

# AGAINST THE DARK ENSLAVING EMPIRE!



*A condemnation of the global  
criminocratic conspiracy*

Paul Cudenec





Against the Dark  
Enslaving  
Empire!

A condemnation of the  
global criminocratic  
conspiracy

Paul Cudenec



winteroak.org.uk

Copyright © 2024 Paul Cudenec. The author formally  
retains copyright over this work but permits non-  
commercial reproduction or distribution

*ISBN: 978-2-9575768-8-3*

# CONTENTS

Preface	vii
The dark enslaving empire	1
Giving the game away: the criminocracy's fatal own goal	3
An ABC for opposing the criminocracy	35
A crucial moment for humankind	38
Fake terrorism and the genocide agenda	41
The nauseating hypocrisy of the murderous criminocrats	49
Blair, Berlusconi and false flag terror	63
The false red flag	67
Clarity and focus	112
The world out of kilter	122
Losing the labels	130
The Olympic agenda is profit and control	141
Volk and freedom!	155
Power and corruption: the public-private imperial mafia	171
Joined dots and spontaneous synchronicity	210
Wars, resets and the global criminocracy	219
Evil beyond words	231

A self-conscious philosophy of resistance	236
Electoral fraud: the illusion of democracy	241
Exposed: how the climate racketeers aim to force us into smart gulags	246
The military-industrial guilt complex	251
Escaping the industrial nightmare	258
Deliberate dispossession and our struggle for autonomy	267
Organic radicalism: challenging the system to its core	289

## PREFACE

It can be a strange feeling, at times, to be putting forward an understanding of the world that differs so radically from that generally accepted by my contemporaries.

Recently I found myself wondering, as I tried to summarise my findings to some acquaintances, whether I was really on the right track.

The sheer enormity of what I was describing – the utter *unbelievability* from a ‘mainstream’ perspective – momentarily struck me with doubt.

Was I wrong about all this? Had I somehow lost my way and wandered off into some credulous cul-de-sac?

I am happy to report that the work of putting together this book has definitively relieved me of any such misgivings!

In itself, the very task of transforming hundreds of online hyperlinks into book-friendly endnotes has reminded me that the conclusions I draw do not come from nowhere.

Everything I have written about the identity and nature of the criminocracy is based on solid

evidence.

And, indeed, it was this evidence that led me to the position I now take. I was not looking to discover this particular reality and had no existing hypothesis for which I needed to cobble together proof.

Step by step, click by click, book by book, the evidence has led me here.

The judgement that I pass on that state of affairs, and the alternative that I put forward, are, of course, personal.

But even here I know that the anger I feel at the dominant system, my gut feeling that what we are talking about is indescribably evil, is not merely individual, but widely shared.

I sense that we are increasingly experiencing, together, a powerful *collective realisation* of what is ruling over us and how vital it is that we end its evil reign.

I begin this compilation of my writings from 2024 with the piece that lent the book its title – *The dark enslaving empire*.

Although it says nothing I have not said before, and brings no new information to the table, it has the merit of summing up the rest of the contents of this tome, and could indeed have served as a preface on its own!

This opening item was posted online, at Winter Oak and on my Substack, on July 12, 2024, but the rest of the articles are presented in



the order in which they were originally published.

*Giving the game away: the criminocracy's fatal own goal* (January 27, 2024) weighs straight into one of the most important and controversial questions of our day – the instrumentalisation of alleged “anti-semitism”.

Taking a detailed look at the organisations and individuals lurking behind a particular EU project, I conclude that this approach is a big mistake on the part of those responsible, exposing as it does the nature of their agenda.

I note: “They have walked into a logical trap in which the very act of denouncing an analysis they consider dangerous itself reinforces and propagates that analysis”.

*An ABC for opposing the criminocracy* originally appeared in *The Acorn 91* (February 19, 2024).

I argue that if we wish to fully understand, and thus to effectively oppose, the global criminocrats, we need to stop thinking in terms of “politics” as currently known.

“This is because they are, quite simply, criminals whose sole aim is to expand and protect their own ill-gotten wealth and power”.

*A crucial moment for humankind* (February 20, 2024) is a reflection prompted by the overall content of that same bulletin.

I (*once again!*) urge revolt against the global

powers, which I say are “quite obviously currently making a big move towards their long-cherished goal of a totalitarian world state in which people and nature alike have been reduced to nothing but assets, owned and exploited by the sociopathic ruling class”.

*Fake terrorism and the genocide agenda* (February 26, 2024) delves into another issue which is highly sensitive for the system and thus subject to much censorship and intimidation.

I ask: “Could it be that all or most of the big ‘Islamist’ terror attacks of the first two decades of this century were fake or false-flag events, designed to whip up hatred and fear of Muslims and thus of Palestinians, to demonise and dehumanise them in order to achieve the ‘de-legitimization’ of their cause, as recommended by Jerusalem Summit?”

“Was this all part of a long-term plan to pave the way for the ethnic cleansing horrors that we have seen unfolding in Gaza since October 2023?”

The “terrorism” theme continues with *The nauseating hypocrisy of the murderous criminocrats* (March 8, 2024).

Looking at strong evidence that the 2005 7/7 terror attack in London was a false flag operation involving British and Israeli intelligence, I remark: “It is hard to imagine how any ruling complex could be any more depraved,

sadistic, murderous, inhuman, duplicitous and nauseatingly hypocritical than the one in power today”.

Further reflections on this issue come in *Blair, Berlusconi and false flag terror*, which originally appeared in *The Acorn 92* (March 20, 2024).

Here I look at war criminal Tony Blair’s close links with the late Italian politician Silvio Berlusconi, who was notoriously involved in dozens of court cases on charges including money laundering, mafia collusion and underage prostitution.

I remark: “Thinking back to Gladio, P2 and false-flag terrorism, it is interesting to recall that Blair was PM at the time of the 1999 London Nail Bombings, took the UK into US-led wars in Afghanistan and Iraq following 9/11 and was still Prime Minister in 2005 when London suffered the notorious 7/7 terror attack, which I discussed in a recent article. All just coincidence, no doubt!”

*The false red flag* (March 28, 2024) is a long essay which I have already issued as a free pdf, but which I feel deserves to find its way into an actual book!

It was originally published online in five parts, whose titles nicely sum up my conclusions as to what state communism really involves: pseudo-resistance; lies and repression; industrial slavery; a repugnant racket; a despotic dead end.

In *Clarity and focus* (April 15, 2024) I confirm my opinion, first voiced in 2022's 'Enemies of the People' booklet, that the corrupt heart of the criminocracy is Rothschildian: "Nothing I have seen or heard since then has cast any doubt on this conclusion".

Indeed, I say, this reality has become even more visible thanks to events in Gaza.

"It is obvious, from the *carte blanche* given to Israel for its genocidal activities, and from the smearing of anyone daring to speak out against the bloodbath, that the global criminocracy is aligned with Zionism and Israel".

And, needless to say: "No family is more closely associated with the Zionist/Israeli entity than the Rothschilds".

In *The world out of kilter* (April 22, 2024) I take a step back from the detail to communicate the feeling that I have long had that there is something deeply *wrong* about the society we live in today.

I conclude: "It is time for us to grab back our future from the greed-soaked hands of the lying robber-tyrants who have, for so long now, pushed our world out of kilter. It is time for us to reclaim our lives".

*Losing the labels* originally appeared in *The Acorn 93* (May 3, 2024) and is a review of a new academic book, *Far-Right Newspeak and the Future of Liberal Democracy*.

I take issue with the assumed division between “right” or “far right” and “left” or “far left”.

“These terms are false categories, designed to limit people’s critical thinking, close down proper discussion and pit us all up against each other rather than against the criminocracy”.

I came to research and write *The Olympic agenda is profit and control* (May 6, 2024) because of disturbing reports of what was going to be inflicted on Paris in the summer of 2024 under the name of “sport”.

As I took a look at the Olympic “movement”, I realised with a sinking heart that it was part of the same odious global entity that I discover under every metaphorical stone that I lift.

As a “tool for development”, the Olympic Games open up money-making possibilities for those whose agenda they advance, I write.

“They are a racket in the proud Fascist tradition of public-private partnerships – everything from the bidding process to the building of venues, accommodation and new transport infrastructures represents an Olympian opportunity for those on the inside to make a financial killing”.

*Volk and freedom* (May 10, 2024) is a new profile of Gustav Landauer, the German-Jewish radical thinker who has been a great influence on my own ideological evolution over the years.

I remark: “The story of his political life, in which he was largely spurned by members of his own movement who were trapped inside the conformist groupthink of the era, told me of the overriding need always to follow one’s own inner ideological compass rather than to cravenly seek safety in the shared opinions of any particular political herd”.

*Power and corruption: the public-private imperial mafia* (May 15, 2024) is possibly the most important article in this book, confirming as it does the nature of the British imperialist ruling clique.

I trace, one by one, the backgrounds and connections of the presidents and trustees of Chatham House, aka The Royal Institute of International Affairs, an extremely influential London “think tank”.

The mesh of interests and affiliations revealed by this painstaking process leaves, in my mind, no room for doubt as to what the “Establishment” really represents.

I state: “Chatham House is in many ways a miniature version of the British state itself, and indeed of the global public-private governance as a whole. Behind a veneer of ‘royal’ respectability lurks something that can only be described as a mafia”.

In *Joined dots and spontaneous synchronicity* (May 24, 2024) I take on the most

common objection to my general analysis, namely that the existence of the criminocratic monopoly is simply not possible, that we live in a pluralistic world of competing interests and that it is absurd to imagine that one small group could have taken control over absolutely everything.

I refer these critics to the board game *Monopoly*, and in particular to the end of the game when one player is in an entirely dominant position.

“We know that it is just a matter of time before he or she will bankrupt their rivals and ‘win’ the game by achieving the aim as stated in its title”.

*Wars, resets and the global criminocracy* (June 10, 2024) was written as a contribution to the 2024 Chisinau Forum, whose theme was ‘Unrestricted warfare: a holistic approach to the Great Reset’.

I set out the striking parallels between the Great Reset and wars – the way that they serve the same short-term, medium-term and long-term aims.

“I have come to the conclusion – shocking for some, perhaps, but utterly unsurprising for others – that the agenda behind all modern wars is the same as that behind the Great Reset, Fourth Industrial Revolution, New World Order or whatever else you choose to call it”.

It took me nearly a month after seeing the new French documentary *Les Survivantes* to be able to write the short piece entitled *Evil beyond words* (June 13, 2024).

The film had a profound effect on me. As I remark: “I’ve always thought that mere human beings can no more be entirely evil than they can be entirely good. Now I’m not so sure”.

*A Self-conscious philosophy of resistance* (June 19, 2024) was written following a talk I gave in Scotland about the organic radical philosophy.

I explain that this is a “sussed” 21<sup>st</sup> century approach that takes on board a comprehension of the forces that have shaped today’s toxic society.

“Yes, the roots of organic radicalism are in traditional wisdom and our belonging to the natural world, but the philosophy is also built on an understanding of how and why that belonging-based wisdom – our witness – has been deliberately eroded”.

*Electoral fraud: the illusion of democracy* is one of two articles featured here that originally appeared in *The Acorn 94* (June 15, 2024).

I restate the age-old anarchist conviction that voting for someone to rule over us is a mistake and that the thing sold to us as “democracy” is anything but that.

“Real democracy would involve the localisation of decision-making, the end of global



corporate imperialism and the restoration to communities of the right to shape their own destinies”.

The second article is one that I am slightly embarrassed about presenting under my own name, as it is almost entirely based on research by somebody else!

But Kate Mason’s work on the threat of “managed retreat” in her native Australia, as well as in New Zealand, is so important that I think it is worth amplifying in every possible way.

The subject matter is self-evident from the title of the piece: *Exposed: how the climate racketeers aim to force us into smart gulags*.

*The Military-Industrial Guilt Complex* (July 3, 2024) takes us back into territory that I explored in January – the use of “anti-semitism” smears to disqualify all criticism of the system.

I report on a brochure that takes this process a step even further by presenting a diagram placing “anti-semitism” at the centre of all so-called “conspiracy theories”.

This looks to me like a projection of the authors’ own guilt on to those whom they are attempting to discredit.

I add: “Although this gaslighting projection of guilt is not meant to be an admission, it effectively plays that role”.

*Escaping the industrial nightmare* (July 5,

2024) is the first of two reviews of recent books issued from the broad anti-industrialist movement here in France.

By describing their content, and translating a few salient passages, I hope to help make these important ideas better known in the English-speaking world.

In *La Décroissance libertaire, une étape cruciale* ('Libertarian degrowth, a crucial step'), Jean-Pierre Tertrais correctly identifies the very concept of "development" as being a primary source of the evil afflicting our world and describes how it fuels global imperialism.

He adds: "Massive adherence to productivism and the glorification of technological progress have prevented any critical perspective".

The second review is of Aurélien Berlan's *Terre et liberté: la quête d'autonomie contre le fantasme de délivrance* ('Land and freedom: the quest for autonomy against the fantasy of deliverance').

As I explain in *Deliberate dispossession and our struggle for autonomy* (July 19, 2024), his message is basically that "we have been dispossessed and disempowered – systematically reduced to total dependency on an industrial system that does not wish us well".

Berlan warns that "development" everywhere amounts to "internal colonisation",

with the external occupying force being that of rapacious global Capital.

Finally, *Organic radicalism: challenging the system to its core* (August 2, 2024) was my contribution to the ‘Three Days Against the Techno-Sciences’ gathering in northern Italy over the weekend of July 26-28, 2024.

Presenting a life-affirming worldview that is diametrically opposed to that of the dark enslaving empire, I say: “The global criminocracy’s ongoing domination of our societies depends on deceit – constant, blatant deceit in every sphere.

“Its biggest lie of all is that there is no alternative to the dehumanised, centralised and degraded future it has lined up for us”.



## THE DARK ENSLAVING EMPIRE

The dark enslaving empire  
Is built on massacres and money  
On puppet police and politicians  
On virtue-signalled violence  
On inversion and infection  
On blackmail and bombs  
On petroleum and predation  
On gaslighting and greed

The dark enslaving empire  
Is ruled by the demon they call development  
By the usury they call growth  
By the fabrication they call history  
By the theft they call law  
By the imposture they call authority  
By the occupation they call government  
By the dictatorship they call democracy

The dark enslaving empire  
Is stained with deceit beyond belief  
With hypocrisy beyond imagination  
With criminality beyond all limits  
With cruelty beyond understanding

With the screaming deaths of children  
With the rituals of its terror  
With the evil oozing from its smile

The dark enslaving empire  
Is mortally afraid of our freedom from fear  
Of our angry authenticity  
Of our truth-telling  
Of the courage of our convictions  
Of our loving and our laughter  
Of the spirit of our soaring  
Of the resonance of our revolt

## GIVING THE GAME AWAY

Imagine, for a moment, that you are part of the criminocracy.

Yes, I know that's not easy for anyone with a modicum of self-respect, ethics or humanity, but try to put yourself there, nonetheless.

OK. Now imagine that, for whatever self-destructive reason, you want to bring down that criminocracy from within, by exposing its noxious nature to the general public.

What would be the best way to go about that, do you think?

A good plan might be to launch some kind of Grandiose Project, packed full of profitable possibilities, to be carried out by one of the institutions you control.

This would set out to smear and criminalise your critics and ostensibly pave the way for legislation and restrictions that would silence their voices.

But your cunning plan would involve letting slip that a particular report, produced by one of your other organisations, was a major influence on this Grandiose Project.

And through the background and activities of the people involved in this other organisation, the real agenda behind the project and all its propaganda would quickly become clear to anyone who took even a cursory look.

You would then, accidentally on purpose, have shattered the wall of invisibility surrounding your criminocracy and left it vulnerable to righteous revolt from the vast majority of the population!

If you think this self-sabotaging scenario seems somewhat unlikely, I would point you in the direction of the EU Strategy on Combating Antisemitism and Fostering Jewish Life (2021-2030). [1]

This decidedly grandiose scheme is described by the EU as “an ambitious and comprehensive strategy”.

It declares: “Generations after the end of the Shoah, antisemitism is worryingly on the rise, in Europe and beyond. Antisemitism is incompatible with Europe’s core values. It represents a threat not only to Jewish communities and to Jewish life, but to an open and diverse society, to democracy and the European way of life. The European Union is determined to put an end to it”.

We learn that the strategy involves three pillars and “seeks to place the EU firmly in the lead of the global fight against antisemitism,



complementing measures within the EU with international efforts along all the three pillars”.

Pillar 1 is “preventing and combating all forms of antisemitism” with the aim of “a European Union free from antisemitic hate speech and hate crime, online and offline”.

*Obviously this is all about censorship.*

Indeed, the intent is described as to “strengthen the fight against online antisemitism by supporting the establishment of a Europe-wide network of trusted flaggers and Jewish organisations, in line with the Code of conduct. It will also support the European Digital Media Observatory and its national hubs to increase the capacity of their fact-checkers on disinformation and will work with independent organisations to develop counter-narratives, including in non-EU languages”. [2]

The big question here is what exactly will be regarded as “anti-semitic” by these “trusted flaggers” and “fact-checkers on disinformation” – a point we will come back to later.

Pillar 2 is “Protecting and fostering Jewish life in the EU” – creating “a European society aware of Jewish life, culture and history, past and present, and where Jews feel safe”.

Pillar 3 is “Education, research and Holocaust remembrance”, aiming for “a Europe that remembers its past and looks into the future through research and education”.

Alongside the propagandistic purposes clearly implied by both these “pillars” comes the ever-important issue of what the EU terms “funding opportunities”.

It declares that “the implementation of the proposed policy measures and targeted actions will be supported through various EU funding programmes, under the current multi-annual financial framework 2021-2027”.

The project stands to receive European taxpayers’ money from no fewer than ten different EU funding programmes.

Top of the list is the “Citizens, equality, rights and values (CERV) Programme”, with a budget of EUR 1.55 billion.

But the cash will also be flooding in via “The Justice programme”; “Horizon Europe”; “Creative Europe”; “Erasmus+”; “The EU Internal Security Fund”; “The Cohesion policy funds”; “The Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument (NDICI)”; “The Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance” and “The Technical Support Instrument (TSI)”.

In charge of the Grandiose Project is Katharina von Schnurbein, who was appointed the first “European Commission Coordinator on combating antisemitism and fostering Jewish life” in December 2015. [3]

Although she is not Jewish, her parents were “ardent supporters of Israel” [4] and she has

made a career out of drawing attention to an alleged “rise in anti-semitism”.

The *Electronic Intifada* website wrote in 2018: “The German official has used her EU perch in a tireless campaign to smear defenders of Palestinian human rights.

“She has pushed for the wide adoption of an official definition of anti-Semitism supported by Israel lobby groups that falsely equates criticism of Israel and its discriminatory state ideology Zionism with anti-Jewish bigotry.

“She has smeared the nonviolent boycott, divestment and sanctions (BDS) movement for Palestinian rights by claiming without offering a shred of evidence ‘that anti-Semitic incidents rise after BDS activities on campuses.’” [5]

Asked in a 2016 article how her post came to be created, von Schnurbein replied, tellingly: “European Jewry, as well as the State of Israel, has been calling for this position for some time, given the recent rise in anti-Semitism”. [6]

But what were the origins of this perception of a rise in anti-semitism that justified the creation of her post and her appointment to it?

In a 2019 piece singing her praises, the *Jewish Telegraphic Agency* declared: “Some of the most shocking headlines about anti-Semitism in Europe since 2015 came from work promoted by von Schnurbein, who began working at the European Union in 2002 as a press officer”. [7]

The article quotes the chief rabbi of Rome as saying that during her tenure “anti-Semitism has exploded” – and that this was meant as a compliment!

The great achievement of her “relentless efforts” was to have “generated headlines that drew considerable attention to the problem that she was hired to fight, amplifying its footprint in the media and government”.

Von Schnurbein insisted: “Because we are looking into it, it is more visible”.

In other words, she had worked for years to whip up a “problem” for which a “solution” had to be provided – namely the creation of the post of EU anti-semitism czar, long sought by the Israel lobby, her appointment to this post and the launch of the current Grandiose Project.

An important part of this manipulator’s mission is to fend off criticism of the Israeli state and its backers by depicting this as some kind of “hate crime”.

She maintained in 2017: “Anti-Semitism hides behind anti-Zionism”. [8]

And she has long called for restrictions on people’s right to express views of which she and her friends disapprove.

Von Schnurbein said in the 2016 interview: “One of the priorities now is to tackle online hate speech. We recently initiated a European dialogue with IT companies. Then we will ensure

the enforcement of existing EU legislation, which includes the Holocaust denial ban.

“We will also work closely with NGOs that are helping to prevent and combat, among other things, anti-Semitism through projects. We currently have an open call for 5.5 million euros to tackle hate crime and hate speech”. [9]

Once again, the enticing glitter of “funding opportunities” lights up the hate-filled gloom!

For all these efforts, von Schnurbein has been lauded by Laurence Weinbaum, director of the World Jewish Congress’s Israel Council on Foreign Relations, as the “indefatigable heroine of the struggle for many of us”. [10]

But von Schnurbein’s dishonest agenda doesn’t stop there.

In recent years she has been talking about the threat of “new forms” of anti-semitism that have allegedly emerged in response to the Covid manoeuvre.

In a June 2023 *Jerusalem Post* article she sought to depict anything that could be described as “conspiracy theory” as necessarily tainted with “anti-semitism”. [11]

“Where conspiracy grows, antisemitism has already grown,” she said.

The article adds: “As for conspiracy theories that are publicized on social media, von Schnurbein cited the COVID-19 pandemic, in which conspiracy theories about Jewish

involvement in the spread of the disease resulted in so many fatalities”.

*This is a truly puzzling statement. What on earth is it referring to?*

She told the same story in an interview with *Politico*, claiming that there had been a huge increase in “anti-Jewish racism” in online spaces during the scamdemic. [12]

“It really exploded and I think that we saw that many of the old conspiracy myths, the old ideas, were repackaged,” she said. “How quickly this increased was really shocking”.

The only cited evidence for von Schnurbein’s claims was that “a recent study commissioned by the EU’s directorate-general for justice found that when it comes to anti-Jewish hate on Telegram, Twitter and Facebook, there was a 13-fold increase in German language posts, and a seven-fold increase in French ones during the pandemic”.

So what is this report? What kind of “anti-Jewish hate” does it identify? And what kind of people produced it?

It is entitled *The Rise of Antisemitism Online During the Pandemic: A study of French and German content* [13] and, having read the thing, I have to say that it is an extremely spurious document.

