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I. INTRODUCTION

A Framework for History – A Modern Taboo?

Society is filled with many hidden taboos – subjects that are not discussed or written about openly. It is intriguing that the identification of long term patterns in history would seem to be one of these. US and European history textbooks typically present a list of events, sometimes with a simplistic explanation of short-term causality, but in essence more or less an expanded timeline. Considerations of longer term patterns, by contrast, are all but unknown.

Descriptive political history in both the West and Marxist countries consists principally of description and analysis within a political framework of "right" or "left." However, there is another earlier, more generalized, framework for historical analysis that has been all but forgotten in our times: Hegelian logic.

This omission is particularly intriguing because this ‘taboo’ would seem to be the product of the 20th century – no earlier.

Why did this extremely influential philosophical framework, one which formed the basis of practically all following philosophical schools, disappear from the public eye?

The first answer is that it didn't, at least not completely. Parts of Hegelian theory are taught to this day in socialist countries under Communist Party rule. Was the Hegelian historical dialectic discredited in the West? There certainly seems to be no evidence of this. It is simply not taught.

Providing a definitive answer to explain this seemingly curious phenomenon is beyond the scope of this essay. Yet by applying Hegelian theory to the events of the past 200 years we are at least led to conclude that it is unlikely to be a coincidence.

The Hegelian Historical Dialectic Revisited

"Wir leben nur durch Illusionen – unser Bewußtsein streift die Oberfläche” (We live only through illusions – our consciousness skims the surface.) – F. Nietzsche

(Source: Betrachtungen über den Kampf von Kunst und Erkenntnis, 1872/73)

Hegel’s life work can be seen as an attempt to define reality. In this, he quite consciously attempted to pick up where Plato left off. Similar to Nietzsche’s struggle to differentiate truth and illusion or Plato’s shadow-watching cavemen in his Allegory of the Cave, Hegel saw the principal challenge in defining reality to be the differentiation between Sein (existence, i.e. reality) and Schein (appearance). Identifying a lie is somewhat easier, but given the limitations of human perception, the multi-layered nature of reality and the human preference for simplistic explanations, the truth is ultimately a voyage rather than a
destination. In this context, perhaps the best any individual can hope for is (a) to recognize one’s own limitations and (b) continually question both one’s assumptions and one’s conclusions. This is in itself a kind of truth.

Moreover, if one considers the masses of humanity to be in essence sophisticated high-end batteries, little engines of production as it were (the analogy used in the film Matrix), it could be argued that the simplistic explanations for reality provided by society are in fact efficient for society as a whole. Yet what may be efficient for society as a whole is not necessarily advantageous for the individual.

In light of these considerations, history – or rather our perception of current and past events – can be seen as an attempt to define something we call ‘reality’ based on our assumptions and perceptions of the moment. Since our limited perception means that we can never know what is ‘really’ going on, we rely heavily on our assumptions. For lack of a better word, we come up with a ‘scenario’ – a simplified version of reality boiled down for human consumption. This scenario is then used to ‘frame’ events – to ‘put them into context’ as it were.

Obviously, the principal determinant in our perception of ‘what is going on’ is not our everyday experiences, but rather the scenario we espouse. Perceptions of scenarios vary over time and from person to person. Yet if we assume there are certain commonalities to the scenarios espoused by the general population – a ‘common culture’ or ‘common understanding’ as it were – then the question arises: How do these perceptions change over time?

Put quite simply, Hegel’s answer to this question is the notion that conflict creates history.

Unlike Marxist philosophy, the Hegelian historical dialectic (as it came to be interpreted) posits neither predetermined paths nor the inexorable necessity of any particular stages of historical development. Nor does it postulate the existence of a single ‘conspiracy’ or set of factors to explain all events. Yet in the hands of resourceful and determined groups, G. Wilhelm Hegel’s simple theoretical framework provides a potent recipe for consciously creating such conflicts (a) to influence the course of history, (b) to effect change, and – by using their prior knowledge of upcoming events – (c) to profit enormously from those conflicts and related crises.

Consequently, if this conclusion should prove to be accurate, we may need to reconsider the labels traditionally attached to members of the political and economic elites involved in consciously catalyzing these conflicts. In such a scenario, categories such as "right" or "left," secular or religious, Marxist or Capitalist, are revealed to be mirages, smokescreens to cover the true intents of the political and economic elites involved. These elites and their objectives are all of these and none of these.

In Hegelian philosophy the conflict of political "right" and political "left," or thesis and antithesis in Hegelian terms, is essential to the forward movement of history
and historical change itself. Conflict between thesis and antithesis brings about a synthesis, i.e., a new historical situation.

Proponents of 'capitalist' or 'market economy' models for society are not particularly well known for either long-term visions of the future (cf. "end of history" or "more of the same, just a little better"), or for penetrating analyses of the past. In fact, analytical history seems to have been stopped in its tracks by Karl Popper’s influential work “The Poverty of Historicism” (1957), in which he often seems to reject the analysis of historical patterns altogether. The Marxists, for their part, did produce analyses of the course of history (historical necessity), as well as some relatively specific ideas on the directions in which society was likely to develop. Yet it is difficult to match these up either of these ‘visions’ with actual events as they unfolded.

Turning back a few more pages to Hegel, on the other hand, reveals a different picture. Hegel had a clear concept of how change in society occurs – or at least CAN occur. And in contrast to the above two better known 'models', his conceptual construct reveals itself as a reasonably GOOD fit for many of the phenomena (to use a Hegelian term) of the past 200 years.

A student of Hegel might point out that while ideologies may reflect sincere beliefs on the part of some, they can also represent efforts towards conscious manipulation on the part of others. Specifically, historians conscious of the Hegelian worldview might well look for the manipulative use of ideology to catalyze dialectic processes – and ask what which types of historical syntheses these processes would seem to be leading to.

II. HOW THE HEGELIAN DIALECTIC PROCESS WORKS

Historical Roots

Over the last 200 years we can identify at least two conflicting systems of philosophy and thus 2 opposing ideas of state, society and culture that have consistently played a role throughout that period.

Certainly the concept of “Rule of Law” (cf. ‘Rechtsstaat’, ‘État de droit’) is a theme that permeates post-Renaissance European thought on desirable organizational forms for ‘civilized’ society. That said, the rights and laws on which leading thinkers have focused their attention have varied from region to region and from time to time. Within this context, official public philosophy in many countries – particularly in France as well as the British Empire and its (former) colonies - has emphasized the rights (or ‘freedoms’) of the individual. Particular emphasis was on the inviolability of his/her property rights, as echoed in the earlier less well-known French revolution motto: “égalité, liberté et propriété”. This was in itself a relatively new philosophy that arose as part of the Enlightenment.
By contrast, German Idealism in the tradition of Fichte and Hegel took a slightly different route, more in the tradition of the later motto “égalité, liberté et fraternité”. While some importance was certainly also attached to individual rights and property protection, over time these aspects came to be seen more as secondary to the needs of the society as a whole. The resulting ideals of the paternalistic state and ‘universal brotherhood’ (fraternité) can and ultimately did in many cases evolve into a more general rejection of individualism.

This train of thought served as the basis not only for the work of Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels and the so-called Left Hegelians but also for that of Bismarck, Hitler and the so-called Right Hegelians.

This is the paradox: That Hegel gave a theoretical basis not only to the most conservative of European movements, but also to most of the revolutionary movements of the 19th century. Both Marx and Hitler have their philosophical roots in Hegel’s work.

From this system of Hegelian philosophy comes the historical dialectic, i.e. the theory that all significant historical developments emerge from a conflict between opposing forces. Though Hegel himself apparently never used this term, any idea or implementation of an idea may be seen as the THESIS. This thesis will encourage emergence of opposing forces, known as the ANTITHESIS. The final outcome will be neither thesis nor antithesis; rather, a SYNTHESIS of the two forces in conflict.

**Hegelianism as a Precursor to Marxism**

Karl Marx, in *Das Kapital*, depicted capitalism in classical Hegelian manner as thesis and socialism as antithesis. Communism was seen to be the synthesis. This fact remains almost universally suppressed in Western education, where Leninist socialism was labeled as ‘communism’, thus confusing antithesis and synthesis. This new ‘communist’ synthesis can perhaps be described as reflecting the concept of the State as God and the individual as totally subordinate to the all-powerful State.

**Hegelianism in the Parliamentary System**

What then is the function of a Parliament or a Congress for Hegelians pursuing this line of thought? In this type of scenario building towards a series of staged conflicts, these institutions function primarily as tools to reassure the sheeple that their government truly represents THEIR opinion. To the extent that a two-party system is retained, people are led to believe that the ballot box provides some sort of ultimate assurance of this. Thus they are made to feel that opinions have some value and, at the same time, the government may choose to take advantage of whatever wisdom the sheeple should accidentally demonstrate. As Hegel puts it: "By virtue of this participation, subjective liberty and conceit, with
their general opinion, (individuals) can show themselves palpably efficacious and enjoy the satisfaction of feeling themselves to count for something."

War – The Quickest Path to Change

"A people living under the perpetual menace of war and invasion is very easy to govern. It demands no social reforms. It does not haggle over expenditures for armaments and military equipment. It pays without discussion, it ruins itself, and that is an excellent thing for the syndicates of financiers and manufacturers for whom patriotic terrors are an abundant source of gain” - Anatole France, pseudonym for Jacques Anatole Thibault (1844-1924)

War, the organized conflict between nations, is the most visible and in many ways the most effective type of conflict available to catalyze change. Its effects are also easy to understand and interpret in the context of the historical dialectic. As John Dewey puts it: "War is the most effective preacher of the vanity of all merely finite interests, it puts an end to that selfish egoism of the individual by which he would claim his life and his property as his own or as his family's."
(Source: John Dewey, German Philosophy And Politics, p. 197).

While this may be considered obvious, such common sense is rarely put on paper. For this we can thank the early trustees of the Carnegie Foundation, whose thoughts on the matter were kindly shared with the world by the Reece Committee of the US Congress in 1954 (aka the “Congressional Special Committee to investigate tax-exempt foundations”). According to Norman Dodd, the director of research for the Reece Committee, in 1908 “the trustees, meeting for the first time, raised a specific question, which they discussed throughout the balance of the year, in a very learned fashion. And the question is this: Is there any means known more effective than war, assuming you wish to alter the life of an entire people?”

