the objectives of Cecil Rhodes's testament to conquer the United States by assimilation.

The SOE project is usefully described as a "retargeting" operation, like the "Rote Kapelle." By coopting the Roosevelt administration into a partnership on the pretext of short-term, war-time objectives, against Germany and Japan, the SOE enable the "Company" to penetrate deeply into much more than the post-war U.S. intelligence establishment. In the end; the U.S.A. partner of London proved to be the real target of the British SIS operation.

Although, for the deception of the gullible, SOE was professedly dissolved at the close of the 1940s, all its essential elements are much larger and more powerful than ever. In addition to continuing SIS control, variously formally and de facto, over U.S. intelligence community entities, there are two features of SOE which are of principal importance for understanding the sources of the war-danger today. The first of these two is the London Tavistock Institute (Sussex), the British psychological-warfare center and coordinator of "Russian Studies" for the Atlantic Alliance community. The second is a monstrous fungus of proliferating, multinational corporations, typified by Rio Tinto Zinc and ITT, which are the self-sustaining form of corporate life of the SOE intelligence-operations capability.

The largest single component of power behind the SOE entities, then and now, is a global network of "offshore," essentially or wholly unregulated finance, closely interconnected with the two-century-old British East India Company control of the international drug traffic. This global network matches the drug-money condrits: the Canadian, Hong Kong, Singapore, British West Indies "offshore" banking and insurance cabal. At this time that combination, targeting the internal U.S.A. chiefly by way of Canadian banking and insurance, is the largest single concentration of deployable credit in the world. This power is by no means diminished by the more than \$200 billion a year of international drug-traffic income conduited chiefly through that cabal's networks.

This cabal is the largest single lever involved in both the U.S.A.'s and the international financial bubble identified earlier.

This outgrowth of the "Genoese" rentier-financial networks, the "Company," does engage in some important productive investment. However, that is not the functional character of its financial operations overall. Apart from being an absorber of illicit-drug revenues, the "Company" is essential "feudal" in outlook. It is a speculator in capitalized ground-rent.

Henry C. Carey and Friedrich List were both entirely correct in insisting that British political economy is not capitalist. Rather, it merely includes subordinated capitalist development, dominated politically and financially by "feudalist" policy and institutions. It is that, and not any intrinsic feature of industrial-capitalist development which produces the cyclical "internal contradictions" which Marx observed in his Capital.

That is the key to the Anglo-American aspect of the presently growing war-danger.

The "Technetronic" Cult

The current version of a plan to establish an oligarchist Utopia worldwide was set into motion in Britain during the 1920s. The two principal figures of this project were the former World War I chief of British foreign intelligence, H. G. Wells, and Wells's off/on collaborator from

the ranks of British intelligence, Bertrand Russell. Wells is sometimes regarded as exemplary of the "right wing" version of the Utopian scheming. Russell is usually identified with the "left wing" version of the same scheme. Morally, there is little difference and much cooperation between the two; the essential differences are merely matters of tactical inflection.

Russell set forth his version of the oligarchical Utopian scheme during the late 1920s, summing this up as a three-point program. The first point: Halt all efforts to achieve further fundamental advances in scientific knowledge. The second point: Develop a broader spectrum of psychotropic drugs, to provide a cheap mass means for mind control. His third point: Develop "linguistics" as a weapon for destroying the cognitive potentialities of existing literate languages.

Wells differed with this on one principal point. Where Russell generally proposed wiping out science and technology entirely, Wells proposed institutions such as Aldermaston today, into which the oligarchy would tuck away all scientific and related knowledge, away from the knowledge and practice of society generally, but providing a reservoir, among other things, of oligarchical military arts.

Although Dirty Bertie's (Russell's) fascist Dionysiacs generally pollute the landscape of most nations today, it is the H. G. Wells orientation which presently predominates among leading pro-oligarchical circles.

Otherwise, Wells and Russell shared collaborators and proteges rather freely. The Lucifer-cultist, theosophist, and high priest of the Isis-Urania cult, Aleister Crowley, was prominent among the collaborators of Wells. It was Crowley who indoctrinated three of Wells's proteges, Aldous Huxley, Julian Huxley, and George Orwell, into the psychedelic mysteries of the sodomistic (Uranus) Isis-Urania cult. Aldous Huxley, the principal British intelligence figure in the campaign to put the United States on drugs, from the 1930s onward, was a close collaborator of Russell's, and they shared numerous prominent collaborators (Robert M. Hutchins, et al.) in common.