Its hysterical propagandistic tone is perhaps summed up best by its claim that the Covid-19

“pandemic” was accompanied by “a virus of hate”.

It strikes me that it is really describing the “great awakening” that many of us have noticed emerging since 2020.

The measures unleashed against us all were so extreme, so cruel, and the co-ordination so tightly organised across the world that they opened many people’s eyes to the existence of the very real global ruling mafia.

The report sees this phenomenon from the perspective of that same mafia, from the vantage point of someone who is absolutely enraged that so many people have woken up and would dearly like to deliver them a heavy blow to the head to send them back into their previous unconscious state.

It fumes: “Since the beginning of the Covid-19 pandemic, the economic uncertainties and anxieties around the virus have been weaponised by a broad range of extremists, conspiracy theorists and disinformation actors, who have sought to propagandise, radicalise and mobilise captive online audiences during global lockdowns”.

This, it says, has “dangerous implications for public safety, social cohesion and democracy”.

Anyone managing to see through this smokescreen of insults and scaremongering rhetoric – *they really roll them all out here!* –

might still wonder exactly where the problem lay in people questioning the official narrative on Covid.

But, of course, there is that familiar trump card to be pulled from the sleeve – “Antisemitic hate speech is often a common feature of these diverse threats”.

The authors of the report had clearly been told to come up with something that would reveal a rise in “anti-semitism”, but in order to do so they needed to completely conflate “conspiracy theory” with “hate speech”.

At one point they even *admit* that the vast majority of the thoughtcrimes they identify were merely “conspiracy theories about elites secretly controlling world events”.

They add, with regard to Germany: “A smaller number of posts (4%) contained material ‘calling for, aiding, or justifying the killing or harming of Jews in the name of a radical ideology or an extremist view of religion’, as well as Holocaust denial or distortion (3%)”.

*So, by their own reckoning, 93% of the online “anti-semitism” identified by their analysis was, in truth, nothing of the sort!*

The report ties itself in knots trying to get around this inconvenient lack of *actual* anti-semitism.

The authors complain: “Our research showed French and German language antisemitism



online to be often characterised by coded language and subtle insidious tropes that are both challenging to detect and to categorise neatly”.

They add: “One especially common trope remains the alleged control of a vague ‘system’ enslaving mankind, by the whole of Jewry or certain ‘elite’ Jewish individuals like the Rothschild family or George Soros”.

For them, identifying the existence of the global system is, itself, an “anti-semitic trope”.

So in order *not* to be “anti-semitic” you presumably have to keep your eyes firmly shut and refuse to see the obvious?

This following passage is quite revealing and worth quoting in full:

“As many online conspiracy theory movements started to argue that the virus was either not real or far more harmless than suggested by public health authorities, the narrative of a ‘New World Order’ (NWO) became prominent.

“While ‘NWO’ conspiracy theories are not exclusively antisemitic, there is a considerable overlap with anti-Jewish stereotypes, such as elites in control of financial institutions, and they establish a natural narrative environment prone to antisemitism.

“It is also notable that many alleged perpetrators have, according to this conspiracy

theory, a Jewish background.

“For example, a French Instagram user posted an image of alleged members of the Bilderberg Group. These include George Soros, Jacob Rothschild, Jacques Attali and other Jewish individuals alongside some non-Jews like the Clintons and Bill Gates.

“Adapting this old trope to fit current affairs, conspiracy theorists claimed that the world’s ‘elites’ (often framed in terms of prominent Jewish individuals) faked a pandemic to curb civil liberties through lockdown measures, introduce communism through economic support programmes or undermine data protection with vaccine passports and tracking apps”.

Elsewhere, they cite as an example of “anti-semitism” what they describe as “a caricature of France’s former health minister Agnès Buzyn, who is Jewish”, ignoring the possibility that during the Covid tyranny there might have been very real reasons for targeting the health minister other than her ethnic identity.

And they push it still further, when they write: “In France, well-known Jewish figures such as politicians, government advisors and well known intellectuals as well as President Emmanuel Macron, who previously worked for the Rothschild bank, are targeted with accusations that they are part of a malicious secret organisation”.

They later again refer to “antisemitic allusions to Emmanuel Macron’s past employment at the Rothschild bank”.

*How can it be “anti-semitic” for French people to mention the very real and undisputed employment record of their hugely unpopular and authoritarian president?*

The confusion increases in a particularly convoluted section which declares: “Conspiracy theories about blood-drinking elites and powerful bankers holding people in ‘debt slavery’ allow those propagating them to deny that these narratives are directly targeted against Jewish people.

“Furthermore, non-Jewish individuals such as Bill Gates and the Clintons are frequently targeted using tropes with antisemitic origins”.

What does it mean to target non-Jewish individuals with “tropes with antisemitic origins”? Are they saying here that because they have themselves defined analysis describing high-level public-private corruption as “anti-semitic”, because it *might* be targeting Jewish individuals, then *any* such analysis, whether or not Jewish people are implicated, is necessarily “anti-semitic”?

*This is not so much expanding the definition of “anti-semitism” as entirely reinventing it!*

The authors add that “this could be an example of ‘harmful but legal’ antisemitic

content”, a category which provides much frustration for those who would like to see any challenging of the global criminocracy crushed by the firm hand of their authority.

They complain: “Most antisemitic content that we analysed that crossed the threshold of the non-legally binding IHRA working definition was non-violent and not obviously illegal under German and French law.

“Addressing the proliferation of such ‘legal but harmful’ antisemitic content provides a considerable challenge for tech companies and governments alike”.

*Ah yes, a tricky one, that. How can they concretely criminalise the expression of opinion that is entirely legal but harmful to certain powerful interests?*

The report contains some pitiful barrel-scraping attempts to demonstrate that resistance to the Covid scam is the same thing as “anti-semitism”.

It claims that “trivialised comparisons of Covid-19 vaccinations to the Holocaust” is “potentially antisemitic expression”, as indeed are all “false Nazi analogies”.

There is, of course, nothing “false” about comparisons between the Great Fascist Resetters and their 20th century totalitarian equivalents, but that doesn’t stop the report’s authors from ploughing ahead, regardless, desperately trying

to frame this as anti-Jewish hate speech.

“Opponents of lockdown measures and Covid-19 vaccinations have been comparing the treatment of Jewish people under fascist regimes to public health measures.

“This arguably represents a trivialisation of the suffering of Jewish people under the Nazi regime. The insignia and rhetoric of historic French and German fascist regimes have been used to describe the respective governments’ responses to the pandemic, with some conspiracy theorists even claiming that the contemporary situation is worse than Vichy France or the Third Reich.

“For example, French actors repeatedly shared an image where Emmanuel Macron’s face was merged with a portrait of Philippe Pétain, the Chief of State of Vichy France (although the original image appears to predate the pandemic).

“In another case, a French Instagram user posted a cartoon of Macron in a Nazi uniform with a red banner on which two syringes form a symbol similar to a swastika”.

*They seem very sensitive about criticism of Macron, which is strange since his well-being is presumably beyond their remit. Could it be that there is something else at stake here, that does not actually relate to Jewishness?*

The same indignation that Covid totalitarianism might be interpreted as... well,

totalitarianism... is expressed with regard to Germany, where naughty dissidents took to calling Bavarian Minister-President Markus Söder “Södolf” for his draconian policies “in a reference to Adolf Hitler”, complains the report.

It continues: “Opponents of vaccination programmes have likened themselves to victims of the Holocaust by wearing yellow Stars of David or posted edited pictures of the gates of Auschwitz where the slogan ‘Arbeit macht frei’ (work sets you free) has been changed to ‘Impfen macht frei’ (vaccination sets you free)”.

*Ja und?* as they say in Germany. So what? Does being against modern-day fascism suddenly make you “anti-semitic”?

Apparently what this amounts to is the thoughtcrime of the “trivialisation of the Holocaust”.

The report’s authors, themselves clearly well to the Hitler side of the libertarian-totalitarian scale, deeply regret that although this is a “punishable offence” under German and French law, “there has not been systematic prosecution of these offences”.

The report’s approach to detecting “anti-semitism” is rather similar to the PCR test approach to detecting “Covid”.

They explain that they used a “high-certainty” keyword list “compiled of terms that very probably lead to antisemitic content”.

These included “names of groups or individuals (for example ‘Rothschild’, ‘Soros’, and ‘Zionist lobby’) who are frequently linked to antisemitic beliefs in these online subcultures”.

*Mentioning the Rothschilds, Soros or the Zionist lobby is a “high-certainty” indicator of “anti-semitism”? Utterly ridiculous.*

That is how absurdly low the report’s authors needed to set the bar in order to come up with the required conclusion of a rise in “anti-semitism” that could be cited by von Schnurbein and used to justify her Grandiose Project.

Although the report was published in Luxembourg by the Publications Office of the European Union, it was not in fact written by EU staff.

The task had been outsourced to the Institute for Strategic Dialogue, an international “think tank” focused on combatting what it describes as “disinformation”, “hate” and “extremism”. [14]

On the “partnerships & funders” page of its website, the ISD boasts of its “independence” and describes itself as “non-partisan”, [15] only to go on to provide a list of the aforementioned partnerships and funders that entirely demolishes this claim!

Public sector funders include, of course, the European Commission and the Council of Europe, as well as various ministries in

Germany, Netherlands, Denmark, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, Finland, the UK, Canada and Australia.

The ISD is also financed by three different parts of the United Nations – its Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), its Office of Counter-Terrorism (UNOCT) and its Development Programme (UNDP).

Other funders include the Centre for Research and Evidence on Security Threats, the Global Coalition to Defeat Daesh/ISIS and the US Department for Homeland Security.

Private sector funders include Facebook, Google, Microsoft, Spotify and YouTube.

Among the foundations funding the ISD we find the British Council, the Children’s Investment Fund Foundation, the National Democratic Institute, the Omidyar Group, George Soros’s Open Society Foundations and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

*Entirely “non-partisan” on the whole Covid issue, then!*

Its “institutional partnerships” feature the German Marshall Fund Alliance for Securing Democracy, the Global Center on Cooperative Security, the Global Counterterrorism Forum, the United Nations Counter Terrorism Executive Directorate and the ultra-Zionist Anti-Defamation League. [16]

*The ISD has a very peculiar understanding*



*of the term “independence”!*

In fact, as Iain Davis has pointed out, it is “essentially an anti-democratic organisation that serves to undermine purported democracies”. [17]

One of its two co-founders was publisher George Weidenfeld (Baron Weidenfeld) who died in 2016 at the age of 96.

Even *Wikipedia* makes no bones about where his allegiances lay, describing him as “a lifelong Zionist and renowned as a master networker”. [18]

It adds: “He was on good terms with popes, prime ministers and presidents and put his connections to good use for diplomatic and philanthropic ends”.

A friend of Henry Kissinger, Weidenfeld was a Bilderberg attendee [19] whose name appeared in Jeffrey Epstein’s black book. [20]

ISD’s other co-founder, and current CEO, is Sasha Havlicek, known to the British public as an “expert advisor” to the UK Counter-Extremism Commission and the Mayor of London’s counter-extremism programme. [21]

She was a speaker [22] at StratCom DC 2019, described as a “spooky conference arranged by the deep state Atlantic Council”. [23]

Held on October 23 and 24 of that year – and thus just a few months before the Covid coup – the event brought together a number of deep

state agendas, like “vaccines”, “climate change”, “extremism”, “fake news” and how to most efficiently censor any opposing voices.

Havlicek is a member of the WEF’s Global Coalition for Digital Safety [24] and is acknowledged by the WEF in their booklet ‘Global Principles on Digital Safety: Translating International Human Rights for the Digital Context’. [25]

She is also a member of the European Council on Foreign Relations, [26] which is funded by George Soros. [27]

ISD chairman Michael Lewis is a South African-born British-Jewish business tycoon, the chairman of Foschini Group, one of South Africa’s big clothing retail groups.

Lewis generally keeps a low profile, but he came into the limelight in 2021 when he married Lady Kitty Spencer, niece of Diana, King Charles’ previous and deceased wife and therefore the first cousin of William, Prince of Wales and Prince Harry, Duke of Sussex. [28]

Lord Adair Turner, who chairs the ISD’s Policy Board, is a self-described “technocrat”, whose career has seen him working for BP, Chase Manhattan Bank, McKinsey & Co (as a director), the Confederation of British Industry (as director-general) and Merrill Lynch Europe (as vice-chairman). [29]

In 2008, he was appointed chairman of the

UK's Financial Services Authority and in 2013 he became a senior fellow at the Institute of New Economic Thinking, whose funders include Lord Sainsbury, David Rockefeller and, most notably, George Soros. [30]

*Oh no! I just inadvertently mentioned George Soros yet again! I'd better hand myself in for hate crime!*

There are plenty of other interesting characters on the ISD board, [31] such as its treasurer Stuart Fiertz of Cheyne Capital. [32]

Fiertz's CV includes spells at Morgan Stanley, Merrill Lynch and Lehman Brothers, the now-defunct international bank whose collapse prompted the 2008 banking crisis.

He is described as "a longstanding advocate" [33] for "Impact Investing", that innovative new UNSDG-fuelled system of digital slavery. [34]

And then there is Mark Bergman, who for 39 years was part of the New York-based international law firm, Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP, where he says he "managed and executed complex capital markets, financing and other corporate transactions". [35]

He adds: "I am a member of Chatham House, and a supporter of its US and the Americas Programme".

Chatham House, the Royal Institute of International Affairs, is the London think tank identified by Professor Carroll Quigley as being

at the heart of the Rothschild-linked “Anglo-American Establishment”. [36]

Another ISD director [37] is Stephen Zinser, an American-born, London-based hedge fund manager. [38]

Having worked for Chase Manhattan Bank and Merrill Lynch, Zinser co-founded European Credit Management and then Roxbury Asset Management.

From 2014 to June 2021 he was on the board of GAVI – the “Vaccine Alliance” dominated by UNICEF, WHO, the World Bank and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation – and he continues to act as advisor to its Investment Committee. [39]

*Don't forget, folks! The ISD is entirely independent and non-partisan!*

But what of the actual authors of the report that is inspiring the EU's Grandiose Project?

One of them is Lea Gerster who is – or was at the time, at least, given that her bio has now disappeared from the site – an analyst at ISD.

The archives reveal that she previously “worked for two years in online extremism-related roles at TRD Policy and the Centre on Radicalisation and Terrorism”. [40]

TRD Policy describes itself as “a pro liberal order political strategy firm” [41] and is visibly [42] the same thing as Article 7, [43] which aims to “put technology at the service of defending democracy”. [44]

Its founder Dr Garvan Walshe is a former foreign policy adviser to the British Conservative Party, who “serves as Head of Communications for the European Policy Centre”, [45] a body boasting “strong links to foundations that share the principles, values and basic objectives of the EPC”. [46]

This line is telling us that the EPC is part of the deeply intertwined institutional infrastructure set up by the criminocracy.

The EPC has a “long-standing strategic partnership with the King Baudouin Foundation”, [47] which seeks “sustainable and positive change in society, in Belgium, Europe and around the world”. [48]

Gerster’s other cited former employer, the Centre on Radicalisation and Terrorism, [49] is part of the neocon Henry Jackson Society, [50] which has been described as “a hard-line militarist strategy think tank, filled with former leaders of intelligence services and deep state operatives, especially connected to Israeli intelligence and the British Conservatives”. [51]

The Henry Jackson Society’s activities have been openly funded by the Rothschilds [52] and its 2014 Conference on Inclusive Capitalism, co-hosted by the City of London Corporation and EL Rothschild investment firm, was attended by Christine Lagarde of the IMF and the future King Charles III, who officially launched the

Great Reset in 2020. [53]

The other author of the EU-commissioned report is Milo Comerford, described as “Head of Policy & Research, Counter Extremism, leading ISD’s work developing innovative research approaches and policy responses to extremism”. [54]

In 2023 he wrote an article, [55] trying to make a link between “conspiracy beliefs” and “terrorism”, for the Global Network on Extremism and Technology, a partner of Tech Against Terrorism, a “public-private partnership working with the global tech industry” which works with various governments and “inter-governmental organisations such as UN, OSCE, [Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe] and the Commonwealth CVE Secretariat”. [56]

Comerford’s article is very revealing of the real agenda behind the EU report and the associated Grandiose Project.

He describes “the diverse manifestations of violence that have emanated from conspiracy theories, especially in the wake of the coronavirus pandemic which helped to mainstream such movements across societies”.

*And what “violence” would this be?*

“Specific examples of conspiracy-related violence include the targeting of 5G masts, based on conspiracy theories... perpetrators are often

inspired by a blend of conspiratorial and extremist ideological perspectives in their attack planning”.

His definition of “harms” proves to be even more spurious than the notion that sabotaging dangerous 5G infrastructure amounts to “violence”.

Comerford writes: “It is also important to note that conspiracy theories can also result in a range of harms beyond violence.

“This can include disengagement from the state and reduced cooperation with government bodies (e.g. homeschooling, refusal to pay taxes or lower vaccine uptake), as well as longer-term threats to democratic institutions and civic culture”.

*This is unbelievable stuff. He is actually suggesting that not wanting to take the Big Pharma job or preferring to educate your children at home amount to “harms” worthy of being discussed in an article with “terrorism” and “violent” in its title!*

In his next paragraph, Comerford essentially dismantles his claim about “longer-term threats to democratic institutions and civic culture”, when he notes: “As is explored in a later Insight in this series focused on policy responses to violent conspiracy movements, this ‘threat to democracy’ framing is increasingly being adopted by governments in their conceptualisation of

these threats”.

*So there we have it. The so-called “threat to democracy” is just a “framing” by which authorities demonise dissent.*

The same goes for all the “violence”, “terrorism” and “hate” that Comerford and his like are constantly invoking to justify the silencing of all criticism of the system they serve.

*It’s all just propaganda, and here he has admitted as such.*

It turns out that propagandist Comerford was previously “Senior Analyst at the Tony Blair Institute for Global Change”, [57] a sinister organisation whose connections are explored in my article on Tony Blair and the Rothschilds. [58]

He has also had the honour of speaking at an “emerging leaders” conference [59] staged in Israel by the World Union of Jewish Students and B’nai B’rith International, “The Global Voice of the Jewish Community”. [60]

Funnily enough, another “confirmed speaker” identified on the B’nai B’rith site is none other than Katharina von Schnurbein, European Commission Coordinator on combatting antisemitism and fostering Jewish life and 2018 recipient of B’nai B’rith Europe’s Human Rights Prize.

*It’s a small world, for globalists.*

So, to wrap up, the EU Strategy on



Combating Antisemitism and Fostering Jewish Life (2021-2030) is based on assumptions derived from sources that are as far from independent and non-partisan as it is possible to be.

Simply by following the trail of breadcrumbs laid down by von Schnurbein's leadership of this Grandiose Project, and the ISD report she cites as justification, we come across numerous players in the criminocratic global game that these people would like us to believe does not actually exist.

Because of the repeated multiple interconnections between these various elements – that I have also described in previous articles – it is quite clear to me that they constitute one single entity, a self-concealing corrupt global governance that I have termed the criminocracy.

These criminocrats make no secret of the fact that they wish to control what we do and what we say.

But they are lying when they say this is out of a desire to prevent bad things like “anti-semitism”, “extremism”, “hate” or “terrorism”.

As Milo Comerford rather foolishly spelled out in his article for the Global Network on Extremism and Technology, their idea of dangerous “harms” to be combated includes anything – such as “disengagement from the state and reduced cooperation with government bodies” – that involves us remaining or moving

outside the domination of a system that they aim to make entirely “inclusive”.

The criminocracy would like to close down all discussion of its existence and ill deeds by means of deceitful gaslighting.

Starting from the (false) assumption that there is no such thing as the system, they insist that those who dare say otherwise are therefore necessarily bad – “extremists, conspiracy theorists and disinformation actors” – who must be silenced by any possible means.

However, embedded in their approach is a major strategic error which it is now impossible for them to rectify.

The use of the “anti-semitism” smear has worked very well for them so far, but it is also a double-edged sword.

In order to explain to the public why it is “anti-semitic” to criticise a system which they claim does not exist, they have had to *themselves* point out that many leading figures on the global stage are Jewish (such as George Soros) or closely linked to Jewish/Zionist networks (such as Emmanuel Macron vis-à-vis the Rothschilds).

They have walked into a logical trap in which the very act of denouncing an analysis they consider dangerous itself reinforces and propagates that analysis.

People naturally ask themselves why it would be “anti-semitic” to criticise the banking

system or Big Pharma if those entities were *not*, in fact, largely controlled by Jewish interests.

But at the same time, they ponder, how *could* it be automatically “anti-semitic” to criticise those entities, simply on the basis that they *were* largely controlled by Jewish interests?

If I condemned a local drug dealer who happened to be, I don’t know, Icelandic, would that make me Icelandophobic, or would it just mean that I don’t like drug dealers?

Should my right to condemn drug dealing be removed because it risked stirring up hate against Icelandic people?

Should the whole of my community be sternly told never to condemn drug dealing because to do so would threaten the well-being of Icelandic residents, even though these people amounted to only 0.22% [61] of the local population and most of them had nothing to do with drugs?

Should new laws be passed making it illegal for the other 99.78% of us to refer to drug dealing and the people behind it, because of the risk of inciting anti-Icelandic hate?

Should the local council pour huge amounts of taxpayers’ cash into a Grandiose Project on “combating Icelandophobia and fostering Icelandic life” on the basis of the allegedly anti-Icelandic nature of all criticism of drug dealing?

And if the local authority figure proposing

all this was known to hang out with the drug dealer and his mates, some of whom were mightily interested in the “funding opportunities” presented by the Icelandophobia project, where would that leave his credibility?

Trying to disqualify and ban all analysis exposing the existence of the corrupt global mafia on the basis that it amounts to “anti-Jewish hate” is, in truth, a fatal own goal.

It gives the game away to such an extent that I believe it will inevitably lead to the ignominious collapse of the whole criminocratic racket.