In a live interview conducted shortly before his death in 1982, Dodd elaborates on the answer the trustees provided: “They conclude that no more effective means to that end is known to humanity than war. So then, in 1909, they raise the second question, and discuss it. Namely, how do we involve the United States in a war? And then, that very naturally raises the question of how do we do that? They answer it by saying, we must take over and control the diplomatic machinery of this country and, finally, they resolve to aim at that as an objective. Then, time passes, and we are eventually in a war, which would be World War I. At that time, they record on their minutes a shocking report in which they dispatch to President Wilson a telegram cautioning him to see that the war does not end too quickly.” (Original video of 1982 N. Dodd interview available here: http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-7529890059122668728)

20 years later, apparently F.D.R. held similar sentiments. Not only did he refuse an unequivocal offer of a conditional surrender made at the highest levels in
1943 by the German High Command, but he literally forced Japan into war with the United States by closing the Panama Canal to Japanese traffic and invoking a total trade embargo, thus cutting off their oil supply. Moreover, after taking these measures he turned down Japan’s sweeping offer to withdraw from most of its possessions in Asia and the Axis Pact in return for a suspension of the trade embargo. Specifically, on October 7, 1941, as cited in a text by Anthony Hilder, Japanese Foreign Minister Toyoda told US Ambassador Grew: “The Japanese Government is willing and prepared to return to the situation prevailing 4 years ago but it is essential that the Government of the United States of America should understand that to undo virtually at a moment’s notice the work of the past four years is an undertaking of tremendous scope.”

Hilder continues: “In effect, Japan re-stated the terms Minister Matsuoka and Prince Konoye had offered Washington in November 1940 through Bishop James E. Walsh, who was released from a Red Chinese prison in July 1970. Professor [Charles C.] Tansil states: 'Matsuoka asked Bishop James E. Walsh, Superior General of the Catholic Foreign Mission Society of Maryknoll, New York... to undertake a special mission to Washington in order to impress upon the President the fact that the Japanese Government 'wished to negotiate a peace agreement: An agreement to nullify their participation in the Axis Pact’.... a guarantee to recall all military forces from China and to restore China its geographical and political integrity.’” (cited in “The War Lords of Washington” by Anthony J. Hilder, 1973, p. 13, original source of second quotation presumably “Back Door to War” by Charles C. Tansil, 1952.).

The active role the Roosevelt administration played in provoking war with both Japan and Germany has been documented in many places, most explicitly in a recent work by Robert B. Stinnett, a World War II Navy veteran and self-professed F.D.R. sympathizer. Stinnett obtained numerous relevant documents through the Freedom of Information Act. In Day of Deceit: The Truth about FDR and Pearl Harbor (2000), Stinnett explains that Roosevelt’s plan to provoke Japan began with a memorandum from Lieutenant Commander Arthur H. McCollum, head of the Far East desk of the Office of Naval Intelligence. The memorandum advocated eight actions predicted to lead Japan into attacking the United States. McCollum wrote: "If by these means Japan could be led to commit an overt act of war, so much the better."


[...] comprehensive research has not only shown Washington knew in advance of the attack, but deliberately withheld its foreknowledge from our commanders in Hawaii in the hope that the "surprise" attack would catapult the U.S. into World War II. Oliver Lyttleton, British Minister of Production, stated in 1944: "Japan was provoked into attacking America at Pearl Harbor. It is a travesty of history to say that America was forced into the war."
Although FDR desired to directly involve the United States in the Second World War, his intentions sharply contradicted his public pronouncements. A pre-war Gallup poll showed 88 percent of Americans opposed U.S. involvement in the European war. Citizens realized that U.S. participation in World War I had not made a better world, and in a 1940 (election-year) speech, Roosevelt typically stated: "I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again: Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

But privately, the president planned the opposite. Roosevelt dispatched his closest advisor, Harry Hopkins, to meet British Prime Minister Winston Churchill in January 1941. Hopkins told Churchill: "The President is determined that we [the United States and England] shall win the war together. Make no mistake about it. He has sent me here to tell you that at all costs and by all means he will carry you through, no matter what happens to him — there is nothing he will not do so far as he has human power." William Stevenson noted in A Man Called Intrepid that American-British military staff talks began that same month under "utmost secrecy," which, he clarified, "meant preventing disclosure to the American public." Even Robert Sherwood, the president’s friendly biographer, said: "If the isolationists had known the full extent of the secret alliance between the United States and Britain, their demands for impeachment would have rumbled like thunder throughout the land."

Why did the Carnegie Foundation want to take the United States into war? What types of changes were they hoping to bring about? Why was FDR so determined to bring the United States into World War II? Why was he so determined not to end it too soon?

These are some serious questions that deserve answers. But they are merely two examples out of hundreds from the past 200 years that could be provided for the intentional provocation of war under false pretenses – mostly by use of so-called ‘false flag’ operations. In fact, intentional manipulation of ‘public opinion’ to promote passionate conflict is clearly a recurring feature of human history; and each time essentially private resources and energy are channeled into the service of the State.

Depending on the extent of (a) the diversion of resources during the war, and (b) the destruction caused by the war, the societie(s) that emerge at the end of any given conflict will be reorganized and changed to a greater or lesser degree. As Robert Wright remarks in his seminal book Non-Zero, as long as it does not result in the complete destruction of the participants, war represents the most effective promoter of societal cohesion and efficiency known to mankind. It is in a way a type of forced evolution. Seen from this perspective, it would be fair to say that the countless wars of the last 200 years have probably played a major – if not THE major – role in fast-forwarding the evolution of global human society and technology.
Leaving out for the moment those nostalgics among us, we can choose to take this at face value and say ‘yes, very interesting; lucky that we have so many wars’. But each iteration of change reshuffles the list of winners and losers, even if many of the latter are preconditioned by society not to notice the fact. And if we should come to the conclusion that many or perhaps even most wars have been fought under false pretenses, identifying the ‘winners’ may help us to evaluate whether we are looking at a ‘random’ or ‘controlled’ dialectic process.

Was a War X caused by one megalomaniac or paranoid ruler? Or did things just ‘get out of hand’ after some random incident? These two scenarios would correspond to the ‘lone gunman’ theme much beloved in the history textbooks provided to most children around the world. Or does the evidence of successive conflicts reveal repeated patterns? Or consistent winners? Or can perhaps the actors involved in triggering events can be linked to the winners? Ultimately the answers in each case are to be found by looking at (a) the individuals and/or groups who were responsible for arranging the kindling and (b) those responsible for striking the match.

The Role of the State in Hegelian Philosophy

In his seminal treatise Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts (1820, Traditional English Tr.: Elements of the Philosophy of Right), Hegel basically posits that free will can only realize itself in the complicated social context of property rights and relations, contracts, moral commitments, family life, the economy, the legal system, and the polity. A person is not truly free, in other words, unless he or she is a participant in all of these different aspects of the life of the state.

Hegel seemed to firmly believe that history led to increasing levels of freedom – at least ‘freedom’ in his definition. However, this view was not necessarily equally shared by his followers. Statements such as “The State is not the work of human art, only reason could produce it” have frequently been interpreted to view the State itself as the pinnacle of the development of human society, rather than as a tool to facilitate other objectives.

In this view, individuals are secondary at best; the individual has limited rights and morality consists principally in being a loyal ‘constructive’ member of the State. For the ambitious individual the rule is Senator Mansfield’s maxim: "To get along you have to go along."

Compare this to the spirit and letter of the Constitution of the United States: "We the people" grant the state some powers and reserve all others to the people. The state is explicitly defined as servant of the people; not the other way around, with its laws limited to the absolute minimum necessary.

A look at the pervasiveness of state control throughout all Western societies today should give an objective analyst a clear idea which of these two concepts is in the ascendant.
III. DIALECTIC PROCESSES AND AGENTS IN HISTORICAL RECORDS

Dialectic processes are primarily struggles for mindshare, as it were. Perhaps it could be said that the culmination of any particular struggle facilitates a mental reset of expectations. Along the way, resources are diverted to the struggle (government, arms manufacturers, Moral Majority-type organizations etc.). And at the same time, resources and attention are diverted away from the many other issues that would more logically be in the interest of the bulk of the citizenry, such as the reduction of government and private debt, improvements in educational opportunities or simply cutting the probability of dying in foreign wars.

These dialectic processes need not necessarily be consciously set in motion. Yet influential and ambitious groups with a clear understanding of the process are likely to be sorely tempted to use their knowledge to help things along. Looking through the last 200 years of history for conscious ‘dialectic processes’ means looking for evidence of consciously organized conflicts. For those who wish to see, such evidence in fact abounds.

Such struggles can occur on many different levels and in many different arenas. To cite just a few examples, they can involve physical struggles between armies, international ideological wars such as the so-called Cold War between the ‘first world’ (capitalist) and the ‘second world’ (socialist), the competition between political parties or the economic struggles between the ‘labor movement/unions’ and the ‘capitalists’.

We must assume that the process of conscious conflict creation is likely to involve a certain amount of deception – or at least stealth. However, it would appear that a ‘certain amount of secrecy’ does not necessarily mean ‘completely secrecy’. On the contrary, knowledge of the existence of such arsonists and even cognizance of the processes at work on the part of a small minority do not seem to have any recognizable effect. It seems sufficient that knowledge of these processes is prevented from entering the general “public domain” through control of the media and education.

The Random Walk Theory

“To ignore the pivotal role played by particular individuals who are in positions of power is to do violence to historical accuracy. A recognition that the course of economic events can be influenced by individuals who have the imagination and the power to take advantage of prevailing conditions does not constitute acceptance of a ‘conspiracy’ theory of history.”
- John Blair, former Chief Economist for the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Anti-Trust and Monopoly (source & date unconfirmed)

Mr. Blair raises an important point. Conventional wisdom in the United States and much of Western Europe in the early 21st century does just this. If any
explanation for historical patterns is offered at all it is typically limited to underlying forces such as ‘the unseen hand of the market’. This impression is particularly supported by the oligopolized corporate press – a press which dares neither to look for root causes nor to demand answers. The implication is that the unfolding of history is essentially a kind of random walk, where bumbling public figures have at best short-term influence on outcomes. Well-known historical successes of acknowledged ‘conspiracies’ - such as the Communist movement in the first half of the 19th century – are either forgotten or at best brushed off as one-time events. Assassinations are attributed to crazy lone gunmen. Wars in the distant past are explained away with accidents (someone shot the archduke and things got out of hand) or blamed on trigger-happy incompetent leaders. And as always, ongoing wars are justified as unavoidable responses to unwarranted provocations.

Such a conclusion – also called the “accidental theory of history” or “crazy person theory of history” – is particularly understandable when one considers the severely limited background information typical readers of Western newspapers have at their disposal. This shortage of reference points makes events seems doubly ‘accidental’.

To start with, they get little background from press articles on current ‘news’ events. Current journalistic practice seems to reject the supply of any type of background information that could potentially be interpreted at speculative. This more or less excludes mention of any past government covert operations, no matter how well known, and seems to apply across the Western world - regardless of which Western government conducted the operation. It also severely limits mention of any role played by, or benefits accruing to large multinational corporations in the course of conflicts – e.g. the links between the short-lived nationalization of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company (now British Petroleum) in Iran and sudden overthrow of the Iranian government shortly thereafter. Even in the United States, the leading role played by the CIA in that fateful operation is no longer classified; on the contrary, it is a matter of public record (See: Operation Ajax: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Operation_Ajax). Yet this seminal defining event is almost never referenced in articles in American media.