The scheme for destroying the United States from within, cen "ring around Aldous Huxley's LSD-25 and cult projects, was worked into official U.S.A. ntelligence conduits soon after the war. The now-notorious MK-Ultra LSD-25 and cult project is an example. This project was furthered with aid of the numerous branches of the Tavistock Institute planted in the United States, such as the Tavistock-created RAND Corporation and the Stanford Research Institute.

The "new left" projects of the 1950s and 1960s, although coordinated internationally through tainted channels of the Socialist International and SOE trade-union networks, were essentially Tavistock-directed, with heavy participation of Russell and his networks.

This topic is vastly documented, with entire chunks already the subjects of books and major magazine articles in print. Since we have given the general direction of the undertaking with these illustrations, we can move ahead now directly to the issue at hand.

The first widespread effort to promote a neo-Malthusian policy-turn in the United States came in the wake of the 1957-1958 recession. James R. Schlesinger's 1960, avowedly neo-Malthusian book, is a sample of that period's initial propaganda for a neo-Malthusian turn. During the early 1960s, this effort was exemplified by Hutchins's Triple Revolution lunacy, the first prominent effort to establish a mass-base support for a turn to a "post-industrial society." More broadly, this was also the period in which business executives and politicians began to be systematically brainwashed with repeated propaganda proposing a shift away from a "nineteenth-century industrial society," to a "modern services-oriented pattern of employment."

During the early 1960s, this met with stiff resistance. President Kennedy adopted NASA, the National Science Foundation, and pushed through investment tax-credit incentives. The

neo-Malthusians were not pleased with these (and certain other) aspects of the Kennedy administration.

The turning point came during 1966-1968. The theme was struck by a Tavistock Institute report on the effects of NASA's image on the outlook of the general population. Science was becoming popular; Tavistock was displeased, even alarmed. Anatol Rapoport's report provides some access to Tavistock's thinking at that time.

British intelligence ordered the United States to contract NASA around the completing of the moon-landing objectives, and ordered the United States to rapidly phase down science-promoting activities and basic research and development in most categories. Predominantly, the United States obeyed.

This was the same period that British intelligence spun off the genocidal, neo-Malthusian Club of Rome from NATO intelligence. It was during this period that Tavistock subordinate Zbigniew Brzezinski published his Orwellian prescription for a "Technetronic Age." Military requirements considered somewhat separately, basic industry was to be cut back substantially. Support would be concentrated chiefly on the electronic-communications categories, with a view to creating networks of total Orwellian control over society by aid of this new hardware.

The "zero technological growth" movement was turned into a mass movement of "environmentalists" on orders from above, beginning Fall 1969. There was nothing at all spontaneous in the emergence of the "antinuclear" ferment in any country.

During the 1970s, beginning with the "Watergate" crisis launched in 1972 by Kissinger and his Institute for Policy Studies accomplices, crisis-management methods have been used by SOE (and London petroleum-marketing entities) to accelerate the monetary collapse-process, and to eradicate institutional defense of high-technology, capital-intensive investment in non-"technetronic" basic industry and agriculture. Meanwhile, everything one might imagine has been done to prevent any of the obvious measures of monetary reform, including Third World debt rescheduling, which could revive world trade generally.

What we are confronted by is not a capitalist faction, but a "feudalist" faction. This faction is determined to reverse permanently the institutionalized effects of the Golden Renaissance, to eliminate that form of the sovereign nation-state which produced industrial society. These fanatical modern "Hesiods" are determined to establish forever, over the coming period, their everlasting world-rule under a "one world" oligarchical "utopia."

In order to establish a world able to function on a generally lower level of productive technologies, these "feudalist" fanatics have dedicated the period between now and the year 2000 A.D. to what is in effect a "new dark age," during which famine, epidemic, local wars, and homicidal chaos, reduce the human population on the order of billions of persons.

If the assessment of these "feudalists" current position were confined to the combination of OECD and developing nations, Peking included, we might tend to judge that the "feudalists," chiefly by taking over the command of the United States, appear to have won. In that part, their success in bringing into being their desired oligarchical one-world seems almost assured.

As long as the Soviet Union develops in economic (and, therefore, military) potentials, the push into the "new dark age" must be halted. Yet, to halt, to reverse track toward resumed industrial strength of the OECD nations, means to sacrifice not only neo-Malthusian gains, but major chunks of the institutionalized social forces and policies dedicated to the oligarchical-utopian objectives. Perhaps, the "feudalists" fear, if protechnology forces are turned loose, the republican forces will recover their former power, and perhaps hold to it more tenaciously, precisely because they had come so near to losing everything.

So, the next step toward the "new dark age" depends upon the possibility of immediately disrupting or bluffing into capitulation the industrial power of, especially, the Soviet Union.