[1]

[https://commission.europa.eu/strategy-and-policy/policies/justice-and-fundamental-rights/combating-discrimination/racism-and-xenophobia/combating-antisemitism/eu-strategy-combating-antisemitism-and-fostering-jewish-life-2021-2030/about-eu-strategy\\_en](https://commission.europa.eu/strategy-and-policy/policies/justice-and-fundamental-rights/combating-discrimination/racism-and-xenophobia/combating-antisemitism/eu-strategy-combating-antisemitism-and-fostering-jewish-life-2021-2030/about-eu-strategy_en)

[2] [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=COM:2021:615:FIN&pk\\_campaign](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=COM:2021:615:FIN&pk_campaign)

[3] <https://commission.europa.eu/system/files/2023-08/Katharina%20von%20Schnurbein%20-%20bio%20EN%20AUGUST%202023%20.pdf>

[4] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Katharina\\_von\\_Schnurbein](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Katharina_von_Schnurbein)

[5] <https://electronicintifada.net/blogs/ali-abunimah/supporters-israels-war-crimes-give-human-rights-prize-eu-official>

[6] <https://momentmag.com/22574-2/>

[7] <https://www.jta.org/2019/06/18/global/this-mother-of-4-is-the-eus-indefatigable-heroine-in-the-fight-against-anti-semitism>

[8] <https://www.jta.org/2019/06/18/global/this-mother-of-4-is-the-eus-indefatigable-heroine-in-the-fight-against-anti-semitism>

[9] <https://momentmag.com/22574-2/>

[10] <https://www.jta.org/2019/06/18/global/this-mother-of-4-is-the-eus-indefatigable-heroine-in-the-fight-against-anti-semitism>

[11] <https://www.jpost.com/diaspora/antisemitism/article-746310>

[12] <https://ec.europa.eu/newsroom/just/items/719267>

[13] <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/d73c833f-c34c-11eb-a925-01aa75ed71a1/language-en>

[14] <https://www.isdglobal.org/about/>

[15] <https://www.isdglobal.org/partnerships-and-funders/>

[16] <https://www.theguardian.com/news/2024/jan/05/adl-pro-israel-advocacy-zionism-antisemitism>

[17] <https://off-guardian.org/2023/04/26/bbc-musk/>

[18] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George\\_Weidenfeld,\\_Baron\\_Weidenfeld](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_Weidenfeld,_Baron_Weidenfeld)

[19] [https://wikispooks.com/wiki/Institute\\_for\\_Strategic\\_Dialogue](https://wikispooks.com/wiki/Institute_for_Strategic_Dialogue)

[20] [https://wikispooks.com/wiki/Jeffrey\\_Epstein/Black\\_book](https://wikispooks.com/wiki/Jeffrey_Epstein/Black_book)

[21] <https://www.isdglobal.org/team/>

[22] <https://web.archive.org/web/20201204174916/http://stratcomdc.org/speakers/>

[23] [https://wikispooks.com/wiki/StratCom\\_DC\\_2019](https://wikispooks.com/wiki/StratCom_DC_2019)

[24] <https://initiatives.weforum.org/global-coalition-for-digital-safety/members>

[25] [https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF\\_Global\\_Charter\\_of\\_Principles\\_for\\_Digital\\_Safety\\_2023.pdf](https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Global_Charter_of_Principles_for_Digital_Safety_2023.pdf)

[26] <https://uk.linkedin.com/in/sasha-havlicek-0378921>

[27] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European\\_Council\\_on\\_Foreign\\_Relations](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_Council_on_Foreign_Relations)

[28] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lady\\_Kitty\\_Spencer](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lady_Kitty_Spencer)

[29] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adair\\_Turner,\\_Baron\\_Turner\\_of\\_Echinswell](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adair_Turner,_Baron_Turner_of_Echinswell)

[30] <https://www.bbc.com/news/business-21992578>

[31] <https://www.isdglobal.org/isd-board/>

[32] <https://www.cheynecapital.com/>

[33] <https://www.cheynecapital.com/>

[34] <https://winteroak.org.uk/impact-slavery/>

[35] <https://www.7pillarsglobal-insights.com/>

[36] <https://winteroak.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/the-great-racket-paul-cudenec.pdf>

[37] <https://find-and-update.company-information.service.gov.uk/officers>

/SZv\_Hzo67LpsZgMk5NCRjfeWn60/appointments

[38] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stephen\\_Zinser](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stephen_Zinser)

[39] <https://www.gavi.org/governance/gavi-board/members/stephen-zinser>

[40] [https://web.archive.org/web/20221220023452/https://www.isdglobal.org/isd\\_team/lea-gerster/](https://web.archive.org/web/20221220023452/https://www.isdglobal.org/isd_team/lea-gerster/)

[41] <https://www.linkedin.com/company/brexit-analytica>

[42] <https://trdpolicy.eu/>

[43] <https://article7.eu/>

[44] <https://article7.eu/about>

[45] <https://article7.eu/about>

[46] <https://www.epc.eu/en/about>

[47] <https://www.epc.eu/en/about>

[48] <https://kbs-frb.be/en/about-us>

[49] <https://henryjacksonsociety.org/centre-on-radicalisation-and-terrorism/>

[50] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Henry\\_Jackson\\_Society](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Henry_Jackson_Society)

[51] [https://wikispooks.com/wiki/Henry\\_Jackson\\_Society](https://wikispooks.com/wiki/Henry_Jackson_Society)

[52] <https://www.standard.co.uk/news/london/lady-de-rothschild-sues-thinktank-over-funds-from-caring-capitalism-summit-9625722.html>

[53] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/04/15/charles-empire-the-royal-reset-riddle/>

[54] <https://www.isdglobal.org/team/>

[55] <https://gnet-research.org/2023/09/05/beyond-terrorism-understanding-the-diverse-violent-outcomes-of-conspiracy-beliefs/>

[56] <https://gnet-research.org/partners/>

[57] <https://www.isdglobal.org/team/>

[58] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2023/11/14/tony-blair-and-the-rothschilds/>

[59] <https://www.bnaibrith.org/global-advocacy/impact-emerging-leaders-fellowship/>

[60] <https://www.bnaibrith.org/>

[61] The Institute for Jewish Policy Research gives a variety of figures for the Jewish population of the EU, depending on the definition of “Jewish”, ranging from 781,000 to 1.5 million. If we take 1 million as fair, since the total population of the EU is 445 million, we see that 1 in 445 people in Europe are Jewish, 0.22%. <https://www.jpr.org.uk/countries/how-many-jews-in-european-union>

## AN ABC FOR OPPOSING THE CRIMINOCRAY

If we wish to fully understand, and thus to *effectively* oppose, the global criminocrats, we need to stop thinking in terms of “politics” as currently known.

*They* couldn’t care less about questions of political ideology and values, about “left” or “right”, “red” or “blue”, “capitalism” or “communism”.

Yes, these are useful *devices* in their divide-and-rule strategies, but they have no interest at all in the political *content*.

This is because they are, quite simply, *criminals* whose sole aim is to expand and protect their own ill-gotten wealth and power.

They were just as happy to make money in the USSR and Nazi Germany as they are today in fake Western “democracies” or Eastern oligarchies, whether or not currently labelled “communist”. The only thing that matters to them is that the regime in question facilitates Business as Usual for their nefarious activities.

Basically this amounts to:

**A.** An ever-ongoing flow of money-making opportunities under the guise of “progress”, “development”, “innovation”, “economic growth” or “modernisation”. They lend the money to governments for allegedly crucial “infrastructure”, they win the contracts, they exploit the labour, they supply the raw materials, they build the machinery, they sell the product, they rake it in. If this gravy train ever slows down a little, all it needs is a convenient war, “pandemic” or other “crisis” to kick it back to full speed.

**B.** A means of imposing their domination on the population. This historically means the state, which, by direct and indirect taxation, makes people pay for the mechanisms by which they are repressed. Police, government bodies and the military/intelligence forces are all there to protect criminocratic rule and racketeering from dangerous outbreaks of real democracy. As institutional power is globally centralised, international bodies like the EU, the WHO and the UN are also playing this enforcement role.

**C.** Ensuring their own invisibility. This is very important for the criminocracy because they are all too aware that they are a tiny minority – a few thousand core players against a global population of more than 8 billion. If large numbers of people understood that the



criminocracy existed, and what it was up to, the resulting revolt could not be held down, even by the resources available to the criminocracy. A particular worry would that be individuals currently unknowingly working for the criminocracy might switch sides if they understood the real stakes. So the criminocrats encourage limited and misleading versions of history, tightly control media output and systematically deploy the term “conspiracy theorist” to discredit anyone who points in their direction, implying stupidity and borderline insanity with, for added effect, smears such as “extremist”, “reactionary”, “far-right”, “fascist”, “terrorist”, “hate criminal” and “anti-semite”.

In view of this, we can see, emerging from the fog of “political” confusion, the only dividing line that really matters.

Resistance to the criminocracy needs to involve:

- A.** Opposition to its money-making “development” racket.
- B.** Opposition to the institutions that impose its central control.
- C.** Exposure of the existence and activities of the criminocracy to as wide a global public as possible.

Any “resistance” not built on these foundations can achieve nothing.

## A CRUCIAL MOMENT FOR HUMANKIND

I've lost count of the number of times that I have warned, especially since 2020, of the enormous danger currently staring us in the face.

Looking through the latest *Acorn* bulletin, I am struck by the realisation that the situation really is as bad as I have been saying, if not even worse!

There is Giovanni Pandolfini pointing to the “perverse and diabolical path” by which small farmers are being forced into debt and off the land in favour of the biggest, most capital-backed, hi-tech and predatory agri-businesses.

There is Escapekey explaining how the fake-green global “climate” operation is nothing other than fraud and theft, “a colossal public transfer to the privileged few”.

There are Lynn Davenport and Alice Linehan pointing out that “investors” are making money from our children’s schoolwork, thanks to software that turns educational data into yet another source of profit for the financial parasites.

Then there is Toby Rogers warning that

“lockdowns” represent “the most extreme form of enclosure in human history”; Kate Mason describing how the “far right” label is being systematically used to crush dissent; reports that “rhetoric seeking to undermine confidence in solutions to climate change” is being presented as the latest variant of “climate denial” and news that draconian new legislation in France criminalises criticism of Big Pharma and its jabs.

We also learn that not only is the UK arming and approving Israel’s genocidal ethnic cleansing in Gaza but that, as Lowkey reports, “pro-Israel forces currently have control of NHS, Foreign Office, Home Office and Ministry of Defence data”.

I can only agree with Craig Murray when he says: “Sometimes the blindingly obvious is worth saying out loud. Whether I am fighting for Julian Assange, fighting to save Palestinians or fighting the massive wealth gap in western society, I always find I am fighting against precisely the same people and forces”.

These people and forces are quite obviously currently making a big move towards their long-cherished goal of a totalitarian world state in which people and nature alike have been reduced to nothing but assets, owned and exploited by the sociopathic ruling class.

They are, to a great extent, throwing caution to the wind in doing so, and are arrogantly re-

vealing their agenda in a way previously unimaginable.

This is the moment to act! We cannot let them get away with their twisted project, even though the vast reach of their corrupt power makes this a challenging proposition.

I have been discussing how we might best resist the criminocacy in my series of articles from *Our Quest for Freedom*, [2] but here I'll leave the last word to our friends over at *The Stirrer*.

“One thing we are doing our level best to do is to encourage people to start quietly withdrawing their consent for the system to carry on functioning as it is”. [3]

[1] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2024/02/19/the-acorn-91/>

[2] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2024/02/16/our-quest-for-freedom-explaining-and-proposing/>

[3] <https://stirfrombelow.substack.com/p/quietly-withdrawing-consent>

## FAKE TERRORISM AND THE GENOCIDE AGENDA

The criminocracy is in danger of losing its carefully-constructed shield of invisibility as it accelerates its deranged bid for total and permanent global control.

It is therefore obliged to ramp up its attacks on those who dare expose its existence, its crimes and its lies.

Iain Davis writes: “UK independent journalist, researcher and documentary filmmaker Richard D. Hall faces conviction, sizeable damages and an injunction that could potentially end his career and his livelihood.

“The High Court of Justice has denied Hall the opportunity to present any kind of meaningful defence. This travesty of justice has potential implications, not just for Richard D. Hall, but for all journalists who dare to question power”.

The overall situation is that Hall is being sued by two alleged victims of the 2017 Manchester Arena “bombing”, which he convincingly argues was nothing of the sort, but

a manufactured psy-ops.

In a recent video, Hall describes in detail the issues involved and wonders whether the case against him is really being instigated by the alleged victims or by other, hidden, forces. [2]

He mentions in particular Marianna Spring, the BBC's first ever "disinformation specialist and social media correspondent", who has been actively seeking to discredit his work. [3]

Kit Klarenberg writes on *The Grayzone* site that there are "troubling questions" [4] about Spring, who appeared out of nowhere to take up the newly-created thought-police post in March 2020, at the tender age of 24. [5]

She played a leading role in "diminishing and discrediting sizable anti-lockdown protests that engulfed the streets of central London" and depicted them as "comprised almost entirely of fringe lunatics", he writes.

Klarenberg points to Spring's links with the extremely dodgy "think tank" the Institute for Strategic Dialogue, which I have previously described.

As I explained, the ISD was co-founded by ardent Zionist George Weidenfeld and enjoys an "institutional partnership" with the even more ardently pro-Israel Anti-Defamation League.

A 2022 episode of the BBC's Panorama programme presented by Spring featured ISD boss Sasha Havlicek discussing "how and why

people come to believe that terror attacks are hoaxes”. [6]

Hall’s admirable forensic investigation into the Manchester event was presented as evidence of a supposed “mainstreaming of extremism, hatred and conspiracy”, with Spring and Havlicek stressing “the impact these conspiracy theories have on the survivors of terror attacks”.

The ISD’s Zionist affiliations are particularly pertinent here, since the Manchester “bombing” is officially regarded as having been the work of “Islamic extremists”.

*Wikipedia* describes it as “the deadliest act of terrorism and the first suicide bombing in the United Kingdom since the 7 July 2005 London bombings”, [7] also blamed on “Islamist terrorists”. [8]

The same familiar enemy is said to have been behind pretty much every big “terrorist” attack of the 21st century, starting with 9/11, and pesky “conspiracy theorists” have been asking questions about all of them. [9]

There is certainly historical evidence to suggest that terror attacks are often not what they appear to be.

Gianfranco Sanguinetti wrote in 1980: “I have never said that the secret services were behind every single attack, given that these days even a Molotov cocktail or a workplace sabotage are considered to be ‘attacks’: but I have said,

and I have been saying for nearly ten years now, that all spectacular acts of terrorism are either remote-controlled, or directly carried out, by our secret services”. [10]

He was referring to the terrorist attacks, in Italy and across Europe, which are now known to have been co-ordinated by NATO under what is often termed Operation Gladio. [11]

The aim of that wave of killing – which was not faked but very real – was seemingly to push scared populations into the arms of the security state and to discredit radical groups falsely accused of being responsible.

The first of these aims is most likely still true today – who, since 2020, can seriously doubt that deliberate fearmongering plays an important part in keeping populations under control?

But the second aim must be slightly different now, because the “terrorists” involved are said to be “Islamist”.

Why would the system feel the burning need, one might ask, to create fake or false-flag events to discredit Islamist groups that do not present an obvious domestic political threat to the governments of the various countries targeted?

The answer, I suspect, lies in the way in which our political institutions have been systematically captured by elements favourable to, and often funded by, Israel – a reality that



has become all too obvious since the onslaught against Gaza began. [12]

We might also consider a document published by Jerusalem Summit nearly 20 years ago. [13] *The Acorn* reported in 2016 [14] that the leadership of this Zionist organisation included Daniel Pipes, the pro-Israel and anti-Islam US commentator, and Britain's Baroness Cox, [15] described by Craig Murray in 2014 as "a prominent supporter of organisations which actively and openly promote the ethnic cleansing of all Palestinians from Gaza". [16]

The document in question envisages "relocation" of Palestinians from their homes in Israeli-controlled territory "to allow them to build a new life for themselves and their families in countries preferably, but not necessarily exclusively, with similar religious and socio-cultural conditions".

The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) has been in the limelight in recent months, accusing Israel of crimes against humanity and, in turn, being depicted as a tool of Hamas by Israel and its supporters. [17]

Interestingly, the archived Jerusalem Summit document declares that "the dissolution of UNRWA is an essential prerequisite for any comprehensive, durable solution of the Palestinian issue".

Also, crucially in the context of this article, it states: “The de-legitimization of the Palestinian narrative becomes a vital prerequisite to any comprehensive resolution of the Palestinian issue”.

How exactly could that “narrative” be delegitimized – thus allowing the ethnic cleansing of Palestinians, by whatever means necessary, to go ahead without too much global opposition?

One way would be to associate Palestinians, in the minds of the international public, with terrorists who have been attacking their own communities.

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has long been trying to make this link, claiming back in 2014: “ISIS and Hamas are branches of the same poisonous tree. When it comes to their ultimate goals, Hamas is ISIS and ISIS is Hamas. And what they share in common, all militant Islamists share in common”. [18]

He made the same claim in October 2023, declaring: “We have always known what Hamas is. Now the whole world knows. Hamas is ISIS... We will defeat [Hamas] precisely as the enlightened world defeated ISIS”. [19]

With many people pointing out that Hamas was created and propped up by Israel itself, [20] insisting that ISIS is “a US-Israeli creation” [21] and wondering if the October 7 attacks were a

false-flag event, [22] a disconcerting possibility emerges.

Could it be that all or most of the big “Islamist” terror attacks of the first two decades of this century were fake or false-flag events, designed to whip up hatred and fear of Muslims and thus of Palestinians, to demonise and dehumanise them in order to achieve the “de-legitimization” of their cause, as recommended by Jerusalem Summit?

Was this all part of a long-term plan to pave the way for the ethnic cleansing horrors that we have seen unfolding in Gaza since October 2023?

If so, is this why the Israel-linked ISD is so keen, through its boss Havlicek and her sidekick Spring, to shut down all investigation of the truth behind these events and the genocidal agenda they were designed to advance?

[1] <https://iaindavis.com/richard-d-hall-a-travesty-of-justice/>

[2] [https://www.richplanet.net/richp\\_genre.php?ref=311&part=1&gen=99](https://www.richplanet.net/richp_genre.php?ref=311&part=1&gen=99)

[3] [https://www.richplanet.net/richp\\_genre.php?ref=306&part=1&gen=99](https://www.richplanet.net/richp_genre.php?ref=306&part=1&gen=99)

[4] <https://thegrayzone.com/2023/06/01/bbc-specialist-disinformation/>

[5] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marianna\\_Spring](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marianna_Spring)

[6] <https://www.isdglobal.org/isd-in-the-news/sasha-havlicek-on-why-conspiracists-claim-terror-attacks-are-being-faked/>

[7] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Manchester\\_Arena\\_bombing](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Manchester_Arena_bombing)

[8] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/7\\_July\\_2005\\_London\\_bombings](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/7_July_2005_London_bombings)

[9] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2016/02/09/the-acorn-21/#4>

[10] Gianfranco Sanguinetti, *Del terrorismo e dello Stato* (1980).

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

- [12] <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/opendemocracyuk/pro-israel-lobby-in-britain-full-text/>
- [13] [http://web.archive.org/web/20060406050101/http://www.jerusalemsummit.org/eng/hs\\_short\\_eng.htm](http://web.archive.org/web/20060406050101/http://www.jerusalemsummit.org/eng/hs_short_eng.htm)
- [14] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2016/01/11/the-acorn-20/#3>
- [15] <http://jerusalemsummit.org/presidium.htm>
- [16] <https://www.craigmurray.org.uk/archives/2014/07/gaza-genocide-promoter-baroness-cox-dundee-university-must-withdraw-honorary-degree/>
- [17] <https://www.palestinechronicle.com/defunding-unrwa-international-law-and-compelling-israel-to-compliance/>
- [18] <https://time.com/3445394/netanyahu-un-general-assembly-amas-abbas/>
- [19] <https://www.timesofisrael.com/likening-amas-to-isis-netanyahu-vows-victory-in-war-for-our-existence/>
- [20] [https://www.democracynow.org/2023/10/20/divide\\_and\\_rule\\_how\\_israel\\_helped](https://www.democracynow.org/2023/10/20/divide_and_rule_how_israel_helped)
- [21] <https://www.globalresearch.ca/isis-is-a-us-israeli-creation-top-ten-indications/5518627>
- [22] <https://geopoliticsandempire.com/2023/12/06/was-al-aksa-flood-false-flag/>

## THE NAUSEATING HYPOCRISY OF THE MURDEROUS CRIMINOLOGISTS

It's very difficult to identify a weak spot in the defences of the multi-trillion-dollar global complex that has seized control of pretty much everything.

But I would suggest that there is one broad area of vulnerability, linked to the issue of false-flag terrorism, as discussed in a recent piece.

There I described how evidence points to the Manchester Arena “bombing” of 2017 being a fake, staged, event. The same looks to be true, as a video shows, of the Boston Marathon “bombings” of 2013. [1]

A sceptical friend, well aware of the ruthless brutality of the system, asked me why on earth it would need to go to all that trouble of employing a cast of actors – and relying on the silence of so many complicit individuals – when it could simply have sent in its usual remote-controlled terrorists to carry out a real outrage.

The answer, I think, comes in a comment made in the *OffGuardian* presentation of my article, which says it was all about “eliminating

calls for justice from the families of dead victims or the injured themselves. No awkward questions to answer or calls for more extensive public enquiries”. [2]

Angry and utterly determined family members had been a thorn in the side of the false-flag terrorism organisers both in the USA after 9/11 and in the UK following the horrific atrocity in London on July 7 2005.

The significance of this considerable threat to the official narrative – which probably prompted the switch to faked events – is echoed in an expanded 2020 version of the 7/7 Ripple Effect video by researcher Muad’Dib (Anthony John Hill). [3]

Like Richard D. Hall, who investigated the fake Manchester event, he was attacked by the British state via both the BBC and the legal system for his forensic dismantling of the story fed to the public.

Muad’Dib explains how he was held in prison in London for several days (out of a total of more than 100 days behind bars on this issue) on dubious charges relating to the distribution of his original film – which he says had been viewed by millions of people – and only finally released on bail after the end of the official 7/7 enquiry. [4]

This was, he thinks, because the system was frightened that he would meet survivors, and

families of the victims, and share his eye-opening insights (and DVDs!) with them.

Detailed investigative work carried out by Muad'Dib, along with Hall and Nick Kollerstrom, suggests very strongly indeed that the official story of what happened on 7/7 is an odious lie.

The explosions on three tube trains and a bus were not caused by the four supposed Muslim “bombers”, it appears, but by shadowy forces using these young men as patsies in their scheme.

There are several revelations in the film that back up the hypothesis, outlined in my previous article, that large-scale “Islamist” terror attacks like this were staged to advance the long-term Zionist agenda.