If Event B is causally related to Event A, but Event A was never reported in the media of a given country, then unsurprisingly that country’s citizens will be puzzled by Event B. Event B will seem to be random or irrational – perhaps the result of action by some ‘crazy person’. This phenomenon is well illustrated by the so-called ‘Iranian hostage crisis’ in 1979, during which the staff of the American embassy in Teheran was held hostage for more than a year after the successful overthrow of the hated CIA-backed government. This was a classic case of ‘blowback’ – to use CIA terminology: so-called ‘unplanned’ side effects of covert operations. In reality there was nothing mysterious at all about the fierce anti-American sentiments expressed by the Iranian people. Nor was the attack on the Embassy surprising – the Embassy was well-known to be the local CIA headquarters, and thus a top military target. ‘Covert’ was only vis-à-vis the
American people; throughout the Middle East it was common knowledge that the CIA had not only overthrown Iran’s democratically elected government, but had also facilitated 25 years of harsh dictatorial rule*. Yet since crucial background information was withheld by both the US press and government, the entire incident left most Americans mystified. (Cf. Blowback: The Costs and Consequences of American Empire, by Chalmers Johnson, or the 2001 article Blowback in The Nation: http://www.thenation.com/doc/20011015/johnson)

* After the Shah was overthrown by his own people, CIA chief William Colby called installing the Shah the CIA's proudest achievement and said, "You may think he failed, but for twenty-five years, he served us well." He certainly killed as many as he dared, especially in that last year, 1978. I've always said it was about thirty-seven thousand that year, but we'll never know exactly how many. I think there were two thousand gunned down on Black Friday alone, that August. There were a million people out on the streets that day, and they came through Jaleh Square, many wearing shrouds so that it would be convenient to bury them if they were killed. Huey helicopters fired on them from a hundred feet in the air with fifty-caliber machine guns. (Source: Former US Attorney General Ramsey Clark (1967-69), in a early 2001 interview with Sun Magazine entitled Neighborhood Bully – Ramsey Clark on American Militarism)

This case is merely particularly well documented; otherwise, it is in no way exceptional. On the contrary, under the guise of ‘objectivity’, such ‘backgroundless’ reports regularly fill the columns of all major Western newspapers, leaving readers left to assume that the world is dominated by inexplicable phenomena.

Boiled down to a simplified form, this vision ('Weltbild' or 'Weltanschauung' might be better words) says that the selection of winners and losers is the chance result of a one-time roll of the dice. The result of Round 2 is unconnected to that of Round 1. This vision simply does not match reality. Most of today’s events are clearly linked to previous ones. While the underlying factors (e.g. population density, technological development) certainly have an immense effect on historical trends and outcomes, they don’t help individuals or small groups. WHO wins and WHO loses today is strongly influenced by prior events and decisions. To postulate or imply a random walk is not only demonstrably false, but ultimately a smokescreen to enhance the effectiveness of the strategies and plans that ARE in motion, by effectively admonishing people from seeing cause and effect chains in action.

Leadership in Society

If the selection of winners and losers is NOT in fact terribly random, if the events of today (e.g. the Big Brother State or 9/11) are bound by countless subtle and not-so-subtle strings to events 40 or even 60 years ago (e.g. the Kennedy assassination or World War Two), who or what are the real sources of leadership in today’s societies? Does the provision of leadership necessarily imply ‘leadership for change and development’? And if so, assuming for a moment that
powerful persons and organizations instinctively act to preserve and enhance their own power, how do they go about making sure they remain in the ‘Winner Group’? Regardless of whether one espouses a Hegelian framework or not, considering these questions should tell us something about the mechanics behind real-life historical processes.

Moreover, seen from a Hegelian perspective, should we conclude that some of the conflicts we observe in reality may possibly be staged, some individuals or groups must be doing the staging. The obvious manipulators are the politicians elected to executive office - e.g. presidents, prime ministers and governors. But are such persons well positioned to custom-design conflict?

On a small scale perhaps yes, particularly when ‘conflicts’ serve to primarily to distract attention. One blatant example is the gay marriage ‘debate’ which Americans are repeatedly encouraged to worry about whenever elections come along. Staged or not, some observers might wonder whether the heavily publicized criminal prosecutions of public figures from the entertainment world (OJ Simpson, Michael Jackson etc.) serve a similar purpose.

By contrast, the creation of larger and deeper conflicts takes time; and time is one thing that today’s elected officials rarely have. School textbooks teach that term limits are a good thing – and perhaps they are. Yet the downside is seldom pointed out: with terms of executive office in most countries limited to 10 years or less, and frequent elections throughout the entire period, someone relying on the authority of his or her office alone will find putting long-term plans into motion to be difficult. This difficulty is irrespective of whether goals are pursued openly, via deception or via a mixture of the two approaches.

Forgetting for a moment the ever-looming threat of assassination by the CIA, in the US political system even in theory presidents have no more than 3½ years of breathing space to ‘fix’ things. And in reality ‘midterms’ can derail any initiative requiring legislation to be passed by Congress. With every election the entrenched interests of society (press, armaments industry, special interest groups, banks etc.) have a chance to make their disapproval felt. Even if one believes the electorate is not being manipulated by the press, one must admit that politicians subject to this type of micromanagement face monumental challenges when attempting to catalyze any type of meaningful change.

This is not to say that such public figures are unlikely per se to be involved in the laying of long-term plans and/or the conscious staging of conflicts towards these ends. However, it does seem clear that in North America and Western Europe they cannot rely on the authority of their office for these purposes. Moreover, once they enter public office and publicly espouse certain positions, their scope for both tactical and strategic manoeuvring is radically reduced. Not only is their physical freedom of movement severely constrained, but they also are constantly hampered by the public record of positions they previously espoused. Even forgetting for a moment the information filter imposed by the media and their 100% control over spin, politicians with a commitment to honesty are hard put to
coherently explain their positions in a form understandable to their poorly informed and uninterested electorate. On the contrary, given the electorate’s demonstrated preference for simplified black and white scenarios, cynics would probably argue that thoroughly dishonest politicians are in fact in the better position.

Political parties and political action committees are a second candidate for the role of change catalyst. A glance at some historical movements, the socialist and environment movements in particular, would seem to indicate that parties can play such a role. Yet both of these movements were not only well funded but also broadly supported in the press. At a minimum this should cause one to suspect that the ultimate source of ‘leadership’ in these parties and/or PACs is to be found not within them, but amongst their ‘backers’. In fact in many cases, (e.g. John Birch Society, NAACP) it has been documented that such PACs were originally created using foundation funds. Just to cite one better-known example, David Rockefeller has been quoted as claiming that the Rockefeller Foundation was a primary sponsor involved in establishing both the environmental and the ‘women’s liberation’ movements.

Certainly it is difficult to detect much evidence of long-term planning on the part of either of the 2 parties dominating the political landscape of most North American and Western European countries. The party in power changes occasionally, but differences in policy are very limited in scope. Given their extreme dependence on support from (1) the media, (2) influential special interest groups (e.g. AIPAC) and (3) corporate funding, this should not be too surprising. Yet this dependence puts them in a very weak position to espouse any policies running counter to the interests of their benefactors.

If the above analysis is correct – i.e. that the above persons and institutions are not very likely sources of long-term leadership in Western society – then we must conclude that either (1) there is no long-term leadership, or (2) we need to look elsewhere. Assuming that the ships are not completely rudderless, what other candidates are available?

**The Great Depression – A Clear-Cut Case**

Logically, some candidates are to be found in historical records. Though explicit references are rare, glimpses of dialectic processes and their catalyzing agents in action can in fact be found in modern historical works. For instance, Karl Popper pointed out the role of Hegelian ideas in the rise of Fascism, but failed to consider their applicability to other historical phenomena.

Perhaps the most comprehensive insights into the conscious staging of paradigm-changing conflicts are to be found in the extensive literature on the Great Depression that crippled the ‘capitalist’ world from 1929 to 1931. It can be argued that The Great Depression impacted the development of the Twentieth Century more than any other single event. And at any rate, at a minimum it has to be ranked with the 2 World Wars and the Rise of Communism as one of the
top four events. And whereas the cause and effect chains surrounding the other 3 mentioned events are shrouded in countless layers of lies, distortions and outright fairytales, in retrospect the cause and effect chains involved in triggering of the Great Depression are actually quite clear: they reflect a conscious tripping of the switch.

Economic writers, bankers and financial commentators have on occasion been quite explicit about this. Perhaps the most well-known of these is the Nobel Prize winning economist Milton Friedman, who pointed out on multiple occasions that there can be little doubt that the Great Depression was no accident. Just to cite one instance, in an NPR interview he gave in January 1996 Friedman stated: “The Federal Reserve definitely caused the Great Depression by contracting the amount of currency in circulation by one-third from 1929 to 1933.”

True, some commentators claim that such a judgment of ‘no accident’ does not prove ‘intention’. However, such a supposition could only be true if one also chooses to believe in sudden collective attacks of amnesia. All the bankers managing the US Federal Reserve must have had just such an attack – one lasting two full years from 1929 to 1931 and causing its sufferers to forget all the basics they and their predecessors had gleaned from 150 years of central banking experience.

In his book “F.D.R. My Exploited Father-in-Law” (1968), F.D.R.’s investment banker son-in-law Curtis Dall (formerly with Lehman Brothers) summarizes the rollout succinctly: “The depression was the calculated 'shearing' of the public by the World Money Powers, triggered by the planned sudden shortage of supply of call money in the New York money market.” His words are echoed in multiple statements from Congressman Louis T. McFadden, Chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee in the 1930s. On one occasion Mr. McFadden was quoted as saying: "It [the depression] was not accidental. It was a carefully contrived occurrence.... The international bankers sought to bring about a condition of despair here so that they might emerge as the rulers of us all.” (source & date unconfirmed)

Translated into Hegelian terms, the Great Depression can be seen as a conflict between ‘heartless and unstable capitalism’ (thesis) on the one side, and ‘socialism’ (antithesis) on the other. Some of the harvests: (1) incalculable profits for those who moved their assets into cash in advance of the event and were in a position to later purchase assets of bankrupt companies at auction, (2) the rise of the NSDAP in Germany and Germany’s later elimination as Continental Europe’s dominant power, and (3) millions of ready and willing agents for the cause of socialism/communism throughout the world. The ‘synthesis’ that emerged from the Great Depression set the stage in turn for World War II, by building up fascism in some countries and well-funded pro-communist ‘third columns’ in others. The support provided by these converts at all levels of the US and UK governments later played a key role in facilitating the military build-up of the Soviet Union and the triumph of communism in China. One of the converts was Eleanor Roosevelt, whose husband was then entrusted with the task of
dismembering Germany and conquering Europe for the Soviet Union – tasks which he performed with exceptional brilliance*

*It is relevant to note that Soviet archives opened in the early 90s confirmed that in fact most of FDR’s principal advisors – and chief wartime ‘negotiators’ – were listed as Soviet spies. In Witness, his epic 1952 insider account of 13 years in the US Communist Party, Whittaker Chambers summarizes the staggering scope of the subversion of the US Government during this period: “In a situation with few parallels in history, the agents of an enemy power were in a position to do much more than purloin documents. They were in a position to influence [an understatement!] the nation’s foreign policy in the interests of the nation’s chief enemy, and not only on exceptional occasions, like Yalta or the Morgenthau Plan for the destruction of Germany, but in what must have been the staggering sum of day-to-day decisions. That power to influence policy had always been the ultimate purpose of the Communist Party’s infiltration. It was more dangerous, and, as events have proved, much more difficult to detect, than espionage, which beside it is trivial, though the two go hand-in-hand.” (Random House edition, 1952, p. 348)

One obvious key to this success - ‘mindshare’ captured with the aid of the Great Depression.