The then-PM Tony Blair – who was suspiciously quick off the mark to blame Muslims before any such evidence had been produced – is closely linked to the Rothschilds, the Zionist gang who brought the Israeli state into being. [5]

Israeli technology firms were heavily involved in the CCTV systems which mysteriously failed to record key moments and the double-decker bus was blown up outside the Tavistock Square offices of ICTS, [6] a Dutch-registered security firm that, according to *Wikipedia*, is “an Israeli company owned and operated by senior officers of the Mossad”. [7]

One of ICTS International's subsidiaries, Huntleigh USA, was "the airline security and passenger screening company that was responsible for the passengers that boarded the flights at Boston and Newark prior to the 9/11 attacks".

An earlier, archived, version of that *Wikipedia* page also reveals that the firm's security system came under scrutiny as part of "the international investigation into how Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab was able to board Northwest Airlines Flight 253 with explosive materials, garnering criticism for 'its possible responsibility for the security failure at Schiphol.'" [8]

It adds: "While this story was widely reported in the Israeli and European press, mainstream media outlets in the United States gave it no coverage. ICTS was also responsible for security at the Charles de Gaulle Airport where Richard Reid, the 'shoe bomber', boarded American Airlines Flight 63 in December 2001".

Needless to say, like 9/11 and 7/7, both these ICTS-related incidents are officially linked to "Islamists"...

Current Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu was in London on the morning of 7/7 and told media he had been warned shortly before the blasts not to leave his hotel. [9]

Although he initially claimed this tip-off had



come from British police, it was later stated that it was from Israeli secret service agency Mossad.

*How did they know?*

A hint at the answer came from an incredible Freudian slip by Israeli “security expert” (Mossad operative) Juval Aviv when he told *Fox News* in July 2007: “It is easy to put a truck bomb, as we did – as happened! – in London”.

You can see the damning clip on the video made by Muad’Dib, who concludes that 7/7 was either a MI5 operation, a Mossad operation, or a joint operation between the two.

Some kind of complicity between the UK and Israeli states is clearly implied. How could Israel, alone, mount a false-flag attack of this scale in London, without British security services at the very least knowing about it?

The elephant in the room here is that these two intelligencies agencies are, in truth, nothing more than two departments of the same overall entity, that I have termed the criminocracy.

This entity started to make itself more visible four years ago, when Operation Covid was sprung, to kick-start the Great Reset.

It rapidly became clear to millions that not only was the “pandemic” a lie, but it was a lie that was being told and imposed – *using the same narrative and language* – across the world by states, institutions, media, big businesses,

celebrities and religious leaders.

The outbreak of “conspiracy theories” of which the system so often complains was the inevitable result of it dropping its usual pretence and revealing itself as the centrally co-ordinated public-private global entity that it actually is.

Anyone paying attention could see that this was so.

At the same time as people started to notice the *existence* of this entity, they also became aware of its *nature*.

It was not in the least *benevolent*. It cared nothing for people’s suffering or death. It was lying to us and laughing at us for believing it.

It was up to its neck in corruption; profiteering; money-laundering; drug dealing; child trafficking; polluting; racketeering and warmongering.

At the same time it pretended to represent democracy, decency and humanity.

*It was not only a criminal entity but an utterly hypocritical one.*

The nature of the elephant in the room became even more obvious after events in Gaza, from October 2023. Not instantly, perhaps, because reports of the terror attacks on Israelis were shocking, but after several weeks, when the totally disproportionate nature of the Israeli “response” became apparent.

With Israeli flags projected on to Downing

Street, the Eiffel Tower and other public buildings; [10] with politicians refusing to condemn Israel; calls for a ceasefire being called “anti-semitic”; dissent rebranded as “hate”; censorship and cancellation of pro-Palestinian voices; hysteria whipped up about terrorists in our midst, it was Covid (and Ukraine) all over again.

The link was confirmed by the involvement of pro-Zionist “think tanks” like the Institute for Strategic Dialogue, which had already been trying to conflate anti-lockdown protests with “anti-semitism”.

Even the tone of the pro-Israel voices was strangely familiar.

David Rovics, the left-wing Jewish and anti-Zionist musician, reported on March 2 that in just one week he had received more than 2,000 abusive messages on Facebook from Zionist trolls. [11]

He added: “The style and methods of the pro-Israel trolls are absolutely and completely identical to the style and methods of the allegedly ‘antifascist’ trolls who have been targeting me actively since January, 2021”.

So, after Covid showed us that the global entity existed and that it was a deeply unpleasant one – a criminocracy in fact – its reaction to the Gaza genocide has confirmed that it is also pro-Zionist.

I say “confirmed” because by 2022 I had already thoroughly researched the crucial role in that criminocracy of the aforementioned Rothschild family, so proud of their part in creating Israel. [12]

It is certainly a problem that Zionism is so central to the criminocracy, given that, as we have seen in the last few months, it embraces a fanatic, ruthless, murderous contempt for the lives of those outside its own group that the world has not seen since Hitler’s Nazi regime.

But you could say that it is not *specifically* the Zionist factor that is the essential issue, since it would be a bad thing for *any* small ethno-political group to be exerting such domination over the rest of the people of the world.

Actual democracy is not possible under such circumstances. The ruling group in any country is governing *on behalf of* the global entity. It is therefore acting *in the interests of* that entity and *not* in those of the country concerned or of its population.

This is a *colonial* form of government, of the kind long imposed all across the world by the criminocracy in the guise of its British Empire [13] and Pax Americana.

What people living in “the West” have to realise is that *they too* are colonial subjects of an empire that regards them as nothing more than “human capital”.

This colonial mindset can clearly be seen every time that subject peoples express their spirited opposition to the grim future being forced upon them; to the destruction of their culture; to the abolition of their freedom and to the erosion of their standard of living.

The smears are rolled out and the shock troops are sent in. [14]

However, it is the very fact that criminocratic rule is *colonial* that makes it more vulnerable than you might think.

Despite its near-complete capture of institutional power and its unlimited access to money, its core amounts to a very small group of people.

Such a small group cannot *directly* or *openly* impose its rule on 8 billion human beings, but needs the help of intermediaries who are not part of its in-group and thus *would not support* that in-group's very narrow and self-interested agenda, if they were fully aware of it.

The criminocrats therefore have to use manipulative lies and illusions to trick millions upon millions of people into working on their behalf.

These individuals (and groups) *imagine* that they are putting their life energy into *doing good, protecting the nation, defending democracy, fighting for social justice or saving the planet.*

But in truth they are advancing the interests

of a global entity that has *no interest at all* in the well-being of their country or of humankind as a whole, that couldn't care less about the health of the planet, that spits on real social justice and for which *actual* democracy will always *necessarily* be a threat to its colonial occupation, rather than something it intends to uphold.

This deceit-based relationship with its local footsoldiers, and with the public as a whole, is the global criminocracy's weak point, its Achilles heel – and it knows it.

That's why it has always made sure that it controls people's perception of reality through its newspapers, its radio and its TV.

That's why it sends its employees on brainwashing courses, to dull their critical senses and indoctrinate them with its globalist dogma.

That's why it gets so angry about “conspiracy theorists” casting doubt on its version of the truth, rolling out all its usual triggering language such as “denial”, “hate”, “extremist”, “far right” and “anti-semitic”.

It knows that if ever its intermediaries – the people from the colonised populations tricked into working for their oppressors' agenda – realised what was really going on, they would withdraw consent from its agenda.

After all:

\* Who could be happy about working for an entity that invented a fake pandemic in order to

cruelly humiliate you: to lock you in your own home; muzzle you; deprive you of your livelihood; tear you apart from your loved ones; browbeat you into being injected with a dangerous experimental chemical and then label you a menace to society when you dare to challenge this?

\* Who could be happy about working for an entity that cheats and lies and threatens and blackmails and kills in order to get what it wants; a criminal gang that has nothing but contempt for your fellow countrymen and women?

\* Who could be happy about working for an entity that regards you, your family and your friends as its possessions, its slaves, and aims to herd your children and grandchildren into smart-city concentration camps to be fed on insects and chemical nutrients, wired up to the Matrix and turned into sources of sustainable profit for “impact” parasites?

\* Who could be happy about working for an entity that deliberately starts and prolongs world wars in order to increase its profits and its power, callously sacrificing the lives of millions of ordinary people for its own corrupt self-interest?

[15]

\* Who could be happy about working for an entity that is currently committing genocide in Gaza and, at the same time, using this crime to

claim that “the usual recipes for international problem-solving are no longer fit for purpose” and that therefore a new system of global governance is required? (Iain Davis quotes the Lowy Institute, which he describes as a “Rothschild think tank”, as saying just this, with the WEF echoing the call for a “multi-polar” New World Order. [16])

\* And, coming back to the false-flag terrorism issue, who could be happy about working for an entity that brutally blows to pieces your fellow citizens, blames its enemies, sheds crocodile tears, covers up the truth and then informs you that you are a threat to society if you try to tell people what you think really happened?

The answer is, of course, that *nobody* with any decency could be happy working for such an entity – if they realised what it was doing!

*It is hard to imagine how any ruling complex could be any more depraved, sadistic, murderous, inhuman, duplicitous and nauseatingly hypocritical than the one in power today.*

This is why, in *Our Quest for Freedom*, I insist upon the necessity of *exposing* the criminocracy before we can set about defeating it.

When the truth about the criminocracy’s existence and utterly odious activities is known to those who currently work for it, the situation will rapidly change.

Even if these people don’t walk out of their



job, or quit the controlled organisation to which they belong, their participation will be less enthusiastic, even obstructive.

There are subtle ways of sabotaging any job, any role, if you are so inclined. You drag your heels, you look the other way, you throw little spanners into the works whenever you get the chance.

Very quickly, the criminocracy will find itself defended only by a disintegrating army of disenchanting mercenaries – permanently alienated from its agenda and hoping only for a chance to slip away from the fray.

And up against them will be a resistance movement motivated by righteous life-affirming anger and sworn to keep fighting until the evil empire is finally brought down.

[1] [https://www.richplanet.net/richp\\_genre.php?ref=303&part=1&gen=99](https://www.richplanet.net/richp_genre.php?ref=303&part=1&gen=99)

[2] <https://off-guardian.org/2024/03/01/fake-terrorism-and-the-genocide-agenda/#comments>

[3] <https://mtrial.org/>

[4] [https://www.richplanet.net/richp\\_genre.php?ref=109&part=1&gen=99](https://www.richplanet.net/richp_genre.php?ref=109&part=1&gen=99)

[5] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2023/11/14/tony-blair-and-the-rothschilds/>

[6] <https://www.ictsintl.com/about-icts/icts-management>

[7] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ICTS\\_International](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ICTS_International)

[8] [https://web.archive.org/web/20100301180532/https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ICTS\\_International](https://web.archive.org/web/20100301180532/https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ICTS_International)

[9] <https://www.globalresearch.ca/was-there-advanced-knowledge-of-the-7-7-london-bomb-attacks/31748>

[10] <https://x.com/ClareDalyMEP/status/1765701182087975040>

[11] <https://davidrovics.substack.com/p/what-are-the-pro-israel->

trolls-trying

[12] <https://winteroak.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/enemiesofthepeople--1.pdf>

[13] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/05/15/empire-of-hypocrisy/>

[14] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2023/05/02/adieu-to-the-illusion-of-democracy/>

[15] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/10/14/a-crime-against-humanity-the-great-reset-of-1914-1918/>

[16] <https://geopoliticsandempire.com/2024/02/27/al-aqsa-flood-false-flag-part-3/>

## BLAIR, BERLUSCONI AND FALSE FLAG TERROR

I have been going on for years about Gladio, the NATO-organised terrorist network behind a glut of false flag attacks in the second half of the last century, a forerunner to the false flag spectacles we have seen more recently. [1]

So I was intrigued to read, via Kit Klarenberg, that mainstream Italian newspaper *La Repubblica* has just published an interview with Roberto Jucci, veteran “general of top secret missions”, in which he talks about its activities. [2]

The paper seems to focus on the role of US “centers of power” in the murder of “left-leaning statesman” Aldo Moro.

But also notable is the reminder that they worked “in conjunction with notorious Masonic lodge P2” of which one of the highest-profile members was the late politician and media tycoon Silvio Berlusconi.

Berlusconi, as *The Independent* reports, was “involved in dozens of court cases on charges including money laundering, mafia collusion and

underage prostitution”. [3]

Researchers into nefarious goings-on [4] have long shown an interest in the links between Berlusconi and former British Prime Minister Tony Blair, so close to the Rothschild gang. [5]

And *The Independent's* piece notes that Blair and his wife Cherie, who were known for frequently holidaying in Tuscany, Italy, [6] were entertained by Berlusconi in 2004 at his luxury villa in Sardinia.

“The Italian leader put on a £50,000 firework display to welcome the Blairs, which culminated in rockets spelling out ‘Viva Tony’ in the Mediterranean sky.

“In an interview with an Italian magazine a few years later, Cherie Blair said she ‘never had such a night as the one we spent with [Berlusconi] in Sardinia’.

“Downing Street defended the meeting at the time, claiming Mr Blair and Mr Berlusconi were discussing the Iraq War, as well as other business deals”.

Blair and Berlusconi were so chummy that Sir Ivor Roberts, former British ambassador in Italy, went so far as to describe the relationship between the two men as a “bromance”. [7]

He wrote: “The last time the two met as prime ministers of their respective countries was in Italy, and I had a ringside seat as British ambassador in Rome. After introducing his

cabinet to Blair, Berlusconi cut the desultory conversation of EU politics off and declared: “Tony, I love you so much that if you were a woman I would propose to you’.

“Blair took this unusual gambit in his stride and without a pause replied: ‘And, Silvio, if you were as rich as you are, I would accept!’.”

By 2002, the UK state was already so worried that Blair was being seen to be too close to Berlusconi that it manipulated media coverage to play down the link, as a 2023 *Guardian* report explains. [8]

After Berlusconi’s death last year, Blair predictably sung his praises: “Silvio was a larger-than-life figure. I know he was controversial for many but for me he was a leader whom I found capable, shrewd and, most important, true to his word”. [9]

Ex-ambassador Roberts says that, given that they were supposedly at different ends of the fake left-right political “spectrum”, the close relationship between Blair and Berlusconi was “one of the mysteries of European politics”.

But anyone aware of their roles in the corrupt global criminocracy will hardly find their closeness surprising.

Thinking back to Gladio, P2 and false-flag terrorism, it is interesting to recall that Blair was PM at the time of the 1999 London Nail Bombings, took the UK into US-led wars in

Afghanistan and Iraq following 9/11 and was still Prime Minister in 2005 when London suffered the notorious 7/7 terror attack, which I discussed in a recent article.

*All just coincidence, no doubt!*

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

[2] <https://www.kitklarenberg.com/p/gladio-role-in-aldo-moro-murder-confirmed>

[3] <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/silvio-berlusconi-italy-vladimir-putin-b2462051.html>

[4] [http://www.declarepeace.org.uk/captain/murder\\_inc/site/blair.html](http://www.declarepeace.org.uk/captain/murder_inc/site/blair.html)

[5] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2023/11/14/tony-blair-and-the-rothschilds/>

[6] <https://www.newstatesman.com/long-reads/2003/03/why-tuscany-hates-blair>

[7] <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2023/06/12/silvio-berlusconi-tony-blair-bromance-sir-ivor-roberts/>

[8] <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2023/jul/19/tony-blair-sought-avoid-reports-snuggling-up-silvio-berlusconi-national-archives>

[9] <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2023/jun/18/for-tony-blair-silvio-berlusconi-was-shrewd-capable-and-true-to-his-word-for-others-not-so-much>

## THE FALSE RED FLAG

### **Pseudo-resistance**

I have always had a rather uneasy relationship with the “socialist” and “communist” left.

On the one hand I have been deeply inspired by many thinkers and rebels loosely associated with this tradition, from John Ball of the peasants’ revolt [1] and the legendary Robin Hood (robbing the rich to feed the poor), to Gerrard Winstanley [2] or William Morris. [3]

I have campaigned alongside grassroots socialists and communists, in both Britain and France, on numerous occasions when our causes have coincided and would, of course, do so again.

However, at the same time I have the gut feeling that there is something *wrong* about this movement.

My ambivalent attitude embraces all the terms it uses to describe itself.

Two writers who have greatly influenced me, Gustav Landauer [4] and George Orwell, [5] described their thinking as “socialist”, while going out of their way to warn us against communism.

But at the same time, the most insidious “left-wing” organisation I have personally come across is the UK’s *Socialist Workers Party* – a Trotskyist outfit notorious in anarchist circles a quarter of a century ago for “parachuting” into struggles and diverting them away from genuine resistance to the system.

Its “Globalise Resistance” front group, or “Monopolise Resistance” as it was dubbed, was deliberately set up to hijack the anarchic energy of the anti-globalisation movement. [6]

In 2001 it effectively sabotaged the May Day resistance planned for Oxford Street in London by forming a march that led protesters into a police trap hours ahead of the scheduled protests. [7]

I can well remember helpful police officers gesturing to us to follow the SWP up Regent Street into the awaiting kettle at Oxford Circus – an offer my friends and I chose not to accept!

The SWP called on people [8] to vote for Tony Blair’s neoliberal New Labour in 1997, just as the French Communist Party called in 2022 for people to vote for “former” Rothschild employee Emmanuel Macron in the second round of the presidential elections (to “keep out the far right”). [9]

This is typical of a certain hypocritical *falsity* about the left that strikes me as one of its primary characteristics, along with a naively



blind acceptance of the social and technological “Progress” sold to us by the system and a propensity for authoritarianism – a barely-concealed impulse to censor, silence and intimidate all those who fail to conform to its view of the world.

This showed itself once again in 2020, when the vast bulk of socialists and communists (as well as “anarchists”!) eagerly jumped on board the Covid bandwagon and started attacking dissidents with the “far right” and “reactionary” smears that their movement has often used to attack opponents who are actually more anti-establishment than they are.

My aim here is to put a bit more meat on the bare bones of my personal hunches and experiences and to sketch out what seems to be fundamentally wrong with the thing we call communism.

Obviously in one single article it would be absurd to even pretend to address the whole historical movement, with all its subtleties, varieties and complications, let alone the vast and immensely dull world of Marxist theory.

Instead, I will be focusing on a few select accounts of communism’s basic character as manifested in the former Soviet Union, before coming back to the ideology itself.

Many communists would no doubt insist that this is unfair and that the 70 years of com-

munist rule there were not representative of their ideology or movement as a whole.

But I concur with the Russian anarchist Voline, an important source for this essay, when he declares: "The history of repression in the USSR is not only, in itself, suggestive and revealing: it is also an excellent means for making clear the *very substance, the hidden aspects, the real nature of authoritarian communism*". [10]

### **Lies and repression**

An authentic mood of revolt had been swelling up in Russia for some time before 1917, with a previous attempted revolution in 1905-06 violently repressed by the tsarist regime.

A great inspiration behind this mood was the back-to-the-land Christian anarchism of the revered Russian novelist and thinker Leo Tolstoy, [11] author of *War and Peace*.

Contemporary observer Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu wrote in 1910: "We know that Tolstoy's ideas about land are those of the majority of Russian peasants". [12]

This radical outlook regarded the earth as a common treasury for all, like air and water: the land belonged to those who dug it and not to speculators.

"Land and freedom" was the slogan that captured the imagination of peasant families,

whose ideal was the *mir*, a village community based on traditional values and involving democratic decision-making, sharing of resources and mutual aid.

These peasants lived simply, healthily and largely beyond the reach of both central state power and, crucially, of the money-based economy. [13]

The same sort of thinking, based on popular self-determination, was even behind the creation of the Soviets – workers’ councils – that were later to give the communist empire its name.

Voline, who was on the ground in 1905-06 when the first of these was set up in St Petersburg, insists that no party or “leader” was involved.

“It emerged spontaneously, as the result of a collective agreement in a small and private group that came together by chance”. [14]

He describes how the subsequent general strike in what was then the Russian capital was, likewise, entirely spontaneous and self-organised, with no political party having the chance to grab control of it.

This anarchic spirit emerged again in 1917-18, he says. “Its influence, very weak at the start, grew as events developed”. [15]

The aim was “to transform the economic and social basis of society *without making use of a political state, a government, a ‘dictatorship’ of*

*any kind*, in other words to bring about the Revolution and resolve its problems not by means of *politics* and the *state*, but by the free and natural, *economic and social*, activities of *associations of the workers themselves*, after overturning the last capitalist government”. [16]

Voline describes how ordinary people gravitated towards these sorts of ideas all across the Russian empire, by some sort of process of natural shared intuition.

“When the working masses have the possibility of thinking, searching and acting *freely*, they see more or less the same path, whatever the locality, the mood and even – let’s add – the era, if we refer back to previous revolutions. Independently of all other reasoning, this must lead us to believe that on the whole this path is the *right* one, the *just* one, the *true path for the workers*”. [17]

This true path of revolt proved particularly popular in Ukraine, under the inspiring leadership of anarchist warrior Nestor Makhno.

His insurrectionary army initially fought on the side of the Bolsheviks against anti-revolutionary Ukrainian nationalists and Whites.

But Voline explains that commitment to freedom ran deep in the blood of the Makhnovshchina, and, with their great “organic” vitality, [18] they were not prepared to bow to

repression from any direction.

He describes how their army advanced at lightning speed – flying, on their leading two-horse cart, a large black flag embroidered with the words “Liberty or Death”. [19]

Whenever he took over a town, Makhno put up posters declaring, more or less: “Your town is occupied, temporarily, by the insurrectionary revolutionary army (Makhnovist). This army is at the service of *no political party*, of *no power*, of *no dictatorship*. On the contrary, it aims to *liberate* the region from all power, all dictatorship”. [20]

Voline continues: “Total freedom of speech, press, assembly and association, of all kinds and for everybody, was immediately proclaimed”. [21]

But, of course, freedom, mutual aid and self-determination were the very last things the Bolsheviks were going to welcome. Their aim was to establish a centralised workers’ state, the long-cherished “dictatorship of the proletariat”. [22]

Voline recalls that he and his friends made desperate attempts to alert fellow Russians to the “imminent danger for the real Revolution” if the Bolsheviks established control. [23]

The weekly anarchist paper *Goloss Trouda* warned in 1917: “Instead of a free unification *from below*, we will see the establishment of an authoritarian, political state apparatus which

will act *from above* and set about crushing everything with its iron fist”. [24]

By the end of 1918, the Bolsheviks were seriously worried by the growing influence of the pro-freedom, anarchist, spirit, says Voline. “From 1919 until the end of 1921 they were forced to conduct a very severe struggle against the advance of this idea: a struggle at least as bitter and lengthy as that against the forces of reaction”. [25]

Part of this assault on authentic revolutionaries involved the use of smears, always a favourite tool in such circles.

Anarchist thinkers were dismissed as “utopian”, “irresponsible dreamers”, “abstract philosophers” or “mystics” whose ideas bore no relation to “real life”, while anarchist activists were depicted as “enemies of the public”, “fools”, “bandits”, “criminals” or “terrorists”. [26]

The Makhnovshchina were described by the Bolsheviks as “rioting kulaks”, [27] while Makhno himself was labelled a “looter”, a “murderer” [28] and, despite the presence of numerous Jews in his ranks, an “anti-semite”. [29]

The communists’ propaganda assaults paved the way for physical attacks, with activists set upon, books burned and premises pulled down in what Voline calls “a real fury of repression”. [30]

“No sooner had they got to power than they

were planning *the suppression* of the popular movement by all the means at their disposal: press campaigns and meetings, smears, tricks, traps, bans, raids, arrests, acts of violence, ransacking of buildings, murders – they stopped at nothing”. [31]

When their initial repression and censorship failed to stem the spread of anarchist ideas, they started using even more violent means, systematically throwing them in prison, outlawing them, putting them to death.

Voline says the conflict in some parts of the Russian empire essentially amounted to civil war: “In Ukraine, notably, this state of war lasted more than two years, obliging the Bolsheviks to mobilise all their forces to stifle the anarchist idea and crush the popular movements it had inspired”. [32]

The communist repression in Ukraine got underway in April 1919, in reaction to the regional congress of peasants, workers and partisans held in Makhno’s home town of Huliaipole. The delegates from 72 districts represented a population of more than two million people.

Voline writes that he regrets no longer having access to the minutes of the congress – “they show quite clearly with what drive and, at the same time, with what spirit of wisdom and forward thinking the people sought, in the

Revolution, *their own path*, their own *popular* forms of the new life". [33]

Towards the end of the event a telegram arrived from a Bolshevik military commander declaring the congress to be "counter-revolutionary" and its organisers "outside the law", he explains.

"This was the first direct attack by the Bolsheviks on the freedom of the region. It was at the same time a declaration of war on the Insurrectionary Army". [34]

The next month the Bolsheviks tried to have Makhno murdered [35] then in June 1919 they launched a military attack on his rear while he was holding back the White army of Cossacks led by Anton Denikin – a real stab in the back of what were supposed to be their allies.

"Bursting into the villages, the Bolsheviks seized activists and executed them on the spot; they destroyed the free communes and the other organisations". [36]

The attack was ordered by none other than Leon Trotsky, today such a hero to the leftists of the Socialist Workers Party and similar organisations, who is described by Voline as intellectually limited but "inordinately arrogant and malicious". [37]

Trotsky next ordered that no further arms should be supplied to Makhno's army in its struggle against Denikin and then, "with



monstrous cynicism, with unimaginable insolence and hypocrisy”, [38] claimed that his anarchist rivals had betrayed the revolution by deliberately letting Denikin advance.

Interestingly, and relevantly since we are here interested in the phenomenon of communism as a whole, Voline goes on to explain that a similar “tactic” was later used by communists during the Spanish Civil War, when one of their brigades was manning the front against Franco alongside an anarchist brigade of some 1,500 men.

The communists deliberately and secretly abandoned their position in the middle of the night, allowing the fascists to move into the breach and surround the anarchists, of whom 1,000 were unable to escape and were duly massacred.

“The following day the ‘communists’ accused the anarchists of having betrayed them and opened the front to Franco”. [39]

Time and time again, Voline observes, communists use “brutal force, based on deceit and imposture” [40] to get their way.

For all his heroics, Makhno was finally defeated by the Bolsheviks, fleeing the country with a gaggle of followers.

Worse still, the freedom of the Ukrainian peasants was broken by the communist dictatorship and its massacres, intended to

destroy for ever their rebellious spirit and ensure that they would never rise up again.

Outside Ukraine, the most notorious example of communist repression was of the Kronstadt rebellion of 1921, in which sailors and civilians rose up against increasingly authoritarian Bolshevik rule, calling for freedom of speech, press and assembly. [41]

To cut a long story short, the rebellion was eventually crushed by the Bolsheviks in what Voline describes as “a brutal massacre, a real bloodbath”. [42]

But the important thing to retain is that, as in Ukraine, the Bolsheviks were not actually repressing “counter-revolutionaries”, as they claimed, but people and groups who were *more radical than them*, who wanted a Third Revolution to achieve a genuinely free Russia.

It was the Bolsheviks themselves who were the *real* counter-revolutionaries, the real betrayers of the people’s movement, simply taking advantage of its revolutionary energy to grab power.

They then ruthlessly destroyed anyone seeking to take that power back into the hands of the people.

Their authoritarian gang “crushed and subjugated the working class to exploit it, under new forms, in its own interests”, judges Voline. [43]

“Their system depends on deception and violence, as in any authoritarian and state system, which necessarily dominates, exploits and oppresses.

“The statist ‘communist’ regime is just another kind of fascist regime”. [44]

## **Industrial slavery**

Leo Tolstoy, with his dreams of a free Russian peasantry, had realised before his death in 1910 that the communists aimed to launch an assault on traditional rural life.

Having analysed Karl Marx’s *Capital* and studied the new “scientific” socialism, he spoke out about what Pierre Thiesset calls the communists’ “industrialised, urbanised and technocratised horizon, where Progress becomes a new religion”. [45]

“He had felt that the revolutionaries were going to fool the people by leading them into a dead end: that of the modernisation of the country and the end of the peasantry.

“What is the point in socialising the means of production if it is to proletarianise the population, to send modern slaves to live in filthy cities and become appendages of machines?

“The writer called on people to resist this development, to struggle against this so-called ‘civilization’.” [46]

This, of course, made Tolstoy a “reactionary” in the eyes of the Bolsheviks, while those who supported his call for land and freedom were labelled “naive” and “retrograde”. [47]

Vladimir Lenin, while recognising that Tolstoy was a spokesman for the ideas and desires of millions of Russian peasants, declared that his ideas were, as a whole, “harmful”. [48]

He announced, 15 years before his party came to power: “This patriarchal peasantry, which lives from its own work under the system of the natural economy, is condemned to disappear”. [49]

Even earlier, in 1899, Lenin had written a book called *The Development of Capitalism in Russia* [50] in which he described the mobility of the workforce and the extension of the market as representing “progress”.

He rejected the idea that the rural commune could serve as the basis for communism and that Russia could take an alternative path that avoided Western-style industrial development.

And he stressed the need to sweep away all the outmoded institutions that impeded the development of capitalism, that supposedly necessary stage on the road to socialism. [51]

When the communists finally grabbed power, they were true to their word and, under Lenin and then Stalin, declared war on the Russian peasantry.

Writes Carroll Quigley: "Communism in Russia alone required, according to Bolshevik thinkers, that the country must be industrialized with breakneck speed, whatever the waste and hardships, and must emphasize heavy industry and armaments, rather than rising standards of living.

"This meant that the goods produced by the peasants must be taken from them, by political duress, without any economic return, and that the ultimate in authoritarian terror must be used to prevent the peasants from reducing their level of production to their own consumption needs". [52]

He says: "The high speed of industrialisation in the period 1926-1940 was achieved by a merciless oppression of the rural community in which millions of peasants lost their lives". [53]

"The chief elements in the First Five-Year Plan were the collectivization of agriculture and the creation of a basic system of heavy industry. In order to increase the supply of food and industrial labour in the cities, Stalin forced the peasants off their own lands (worked by their own animals and their own tools) onto large communal farms, worked co-operatively with lands, tools, and animals owned in common, or onto huge state farms, run as state-owned enterprises by wage-earning employees using lands, tools, and animals owned by the government". [54]

Agriculture was industrialised by the use of machinery, particularly tractors – the number of these in Russia rose from less than 30,000 in 1928 to nearly half a million in 1938, with the percentage of ploughing done by tractor shooting up from 1 per cent to 72 per cent. [55]

Voline describes how the Russian peasant had his patch of land and his possessions confiscated and was attached to a “kolkhoz” like a worker to a factory.

“The state transformed him not merely into its farmer, but into its serf and forced him to work for this new master.

“And, like any real master, it only leaves him, from the produce of his work, the minimum needed to live: the rest, the largest part, is put at the disposal of the government”. [56]

He comments that this system did not lead “towards socialism” but into state capitalism, “even more abominable than private capitalism” and just “another mode of domination and exploitation”. [57]

It was the same story in communist factories, in which the dehumanising production-boosting Taylorism used in the West was wrapped up in workerist propaganda and rolled out as Stakhanovism. [58]

This was all imposed through the regime’s vicious totalitarian approach, spearheaded by the notorious Cheka secret police.

Some of the Kronstadt rebels were already warning in 1921: “A new – communist – serfdom has been established. The peasant has been transformed into a serf of the ‘Soviet’ economy. The worker has become a simple employee in the state’s factories. The working class intelligentsia has been virtually wiped out.

“Those who wanted to protest have been thrown into the Cheka’s jails. And those who continued to agitate were simply put up against the wall. The whole of Russia has been turned into a huge penal colony”. [59]

Quigley writes: “By the middle 1930’s the search for ‘saboteurs’ and for ‘enemies of the state’ became an all-enveloping mania which left hardly a family untouched.

“Hundreds of thousands were killed, frequently on completely false charges, while millions were arrested and exiled to Siberia or put into huge slave-labor camps.

“In these camps, under conditions of semi-starvation and incredible cruelty, millions toiled in mines, in logging camps in the Arctic, or building new railroads, new canals, or new cities”. [60]

He says that most of these gulag prisoners had not even done anything against the Soviet state or the communist system, but were the relatives, associates and friends of persons who had been arrested on more serious charges.

And he adds that many of these charges

were completely false, having been trumped up “to provide labour in remote areas”, [61] among other reasons.

The communist regime effectively amounted, as Voline spells out, to a “totalitarian capitalist state”. [62]

Its society was characterised by “a stifling dogmatism”, the absence of all real individual life and “the despairing monotony of a glum and colourless existence, regulated in the smallest detail by the prescriptions of the state”. [63]

Critical thinking and any questioning of the official narrative was utterly out of bounds and children’s heads were stuffed full of rigid Marxist doctrine, he says. [64]

The communists particularly excelled in the field of propaganda or “more exactly of lies, deceit and bluff”. [65]

“Compared to them, the ‘Nazis’ themselves are nothing but modest pupils and imitators”. [66]

“This deceitful propaganda across the world is of unrivalled scope and intensity. Considerable sums have been sacrificed to it”. [67]

The communist state had declared itself the sole judge of truth on every subject – historical, economical, political, social, scientific, philosophical or anything else, he says.

“In all domains the Bolshevik government considered itself infallible and called upon to lead



humanity”. [68]

Any person or group who doubted the state’s infallibility, who criticised or contradicted it in any way, was considered to be its enemy, and an enemy of both truth and the Revolution – a “counter-revolutionary”! [69]

Voline adds: “Any opinion, any thought, other than that of the state is considered heresy: dangerous, unacceptable, criminal heresy. And, logically, unavoidably, there follows the punishment for heretics: prison, exile, execution”. [70]

He sums up the Soviet system as “a monstrous and murderous state capitalism, based on an odious exploitation of the ‘mechanised’, blind, unconscious masses”. [71]

And he wonders *why* it was that the long-awaited Revolution had resulted only in a “new dictatorship” and “new slavery”. [72]

The next part of this essay will go some way to answering that, along with the key question of why the Bolshevik New Normal of 100 years ago sounds so uncannily similar to the nightmare future towards which we are being herded today.

## **A repugnant racket**

Anyone wishing to understand what lay behind the brutal political repression and totalitarian industrial slavery imposed by the Bolsheviks would do well to read the work of historian Ant-

ony C. Sutton, notably his book *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*. [73]

He shows, with solid evidence, that the communist seizure of power was encouraged and funded by financial interests outside Russia.

This is not to say that there were not genuine revolutionary forces at play in the country and that the tsarist regime would not have been toppled in any case.

But the specific role of the Bolsheviks was to seize power, crush the genuine popular revolt and ensure that Russia was turned into an authoritarian centralised state – under the ultimate control of these financial interests – which could then impose their Great Project.

This project was, of course, all about making money.

Communist Russia was regarded as a “golden opportunity” [74] in certain circles.

An enciphered telegram sent by David Francis, US ambassador in Petrograd (St Petersburg), a year before the revolution began, is very telling for a couple of reasons.

Firstly because he sent it to the State Department in Washington, DC, to be deciphered and forwarded to Frank Arthur Vanderlip, the chairman of the National City Bank in New York, thus indicating which power he was truly serving.

Secondly because of his message to the

banker: “*Opportunities here during the next ten years very great along state and industrial financing*”. [75]

This wouldn't have been the case if the genuine social movement, of which Voline was part, had won the day and managed to place power and wealth in Russia in the hands of the Russian people.

So the international bankers clearly had an important incentive in crushing any real revolutionaries and ensuring that their opportunity-providing placemen were firmly in charge.

Sutton in fact mentions Voline in his book and explains that “the betrayal of the Russian Revolution” which the latter witnessed first-hand was created by “the new powerbrokers of another corrupt political system... the ambitions of a few Wall Street financiers who, for their own purposes, could accept a centralized tsarist Russia or a centralized Marxist Russia but not a decentralized free Russia”. [76]

We are generally taught that there is a fundamental dichotomy between state control of industry and private control – state ownership of the kind exercised under “communism” would necessarily be to the disadvantage of those who profit under “capitalism”, we are made to believe.

But the public-private model tested in Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany, and now championed by the likes of the WEF, should allow us to

see through this illusion.

Like fascism, communism provided financiers with the authoritarian state muscle to *impose* their industrial development projects on people who would not otherwise have gone along with them.

Sutton muses about the apparent contradiction of somebody like George Foster Peabody, deputy chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, being an enthusiast for government ownership of railways.

He argues: “Given the dominant political influence of Peabody and his fellow financiers in Washington, they could by government control of railroads more easily avoid the rigors of competition.

“Through political influence they could manipulate the police power of the state to achieve what they had been unable, or what was too costly, to achieve under private enterprise.

“In other words, the police power of the State was a means of maintaining a private monopoly... The idea of a centrally planned socialist Russia must have appealed to Peabody. Think of it – one gigantic State monopoly!” [77]

In 1922, the same year as they created their Gosbank central bank, the Bolsheviki formed their first international bank, known as the Ruskombank (Foreign Commercial Bank or the Bank of Foreign Commerce).

It was headed by “Bolshevik Banker” Olof Aschberg and on its board, alongside representatives of the Soviet Union, sat tsarist private bankers and representatives of German, Swedish and American banks. [78]

On joining Ruskombank, Max May of Guaranty Trust stated that it was “very important” and that it would “largely finance all lines of Russian industry”. [79]

Sutton’s detailed research and analysis utterly explodes the myths entertained by communists about their relationship to both capitalism and fascism.

Take this statement, for instance: “Trotsky was able to generate support among international capitalists who, incidentally, were also supporters of Mussolini and Hitler”. [80]

But an element of which he was evidently unaware was the true identity of the financiers behind the funding of the Bolshevik beast, as well as of fascism.

Voline mentions in passing a treaty with London that “opened the doors of the country to British capital”. [81]

And Sutton himself provides a clue in his account of the formation of the Ruskombank, when he records: “The foreign banking consortium involved in the Ruskombank represented mainly British capital... The British government itself had already purchased substantial interests in

the Russian private banks; according to a State Department report, ‘The British Government is heavily invested in the consortium in question.’” [82]

J.P. Morgan, the main Wall Street entity that Sutton links to the Bolsheviks, is in fact, as I set out in my booklet *Enemies of the People*, [83] a front for the Rothschild empire, in particular of its UK operation.

The Rothschilds needed a convincing front in the USA because the American public would not have been too pleased to learn that, despite the War of Independence, their country was still largely owned by the City of London.

Guaranty Trust Company – “Aschberg’s New York associate” [84] – was likewise a Morgan/Rothschild entity, as was the aforementioned National City Bank (the word “City” in all such US bank names being a reference to the City of London).

Sutton looks at these bankers’ duplicitous role in the First World War – a subject I have addressed in some detail elsewhere [85] – and concludes: “What is really important is not so much that financial assistance was given to Germany, which was only illegal, as that directors of Guaranty Trust were financially assisting the Allies at the same time.

“In other words, Guaranty Trust was financing both sides of the conflict. This raises the

question of morality”. [86]

Financing both sides of a conflict, with utterly no regard for morality, is a notorious trademark of the Rothschild mafia.

Their familiar fingerprints can be seen all over Operation Bolshevik.

The bankers’ involvement in the Russian Revolution used the vehicle of a “Red Cross Mission” which was yet another spurious organisation hiding behind the mask of “humanitarianism”.

Sutton explains: “In World War I the Red Cross depended heavily on Wall Street and specifically on the Morgan firm.

“The Red Cross was unable to cope with the demands of World War I and in effect was taken over by these New York bankers. [87]

“In August 1917 the American Red Cross Mission to Russia had only a nominal relationship with the American Red Cross, and must truly have been the most unusual Red Cross Mission in history”. [88]

He reveals that all expenses, including those of the uniforms – the members were all colonels, majors, captains or lieutenants – were paid out of the pocket of William Boyce Thompson, director of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York! [89]

And, of course, Thompson’s interest did not have anything to do with the Red Cross’s usual activities.

The *Washington Post* published a report on February 2, 1918, entitled: "GIVES BOLSHEVIKI A MILLION. W.B. Thompson, Red Cross Donor, Believes Party Misrepresented".

This stated: "William B. Thompson, who was in Petrograd from July until November last, has made a personal donation of \$1,000,000 to the Bolsheviks for the purpose of spreading their doctrine in Germany and Austria". [90]

Sutton spells out the reality behind the Red Cross front: "The mission was in fact a mission of Wall Street financiers to influence and pave the way for control, through either Kerensky or the Bolshevik revolutionaries, of the Russian market and resources. No other explanation will explain the actions of the mission. [91]

"Thompson was interested in the Russian market and how this market could be influenced, diverted, and captured for postwar exploitation by a Wall Street syndicate, or syndicates. [92]

"Whether the Russian people wanted the Bolsheviks was of no concern". [93]

Sutton identifies the central co-ordinating point of the communism-funding project as 120 Broadway in New York.

"Two of the operational vehicles for infiltrating or influencing foreign revolutionary movements were located at 120 Broadway: the first the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, heavily laced with Morgan [Rothschild] appointees; the



second the Morgan-controlled American International Corporation”. [94]

Intriguingly, the 1915 skyscraper that is 120 Broadway, the Equitable Building, [95] today features a luxury rooftop Bankers Club and is owned by Silverstein Properties. [96]

Property mogul Larry Silverstein was the man who bought the lease on the World Trade Center two months before 9/11 and later bagged a \$4.55 billion pay-out, successfully arguing that two planes hitting the two towers amounted to two separate incidents for which he should be recompensed. [97]

Sutton also looks into the dubious role played by Raymond Robins, a wealthy businessman who, “for no observable reason”, [98] suddenly declared himself a socialist, backed the Bolsheviks and, according to French government documents, sent “a subversive mission of Russian Bolsheviks to Germany to start a revolution there” – this being the Spartacist revolt of 1918. [99]

He concludes: “There is considerable evidence, including Robins’ own statements, that his reformist social-good appeals were little more than covers for the acquisition of futher power and wealth”. [100]

One might add that this seems to be true of a certain “left” in general and indeed Sutton quotes Quigley when he states that in around

1910 “the Morgan firm [Rothschilds] decided to infiltrate the Left-wing political movements in the United States. This was relatively easy to do, since these groups were starved for funds and eager for a voice to reach the people. Wall Street supplied both”. [101]

Quigley goes on: “It was this group of people, whose wealth and influence so exceeded their experience and understanding, who provided much of the framework of influence which the Communist sympathizers and fellow travelers took over in the United States in the 1930’s.

“It must be recognized that the power that these energetic Left-wingers exercised was never their own power or Communist power but was ultimately the power of the international financial coterie”. [102]

Describing, in a rather cryptical way, “the relationship between the financial circles of London and those of the eastern United States which reflects one of the most powerful influences in twentieth-century American and world history”, [103] he then gets to the core of the issue.

“The two ends of this English-speaking axis have sometimes been called, perhaps facetiously, the English and American Establishments.

“There is, however, a considerable degree of truth behind the joke, a truth which reflects a very real power structure.

“It is this power structure which the Radical

Right in the United States has been attacking for years in the belief that they are attacking the Communists.

“This is particularly true when these attacks are directed, as they so frequently are, at ‘Harvard Socialism’ or at ‘Left-wing newspapers’ like *The New York Times* and the *Washington Post*, or at foundations and their dependent establishments, such as the Institute of International Education.

“These misdirected attacks by the Radical Right did much to confuse the American people in the period 1948-1955 and left consequences which were still significant a decade later”. [104]

Sutton adds, for his part: “We suggest that the Morgan firm [Rothschilds] infiltrated not only the domestic left, as noted by Quigley, but also the foreign left – that is, the Bolshevik movement and the Third International”. [105]

Ripples of the confusion mentioned by Quigley have lingered on today, in the age of the so-called Great Reset.

When some people notice the similarities between this 2020s authoritarian land-grabbing industrial project and that of the communists in Russia in the last century, they draw the conclusion that the Great Reset is “communist”.

This would seem to make no sense, given that Klaus Schwab’s WEF is a body representing the world’s biggest corporations and financial in-

terests and, even though he has been pictured with a bust of Lenin behind him, he is hardly a “communist” in the generally-understood sense.

However, once we realise that communism in Russia was promoted and funded by the same mafia who are now behind the WEF, the fog of confusion quickly clears.

As we have seen, the *real* aim behind installing communism in Russia was to impose, by means of its totalitarian central state, a massive wave of highly profitable industrial development.

Sutton traces the start of the project to the setting up of the American International Corporation (AIC) at 120 Broadway in 1915 and the frustration, reported by Frank A. Vanderlip of National City Bank, that “there was not much more railroad building to be done in the United States”. [106]

Rail infrastructure was, as I have previously described, a major element in the Rothschilds’ empire.

Operation Bolshevik worked rather well in this respect. Soviet Railways, which started operations in 1922 under the direct control of the communist state, was “the backbone of the Soviet Union’s economy” and “greatly upgraded and expanded the Russian Imperial Railways to meet the demands of the new country”. [107]

One of the directors of AIC was C.A. Coffin, chairman of General Electric, whose executive of-

fice was at 120 Broadway and, coincidentally, was chairman of the cooperation committee of the American Red Cross! [108]

The Rothschilds also had a massive vested interest in the global expansion of electrification, dominating as they did the world's supplies of copper, the main material required for the infrastructure.