Statements by Public Figures

Custom-designing conflict requires tools: depending on the type of conflict desired, politicians, media and money markets are some of the obvious ones to use. Accordingly, politicians and civil servants are well positioned to provide evidence of consciously organized conflicts. And while it would foolhardy to assume any statement from a politician to be an accurate reflection of his or her true opinions, sifting through the available record can provide important pointers.

Though few statements from politicians go so far as to single out individual persons, certain influential groups are clearly identified. Moreover, some of the most revealing statements come from those senior leaders who ultimately came to regret the role they played in others’ schemes. These are people who ought to know what they are talking about.

Thanks to the Internet and sources such as wikiquote.org, quotes attributed to public figures are both more accessible and easily searchable than ever before in history. That said, it is worth noting that extreme caution is advisable when dealing with such historical quotes. Quotes are frequently taken out of context, patched together from multiple sources, or completely fabricated. Furthermore, even the apparently ‘real’ quotes are often shorn of the subtlety that so charmingly characterizes reality and assuredly bores the sheeple.

Though it is by definition impossible to be 100% certain of anything, checking attributions against complete manuscripts (as opposed to excerpts) is crucial to sorting out the chaff. True, this slows down research considerably. Yet original
texts also provide contexts, which, by their nature, help guard against misinterpretations. Moreover, these contexts can often be more revealing in their subtle implications than the black & white quotes which are typically drawn from them.

On the other hand, plenty of statements stand on their own merits, regardless of who supposedly made them the first time.

**Banks: The Power-Nexus of Western Society**

"The issue which has swept down the centuries and which will have to be fought sooner or later is The People vs. The Banks."

- Lord Acton, Historian and Lord Chief Justice of England, 1875

"Money is an illusion, truly like the carrot for the donkey. It's only out of fear and greed that the illusion of money is held together by billions of people thinking that money is real. Money is really made up."


Amassing and retaining power is all about gambling. Calculated risks are taken, and there are winners and losers. But a good casino structures its betting system such that in the long term the House always wins – no matter how the bets are placed. Such would in fact seem to be the case with many of the real-life ‘winners’ of the past 200 years. And in fact, the game is clearly stacked for all who care to see – stacked in favor of those able to harness the money-creating power of fractional reserve banking.

It is **not** the goal of this analysis to focus on the role of any particular person, group or institution in the creation of conflicts around the world. **Rather, it is to identify patterns of events, as well as the institutions and tools typically employed.** Yet not all of the key institutions or groups involved in the shaping of history are equally well known or appreciated. On the contrary, many clearly influential institutions such as Masonic societies, guilds or banks seldom receive more than passing mention in historical accounts. It is surely no accident that this apparent oversight applies particularly to the banking establishment, the institution at the core of the power structures that dominate modern Western society.

Typical analyses of political history tend to revolve around governments – their actions, their leaders, their ‘successes’ and their ‘failures’. The implication is that these institutions are the preeminent sources of power in society. **Yet at a minimum for the past 200 years, this implication is seriously misleading.** To overlook the very real power exercised by the banking establishment must inevitably call into question the validity of any such analysis. To paraphrase the indomitable journalist and writer Douglas Reed, it is impossible to rationally assess events or policies when “major elements of knowledge are excluded from public discussion; it is like playing billiards with twisted cues and elliptical balls.”
Moreover, to examine modern history without pointing out the key role played by banks and their owners would render any discussion about the cause & effect chains unnecessarily mysterious.

People work primarily for material inducements – things that in today’s world can mostly be purchased or obtained using money. This fact makes money ultimately (though not immediately) convertible into power. Yet it is an often overlooked fact that the ‘exchange rate’ between money and power has been steadily rising for hundreds of years. Financial power can not only buy more power and influence, but it can do so infinitely more quickly than 500 years ago. Among other factors, the dramatically increased liquidity of markets and the stability of global institutions have doubtless played a significant role in this development. However, the most significant factor was probably the development of fractional reserve banking.

Why? Today’s banks are not simply places where individuals and companies ‘store extra cash’. For one thing, banks decide who gets credit and who doesn’t – i.e. they decide who gets resources. This is obviously an enormous source of power, regardless of how it is used. But more importantly, in today’s fractional reserve banking system banks can create ‘funds’ out of thin air, as it were. Remembering the equation money = power, essentially the banks are licensed to create power - provided of course that the ‘illusion of value’ can be maintained. And although the money may not be ‘real’, as long as people believe in it, the power is. Moreover, to the extent that a given bank is ‘too large to be allowed to fail’, its managers can essentially create this ‘power’ at zero risk to themselves. (This is the so-called ‘moral hazard’ problem.) To the extent that the government is willing to ‘guarantee’ deposits, even small banks can participate. And in the case of their creations the ‘central’ banks, the only limit to this power is the willingness of the public to swallow the implied cost in terms of inflation.

It is difficult to overstate the impact of this invention on history. Were a historian to analyze patterns of power structures in pre-modern societies, and then try to apply these same patterns today without accounting for the influence of the financial industry, it is hard to see how the result would be usable. In this light it is obvious that many of the major sources of power and influence around the world are likely to be found where the money is – amongst the banks and their controlling shareholders. And as it turns out, there is in fact substantial evidence directly linking the banking world with some of the major conflicts of the past 200 years.

Since banks can effectively ‘create power’, ambitious individuals and families, regardless of the industries in which they built their original fortunes, have often tended to gravitate into the banking world. The Rockefeller family (Standard Oil / ExxonMobile, Citibank, Chase Manhattan Bank) is one of the better-known examples of this phenomenon. At the same time, it is worth remembering that these families and the banks they built up also directly or indirectly control significant parts of the world’s key industries: oil (energy), weapons, drugs and
chemicals. Via such major corporations, their influence extends directly to the daily lives and careers of substantial portions of humanity.

Given this scenario, it should not be surprising that insights from Western politicians as to the ‘real’ decision makers often tend to point towards the banking establishment and their creations the central banks. This has particularly been the case in the United States, perhaps due to the open power struggles between the banking establishment and several American presidents in the nineteenth century. Though distorted, the memory of these struggles has not (yet) been completely submerged in the official history books.

Despite this, it is important to remember that references to manipulations by ‘the bankers’ or ‘the central banks’ should not be taken to imply some type of group solidarity or unified front. While this may be true in cases, conscious manipulations of events are by definition acts of individuals or small groups – not of industries per se. Banks and central banks, as well as the ‘bankers’ and ‘central bankers’ that run them, are systems. They should not be confused with the persons or groups who use those systems.

In his seminal treatise *Tragedy And Hope* (1966), the late Carroll Quigley explains this point well: “It must not be felt that these heads of the world’s chief central banks were themselves substantive powers in world finance. They were not. Rather, they were the technicians and agents of the dominant investment bankers of their own countries, who had raised them up and were perfectly capable of throwing them down. The substantive financial powers of the world were in the hands of these investment bankers (also called ‘international’ or ‘merchant’ bankers) who remained largely behind the scenes in their own unincorporated private banks. These formed a system of international cooperation and national dominance which was more private, more powerful, and more secret than that of their agents in the central banks…”

Upon objective analysis, it is hard to deny the power held by the financial establishment today. The question is: How is this power being used? Do the benefits to society outweigh the costs? And perhaps more importantly, does the power of this banking establishment effectively undermine the principles of democratic rule? A quote attributed to Sir Josiah Stamp, President of the Bank of England in the 1920s, takes a clear position on this point: “The Bankers own the earth. Take it away from them, but leave them the power to create deposits, and with the flick of the pen they will create enough deposits to buy it back again. However, take it away from them, and all the great fortunes disappear, and they ought to disappear, for this would be a happier and better world to live in. But, if you wish to remain the slaves of Bankers and pay the cost of your own slavery, let them continue to create money and control credit.” While I suspect that this quote is a patchwork drawn from multiple sources, its clear stance is rare. Understandably, this position will sound extreme to many readers. Yet if we avoid being irritated by the provocative language, one must admit there is much truth in those words. [-> Source: Wikipedia et al. I cannot find any claims]
Wilson’s Testimony

Ironically, one of those most extensive commentaries of the last century on the power of the banking establishment comes from the pen of Woodrow Wilson. In his book “The New Freedom”, President Woodrow Wilson – the man who signed the Federal Reserve Act into law – casts himself in the role of ‘enemy of the bankers’. Now that’s a smokescreen for you – nothing like a frontal attack to confuse the sheeple. The book was published just months before Wilson sponsored the enactment of the bankers’ concept for the US’s third privately-owned central bank. At the time the ‘Federal Reserve’ concept was initially pitched to the public as being a ‘populist’ approach due to its creation of multiple ‘banks’ across the country. (1913, Source: http://www.gutenberg.org/etext/14811). Wilson writes:

"Since I entered politics, I have chiefly had men’s views confided to me privately. Some of the biggest men in the United States, in the field of commerce and manufacture, are afraid of somebody, are afraid of something. They know that there is a power somewhere so organized, so subtle, so watchful, so interlocked, so complete, so pervasive, that they had better not speak above their breath when they speak in condemnation of it.

[...]

The great monopoly in this country is the monopoly of big credits. So long as that exists, our old variety and freedom and individual energy of development are out of the question. 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....

Shall we try to get the grip of monopoly away from our lives, or shall we not? Shall we withhold our hand and say monopoly is inevitable, that all that we can do is to regulate it? Shall we say that all that we can do is to put government in competition with monopoly and try its strength against it? Shall we admit that the creature of our own hands is stronger than we are? We have been dreading all along the time when the combined power of high finance would be greater than the power of the government. Have we come to a time when the President of the United States or any man who wishes to be the President must doff his cap in the presence of this high finance, and say, ‘You are our inevitable master, but we will see how we can make the best of it?’

We are at the parting of the ways. We have, not one or two or three, but many, established and formidable monopolies in the United States. We have, not one or two, but many, fields of endeavor into which it is difficult, if not impossible, for the independent man to enter. We have restricted credit, we have restricted opportunity, we have controlled development, and 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.”