As one website [109] enthusiastically relates, “the electrification of Soviet Russia came about unlike anywhere else in the world” and allowed the banker-backed Bolsheviks to bulldoze traditional Russian life.

“They turned a backward agrarian country into an industrial economy in a matter of years”.

Propaganda presented Lenin as a mystical symbol of electrification and the communist New Normal/Order.

“The electric light that now lit up every home became known as ‘Ilyich’s lamp’, which brought enlightenment (quite literally) and a new way of life to the masses”.

With the “golden opportunity” of a “massive State monopoly” spurring them on, the gang in New York built a private vehicle “to exploit Russian markets and the earlier support given the Bolsheviks”, explains Sutton.

“A group of industrialists from 120 Broadway formed the American-Russian Industrial Syndicate Inc. to develop and foster these oppor-

tunities”. [110]

Financial backing for the new firm came from the likes of the Guggenheim Brothers, also of 120 Broadway, previously associated with William Boyce Thompson.

“Guggenheim controlled American Smelting and Refining; and the Kennecott and Utah copper companies”, [111] Sutton notes.

In 1918 The American League to Aid and Cooperate with Russia was set up, with the involvement of Coffin of the General Electric Company, and the talk was of “economic assistance” for Russia. [112]

Lenin spun the same line when he told the Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party in March 1921 that the country would require “the assistance of capital”. [113]

But in truth the communist regime was not so much being assisted by capital as being *used* by it as a tool to squeeze untold profit from the Russian people and their land.

As Sutton says: “The gigantic Russian market was to be converted into a captive market and a technical colony to be exploited by a few high-powered American financiers and the corporations under their control”. [114]

A final instructive detail is that, with their usual racketeering cynicism, the financial mafia backing the Bolsheviks also, at the very same time, whipped up fear of communism in the USA!

Writes Sutton: “The financial circles that were supporting the Soviet Bureau in New York also formed in New York the ‘United Americans’ – a virulently anti-Communist organization predicting bloody revolution, mass starvation and panic in the streets of New York”. [115]

Pointing to the involvement of Morgan/Rothschild entity Guaranty Trust in this duplicity, he says it “raises, of course, serious questions about the intentions of Guaranty Trust and its directors”. [116]

I can only agree with him that “spreading propaganda designed to create fear and panic while at the same time encouraging the conditions that give rise to the fear and panic” points to “utter moral depravity”. [117]

## **A despotic dead end**

We have seen how the Bolsheviks in Russia repressed the grassroots revolutionary movement and imposed a centralised authoritarian regime that declared war on small farmers and hitherto independent individuals, turning most of the population into powerless slaves to a giant industrial machine.

We have also learned that they were funded and assisted by the global mafia, which obviously stood to gain by creating a forerunner of the dehumanised totalitarian industrial prison camp

which they are currently trying to build via their Great Reset or Fourth Industrial Revolution.

One question that still hangs in the air, however, is whether the Bolshevik example is really a *fair* representation of the communist philosophy as initially set out by Karl Marx.

To address this matter, I will first call as a witness Mikhail Bakunin (1814-1876), the freedom-loving Russian revolutionary who was a one-time associate of Marx before falling out with him in a big way.

By the time he wrote the pamphlet ‘Statism and Anarchism’ in 1873, Bakunin had noticed the dangers lurking in the Marxist creed and astutely foresaw the nightmare that would be inflicted on his own home country when these authoritarian communists later came to power.

He warned: “They will concentrate all the powers of government in strong hands, because the very fact that the people are ignorant necessitates strong, solicitous care by the government.

“They will create a single State bank, concentrating in its hands all the commercial, industrial, agricultural, and even scientific production; and they will divide the mass of people into two armies – industrial and agricultural armies under the direct control of the State engineers who will constitute the new privileged scientific-political class”. [118]



Two years previously, he had written in a letter that there was a connection between communism and big banks, namely that “the Communism of Marx seeks enormous centralization in the state, and where such exists, there must inevitably be a central state bank”.

He commented: “I am certain that Rothschild for his part greatly values the merits of Marx, and that Marx for his part feels instinctive attraction and great respect for Rothschild”. [119]

In ‘Statism and Anarchism’, Bakunin also pointed to the Marxists’ determination that “on the morrow of the Revolution the new social organization should be set up not by the free integration of workers’ associations, villages, communes and regions from below upward, conferring to the needs and instincts of the people, but solely by the dictatorial power of this learned minority, allegedly expressing the general will of the people”. [120]

Bakunin also answered a defence of Marxism that is still being peddled today, namely that *in theory* its authoritarian revolutionary state will eventually disappear, allowing the final liberation of the people in a free socialist society.

He wrote: “They say that this State yoke – the dictatorship – is a necessary transitional

means in order to attain the emancipation of the people: Anarchism or freedom is the goal, the State or dictatorship is the means. Thus to free the working masses, it is first necessary to enslave them...

“They maintain that only a dictatorship – their dictatorship, of course – can create the will of the people, while our answer to this is: No dictatorship can have any other aim but that of self-perpetuation, and it can beget only slavery in the people tolerating it; freedom can be created only by freedom, that is, by a universal rebellion on the part of the people and free organization of the toiling masses from the bottom up”. [121]

Inevitably there will be some who decline to take Bakunin’s word regarding the reality behind the communist agenda, given that he was an anarchist and ended up a bitter enemy of Marx and his gang.

So I will now seek illumination from the horse’s mouth, namely the famous *Communist Manifesto* [122] issued by Marx and Friedrich Engels in 1848, which announced the transition from “the period of the Utopian socialists” to “the period of scientific socialism”, [123] as Quigley puts it.

There are parts of this document, addressing the necessity of grabbing back wealth and power from the hands of the ultra-wealthy ruling class,

with which I obviously agree!

But there are a number of rather alarming details – real red flags indicating that there is something amiss with this supposedly revolutionary programme.

Take, for instance, the sneering dismissal of rivals who do not share their fetishistic obsession with the industrial working class and who promote “not the interests of the proletariat, but the interests of Human Nature, of Man in general, who belongs to no class, has no reality, who exists only in the misty realm of philosophical fantasy”.

*Human beings don't exist, only workers for the Machine.*

Or the dictatorial threats to confiscate “the property of all emigrants and rebels” and to “replace home education by social”.

The pamphlet calls for the “establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture”, which is what Bakunin was referring to.

Their grim communist plan for a grey future is described as: “Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of all the distinction between town and country”.

The Manifesto condemns small manufacturers, shopkeepers, artisans and peasants (ie small farmers) as necessarily “not revolutionary, but conservative”. It adds: “Nay more, they are reactionary, for they try to roll

back the wheel of history”.

*This is, of course, the “wheel of history” as presented in propaganda painting industrial “development” [124] and exploitation as somehow inevitable and “progressive”.*

Marx and Engels are not shy about setting out the authoritarian means that will be needed to keep the wheel of industrial and financial expansion turning.

They declare (and this is in 1848, remember, 70 years before events in Russia): “The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degree, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the State, i.e., of the proletariat organised as the ruling class; and to increase the total productive forces as rapidly as possible.

“Of course, in the beginning, this cannot be effected except by means of despotic inroads on the rights of property”.

And they demand:

- “Centralisation of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly”.
- “Centralisation of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State”.
- “Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State”.

This sort of society is, of course, utterly alien to the desires of most ordinary people, which is

why “despotic” measures would be required.

Their New Order/Normal would also have to involve the smashing apart of old customs and communities in a “radical rupture with traditional ideas”.

It is clear from all of this that the seeds of the brutal authoritarianism and repression seen in communist Russia were present in Marxist thinking right from the start.

While there are no doubt followers of Marx who *do not* support these toxic elements, they are embedded within the ideology and will always be available as a theoretical backdoor for pragmatic authoritarianism.

The truth about communism is that it is not fit for purpose as a philosophy of revolt, offering us no way out of the existing system.

As I have shown, it amounts to nothing but a scam – pseudo-resistance which aims to use its dead-end despotic ideology, along with endless lies and repression, to impose industrial slavery on behalf of the criminocracy.

It has long since betrayed the original spirit of rebellion that animated popular uprisings over the centuries, replacing that love of life, land and freedom with a narrow and sterile “scientific” dogma.

Like the environmentalist movement in recent years, [125] it has been hijacked to serve the interests of the very forces it was meant to be

opposing.

So what would a *real* resistance movement look like?

The main problems with the communist outlook are: its commitment to central control, on a national or international level; its commitment to the role of a central bank; [126] its obsession with increased industrialisation and urbanisation; its war on all tradition and cultural organicity; and its authoritarian, nay “despotic”, intolerance of anyone who declines to go along with any part of its programme.

It is quite easy to see how all of this fits in with the agenda of the financial-industrial mafia who aided and abetted the Bolshevik power grab and who are today trying to push us into their world-state smart-city matrix of digital slavery.

It is therefore also quite easy to identify the specific contrasting positions that should be adopted by a genuine movement of resistance as part of its general dissident vision.

We can ensure that our resistance is – unlike communism – *incompatible* with the global mafia’s project if we:

i. Prioritise decentralisation of power and promote the principle that this process should be continued to the lowest possible level, thus reversing the current power structure and restoring decision-making to the people.

ii. Oppose the existence of central banks

that place control of the economy, and thus of society, in the hands of parasitical financiers.

**iii.** Call for a halt to all further industrial expansion and for the abolition of all structural commitment to “development” and “economic growth” which undemocratically imposes the profiteers’ industrial racket. The long-term direction we want our societies to take should be a question of open public debate.

**iv.** Promote a rejection of digital culture and a return to real life. Work for a reversal of the system’s “social distancing” and for the rediscovery of our belonging to organic community and place, along with the celebration of traditional customs, arts, crafts and know-how.

**v.** Celebrate critical thinking, individual autonomy, diversity of belief and the right of free speech for everybody – even communists!

[1] <https://orgrad.wordpress.com/a-z-of-thinkers/john-ball/>

[2] <https://orgrad.wordpress.com/a-z-of-thinkers/gerrard-winstanley/>

[3] <https://orgrad.wordpress.com/a-z-of-thinkers/william-morris/>

[4] <https://orgrad.wordpress.com/a-z-of-thinkers/gustav-landauer/>

[5] <https://orgrad.wordpress.com/a-z-of-thinkers/george-orwell/>

[6] <https://libcom.org/article/monopolise-resistance-how-globalise-resistance-would-hijack-revolt-schnews>

[7] [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk\\_news/1307173.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/1307173.stm)

[8] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Socialist\\_Workers\\_Party\\_\(UK\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Socialist_Workers_Party_(UK))

[9] <https://www.euractiv.fr/section/elections/news/un-appel-tres-large-de-la-classe-politique-a-voter-pour-emmanuel-macron/>

[10] Voline, *La Révolution Inconnue: du pouvoir bolchéviste à Cronstadt* (Paris: Pierre Belfond, 1972), p. 79. I worked from the original French version of Voline’s work and the translations are

- my own, so will not always correspond exactly to English versions such as that featured on the Anarchist Library website at <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/voline-the-unknown-revolution-1917-1921-book-one-birth-growth-and-triumph-of-the-revolution>
- [11] <https://orgrad.wordpress.com/a-z-of-thinkers/leo-tolstoy/>
- [12] *La Revue des deux mondes*, 15 décembre, 1910 cit. Pierre Thiesset, 'Tolstoï contre les bolcheviks', *Brasero: revue de contre-histoire*, No 1, novembre 2021 (Paris: L'Échappée), p. 93.
- [13] Thiesset, p. 94.
- [14] Voline, *La Révolution Inconnue: de 1905 à Octobre* (Paris: Pierre Belfond, 1972), p. 80.
- [15] Voline, *de 1905 à Octobre*, p. 154.
- [16] Voline, *de 1905 à Octobre*, p. 155.
- [17] Voline, *La Révolution Inconnue: la fin de Cronstadt et l'insurrection en Ukraine* (Paris: Pierre Belfond, 1972), p. 68.
- [18] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 121.
- [19] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 102.
- [20] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 122.
- [21] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 124.
- [22] Voline, *de 1905 à Octobre*, p. 155.
- [23] Voline, *de 1905 à Octobre*, p. 201.
- [24] Voline, *de 1905 à Octobre*, pp. 209-10.
- [25] Voline, *de 1905 à Octobre*, p. 154.
- [26] Voline, *de 1905 à Octobre*, p. 231.
- [27] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 85.
- [28] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 46.
- [29] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, pp. 196-97.
- [30] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 48.
- [31] Voline, *de 1905 à Octobre*, p. 171.
- [32] Voline, *de 1905 à Octobre*, p. 154.
- [33] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, pp.79-80.
- [34] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 80.
- [35] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 86.
- [36] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 89.
- [37] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 89.
- [38] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 92.
- [39] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 93.
- [40] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 165.
- [41] Marie Isidine, 'La Vérité sur Kronstadt', *Braséro No 1*, p. 26.
- [42] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 24.



- [43] Voline, *de 1905 à Octobre*, p. 141.
- [44] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 87.
- [45] Thiesset, p. 97.
- [46] Thiesset, p. 97.
- [47] Thiesset, pp. 94-95.
- [48] Lénine, 'Six études sur Tolstoï', revue *Commune*, no 17, janvier 1935, cit. Thiesset, p. 94.
- [49] V. Lénine, *Oeuvres*, tome VI; janvier 1902-août 1903 Editions sociales (Paris) et Editions du Progrès, Moscou, 1966, cit. Thiesset, p. 95.
- [50] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\\_Development\\_of\\_Capitalism\\_in\\_Russia](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Development_of_Capitalism_in_Russia)
- [51] V. Lénine, *Le Développement du capitalisme en Russie* (écrit entre 1896 et 1899), Editions en langues étrangères (Moscou) et Editions sociales (Paris), 1956, cit. Thiesset, p. 95.
- [52] Carroll Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope: A History of The World in Our Time* (New York: Macmillan, 1966. Reprint. New Millennium Edition), p. 250.
- [53] Quigley, p. 12.
- [54] Quigley, p. 251.
- [55] Quigley, p. 251.
- [56] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 109.
- [57] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 110.
- [58] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 98.
- [59] *L'Izvestia du Comité Révolutionnaire Provisoire*, No 10, 12 mars 2021, cit. Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, pp. 244-45.
- [60] Quigley, p. 254.
- [61] Quigley, p. 254.
- [62] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 28.
- [63] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 150.
- [64] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 149.
- [65] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 131.
- [66] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 131 FN.
- [67] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 132.
- [68] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 123.
- [69] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 124.
- [70] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 124.
- [71] Voline, *du pouvoir bolshéviste à Cronstadt*, p. 125.
- [72] Voline, *de 1905 à Octobre*, p. 21.
- [73] Antony C. Sutton, *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution* (West Hoathley: Clairview, 2016).

- [74] Sutton, p. 156
- [75] Sutton, p. 54.
- [76] Sutton, p. 19.
- [77] Sutton, p. 100.
- [78] Sutton, p. 60.
- [79] Sutton, p. 63.
- [80] Sutton, p. 36.
- [81] Voline, *la fin de Cronstadt et l'Insurrection en Ukraine*, p. 29.
- [82] Sutton, p. 61.
- [83] Paul Cudenec, 'Enemies of the People: The Rothschilds and their corrupt global empire', <https://winteroakpress.files.wordpress.com/2022/12/enemiesofthepeople.pdf>
- [84] Sutton, p. 63.
- [85] Paul Cudenec, 'A crime against humanity: the Great Reset of 1914-1918', <https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/10/14/a-crime-against-humanity-the-great-reset-of-1914-1918/>
- [86] Sutton, p. 67.
- [87] Sutton, p. 72.
- [88] Sutton, p. 73.
- [89] Sutton, p. 73.
- [90] Sutton, p. 83.
- [91] Sutton, p. 87.
- [92] Sutton, p. 97.
- [93] Sutton, p. 87.
- [94] Sutton, p. 127.
- [95] <https://gothamtoago.com/the-historic-equitable-building-shines-a-spotlight-on-its-history/>
- [96] <https://www.silversteinproperties.com/commercial-office-space-nyc/120-broadway>
- [97] Even "fact-checkers" admit this, although they like to wrap it up in weasel words that suggest it's not true. See <https://www.snopes.com/fact-check/wtc-terrorism-insurance/>
- [98] Sutton, p. 84.
- [99] Sutton, p. 91.
- [100] Sutton, p. 84.
- [101] Quigley, p. 594, cit. Sutton, p. 127.
- [102] Quigley, p. 604.
- [103] Quigley, pp. 605-06.
- [104] Quigley, p. 606.
- [105] Sutton, p. 127.
- [106] Sutton, p. 128.
- [107] <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/>

## Railway\_system\_of\_the\_Soviet\_Union

[108] Sutton, p. 130.

[109] <https://www.rbth.com/science-and-tech/334322-electricity-soviet-bolshevik-russia>

[110] Sutton, p. 137.

[111] Sutton, pp. 136-37.

[112] Sutton, p. 156.

[113] Sutton, p. 157.

[114] Sutton, p. 173.

[115] Sutton, p. 123.

[116] Sutton, p. 163.

[117] Sutton, pp. 163-64.

[118] Mikhail Bakunin, 'Statism and Anarchism', Russian volume 1, p. 298, in *The Political Philosophy of Bakunin*, ed. by G.P. Maximoff, (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964) p. 289.

[119] <https://libcom.org/library/bakunin-marx-rothschild>

[120] Bakunin, pp. 238-39, Maximoff, p. 284.

[121] Bakunin, pp. 296-97, Maximoff, p. 288.

[122] <https://www.marxists.org/admin/books/manifesto/Manifesto.pdf>

[123] Quigley, p. 237.

[124] Paul Cudenec, 'A developing evil: the malignant historical force behind the Great Reset'. <https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/08/02/a-developing-evil-the-malignant-historical-force-behind-the-great-reset/>

[125] <https://winteroak.org.uk/the-climate-scam/>

[126] Gosbank was the central bank of the Soviet Union from 1922 until the dissolution of the USSR in 1991-92, when its operations were taken over by the central banks of the successor countries, including the Central Bank of Russia, the National Bank of Ukraine and the National Bank of Kazakhstan. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gosbank>

## CLARITY AND FOCUS

At the end of 2022 I brought out a 100-page booklet entitled ‘Enemies of the People: The Rothschilds and their corrupt global empire’. [1]

To be honest, I was a bit apprehensive about publishing it, as I knew that it would probably lead to me being labelled not just a “conspiracy theorist” but an “anti-semite” as well.

This did actually happen, [2] despite my insistence right at the start of the booklet that “I am not singling out the Rothschilds *because* they are Jewish, but rather *in spite of* that fact”.

Before publishing it, I made very sure that I was completely certain about everything I stated.

I was confident that I had marshalled enough facts and reliable historical analysis to demonstrate the reality of the very disturbing situation that I presented in the final section:

“The Rothschilds have, as I have shown, amassed vast wealth at the expense of the rest of us, consistently put themselves before others, profited from war after war, grabbed hold of industrial infrastructure, exploited humanity, destroyed nature, corrupted political life, used

royalty for their own purposes, privatised the public sector, imposed their global control in a secretive manner and now imagine that they can dictate our future, confining us to a miserable and denatured state of techno-totalitarian slavery”.

Nothing I have seen or heard since then has cast any doubt on this conclusion.

In fact, I have merely come across further nuggets confirming the central role of the Rothschilds in the global criminocracy, such as in my November 2023 dive, sparked by Ben Rubin’s work, into the sinister world of ‘Tony Blair and the Rothschilds’. [3]

Independent journalist Sonia Poulton brought out an excellent video report on the same subject at around the same time. [4]

Incidentally, the strange political continuity between Margaret Thatcher (“Conservative”) and Tony Blair (“Labour”) is easier to understand when you discover the closeness of both British politicians to the Rothschilds.

With regard to the former, the *Bloomberg* obituary of Evelyn de Rothschild declared: “His friendship with Margaret Thatcher – British prime minister from 1979 to 1990 – helped the bank win the job of lead underwriter in the sales of shares in stateowned companies such as British Gas Plc and British Petroleum Plc”. [5]

Somebody has kindly pointed out to me that

Rothschild involvement in planning the privatisation-by-stealth of the NHS is mentioned in the 2022 documentary *The Great NHS Heist* (8 minutes in). [6]

I have also stumbled across a couple of references to the Rothschilds in the writing of respected anarchists from previous centuries.

I quoted Mikhail Bakunin's comments about the compatibility of Karl Marx's viewpoint with that of the Rothschilds in 'The false red flag'.

And I was also interested to find this quote from the Italian anarchist Errico Malatesta:

"Today, government, consisting of property owners and people dependent on them, is entirely at the disposal of the owners, so much so that the richest among them disdain to take part in it. Rothschild does not need to be either a Deputy or a Minister; it suffices that Deputies and Ministers take their orders from him". [7]

Anyone who imagines that this is no longer the case today, and that the Rothschilds somehow lost the vast power they once wielded, has been fooled by their sophisticated self-concealment.

The same goes for people who are aware of the role of the Rothschilds but who imagine that they are just one of several big powerful families and are on even footing with the likes of the Rockefellers.

I am not alone in my conviction that other

billionaire clans have for many decades now been subsidiary to the Rothschilds.

One suggestion, often encountered on Twitter/X, is that the Rothschilds are in fact just a front for an even murkier network of old European aristocracy linked to the Roman Catholic Church.

My doubts regarding this particular theory have led to one or two strange accounts getting quite angry with me, accusing me of being “controlled opposition” and, by focusing on the Rothschilds, “diverting attention” away from the “real” rulers of the world, whom they never seem to actually name.

I feel this issue has now been satisfactorily cleared up by events in Gaza – or rather by the lack of humane reaction to events in Gaza by governments across the world.

It is obvious, from the *carte blanche* given to Israel for its genocidal activities, and from the smearing of anyone daring to speak out against the bloodbath, that the global criminocracy is aligned with Zionism and Israel.

This remains true even if, as seems possible, US/European complicity with these crimes is intended to facilitate the transfer of global geopolitical power to the BRICS-dominated “multipolar” version of the New World Order. [8]

No family is more closely associated with the Zionist/Israeli entity than the Rothschilds.

The Balfour Declaration of 1917, in which Britain expressed the intention of helping to create a Jewish state, was actually addressed to Lord Rothschild and, as Ben Rubin explained on UK Column in March this year, Yad Hanadiv, the Israeli version of the Rothschild Foundation, was “the funding vehicle behind the design and build of the Israeli Supreme Court and Knesset, and was intimately involved in the establishment of the Israeli state”. [9]

Since the global criminocracy has revealed itself to be clearly Zionist, the fact that the Rothschilds are so dominant within Zionism constitutes, by itself – *even without all the rest of the copious evidence pointing that way* – confirmation that they are likewise the dominant force within the global criminocracy.