**Wilson and FDR on the Owners**

Other comments from later on underline the fact that his assessment of the influence of certain non-elected persons over government did not change with his assumption of the presidency. On March 7, 1917 he was quoted as saying: "A little group of willful men, representing no opinion but their own, have rendered the great Government of the United States helpless and contemptible.” (Source: [http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Woodrow_Wilson](http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Woodrow_Wilson))

Over 20 years later, FDR, the next ‘Democrat’ president chosen to lead the United States into war, gave a similar assessment: “The real truth of the matter is, as you and I know, that a financial element in the larger centers has owned the Government ever since the days of Andrew Jackson—and I am not wholly excepting the Administration of W.W. The country is going through a repetition of Jackson’s fight with the Bank of the United States—only on a far bigger and broader basis.” (Source: Letter to Col. Edward Mandell House (of all people!), November 21, 1933, *F.D.R.: His Personal Letters, 1928-1945*, edited by Elliott Roosevelt, 1950), pg. 373, also cited in [Wikiquote](http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Woodrow_Wilson).)

By using the perfect tense in the above statement FDR unambiguously acknowledged that this ‘control’ applied to his own presidential administration. Perhaps FDR was led to believe that those Owners who brought him to power represented a ‘rogue element’ that supported socialism. Or perhaps he believed that he could secretly turn the tables on his backers by ‘regulating’ the financial industry, introducing ever more socialist structures into the US economy and facilitating the expansion of the Soviet Union. In any case, the net result was the same: he was manipulated into implementing a vast ‘conflict agenda’.

It must be said that actually few statements by public figures are explicit about the methods used by these ‘Owners’ to exercise control. Nor is there very much clarity about the goals pursued by the bankers and secret societies, other than general political power and ownership of resources. These missing pieces make it difficult to rely exclusively on such statements to make sense of the past. Yet despite this, plenty of useful insights are to be found.

Clearly Mr. Roosevelt was well informed about the long standing struggle between his predecessors and the 'financial element' which had occupied a number of his predecessors in both Britain and the United States. Besides the two cases FDR referenced in the above-cited 1933 letter (W. Wilson and A. Jackson), certainly Thomas Jefferson repeatedly cited these dangers as far back as 1802. A. Lincoln considered them graver enemies than the Confederacy, and Benjamin Disraeli echoed very similar-sounding concerns with respect to the ‘secret societies’ during his terms as British Prime Minister in the mid 1800s.
Before proceeding to consider the modalities of control and the results thereof, let’s first look at what a few of these other prime ministers and presidents are recorded as saying.

**Thomas Jefferson on Wolves and Sheep**

"I hope we shall... crush in its birth the aristocracy of our moneyed corporations, which dare already to challenge our government to a trial of strength and bid defiance to the laws of our country." - Thomas Jefferson to George Logan, 1816

"I see in the near future a crisis approaching that unnerves me and causes me to tremble for the safety of my country. ... corporations have been enthroned and an era of corruption in high places will follow, and the money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people until all wealth is aggregated in a few hands and the Republic is destroyed." - Abraham Lincoln, Nov. 21, 1864, letter to Col. William F. Elkins, in The Lincoln Encyclopedia, by Archer H. Shaw

Thomas Jefferson’s opinions about the threat to America’s independence posed by Europe’s financial establishment are well known and extensively reflected in his writings. He certainly despised the way in which European governments facilitated the exploitation of the poor by the rich, perceiving the European system of institutionalized dependency as the antithesis of American democratic principles. In 1787 during his term as US Minister to France, he wrote to Edward Carrington saying: "[...] under pretense of governing, they [European governments] have divided their nations into two classes, wolves and sheep. I do not exaggerate... Experience declares that man is the only animal which devours his own kind; for I can apply no milder term to the governments of Europe, and to the general prey of the rich on the poor." (Source: http://etext.virginia.edu/jefferson/quotations/jeff0250.htm, ME 6:58). His writings make clear not only that he identified the European financial establishment as a central figure in this exploitative system, but also that he perceived a clear intent on their part to create similar power structures on the American continent.

One statement allegedly made in 1802 is eerily prophetic in the degree to which it would seem to describe the indebted and dependent state of most Americans 200 years later: “If the American people ever allow private banks to control the issue of their currency, first by inflation and then by deflation, the banks and corporations that will grow up around them will deprive the people of all property until their children will wake up homeless on the continent their fathers conquered.” (Source: Letter to the Secretary of the Treasury Albert Gallatin (1802); later published in The Debate Over The Recharter Of The Bank Bill (1809), http://www.quotationspage.com/quote/37700.html, Originals should be here for the very eager decypherers: http://memory.loc.gov. - Comment: I do not consider this quote to be 100% verified due to my inability to find a copy of this 1809 book. Nonetheless, many sources recount that a bill to re-charter the Bank Of The United States was actually defeated in 1809 in Congress. Moreover,
the sentiments expressed do not diverge considerably from T. Jefferson’s other writings. Hence I think it worth quoting despite the lack of the original.)

In a different letter he describes his views at length: "From a passage in the letter of the [bank] President, I observe an idea of establishing a branch bank of the U.S. [Bank Of The United States, the first US central bank] in New Orleans. This institution is one of the most deadly hostility existing, against the principles & form of our Constitution. The nation, at this time, so strong & united in it’s sentiments, that it cannot be shaken at this moment. But suppose a series of untoward events should occur, sufficient to bring into doubt the competency of a republican government to meet a crisis of great danger, or to unhinge the confidence of the people in the public functionaries; an institution like this, penetrating by it’s branches every part of the Union, acting by command & in phalanx, may, in a critical moment, upset the government. I deem no government safe which is under the vassalage of any self-constituted authorities, or any other authority than that of the nation, or it’s regular functionaries. What an obstruction could not this bank of the U. S., with all it’s branch banks, be in time of war? It might dictate to us the peace we should accept, or withdraw it’s aids. Ought we then to give further growth to an institution so powerful, so hostile? That it is so hostile we know, 1, from a knowledge of the principles of the persons composing the body of directors in every bank, principal or branch; and those of most of the stockholders: 2, from their opposition to the measures & principles of the government, & to the election of those friendly to them: and 3, from the sentiments of the newspapers they support. Now, while we are strong, it is the greatest duty we owe to the safety of our Constitution, to bring this powerful enemy to a perfect subordination under it’s authorities. The first measure would be to reduce them to an equal footing only with other banks, as to the favors of the government. But, in order to be able to meet a general combination of the banks against us, in a critical emergency, could we not make a beginning towards an independent use of our own money, towards holding our own bank in all the deposits where it is received, and letting the treasurer give his draft or note, for payment at any particular place, which, in a well-conducted government, ought to have as much credit as any private draft, or bank note, or bill, and would give us the same facilities which we derive from the banks?” (Dec. 1803, http://oll.libertyfund.org/Texts/Jefferson0136/Works/Vol10/0054-10_Pt02_1803.html#hd lf054-10_head_023)

**Andrew Jackson’s Bank War**

In 1811, Thomas Jefferson was able to terminate the exclusive charter of the First Bank Of The United States. Yet 20 years on, history seemed to repeat itself. A second privately-owned central bank had been chartered by the US Congress in 1816, and in 1829 a new President Jackson declared his resolute opposition to the renewal of its charter. Taking actions similar to those of the Federal Reserve 100 years later, the bank radically contracted credit to force the government into submission. Yet in the 1830s the US Government proved much more resilient than its successor a century later, and the bank ultimately failed in its attempt to blame the government for its actions. Though blandly covered by modern school
textbooks on American history, the details of the so-called “Bank War” remain well-known facts.

The substance of Jackson’s objections to the Bank and its activities are well documented in his 1834 State of the Union address to Congress (Source: http://www.infoplease.com/t/hist/state-of-the-union/46.html). In this address, he lists a number of measures taken by the bank to further its own agenda. These include repeated contractions of credit and high levels of secrecy. Moreover, Jackson clearly states that these crises were manufactured in order to manipulate government and public opinion. In terms of openness, the contrast with public statements by Hoover or FDR is stark:

Circumstances make it my duty to call the attention of Congress to the Bank of the United States. Created for the convenience of the Government, that institution has become the scourge of the people. Its interference to postpone the payment of a portion of the national debt that it might retain the public money appropriated for that purpose to strengthen it in a political contest, the extraordinary extension and contraction of its accommodations [=loans] to the community, its corrupt and partisan loans, its exclusion of the public directors from a knowledge of its most important proceedings, [...] have through various channels been laid before Congress.

Immediately after the close of the last session the bank, through its president, announced its ability and readiness to abandon the system of unparalleled curtailment and the interruption of domestic exchanges which it had practiced upon from August 1st, 1833 to June 30th, 1834, and to extend its accommodations to the community. The grounds assumed in this annunciation amounted to an acknowledgment that the curtailment, in the extent to which it had been carried, was not necessary to the safety of the bank, and had been persisted in merely to induce Congress to grant the prayer of the bank in its memorial relative to the removal of the deposits and to give it a new charter. They were substantially a confession that all the real distresses which individuals and the country had endured for the preceding six or eight months had been needlessly produced by it, with the view of affecting through the sufferings of the people the legislative action of Congress.

[...]

It seems due to the safety of the people funds remaining in that bank and to the honor of the American people that measures be taken to separate the Government entirely from an institution so mischievous to the public prosperity and so regardless of the Constitution and laws. By transferring the public deposits, by appointing other pension agents as far as it had the power, by ordering the discontinuance of the receipt of bank checks in the payment of the public dues after January 1st, 1834, the Executive has
exerted all its lawful authority to sever the connection between the Government and this faithless corporation.

[...]

Events have satisfied my mind, and I think the minds of the American people, that the mischiefs and dangers which flow from a national bank far over-balance all its advantages. The bold effort the present bank has made to control the Government, the distresses it has wantonly produced, the violence of which it has been the occasion in one of our cities famed for its observance of law and order, are but premonitions of the fate which awaits the American people should they be deluded into a perpetuation of this institution or the establishment of another like it.

Here again, the actions Jackson describes – the conscious creation of crises for manipulative purposes – can be well described using a Hegelian framework.

**Disraeli and Churchill on Subversive Intent**

Benjamin Disraeli, Prime Minister of England in the mid 1800s, as well as Winston Churchill, British Prime Minister during the Second World War, are both noted for their reflections the subversive intent pursued by non-public personages and organizations.

"The world is governed by very different personages from what is imagined by those who are not behind the scenes." This, perhaps Disraeli's most famous statement, stems from "Coningsby, the New Generation", a novel that he published in 1844. As today, many truths are easier to reveal in the context of fiction. A number of his public statements, however, echoed similar sentiments:

"It is useless to deny, because it is impossible to conceal, that a great part of Europe - the whole of Italy and France and a great portion of Germany, to say nothing of other countries - is covered with a network of these secret societies, just as the superificies of the earth is now being covered with railroads." (1876)

"The governments of the present day have to deal not merely with other governments, with emperors, kings and ministers, but also with the secret societies which have everywhere their unscrupulous agents, and can at the last moment upset all the governments' plans." (1876)

Almost 50 years later, Winston Churchill reflected very similar thoughts in an article published in the Illustrated Sunday Herald on February 8, 1920. For a statesman, Churchill is unusually explicit about the long-term intent behind the plans put into motion. Churchill writes: "From the days of Spartacus-Weishaupt to those of Karl Marx, and down to Trotsky (Russia), Bela Kun (Hungary), Rosa Luxembourg (Germany), and Emma Goldman (United States), this world-wide conspiracy for the overthrow of civilisation and for the reconstitution of society on the basis of arrested development, of envious malevolence, and impossible
equality, has been steadily growing. It [this conspiracy] played, as a modern writer, Mrs. Webster, has so ably shown, a definitely recognisable role in the tragedy of the French revolution. It has been the mainspring of every subversive movement during the Nineteenth Century; and now at last this band of extraordinary personalities from the underworld of the great cities of Europe and America have gripped the Russian people by the hair of their head and have become practically the undisputed masters of that enormous empire.” (Source: various copies of original print copy available online)

This is only part of what Churchill had to say about the nature of the conspiracy he alludes to, but for the purposes of this analysis, I don’t think much comment is needed. He is basically describing the conscious manipulation of the historical dialectic process.

Twentieth Century Repeats

“The Federal Reserve is one of the most corrupt institutions the world has ever seen. There is not a man within the sound of my voice who does not know that this Nation is run by the International Bankers.” – US Congressman Louis T. McFadden, Chairman of the House Banking Committee in the 1930s (source & date unconfirmed)

“The drive of the Rockefellers and their allies [is] to create a one-world government combining super-capitalism and Communism under the same tent, all under their control. [...] Do I mean conspiracy? Yes, I do. I am convinced there is such a plot, international in scope, generations old in planning, and incredibly evil in intent.” – US Congressman Lawrence (Larry) P. McDonald, 1975, killed in the Korean Airlines 747 that was shot down by the Soviets. (Source: Introduction to The Rockefeller File by Gary Allen, 1976, pp. 3-4)

“We’re not a democracy. It’s a terrible misunderstanding and a slander to the idea of democracy to call us that. In reality, we’re a plutocracy: a government by the wealthy.” - Ramsey Clark, U.S. Attorney General from 1967-69, later founder and chairman of the International Action Center (http://www.iacenter.org), a US-based antiwar society, in a 2001 interview with the Sun Magazine (Source: http://www.thesunmagazine.org/bully.html)

In 200 years, it is astonishing how little seems to have changed!

At a minimum, the above statements clearly substantiate a conviction that small groups – and in particular the ‘master class’ - exert large amounts of control and influence over governments of all colors – and certainly over decisions of war and peace. This point was well put by Eugene V. Debs, the five time Socialist Party candidate for the US presidency imprisoned for 2 ½ years for openly protesting the war. In the famous June 16, 1918 speech leading to his arrest he said:

They tell us that we live in a great free republic; that our institutions are democratic; that we are a free and self-governing people. That is too
much, even for a joke. [...] Wars throughout history have been waged for conquest and plunder. [...] The feudal barons of the Middle Ages, the economic predecessors of the capitalists of our day, declared all wars. And their miserable serfs fought all the battles. The poor, ignorant serfs had been taught to revere their masters; to believe that when their masters declared war upon one another, it was their patriotic duty to fall upon one another and to cut one another’s throats for the profit and glory of the lords and barons who held them in contempt. And that is war in a nutshell. The master class has always declared the wars; the subject class has always fought the battles.

Source: http://www.marxists.org/archive/debs/works/1918/canton.htm

IV. THE DIALECTIC PROCESS IN POLITICS

Subversion of Political Parties

By chance or not, the dominance of an essentially ‘two party system’ in so many of the so-called Western democracies of the past 200 years is quite remarkable. These could be the Democrazia Cristiana vs. the Partito Socialista, ‘Conservative’ versus ‘Labour’, or the ‘Republicans’ versus the ‘Democrats’. From a Hegelian perspective, these could all be described as examples of ‘thesis’ and ‘antithesis’.

It is general knowledge in the United States that leading corporations regularly contribute large sums to both of the two established political parties. While this does provoke occasional muttering about corporate influence over government, the oligopolized media (principally newspapers and television) ensure that the deeper implications raised by these ‘accepted facts’ are relegated to world of books and private discussions.

Here again Professor Carroll Quigley, best known as Bill Clinton’s mentor and self-professed admirer of the goals of the “New World Order”, proves himself one of the most comprehensive analysts in print. In Tragedy And Hope, he describes banker J.P. Morgan's use of the "right" and the "left" as competitive devices for political manipulation of society:

The associations between Wall Street and the Left, of which Mike Straight is a fair example, are really survivals of the associations between the Morgan Bank and the Left. To Morgan all political parties were simply organizations to be used, and the firm always was careful to keep a foot in all camps. Morgan himself, Dwight Morrow, and other partners were allied with Republicans; Russell C. Leffingwell was allied with the Democrats; Grayson Murphy was allied with the extreme Right; and Thomas W. Lamont was allied with the Left. Like the Morgan interest in libraries, museums, and art, its inability to distinguish between loyalty to the United States and loyalty to England, its recognition of the need for social work among the poor, the multi-partisan political views of the Morgan firm in
domestic politics went back to the original founder of the firm, George Peabody (1795-1869). To this same seminal figure may be attributed the use of tax-exempt foundations for controlling these activities, as may be observed in many parts of America to this day, in the use of Peabody foundations to support Peabody libraries and museums. Unfortunately, we do not have space here for this great and untold story, but it must be remembered that what we do say is part of a much larger picture.

Handpicking of Controllable Candidates

This practice by the Owners of supporting both "right" and "left" is a carefully orchestrated play. As Curtis Dall explains, "carefully screened leading ‘actors’ are picked well in advance of election day by a small group, picked for both major parties, thereby reducing the promotional risk to just about zero.” He continues: “On the political stage, one must be groomed by ‘backers’ to become a ‘statesman’. It is desirable for such a candidate to have great personal ambition, and, perchance, to be vulnerable to blackmail for some past occurrences; hence, someone not too apt to become too independent in time, but always amenable to ‘suggestions’ on a policy level. ("F.D.R. My Exploited Father-in-Law", p. 23, 1968) ‘Advisors’ such as Colonel House (Wilson) or Bernard Baruch (Wilson, FDR, Eisenhower) function as the conduit between the politicians and the backers. The ‘backers’ themselves are careful to remain as far as possible from the limelight, thus preserving their freedom of movement and ensuring that they can retain power regardless of the whims of the public or any other circumstances.

These ‘suggestions’ generally prove to be profitable. Advance knowledge of the endless programmed conflicts and engineered crises (such as the Great Depression) has guaranteed the ‘advisors’ enormous personal profits – profits which in many cases can be at least partially documented by using their income tax returns. We can only assume that profits realized by the advisors represent a mere shadow of those that accrue to the backers.

The ‘Capitalist’ Backers of ‘Communist’ Revolution

Another author to point out the apparent paradox of one group supporting both ‘left’ and ‘right’ was former FBI agent Cleon Skousen, author of both The Naked Communist and The Naked Capitalist. On page 1 of the latter Skousen cuts to the chase regarding the connections between Wall Street finance and the creation and buildup of the Soviet Union. Specifically, he relates a conversation he conducted with Dr. Bella Dodd, a former member of the National Committee of the US Communist Party and thus someone who ought to know:

“Dr. Dodd said she first became aware of some mysterious super-leadership right after World War II when the US Communist Party had difficulty getting instructions from Moscow on several vital matters requiring immediate attention. The American Communist hierarchy was told that any time they had an emergency of this kind they should contact any one of three designated persons
at the Waldorf Towers. Dr. Dodd noted that whenever the party obtained instructions from any of these three men, Moscow always ratified them. What puzzled Dr. Dodd was the fact that not one of these three contacts was a Russian. Nor were any of them Communists. In fact, all three were extremely wealthy American capitalists! Dr. Dodd said, ‘I would certainly like to find out who is really running things.’” Her conclusion: “I think the Communist conspiracy is merely a branch of a much bigger conspiracy!”

Mr. Skousen is far from the only source to record these connections; they are as close to a fact as one can hope for in historical research on sensitive topics. Moreover, the massive and traitorous supply of the Soviet Union with confidential information and materiel unrelated to war needs during World War II confirms the incredible amount of support enjoyed by the Soviet Union at the highest levels in the United States. The logic of such an intimate relationship between the leading ‘capitalists’ and their supposed enemies the Soviets is rather challenging to explain using conventional logic. Seen in terms of the Hegelian historical dialectic, the logic is clear.

V. MAINTAINING THE MIRAGE

Many – if not most – of these ‘histories’ are all but unknown to the general population of North America and Western Europe. Seen in the light of the much vaunted ‘freedom of the press’, how is this possible?

John Swinton (1829-1901), a Scottish immigrant to the United States in the mid nineteenth century and later prominent journalist, gives us a glimpse of the real tradition – not the mythology - upon which today’s press builds. A labor advocate, he is credited with one of the most devastating evaluations of the much vaunted ‘freedom of the press’ on record.

The remarks were apparently made by Swinton one night in 1880 at a banquet. Someone offered a toast to the independent press, to which Swinton is recorded as replying:

> There is no such thing, at this date of the world's history, in America, as an independent press. You know it and I know it. There is not one of you who dares to write your honest opinions, and if you did, you know beforehand that it would never appear in print. I am paid weekly for keeping my honest opinion out of the paper I am connected with. Others of you are paid similar salaries for similar things, and any of you who would be so foolish as to write honest opinions would be out on the streets looking for another job. If I allowed my honest opinions to appear in one issue of my paper, before twenty-four hours my occupation would be gone.
The business of the journalists is to destroy the truth, to lie outright, to pervert, to vilify, to fawn at the feet of mammon, and to sell his country and his race for his daily bread. You know it and I know it, and what folly is this toasting an independent press?

We are the tools and vassals of rich men behind the scenes. We are the jumping jacks, they pull the strings and we dance. Our talents, our possibilities and our lives are all the property of other men. We are intellectual prostitutes.


**Freedom to Publish – Yes – But Not Much Else**

How much has changed since Swinton’s days? One hour comparing major online US and British newspapers to a few non-Western publications such as Pravda should be sufficient to make the answer abundantly clear. Not much. The relative diversity of opinion and content in Pravda (partial English translation: http://english.pravda.ru) is striking. Yet with 99%+ of English-language print media in the hands of fewer than 10 large corporations – all with a huge vested interest in maintaining the status quo – high levels of uniformity can hardly be considered surprising.

Newspaper readership levels are another tip-off. In 2006 readership levels in the United States continued to hover around all-time lows - levels reminiscent of those for government newspapers in Communist-controlled European countries prior to 1989. Even the abundant reporting of sports and business related stories does not seem to be sufficient to draw readers.