To be clear on this point, this does not mean that “the Jews” control the world. Most Jews control nothing at all beyond their own personal lives, just like the rest of us.

It is important to very *specifically* refer to the Rothschilds in order to avoid a merging of the notions of Rothschildian power and “Jewish” power which only helps the Rothschilds to hide their own responsibility behind a fog of anti-semitism, whether real or merely alleged.

Simply to talk about the Rothschilds – about what they have done, what they are doing and what they plan to do – is to start challenging



their activities and their dominant status.

Their system only works through the unsuspecting complicity of millions of people who don't realise what masters they are ultimately serving.

Because of this, the Rothschilds don't want the extent of their influence being generally understood, preferring us to focus on the activities of particular individual puppet-politicians; on "rival" nation-states or power blocs within their global system; or on the various ideologies – "capitalism", "communism", "fascism", climate-based "environmentalism" – that all prop up the state-industrial "development" agenda essential to that system.

The flood of "hate" laws being introduced across the world, seeking to prevent so-called "online harm", is, I suspect, largely a response to growing public awareness of the nature of the criminocratic system.

*They're worried that we're on to them and will refuse to go along with their nefarious plans.*

In the 19th century, when the Rothschilds took less care to conceal their wealth and power, they were met with not only written but physical attacks from angry people – particularly in France.

During the 1848 uprising there, insurgents targeted the industrial rail infrastructure with arson and sabotage, particularly the Rothschilds'

massive Nord network – a section of their line near Paris suffered more than a million francs of damage – and a Rothschild chateau in the Parisian suburbs was set on fire! [10]

And in 1895 a home-made letter bomb was sent to a Rothschild address in France, prompting *The Times* in London to comment: “An Anarchist outrage on one of the Rothschilds is not greatly to be wondered at. In France as elsewhere they are so wealthy and hold so prominent a place that they stand out as the natural objects which Anarchists would seek to attack”. [11]

Rothschild offices have also been targeted on several occasions by the Gilets Jaunes (Yellow Vests), a 21st century popular insurgency that brought so much hope to so many of us from 2018.

In 2019 protesters wrote: “Rothschild! Give the money back!” on the road outside the bank in Lyons. [12]

Then in April 2022 a group of Gilets Jaunes walked into the Rothschild premises in Paris and denounced the role of President Emmanuel Macron in a big-money deal involving Nestlé and Pfizer, while he was (*openly, at the time!*) a Rothschild employee. [13]

It would be encouraging to see similar actions happening in the UK, whether at Rothschild HQ, New Court in London, or at

Waddesdon Manor, the country mansion in Buckinghamshire used by the Rothschild Foundation for its secretive and undemocratic meetings deciding, behind closed doors, the future direction the country will be taking (*see, again, the UK Column report*).

The idea of protesting at a country mansion isn't as outlandish as it might seem.

When I was still living in England, I was involved in a couple of protests [14] at Wiston House near Steyning, West Sussex, which is home to Wilton Park, the secretive UK government venue that boasts: "We convene world-changing dialogues".

Just to give you a flavour, recent 2024 events have included "Towards 2030: Transformative actions and partnerships to deliver the SDGs" and "Building the enabling environment for Ukraine's economic growth: the role of its reform agenda". [15]

I was also part of a huge crowd demonstrating outside a luxury country hotel near Watford when it hosted the 2013 Bilderberg meeting, yet another secretive gathering of the "public-private" mafia. [16]

A fellow campaigner and I seized the opportunity to hand out leaflets and chat to people to encourage them to come to our Stop G8 protests in central London a few days later [17] – an uphill struggle given the baffling mutual

suspicion between two groups of people opposing different gatherings of the same global criminocracy.

So what would be the focus, the “hook”, of any future UK protests against the Rothschilds?

Reasons to oppose them are hardly in short supply – personally speaking, their role in fabricating and prolonging the First World War still makes me angry, 110 years on! [18] – but what would be the one likely to attract most support?

I don't think we currently need to look any further than their aforementioned proximity to the Israeli state which is currently committing genocide in Gaza – and in particular their role in corrupting British democracy not just in the interests of their private business, but in the interests of a foreign state.

Quite a powerful wave of voices opposing Zionism and its insidious political influence is now emerging in the UK – I am thinking of the likes of David Miller, Peter Osborne, Asa Winstanley, Lowkey, Tom London, Craig Murray, Mark Curtis, Matt Kennard and Andrew Feinstein.

Importantly, in view of the smears that are always rolled out, many anti-Zionists are Jewish and their continuing involvement should be celebrated and encouraged.

Is it inconceivable that a protest movement

against Zionism in general could start to home in on the Rothschilds in particular?

[1]

<https://winteroak.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/enemiesofthepoole--1.pdf>

[2] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2023/12/02/targeted-and-smearred-by-the-fake-left-thought-police/>

[3] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2023/11/14/tony-blair-and-the-rothschilds/>

[4] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NA4OupQJngo>

[5] <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2022-11-08/evelyn-de-rothschild-london-head-of-banking-dynasty-dies-at-91>

[6] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Www0cHLQulw>

[7] <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/errico-malatesta-anarchy>

[8] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2023/07/17/brics-in-the-wall-of-global-greed/>

[9] <https://riseuk.substack.com/p/tortoise-when-i-strike-i-strike-hard>

[10] Jean Bouvier, *Les Rothschild* (Brussels: Editions Complexe, 1983), p. 142.

[11] Niall Ferguson, *The House of Rothschild: The World's Greatest Banker 1849-1999* (New York: Penguin, 2000), p. 271.

[12]

<https://www.leprogres.fr/rhone-69-edition-lyon-metropole/2019/01/09/des-gilets-jaunes-mobilises-devant-la-banque-rothschild-a-lyon>

[13]

<https://twitter.com/Carterj37919661/status/1510236952016084995>

[14] <https://www.indymedia.org.uk/en/2004/11/300799.html>

[15] <https://www.wiltonpark.org.uk/events/past-events/>

[16] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CxuC-C84vK8>

[17] <https://network23.org/paulcudene/2013/06/15/state-violence-and-the-power-of-anarchy/>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1U9UBzxqbWg>

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/jun/11/anti-g8-protest-headquarters-london-riot-police>

[18] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/10/14/a-crime-against-humanity-the-great-reset-of-1914-1918/>

## THE WORLD OUT OF KILTER

### **Occupation and zombification**

The kind of society I long for is an organic one, in which people live in the way they see fit, guided by their own inclinations, the customs they have inherited and the circumstances of place.

As an anarchist, I am obviously opposed to all authority imposed from above, to any kind of formalised, entrenched power, but that does not mean that there could be no kind of moral “authority” or guidance in the world I want to see.

Traditional societies often look to village elders, wise women, and other respected individuals to help steer their decision-making.

The advice they give arises from within the community concerned and, in order to be followed, will have to correspond to a generally-shared sense that the proposed direction is the right one.

This is not the case with those who exercise power over us today. Due to the corruption of our

society, authority is wielded in the interests of a group which neither identifies with the people as a whole nor is prepared to be guided by its wishes.

Instead, it seeks to impose its own agenda on the population by any means necessary – by propaganda and persuasion, if possible, or otherwise by outright deceit, intimidation and physical violence.

Even worse is that this ruling gang, which is essentially nothing but an occupying force, shares neither the specific local moral codes of the various peoples it rules over, nor the general human sense of right and wrong that would once have been shared by its own ancestors.

This is because it is a rogue element, a criminal entity, intent only on increasing its own wealth and power, and has no use for ethics.

Indeed, it takes sadistic pleasure out of using, manipulating and inverting the majority population's values – their sense of justice, their fondness for their homeland or their love of nature – in order to advance its own venal programme.

Individuals in such a society are unable to follow their own moral compass, to act according to their own innate desires, to follow their dreams, pay respect to the archetypal template in their unconscious.

This is not just because they are physically

constrained, by authority, from acting and living in ways that they feel are right, but also because they have been mentally conditioned not to listen to the voice within.

They are besieged, through all their waking hours, by messaging, by propaganda that tells them they have to live, think and behave in the ways set out by the ruling gang.

A natural society will produce all kinds of individuals who complement each other in the ways that they contribute to its well-being.

There are those who are drawn to caring for others, to teaching the young, to growing, to feeding, to building, to physically defending the community, to resolving disputes and so on.

There are also the artists, poets, preachers and prophets, the antennae of the people, who are sensitive to the overall feel of the society and can sense when something is wrong.

Young people often start out with this gift – think of all the different generations rebelling, in their varying ways, against this modern world! – only to be ground down into compliance by the satanic mills of power.

But some carry on noticing and sounding the alert, with the aim of waking up the population as a whole to the danger they are facing.

It is therefore important for the ruling occupying force to isolate the small minority who remain connected to their own deep knowing and



to the organic spirit of the community.

They do this by insulting, mocking, demonising, dismissing, intimidating, criminalising and imprisoning them – by presenting them, in their usual inverted manner, as a menace to the very society whose well-being they are trying to defend.

This is psychologically difficult for these social antennae, who risk being deeply wounded by a rejection that they feel comes as much from their own community as from the occupying force.

Banding together in self-defence, they can become inward-looking, cultish, and unable to properly communicate with others outside their ranks.

Or, as individuals, they can become bitter and angry with those who refuse to listen to them, dismissing most members of their community as ignorant fools who deserve no better.

In either case, they have completed the work of the ruling gang by cutting themselves off from the social organism to which they belong.

That organism therefore has no more brain, no more soul, but is a social zombie, staggering on towards its own destruction under the malevolent control of the life-sucking criminocracy.

## **Being modern**

To be modern is to accept that which you should refuse; to adapt to evil rather than to resist it.

To be modern is to have been melted down and poured into somebody else's mould.

To be modern is to have forgotten how to remember.

To be modern is to be more detached from nature, more helpless, more dependent, more wasteful, more destructive, more short-sighted than your ancestors could ever have imagined, and yet to feel proud of yourself and your era.

To be modern is to prefer artifice to organicity, surface to depth, quantity to quality.

To be modern is to have absorbed so many meaningless facts that there is no more room in your head for meaningful knowledge.

To be modern is to turn your back on common sense and conform to the collective insanity.

To be modern is to be convinced that all change is necessarily good and to refuse to recognise the instinct that tells you otherwise.

To be modern is to be at home both everywhere and nowhere; to be somebody and nobody; to be still alive and yet already dead.

## **Reclaim our lives!**

I would love to have been born into a stable society – a calm, healthy, wise society – rather than one rattling chaotically downhill at an ever-accelerating rate towards a doom that is increasingly impossible to ignore.

For me, real progress would not be the replacement of human beings by machines, but the nurturing of human beings so as to release their full potential, the patient fine-tuning of our outlooks and habits so that we can live better together.

The community to which I would like to belong would not look like any other community.

It would have evolved in harmony with the specific qualities of its place, its history, the tastes and desires of the people who made it up.

It would be through this rooted belonging that the community could achieve its flowering – its myths, its music, its crafts, its food, its drink, its festivals, its ethos. In such a society, people would decide for themselves, among themselves, how they wanted to live.

There would be no remote central “authority” demanding data and taxes, imposing its rigid requirements, ensuring that everything and everybody conformed to its mechanical model of what life should look like.

People would grow up to feel free and instinctively resistant to outside interference.

They simply would not go along with demands issued from strangers justified only by the rules and jargon these strangers have themselves invented.

They would not tolerate the destruction of a much-loved meadow or forest because of targets or plans or the institutionally-enshrined priority afforded the steamroller of “development” and “economic growth”.

And, because they lived simply, healthily, naturally, collaboratively, they would not have to waste the greater part of their time and energy on toiling for somebody else’s gain, just to have the bare right to food and shelter.

Instead, everyone would contribute to the well-being of their community in whatever way they could.

Such a world would only be perfect in the sense that human imperfection forms part of the overall perfection of the organism we call nature, Earth, the cosmos.

But it would be a living world, a warm world, a kind world, a real world.

And it can be ours, if we truly want it.

It is time for us to grab back our future from the greed-soaked hands of the lying robber-tyrants who have, for so long now, pushed our world out of kilter.

It is time for us to reclaim our lives.

## LOSING THE LABELS

It's no mean feat to have embedded no fewer than three false assumptions in the title of a single book!

And yet this is the case with *Far-Right Newspeak and the Future of Liberal Democracy*, edited by A. James McAdams and Samuel Piccolo (Routledge, 2024).

This is not to say that there is no value in the actual content, as I will go on to explain.

But, first, I do have to take issue with that trinity of tiresome terms...

The most obvious problem, I think, is the use of "Liberal Democracy" and, in particular, the assumption that this is what we are currently living in, here in "the West".

The editors, two US academics, double down on this assumption in their introduction.

They explain: "By 'democracy', we mean a variety of fully functioning institutions such as courts, parliaments, constitutions, and constitutional principles that allow citizens to play an active role in public affairs.

"By 'liberal', we refer to the principles that

democratic leaders are obliged to follow in their interactions with citizens.

“These principles include the rights to free speech, assembly, religious practice, and privacy as well as the guarantee of full equality.

“These values are also based upon universal norms, such as political tolerance and respect for the dignity of every person”. [1]

It is difficult for me to understand how anyone could actually believe that this describes our society in 2024, when citizens’ participation in public matters is quite clearly a manufactured illusion; when the right to free speech and assembly is violated time and time again when it challenges official narratives, whether on Covid or on Gaza; when privacy is being abolished by the smart surveillance of the Fourth Industrial Revolution and when political tolerance has been replaced by the systematic stigmatisation, even criminalisation, of dissident views by use of terms such as “hate speech”, “denial”, “misinformation” and “conspiracy theory”.

Oh, and by the “far right” smear, of course, which leads me nicely on to the next problematic term in the book’s title.

As becomes very obvious in the various essays it presents, there is no clear definition of what the label exactly means.

What is for sure is that the term “far right” is being used today to indicate something much

broader than the previous “racist” designation, which now rather serves as an insinuated evil with which to pollute the reputation of those henceforth included under the vastly-expanded umbrella.

We saw that very clearly with the anti-lockdown protests everywhere and in particular with the truckers’ convoy in Canada.

Because this new use of the term “far right” is spurious – I would say that it is a false assumption that it can readily be identified in the way the book’s title suggests – it is necessary to invent a frame of reference through which it can be presented as actually existing.

Hence the importance of claiming that we live in a “liberal democracy”. If the system is really liberal and democratic, then opposition to that system can plausibly be depicted as anti-liberal and anti-democratic.

Samuel Piccolo ends his conclusion to the book by claiming that “when people no longer believe they live in a liberal democracy, they no longer act as if they do—or care whether its principles live or die”. [2]

Is he trying to imply here that to deny that our society is really a “liberal democracy” is to undermine that supposed liberal democracy and thus to merit a “far right” designation?

*I do hope not!*

The editors claim that “‘far right’ is a useful



umbrella concept because it allows for the systematic examination of the similarities and differences among a wide variety of cases”. [3]

Personally, I find it neither helpful nor valid to categorise a disparate number of individuals as “far right” and then to attempt to stigmatise them purely on the basis of that categorisation.

We certainly do need to dissect their pronouncements, and analyse what lies behind their rhetoric, but the key thing is to discover what agenda they are really serving.

For instance, when in 2023 I denounced Aleksandr Dugin – one of those analysed in the book – it was on the basis that he is demonstrably working for the very globalist entity he claims to oppose. [4]

Likewise, journalist Sonia Poulton’s 2023 exposé of Jordan Peterson, who features prominently in the book, was not based on categorising him as “far right” but on exposing him as controlled opposition, working for a corporate (and, in fact, Zionist) agenda. [5]

I can’t help wondering why the book does not mention Peterson’s vitriolic support for Benjamin Netanyahu’s assault on Gaza (“Give ’em hell”) [6] and how it can refer to Marine Le Pen’s focus on the threat of “Islamism” [7] without thinking to mention her Rassemblement National party’s “unconditional” support for Israel. [8]

*Do such reflections unduly disrupt the “far*

*right” versus “liberal democracy” narrative?*

The third word in the title to which I take exception is “Newspeak”, in relation to the “far right”.

The term “Far-Right Newspeak” is deployed time and time again (103 times to be exact!) in the book, to the extent that it comes across as rather forced.

I think it is a false assumption that such a phenomenon genuinely exists, in the sense that Newspeak was imagined by George Orwell in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. [9]

His fictional Ingsoc (“English Socialism”) entity ran the state – was the state – and used its manipulation of language, including the creation of a pared-down and ideologically-correct Newspeak, to keep hold of and consolidate its power.

Now, I agree that many of those labelled “far right” by the editors and contributors are deceitful in their language, pretending as they do to stand for freedom and the common people when their real agenda is a completely different one.

But it nevertheless seems disingenuous to accuse these “right-wingers” of using phoney-liberal “Newspeak”, given that the editors themselves have used the highly dubious and Orwellian device of pre-defining the current criminocratic system as “liberal democracy”

(think “Ministry of Truth”)!

It also seems somewhat pointless to accuse these same “right-wingers” of misappropriating Orwell’s critique of totalitarianism, when the editors themselves are also misappropriating Orwell’s heritage by using it to criticise people who are at least voicing dissent against the kind of totalitarianism Orwell abhorred.

The “right-wingers” concerned may well be misrepresenting their true position, but “Newspeak” strikes me as entirely the wrong label for that kind of deception.

Was the invention and use of the inappropriate phrase “Far-Right Newspeak” in this book motivated by a desire to reverse and pillory critiques of our current authoritarian plutocracy (*oh, sorry, liberal democracy!*) using an Orwellian lens?

The real problem with the phoney elements in the “freedom movement” is not that they misappropriate Orwell or that they are “far right” people pretending to be liberals, but that they are intent on turning short-term opponents of the system (over wokeness, lockdowns or jobs) into long-term supporters of its industrialist and imperialist agenda, as I have previously warned.

[10]

Far from being a threat to “liberal democracy”, they are simply pretending to oppose that mislabelled system, while advancing

its anti-democratic aims under a different banner.

The good news about the book is that the editors have at least embraced the understanding that there is such a thing as genuine and non-far-right opposition to the system – specifically to the Great Reset – despite the way in which rhetoric on the topic has been instrumentalised by the likes of Peterson and Le Pen.

Contributor Steven Pittz, for example, defends the democratic validity of a pragmatic form of “conspiracism” that “can reflect those liberal virtues that allow citizens to shine a light on powerful people and institutions” [11] – even if he goes on to suggest that it is a bad thing to “delegitimize those in power”! [12]

And, after acknowledging that certain positions categorised as “far right” are also held by the conservative mainstream, editor A. James McAdams concedes: “Nor are far-right actors the only critics of liberal claims to neutrality, neoliberal economic policies, and the self-seeking behavior of politicians and global corporations.

“In fact, in some cases, their arguments dovetail with equally vociferous critiques on the left and far-left sides of the political spectrum”. [13]

In an important contribution, José Pedro Zúquete, of the Institute of Social Sciences at the

University of Lisbon, explores the way that the Great Reset has sparked calls for a new convergence against the system, overspilling the traditional left-right divide.

He quotes Raw Egg Nationalist as noting that “the left has come down very firmly on the side of corporations” and that “a lot of the things we’re saying now sound almost like what the hippies and leftist environmentalists were saying in the 1970s”.

This “right-winger” continues: “For some reason the left that once upon a time was the sworn enemy of corporations — certainly up until Occupy Wall Street — I think something very strange happened”. [14]

Zúquete also quotes Glenn Beck, who made me laugh 15 years ago with his melodramatic denunciation on Fox News of the “extreme left” Invisible Committee and their “dangerous” book *The Coming Insurrection*. [15]

Beck now says, in regard to the New World Order agenda: “We [on the right] were wrong. We thought it would come as, you know, some sort of communist Marxist thing [but] this is coming through our corporations.

“They [the left] knew all this stuff. We mocked them. And now we’re standing where they were and we are like ‘guys, you were right. I mean, can’t you see this?’” [16]

Zúquete goes on to mention the beyond-left-

and-right stance adopted “in the far-left French collective ‘The Invisible Committee’, which has assigned itself the task of imagining a new form of opposition to the system”. [17]

As Beck realises, the radical political landscape has changed entirely since he denounced The Invisible Committee in 2009.

Zúquete and I exchanged emails while he was preparing his chapter and he shares a few of my thoughts in this passage: [18]

*“What happened to the left?” asks Paul Cudenec, an activist and writer who runs the anarchist collective Winter Oak and a prominent anti-Great Reset voice, who blasts what he sees as the “abject historical failure of the left at the hour of our greatest need”.*

*Cudenec blames this failure on identity politics, on the postmodernist tendency that pours “scorn on simplistic old-fashioned concepts such as class struggle or opposing state-corporate power,” as well as “the funding and/or infiltration of left/anarchist organizations by various billionaire-linked foundations and networks”.*

*Cudenec also sees the potential for new alliances: “Today, the ground has shifted and the dividing line is no longer the old left-right one. People who oppose a future of techno-totalitarian global corporate dictatorship have found themselves standing together on one particular*

*side of a new political dividing line based around decentralization versus centralization, freedom versus authority, values against profiteering. This should be an encouraging moment for anarchists, who have every reason to participate in this embryonic 'movement' and help to shape its future evolution”.*

Just to be clear, the convergence I would like to see is not between the “right” or “far right” and the “left” or “far left”.

These terms are false categories, designed to limit people’s critical thinking, close down proper discussion and pit us all up against each other rather than against the criminocracy.

No, the convergence has to involve the people, and the broad ways of thinking, that have thus far been corralled into these constricting constructs by the dominant political culture.

We have to break down the walls of dogma that divide us, deconstruct the very language with which we have learned to express ourselves, peel away all the levels of manipulation that keep us confused and powerless.

We will never all see eye to eye on absolutely everything, but I hope we can at least agree that we urgently need a future in which we are free from the totalitarian control of a worldwide organised crime syndicate!

[1] *Far-Right Newspeak and the Future of Liberal Democracy*, ed. A.

James McAdams and Samuel Piccolo (Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY: Routledge, 2024), p. xv. All subsequent page references are to this work.

[2] p. 256.

[3] p. xiv.

[4] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2023/10/24/alexandr-dugin-a-globalist-pawn/>

[5] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bVXZlZ9cJRQ>

[6] <https://www.middleeasteye.net/news/gaza-israel-jordan-peterson-faces-criticism-netanyahu-unleash-hell>

[7] p. 40.