Nonetheless, information pointing out discrepancies between reality and conventional wisdom is not new. It is not even particularly rare; on the contrary, though rarely raised in the tightly controlled press, such information has been available in published literature throughout the entire historical period under discussion, and is now in addition also readily available online. Moreover, since 1966 researchers have also been able to draw on documents released through the US Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and most recently the Soviet Union archives, thus allowing them to fill in many details previously difficult to ‘authoritatively’ substantiate.

So Dr. Dodd was certainly not alone in asking these questions. In fact, though exceptions exist, the United States as a polity has maintained a commitment to publishing freedom that remains almost unique around the world. Virtually all types of angles, views, compilations and recounts of history may be purchased or
bought – though only if one knows what to look for. At least in the United States, this, not a ‘ban’ on such viewpoints per se, is the true crux of the issue. (Europe is another matter.) Books which question official history threat the establishment, and as such, are effectively blacklisted by press and library systems. And since they often must be self-published, such books seldom get any publicity at all. This is even true for books which merely detail unsavory facts openly acknowledged in FOIA documents released by the US Government. The fake ‘Gulf of Tonkin Incident’ - the excuse used by President Johnson to kick-start the Vietnam War – is a good example of such ‘unwanted’ information.

Before approximately 1995, this de-facto blacklisting was extremely effective, and such books faced essentially insurmountable difficulties in reaching a broad audience. Since then, the tide has certainly turned somewhat, as the information blockade is being progressively undermined by comparatively unbiased Internet-based information sources. Two companies in particular have severely impacted the blockade: Google and Amazon. The non-normative indexing of information sources by Google directly undermines politically motivated filtering, whereas Amazon provides an accessible market outlet for information purveyors selling ‘sensitive’ content. Self-publishing has become a reality, and books can become underground bestsellers without any need for promotion by the New York Times list of approved literature.

At the same time, webzines and other alternative news sources such as the American Free Press, Information Clearinghouse or non-Western press such as Pravda provide instant online access to a much wider variety of news and viewpoints than those available through the so-called mainstream press and television. Unlike their predecessor short-wave radio, these are able to provide much more ‘background information’ to supply context to current events.

**Ignore – Smear – Threaten – Subvert/Co-Opt – Pervert**

Despite these encouraging developments, it would be premature to conclude that the dam has been blown. Breached yes, yet still intact. The increased accessibility of information threatens to undermine the myth of the ‘free press’, and this threat cannot always be ignored by the many corporations and political organizations who depend on this myth for their protection. So how does the establishment protect its myths, be they regarding history per-se or anything else? In the following we will see that there are several well-developed approaches available.

If the “Ignore Strategy” seems to be failing, Strategy #2 is typically “Smear” - also known as “if you don’t like the message, kill (or discredit) the messenger.” Smear pieces (also called ‘hit pieces’) are frequently employed by the Western corporate media, and are actually fairly easy to spot. They are full of ridicule, nitpicking, innuendo and indignation, mostly implying that the messenger is not worthy to be listened to; they seldom make even the pretence of reviewing conflicting points of view fairly. Such articles will often quote unnamed experts, and/or persons identified by name only – without telling the reader why the
opinion of the quoted person is to be trusted. Typical are attacks on the messenger completely unrelated to the matter at hand. And as one further option - if matters should be perceived to be serious - such articles may ‘admit’ to ‘partial’ truths (the so-called ‘limited hangout’), perhaps pointing out one or two scapegoats, only to finish out the last third of the article assuring readers that there is actually nothing serious to worry about. If you see such articles, ask yourself – why is this writer so defensive? Is the main role of this newspaper to supply news? Or to protect the ‘honor’ of established society and government?

Strategy #3 is the “Threaten” tactic: intimidation by the use of violence and threats against family members. This tactic works well against politicians, journalists and prosecuting attorneys. A good case in point is the assault by US Homeland Security on American Free Press journalist Chris Bollyn in mid 2006 at his suburban Chicago home. (More details here: http://rbnlive.com/Bollyn.html. Other examples include the threats made against the children of Jim Garrison (Clay Shaw prosecution for involvement in the JFK assassination) or Ross Perot (third party presidential candidate in 1996). When polls showed Perot to have a real chance to defeat the 2 establishment parties, he was told in no uncertain terms that this could have dire consequences for his family members. He pulled out. Though he re-entered the race 2 months later, the danger was thus averted.

For larger groups and movements such threat tactics may not be sufficient. In such cases Strategy #4 – “Subversion” – seems to be the preferred approach. This may be done using spies, or much more overtly by simply offering to finance these groups and movements. Ideally, such financing can result into effectively co-opting the movement leadership, diverting their energies as much as possible, and maintaining sufficient control to prevent any serious damage.

In other ‘less ideal’ cases, the subversive elements within the movement may use their inside information and/or access to discredit the movement (‘smear’, back to Strategy #2), or to drive the movement to extremes (‘off over the cliff you go’). Or they may proceed to Strategy #5 – “Perversion”. This is often a type of conceptual warfare – almost Orwellian in its blatancy. It can also be called ‘if you can’t beat ‘em, join ‘em’. If we can’t convince the American People to love communism, let’s call ourselves Anti-Communists, too. If war doesn’t suit the zeitgeist, let’s change the ‘War Ministry’ into the ‘Defense Ministry’. If we can’t convince the crazy youth to abandon rock 'n roll, let’s re-orient rock 'n roll to be all about ‘coolness’ and image instead of about overturning the establishment. Of course, this practice is nothing new in history – leaders of established religions have been employing it for millennia.

VI. THE CENSORED HISTORY OF WAR AND REVOLUTION

"Si nous osons dire la vérité sur le passé, peut-être oserons-nous dire la vérité sur le présent." (If we dare tell the truth about the past, perhaps we will also dare to tell the truth about the present.) - Ken Loach, Director of “The Wind That Shakes the Barley”, in a 2006 speech at Cannes upon accepting the Palme d’Or
for best film of the year. The film covers the Irish struggle for independence as well as the Irish Civil War that followed, documenting among other things the savage brutality employed by the British military.

The manipulation of ‘left’ and ‘right’ on the domestic front is duplicated in the international field, where ‘left’ and ‘right’ political structures are artificially constructed and collapsed in the drive for a one-world synthesis.

School textbooks present war and revolution as more or less accidental results of conflicting forces. The decay of political negotiation into physical conflict comes about, according to these books, after valiant efforts to avoid war. Unfortunately, this is nonsense. War is always a deliberate creative act by individuals.

Western textbooks have gigantic gaps. For example, after World War II the tribunals set up to investigate Nazi war criminals were careful to censor any materials recording Western assistance to Hitler. By the same token, Western textbooks on Soviet economic development omit any description of the economic and financial aid given to the instigators of the 1917 Revolution and subsequent economic development by Western firms, banks and the US Government. Nor are the 793,239 German victims of US-run death camps in the period April – September 1945 ever mentioned – 17 years after researcher James Bacque first broke the silence over one of the most barbaric acts of genocide in the history of humanity (Other Losses, Toronto Canada 1989, 1999 and 2004, never published in the United States).

By Way of Deception

"When War is declared, Truth is the first casualty” – Origin unknown, cited by A. Ponsonby
"Kommt der Krieg ins Land, gibt's Lügen wie Sand” – Origin unknown, cited by A. Ponsonby

"Those who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary security deserve neither liberty nor safety” (- first cited in print in 1759, origins obscure, often inaccurately attributed to Benjamin Franklin, see http://www.futureofthebook.com/stories/storyReader$605)

Trade some of your liberty (=livelihoo, resources) for the collective safety we offer you. This is essentially the appeal made to the masses by all war-waging governments. To do this, governments seldom appeal to logic; simplistic propaganda shorn of all subtleties is clearly the preferred approach. In 1928, Arthur Ponsonby, a former British MP, published one of the most comprehensive reviews of wartime ‘propaganda lies’ of all-time. Readily available in earlier times, as of 2006 it was out of print and many (if not all) US library systems have apparently been instructed to discard their copies. However, there is no record of a rebuttal or denial of its contents ever being issued, and thanks to Amazon it is still available secondhand. Ponsonby writes:
Falsehood is a recognized and extremely useful weapon in warfare, and every country uses it quite deliberately to deceive its own people, to attract neutrals, and to mislead the enemy. The ignorant and innocent masses in each country are unaware at the time that they are being misled, and when it is all over only here and there are the falsehoods discovered and exposed. As it is all past history, and the desired effect has been produced by the stories and statements, no one troubles to investigate the facts and establish the truth.

Lying, as we all know, does not take place only in war-time. Man, it has been said, is not a “a veridical animal,” but his habit of lying is not nearly so extraordinary as his amazing readiness to believe. It is, indeed, because of human credulity that lies flourish. But in war-time the authoritative organization of lying is not sufficiently recognized. [...] authorities in each country do, and indeed must, resort to this practice in order, first, to justify themselves by depicting the enemy as an undiluted criminal; and secondly, to inflame popular passion sufficiently to secure recruits for the continuance of the struggle. They cannot afford to tell the truth.

[...]

The use of the weapon of falsehood is more necessary in a country where military conscription is not the law of the land than in countries where the manhood of the country is automatically drafted into the Army, Navy, or Air Service. [...The people] should realize that a Government which has decided on embarking on the hazardous and terrible enterprise of war must at the outset present a one-sided case in justification of its action, and cannot afford to admit in any particular whatever the smallest degree of right or reason on the part of the people it has made up its mind to fight. Facts must be distorted, relevant circumstances concealed, and a [simple] picture presented which by its crude colouring will persuade the ignorant people that their Government is blameless, their cause is righteous, and that the indisputable wickedness of the enemy has been proven beyond question.


Ponsonby continues: “A moment’s reflection would tell any reasonable person that such obvious bias cannot possibly represent the truth. But the moment’s reflection is not allowed; lies are circulated with great rapidity. The unthinking mass accept them and by their excitement sway the rest. The amount of rubbish and humbug that pass under the name of patriotism in war-time in all countries is sufficient to make decent people blush when they are subsequently disillusioned. [...] War is fought in this fog of falsehood, a great deal of it undiscovered and accepted as truth. The fog arises from fear and is fed by panic. Any attempt to doubt or deny even the most fantastic story has to be condemned
at once as unpatriotic, if not traitorous. This allows a free field for the rapid spread of lies.” The truth is that the sheeple have a clear preference for black and white scenarios. The temptation to use this tool to divert and focus their energies is difficult for any government to resist.

**History Is Written By The Winners**

"L'histoire est un mensonge que personne ne conteste." (History is a lie contested by none.) – Classically attributed to Napoléon Bonaparte, probably apocryphally.

Ironically, the frequency with which the above citation is attributed to Napoleon underlines its point. Apocryphal means ‘of doubtful authenticity’, as Ponsonby points out, a designation particularly applicable to records passed down from wartime. *In Falsehood in Wartime* he lists some of the many lies told by both sides in the First World War, of which the sabotaged Lusitania used to bring the United States into the war was just one. For example, according to one of the better-known fables, the German army was accused of manufacturing oil, fertilizer and fats from the corpses of fallen soldiers. The tale began circulating in 1917, and was not laid to rest until 1925 when the British Foreign Secretary Austen Chamberlain admitted that it had been a propaganda lie. In the United States, the Federal Government employed 10,000 employees and 75,000 speakers to inflame anti-German hysteria. In historical perspective, none of this is either surprising or unusual.

What IS revealing is the difference between the fate of the World War I lies and their counterparts 25 years later. Whereas the WWI propaganda machine seems to have been rapidly dissolved after the war, the exact opposite seems to have happened after 1945. After WWII by contrast, the propaganda machine seems to have gone into overdrive.

On April 23, 1923 the American journal *The Nation* observed:

> Everybody realizes that the columns of most of our dailies were filled to overflowing with lies and poison propaganda during the war. [...] In 1916 the Allies were putting forth every possible atrocity story to win neutral sympathy and American support. We were fed every day with stories of Belgian children whose hands were cut off, the Canadian soldier who was crucified to a barn door, the nurses whose breasts were cut off, the German habit of distilling glycerine and fat from their dead in order to obtain lubricants; and all the rest.”

Such an article could not have been written 25 years later. In fact, the WWII version of the glycerine fairytale (“human soap factory”) enjoyed a lifetime of over 20 years before its final belated retirement by an Israeli court. Even today, in most of Europe open questioning of the officially sanctified versions of pre-1947 history is punishable by multi-year prison sentences and/or drastic fines.
It is a truism that history is written by the victors. Yet contemporary sources assiduously avoid considering the implications of this axiom in the context of the 20th century mass media age: Essentially, the life expectation for lies was upped dramatically between 1920 and 1995. For the first time in history, widespread literacy and blanket coverage by broadcast media empowered governments and media owners to effectively dictate the content of ‘histories’ supplied to the masses. It should not be surprising that they accepted the offer.

Official lying for the purpose of manipulation is certainly a much beloved human tradition, but the tools available for this purpose were dramatically improved after 1920, perhaps reaching their ultimate peak in the first Gulf War. Protected by the myth of the ‘free press’, Western governments and their backers have managed to persuade their citizens that that this somehow did not apply to their own countries. As a result, the distortions of history printed in Western textbooks have enjoyed a historically unparalleled success, even managing to spread themselves to formerly Communist countries whose citizens should have known better.

As in so many things, here as well George Orwell proved to have an uncannily accurate vision of what was to come. 16 years after Ponsonby’s book appeared, George Orwell wrote in his February 4, 1944 “As I Please” column for the Tribune newspaper:

Up to a fairly recent date, the major events recorded in the history books probably happened. It is probably true that the battle of Hastings was fought in 1066, that Columbus discovered America, that Henry VIII had six wives, and so on. A certain degree of truthfulness was possible so long as it was admitted that a fact may be true even if you don’t like it. Even as late as the last war it was possible for the Encyclopedia Britannica, for instance, to compile its articles on the various campaigns partly from German sources. Some of the facts — the casualty figures, for instance — were regarded as neutral and in substance accepted by everybody. No such thing would be possible now. A Nazi and a non-Nazi version of the present war would have no resemblance to one another, and which of them finally gets into the history books will be decided not by evidential methods but on the battlefield.

During the Spanish Civil War I found myself feeling very strongly that a true history of this war never would or could be written. Accurate figures, objective accounts of what was happening, simply did not exist. And if I felt that even in 1937, when the Spanish Government was still in being, and the lies which the various Republican factions were telling about each other and about the enemy were relatively small ones, how does the case stand now? Even if Franco is overthrown, what kind of records will the future historian have to go upon? And if Franco or anyone at all

(One example - the threatened fine for digging up mass graves of American and French genocide victims: DM 250,000, Source: Other Losses 2nd Ed. p.XXXV)
resembling him remains in power, the history of the war will consist quite largely of ‘facts’ which millions of people now living know to be lies. One of these ‘facts’, for instance, is that there was a considerable Russian army in Spain. There exists the most abundant evidence that there was no such army. Yet if Franco remains in power, and if Fascism in general survives, that Russian army will go into the history books and future schoolchildren will believe in it. So for practical purposes the lie will have become truth.

This kind of thing is happening all the time. Out of the millions of instances which must be available, I will choose one which happens to be verifiable. During part of 1941 and 1942, when the Luftwaffe was busy in Russia, the German radio regaled its home audience with stories of devastating air raids on London. Now, we are aware that those raids did not happen. But what use would our knowledge be if the Germans conquered Britain? For the purpose of a future historian, did those raids happen, or didn’t they?

The answer is: If Hitler survives, they happened, and if he falls they didn’t happen. So with innumerable other events of the past ten or twenty years. [...] How many German aeroplanes were shot down in the Battle of Britain? Does Europe welcome the New Order? In no case do you get one answer which is universally accepted because it is true: in each case you get a number of totally incompatible answers, one of which is finally adopted as the result of a physical struggle. History is written by the winners.

In the last analysis our only claim to victory is that if we win the war we shall tell less lies about it than our adversaries. The really frightening thing about totalitarianism is not that it commits atrocities but that it attacks the concept of objective truth: it claims to control the past as well as the future. [...] Is it not a strange commentary on our time that even the casualties in the present war cannot be estimated within several millions?...

(Source: [http://www.orwelltoday.com/orwellwarwritten.shtml](http://www.orwelltoday.com/orwellwarwritten.shtml))

**Plus ça change, plus c’est la même chose**

Despite the threat of exposure implied by the Internet, matters seem little changed today. Luckily for the armaments industry, the feared decline in conflicts after the demise of the Soviet Union seems to have been completely avoided. On the contrary, wars continue unabated, with weapons and technology apparently supplied in sufficient amounts to all parties. (One of the better known recent examples was the 10-year Iran-Iraq war, where the US supplied both sides and Israel supported Iran!) Where sincere warmongers or revolutionaries were not plentiful enough, shadowy ‘international’ terrorist organizations kindly volunteered to plug the demand gap.
Similarly, keeping support for multiple sides out of the official histories remains a regular part of the game plan. To take one recent blatant example from Iraq, it seems the current US Government and/or its backers decided that even Nuremberg-style show trials were too risky, presumably for fear that some touchy testimony might escape the censors’ blackout. Instead, it has apparently been decided to substitute a FAKE Saddam Hussein to participate in the court proceedings against him. This can be easily confirmed by comparing courtroom pictures with earlier photographs. Certainly the ‘executed’ Saddam did not bear much resemblance to the Saddam who posed for the courtroom pictures.

Why? We can only guess, but it HAS been widely documented that chemical and conventional weapons formerly used by Iraq against Iran stem from US Government stocks. Moreover, apparently many of the supplied weapons were delivered via a company jointly controlled by George H.W. Bush and Hillary Clinton. Testimony to this effect would risk further underlining the complicity of the prosecuting governments in the very crimes Saddam Hussein is being accused of. Given that the primary excuse used to justify the prosecution and overthrow of Saddam Hussein was his brutal use of these weapons, it is understandable that the current US president (son of the weapons supplier) could hardly risk allowing the real Saddam Hussein to testify. Furthermore, with family-friend Hillary Clinton lined up as George Bush’s preferred successor, he would doubtless prefer to keep the 20-year+ intimate relationship between the Bush and Clinton families out of the news.

**Weapons Don’t Grow On Trees**

Revolution is always recorded as a spontaneous event by the politically or economically deprived against an autocratic state. Never in Western or Marxist textbooks will you find the evidence that *wars and revolutions need finance* and the source of that finance can in most cases be traced back to Wall Street and
London. Today only scattered Islamic countries, plus a few others such as Russia and Venezuela, tolerate such insights in press and textbooks.

Consequently it can be argued that our 'Western' history is every bit as distorted, censored, and largely useless as that of Hitler's Germany, the Soviet Union or Communist China. Though serious attempts to expose these manipulations have been made – just think back to Major Jordan, Norman Dodd or McCarthy in the early 1950s – today no Western foundation will award grants to investigate such topics, few Western academics can "survive" by researching such theses and certainly no major publisher will easily accept manuscripts reflecting such arguments.

In fact, there is another largely unrecorded history and it tells a story quite different than our sanitized textbooks. It tells a story of the deliberate creation of war, the knowing finance of revolution to change governments, and the use of conflict to create change. This includes the development and construction of the Soviet Union (thesis) and Hitler's Germany (antithesis), with the follow-up pairs First World (thesis) and Second World (antithesis) and now the "Judeo-Christian World" (thesis) and the "Islamic World" (antithesis).

In each case, the threats posed by the “opposing forces of evil” are used as a justification for usurping of resources, reduction of individual liberties, and expansion of state control. Though it is certainly debatable whether the collapse of Communist Party rule in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union should be considered a true setback for the New World Order advocates, nonetheless the overall consistency of the net results of each of these conflicts is astounding.

After washing away the pools of spilt blood and writing off the wasted lives, what remains after most conflicts is a society one step closer to a New World Order along Hegelian lines. A society:

- where most individuals are no longer freeholders, independent craftsmen or entrepreneurs, but rather heavily indebted and dependent upon grants, credits or ‘job offers’ from the Owners (alias banks/corporations/state),
  --> cf. T. Jefferson’s prophecy!
- where laws regulate almost every aspect of life,
- where taxes control and tap almost all aspects of human endeavor and activity,
- where the press reports only what serves the interests of the Owners,
- where the "wiggle-room" for independent actions and decisions becomes smaller with every new war and new threat;

Essentially, a society where the Corporatist State controlled by the Owners reigns absolute.

"The responsibility for wars falls solely upon the shoulders of these same masses of people, for they have all the necessary means to avert war in their own hands. In part by their apathy, in part by their passivity, and in part actively, these
same masses of people make possible the catastrophes under which they themselves suffer more than anyone else. To stress this guilt on the part of the masses of people, to hold them solely responsible, means to take them seriously. On the other hand, to commiserate masses of people as victims, means to treat them as small, helpless children. The former is the attitude held by genuine freedom fighters; the latter that attitude held by power-thirsty politicians.” - Wilhelm Reich, the ground-breaking Austrian psychologist, psychoanalyst and scientist whose works had the honor of being banned by Fascists, Nazis and Communists - and then burned by court order in the US, in Die Massenpsychologie des Faschismus (1933, Engl. The Mass Psychology of Fascism)

“The liberty of a democracy is not safe if the people tolerate the growth of private power to the point where it becomes stronger than the democratic state itself. That in its essence is fascism - ownership of government by an individual, by a group or any controlling private power.”

**VII. CONCLUSION**

Today’s worldwide society is the synthesis of earlier societies which have been repeatedly demolished and reconstructed following textbook Hegelian logic over the past 200 years. While this congruence with Hegelian theory does not in itself prove conscious intent, at a minimum it should prompt us to review our cause and effect models. At the same time, it should caution us to seriously reconsider any previous assumptions of ‘randomness’ in the unfolding of the last 200 years of history.