[8] [https://www.lemonde.fr/politique/article/2023/10/18/malgre-le-drame-humanitaire-de-gaza-le-soutien-sans-condition-du-rassemblement-national-a-israel\\_6195244\\_823448.html](https://www.lemonde.fr/politique/article/2023/10/18/malgre-le-drame-humanitaire-de-gaza-le-soutien-sans-condition-du-rassemblement-national-a-israel_6195244_823448.html)

[9] See my essay '1984/2024 – the hidden hope in Orwell's warning', <https://winteroak.org.uk/2024/01/01/1984-2024-the-hidden-hope-in-orwells-warning/>

[10] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2023/11/27/when-will-the-real-opposition-emerge/>

[11] p. 167.

[12] p. 174.

[13] p. 7.

[14] p. 199.

[15] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZKyI2qNskJc>

[16] p. 199.

[17] p. 200.

[18] p. 200.



## THE OLYMPIC AGENDA IS PROFIT AND CONTROL

A lot of people in France are unhappy about the prospect of this summer's Olympic (and then Paralympic) Games.

Part of this, I suppose, stems from a widespread dislike of anything associated with authoritarian plutocratic president Emmanuel Macron, the diminutive former Rothschild [1] banker with an ego the size of the Eiffel Tower.

But there is also unease about the way the country, its capital in particular, is effectively being rented out, prostituted if you like, to The Global Community.

This impression was confirmed by an official poster for Paris 2024, depicting the city as an amusement park constructed for the passing pleasure of the international leisured classes.

Ordinary Parisians are being asked to pay the price in a variety of ways.

While a lot of talk has been of the removal of the famous book stalls from the banks of the Seine, this is just the tip of the iceberg.

Workplace rights are coming under serious

attack, with government threats to ban strikes during the Games and even to prevent certain employees, such as shopworkers, from having their usual weekly day off or from going on holiday during that part of the summer. [2]

Meanwhile, it is planned to dislodge 2,000 students from their accommodation at Crous to make way for staff required for the Olympics.

The youngsters have been resisting the move, which they say shows nothing but contempt for their well-being and their education. [3]

Another concern is the proposed social cleansing of all those who don't fit the bright-and-shiny corporate image of Paris.

This is very much part of the Olympic spirit everywhere. The Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions has estimated that the Olympics displaced more than two million people over two decades, often disproportionately affecting disadvantaged groups. [4]

This time around, some 7,000 homeless people, including asylum seekers, are to be forcibly removed from Paris and dumped in provincial locations. [5]

And in Vitry sur Seine, authorities have announced they will be evicting one of the biggest squats in France, in which 450 people have housed themselves in a disused office building. [6]

All this is so that Paris and its environs can present a “postcard” image for the Olympic tourists rolling in this summer.

The “cleaned-up” city will also be coming under what looks like military occupation, even ahead of the opening ceremony.

35,000 police will “saturate the space”, in the words of Paris’s police chief, backed up by 25,000 private security personnel. [7]

These will be joined by more than 2,000 foreign soldiers from countries including Poland and Germany. [8]

A particularly alarming element is the use of drones, which has been authorised to continue well after the end of the summer sports – until March 31 2025!

Observers fear that this is in fact a means of trying out and normalising a fixture that will become permanent.

A recent article by journalist Hermine Le Quellec points out that this would not be the first time and that the 2012 London Olympics were also used to introduce massive levels of surveillance.

She describes how QR codes on a mobile phone app will be required to access key areas, with airport-style body scanning also deployed.

“Residents who have not fled their neighbourhood, turned open-air prison, will only be able to drive to their homes on condition of

filling in a certificate of residence on the same app”. [9]

The opening ceremony will involve the use of 900 surveillance cameras, including some carried by drones, covering every square inch of the site, with AI algorithms analysing the images in real time and biometrics in use.

While facial recognition is not officially supposed to be part of this, Le Quellec reveals that for the last nine years police forces across France have been using the Israeli Briefcam system in which this can be activated in just a few clicks.

She warns that the Olympics, along with other big sporting events, are being used to push through increased levels of surveillance and control, leading us ever closer to a future of smart-city incarceration.

When you combine this with French trade unionists’ complaints that the Games are being used to turn people into “slaves of capitalism”, [10] a disturbing picture emerges.

While all of this cannot be blamed on the Olympic movement – the collaboration of the domestic authorities is obviously required – it is certainly playing an enabling role.

The modern Olympic Games must have seemed like a positive idea when they were launched at the end of the 19th century.

The original charter described the idea of

Olympism as being “a philosophy of life, exalting and combining in a balanced whole the qualities of body, will and mind”.

It added: “Blending sport with culture and education, Olympism seeks to create a way of life based on the joy of effort, the educational value of good example, social responsibility and respect for universal fundamental ethical principles.” [11]

It only took a few years, though, for a rather different Olympic spirit to reveal itself.

In 1928 Coca-Cola sponsored the Olympic Games in Amsterdam and, as the International Olympic Committee (IOC) points out, has sponsored “every Olympic Games since”. [12]

This included, naturally, the 1936 Olympic Games in Berlin, which Adolf Hitler used as a showcase for his public-private Nazi regime.

What is the real nature and purpose of a global institution that can embrace and combine the American “capitalism” of Coca-Cola with German “national socialism” as well as, at subsequent events, Russian [13] and Chinese “communism”?

We can see what the Switzerland-based Olympic entity is really all about via its own website.

The IOC talks a lot about “development”, that sly term that really describes the extraction of all possible wealth from people and nature and

its transfer into the pockets of the “developers” themselves.

One of the stated objectives of what the IOC calls “Olympic Solidarity” is “urging governments and international organisations to include sport in Official Development Assistance”. [14]

This latter term is a technical category used by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development – based at a former Rothschild property, Chateau de la Muette, in Paris [15] – to measure foreign aid, which can take the form of strings-attached grants or of loans.

*This detailed interest in financial affairs seems rather strange for an Olympic movement founded on a love of physical exercise and “ethical principles”...*

I wrote a couple of years ago about the network of grooming projects, all with similar names, set up by the global mafia to churn out obedient proxies to front the management of their corrupt empire. [16]

I explained that the most notorious of these was the World Economic Forum’s Young Global Leaders project, but there was also “le programme Young Leaders” and “Les Young Leaders franco-britanniques” in France, the Queen’s Young Leaders project in the UK and Commonwealth, the Commonwealth Future Leaders, the London-based Future Leaders Network Ltd, a Future Leaders project in New

Zealand, an Italian Young Leaders project, the Asia 21 Young Leaders scheme, the Johannesburg-based Africa Leadership Initiative Young Leaders... You get the picture.

Brace yourself for a shock, because the International Olympic Committee also has a Young Leaders Programme! [17]

This boasts that 94 chosen individuals have “impacted” more than 30,000 lives in 66 countries, addressing no fewer than 10 United Nations Sustainable Development Goals in the process.

“Knowledge of the UN Sustainable Development Goals” is even listed as a key attribute for applicants. [18]

The website explains: “The IOC Young Leaders programme is delivered over four years to give participants sufficient time to go through the phases of developing a social business/project that provides a localised sport-based solution to a pressing challenge in their respective communities.

“Each year of the programme is designed around the development of the young leader and their sport-based social business/project.

“Overall, the learning journey encompasses a wide range of subjects and experts, in areas such as human centred-design, prototyping, ecosystem mapping, leadership skills, customer segmentation, public relations, fundraising,

impact measurement, user research, user testing, digital communications and finance”. [19]

“Impact measurement” of course refers to impact “investment”, a digital slave-system closely tied in to the UNSDGs and the smart city project of the Fourth Industrial Revolution aka The Great Reset – see the special Winter Oak page for more information. [20]

By a further extraordinary coincidence, the IOC also boasts its own date-linked “Agenda” programme on the lines of the globalist “Agenda 2030”.

The latest version is called “Olympic Agenda 2020+5” [21] and right from the start its language echoes that of the WEF’s Klaus Schwab in his notorious 2020 book *Covid-19: The Great Reset*. [22]

Under the heading ‘The Olympic Movement: turning challenges into opportunities’, it declares: “As we launch Olympic Agenda 2020+5, the slogan ‘change or be changed’ that inspired Olympic Agenda 2020 remains more compelling than ever.

“Recent times have seen the emergence of some near-universal trends, many of them accelerated by the COVID-19 health pandemic. The world will never be again like it was before the crisis.

“As challenging as the circumstances may



appear right now, if we draw the right lessons, we can seize the opportunities they offer. In this way we contribute to shaping the post-coronavirus world by strengthening the Olympic Values”.

The IOC is virtually paraphrasing Schwab when it continues: “COVID-19 has accelerated the digitalisation of society. The physical and digital worlds are progressively merging. This gives us the opportunity to further embrace digital technology as a powerful tool to address people more directly and promote the Olympic values, while keeping in mind that currently about half of the world’s population remains digitally underserved”.

Among its Agenda’s recommendations are to “consider the addition of physical virtual sports in the Olympic Programme” and to “encourage the development of virtual sports and further engage with video gaming communities”.

*So this is what is meant today by the Olympic ideal of “combining in a balanced whole the qualities of body, will and mind”?*

The echoes of Davos are again evident when the IOC declares: “Throughout the impacts of COVID-19, the gaming industry has continued to grow, highlighted by a 30% growth in gamers, 75% growth in gaming usage and the industry being worth an estimated USD 159 billion in 2020.

“Video games are bringing communities together with people gathering around their passion”.

*Video games are bringing communities together. Yes, of course, just like war is peace and slavery is freedom.*

Needless to say, so-called “sustainable development” also gets a mention in the Agenda: “Competition for limited resources is increasingly leading to conflict, climate action is at a tipping point, and the interdependency between healthy people and a healthy planet is unmistakable. Amidst this evidence, sport has been recognised as an important enabler of sustainable development. We have the opportunity to make a real difference through our contribution to the UN Sustainable Development Goals”.

Behind all the “healthy” rhetoric lurks a distinctly unhealthy obsession with finance and here the IOC’s recommendation is to “create partnerships with Development Banks or other development organisations to increase investment in sport infrastructure and scale the impact of sport for sustainable development”.

Its concluding recommendation is to “innovate revenue generation models” via “mutually beneficial purpose-led partnerships” and to “diversify Olympic revenue sources (such as global e-commerce, commercialisation of social media and Olympic-related gaming)”.

The most enlightening statement from the IOC can be found on the “Peace and Development” section of its website.

It tells us: “The IOC cooperates with partners, including numerous United Nations agencies, as well as international governmental and nongovernmental institutions, on projects which use sport as a tool for development and advance the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)”. [23]

*There we have it, in plain sight at last: “use sport as a tool for development”!*

It is quite clear from all this that the “Olympics” entity is just another tacky tentacle of the usual criminocratic octopus.

While its spectacular staged events are not of the same kind as world wars, fake pandemics, phoney revolutions, false-flag terrorism or other Great Reset devices, they do serve the same masters and the same purposes.

As we have seen, they propagandise and glorify global criminocratic power, whether this is presenting itself as Nazism, Communism or Sustainable Development.

We have also seen how they are used as excuses for social cleansing, for the removal of people’s rights, for gentrification of urban spaces – their confiscation by the rich.

The Olympics are also used to tighten the totalitarian noose around our necks, to restrict

our movements, ramp up the surveillance and control, to promote technocracy, digitalisation and impact slavery, nudging us ever closer to the nightmare concentration-camp future our rulers have lined up for us.

But most of all, they are about making money. Great heaps of money. The biggest haul of gold does not go to the winning team of athletes but to the ever-victorious team of profit-seeking parasites.

Communities which host the events do not, overall, economically benefit from the exercise.

Economics professor Andrew Zimbalist says that merely bidding on the Olympics makes cities a victim of the International Olympic Committee and explains: “They cost between \$10 billion and \$20 billion and generate in the range of \$4 billion to \$5 billion”. [24]

As a “tool for development”, the Olympic Games open up money-making possibilities for those whose agenda they advance.

They are a racket in the proud Fascist tradition of public-private partnerships – everything from the bidding process to the building of venues, accommodation and new transport infrastructures represents an Olympian opportunity for those on the inside to make a financial killing.

Corruption is endemic, essential even, to the whole bandwagon. Bribes, exploitation, money-

laundering – every conceivable form of profiteering is offered by this infernal mafia roadshow.

This is not mere speculation on my part. Last summer, French investigators searched the Paris Olympic organisers’ headquarters as part of corruption investigations into contracts linked to the Games.

And, as Associated Press’s report pointed out: “Corruption allegations have hung over the world’s biggest sporting event many times”. [25]

The Olympic Games are corrupt because the global empire of which they are part is made of corruption.

Attempts by various opponents of that entity to disrupt or even halt the Paris Olympics are likely to be numerous, despite all the security and repression.

Even if the putrid globalist jamboree does manage to go ahead in 2024, let’s hope that it is for the very last time.

[1] See Paul Cudeneac, ‘Enemies of the People: The Rothschilds and their corrupt global empire’.

<https://winteroak.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/enemiesofthepeople-1.pdf>

[2]

<https://www.ouest-france.fr/economie/greve/le-droit-de-greve-peut-il-etre-supprime-pendant-les-jo-on-vous-repond-8dcee770-dbcf-11ee-97c7-e4301a9e69a2>

<https://www.ouest-france.fr/jeux-olympiques/jeu-2024-un-rassemblement-a-paris-contre-la-regression-du-droit-du-travail-en-marge-des-jeux-958438ca-b551-11ee-b2a2-ccb95da3b2ac>

[3] *La Tribune des Travailleurs*, mercredi 10 avril 2024.

- [4] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Olympic\\_Games](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Olympic_Games)  
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2008.00785.x>
- [5] *La Tribune des Travailleurs*.
- [6] <https://twitter.com/CerveauxNon/status/1780565596234531147>
- [7] *Nexus*, no 151, mars-avril 2024.
- [8] *La Tribune des Travailleurs*.
- [9] *Nexus*.
- [10] <https://www.ouest-france.fr/jeux-olympiques/jo-2024-un-rassemblement-a-paris-contre-la-regression-du-droit-du-travail-en-marge-des-jeux-958438ca-b551-11ee-b2a2-ccb95da3b2ac>
- [11] <https://olympians.org/woa/olympism/>
- [12] <https://olympics.com/en/paris-2024/committee/games-stakeholder/partners>
- [13] See ‘The false red flag’.
- [14] <https://stillmed.olympics.com/media/Document%20Library/OlympicOrg/General/EN-Olympic-Charter.pdf>
- [15] Paul Cudeneac, ‘A developing evil: the malign historical force behind the Great Reset’.  
<https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/08/02/a-developing-evil-the-malignant-historical-force-behind-the-great-reset/>
- [16] Paul Cudeneac, ‘Puppets of Power’,  
<https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/09/06/puppets-of-power/>
- [17] <https://olympics.com/ioc/young-leaders>
- [18] <https://olympics.com/ioc/young-leaders/application>
- [19] <https://olympics.com/ioc/young-leaders/application>
- [20] <https://winteroak.org.uk/impact-slavery/>
- [21] <https://stillmed.olympics.com/media/Document%20Library/OlympicOrg/IOC/What-We-Do/Olympic-agenda/Olympic-Agenda-2020-5-15-recommendations.pdf>
- [22] See Paul Cudeneac, ‘Klaus Schwab and his Great Fascist Reset’,  
<https://winteroak.org.uk/2020/10/05/klaus-schwab-and-his-great-fascist-reset/>
- [23] <https://olympics.com/ioc/peace-and-development>
- [24] <https://www.wired.com/2016/08/olympic-cities-everywhere/>
- [25] <https://www.ctvnews.ca/sports/paris-2024-olympics-hq-searched-in-third-consecutive-summer-games-scandal-1.6448241>

## VOLK AND FREEDOM

If there is one thinker who has most shaped my own political evolution over the years, then it is the German-Jewish anarchist Gustav Landauer.

I first came across his ideas three decades ago, at a crucial period when I was building up my understanding of the anarchist tradition and sketching out, in my mind, the shape of my own personal anarchist vision.

I would say that Landauer has influenced me in three important ways.

Firstly, he showed me that spirituality is not, as some claim, incompatible with anarchism but, on the contrary, essential to its authenticity.

Secondly, he pointed me to the importance of combining an overall sense of belonging to the human species with an appreciation of particular, rooted, cultures and communities.

He confirmed for me that this conception of an organic society cannot honestly be dismissed, as it sadly and absurdly sometimes is, as some kind of “crypto-fascism”.

Landauer’s worldview (like mine) in fact represents the exact opposite of the cult of

dehumanising authoritarian industrial-militarism which was to grab control of his home country 14 years after his untimely death.

Thirdly, the story of his political life, in which he was largely spurned by members of his own movement who were trapped inside the conformist groupthink of the era, told me of the overriding need always to follow one's own inner ideological compass rather than to cravenly seek safety in the shared opinions of any particular political herd.

That lesson has served me well over the last few years and I know that it will continue, in all circumstances, to guide my approach in the future.

*So thank you Gustav!*

The following is a new article on Landauer that I have written for the Organic Radicals site, a much-expanded and considerably-improved version of the profile I posted in 2019.

### **Gustav Landauer**

Gustav Landauer (1870-1919) was an important anarchist theorist and key precursor of organic radicalism, murdered by proto-Nazi soldiers in Stadelheim Prison, Munich, after the collapse of the Bavarian Revolution.

Strongly influenced by Novalis, Friedrich Hölderlin and Johann Wolfgang von Goethe,



Landauer was very much part of the Romantic anti-capitalist tradition identified by Michael Löwy and has been described as representing “a left-wing form of the *völkisch* current in thought”. [1]

Like his friend Martin Buber, he saw a close link between human interrelationships and the rebirth of community which was needed to put society right.

Landauer also echoed the likes of William Morris and John Ruskin, and prefigured Guy Debord, in condemning what he called this “odious society of masquerade”, [2] the industrial capitalist “unculture” from which free people needed to separate themselves.

He wrote in 1911: “Progress, what you call progress, this incessant hustle-bustle, this rapid tiring and neurasthenic, short-breathed chase after novelty, after anything new as long as it is new, this progress and the crazy ideas of the practitioners of development associated with it... this progress, this unsteady, restless haste; this inability to remain still and this perpetual desire to be on the move, this so-called progress is a symptom of our abnormal condition, our unculture”. [3]

Helmut Rüdiger comments: “Landauer does not share the progressivist optimism so evident in the conceptions of Marx as in other revolutionary theories; he demands awareness of

the human, rather than blind confidence in the development of Technik and science”. [4]

Landauer translated several texts by Peter Kropotkin, [5] whom he met during a brief spell in England, and was very much influenced by the idea of the authentic human community, the *Gemeinschaft*, described by Ferdinand Tönnies. [6]

He also translated into German writing by Bengali poet and fellow organic radical inspiration Rabindranath Tagore. [7]

Like Constantin von Monakow, he extended his concept of the organic to a cosmic level, regarding the universe as a living creature with a collective soul and writing that “the psyche [*das Seelenhafte*] in the human being is a function or manifestation of the infinite universe”. [8]

Landauer’s libertarian “socialism” was in truth, as Peter Marshall writes, “a form of mystical anarchism which stood in the German idealist tradition stretching back as far as Meister Eckhart.

“His originality lies in the way he developed the romantic concern with the *Volk* in a libertarian rather than an authoritarian direction.

“The word *Volk* had come to mean something like the ‘common people’, but it was also used to describe the German language, culture and

customs as distinct from the State. Landauer wanted to realize the potential unity of the *Volk*... Landauer was thus an eloquent prophet of real community". [9]

His view of human communities, and indeed the human species itself, as being living organisms meant that he did not see any essential conflict between collective and individual interests.

He declared. "Anarchy is the expression of the liberation of man from the idols of the state, the church and capital; socialism is the expression of the true and genuine community among men, genuine because it grows out of the individual spirit". [10]

He argued that fellow anarchist Max Stirner's notion of an absolute and independent individual was a phantom, as each individual belonged to their community, and to humankind, both physically and spiritually.

"As the individual organism is only a part of a great, real physical community, so the individual soul is part of a great, real spiritual community... a vital part of a larger organic whole". [11]

Individuals should rid themselves of their ego, in a "mystical death", so as to become fully part of the living human community, believed Landauer.

He wrote: "Restore the natural order;

understand the wise words of Socrates: know thyself! Know thyself, as thou are really”.

One should also know the other as the kindred human soul that he really was, “behind the mask that, just like you, he wears”. [12]

In a 1918 letter to his daughter, Gudula Landauer, he told her that one found meaning in life by setting oneself a personal task.

“This task, however, has nothing to with apparent ambitions or success. How could it be that every child of humanity could be destined to be exceptional? Our task is to be good...” [13]

His belief in authentic individuality, rather than the individualism of fragmented modern society, was reflected in the way he conducted his own life.

Despite – or perhaps because of – the depth and quality of his work, he was often treated as a pariah, rejected by “comrades” who would have preferred him to think less and simply parrot the slogans of the day.

He wrote to Max Nettlau in 1910 that he found himself in a movement of “epigones”, of second-rate imitators and followers.

He added: “You know that I am a heretic. But you perhaps don’t know to what extent I am”. [14]

Rudolf Rocker wrote that “Landauer tried to forge new concepts, leaving behind, if necessary, the previous marked-out furrows” and this made

him the sworn enemy of the “philistines”, who stuck to existing norms and only took “well-trod mental paths”.

This meant that he often found himself working alone, “without paying too much attention to the judgement of the crowds”. [15]

Comments Freddy Gomez: “At the end of the day, this proponent of necessary separation needed to have broken from the existing community of anarchists in order to give the best of himself to anarchism”. [16]

Landauer was inspired by organic medieval society, which he contrasted with contemporary top-down artificiality.

He wrote: “The state, with its police and all its laws and its contrivances for property rights, exists for the people as a miserable replacement for *Geist* and for organizations with specific purposes; and now the people are supposed to exist for the sake of the state, which pretends to be some sort of ideal structure and a purpose in itself, to be *Geist*...

“Earlier there were corporate groups, clans, guilds, fraternities, communities, and they all interrelated to form society. Today there is coercion, the letter of the law, the state”. [17]

“Wherever centralism and bureaucracy reign; there is no community, no synergy, no liberation of joyful forces”. [18]

Landauer explained that the state combined

with industrialism to destroy all authentic collective spirit.

Writes Charles Maurer: “The most obvious sign of the absence of *Geist* was for Landauer the plight of the industrial workers.

“Separated from the earth and its products and spiritually isolated from each other despite the closeness of their living conditions, they become victims of alcohol, disease, and poverty.

“The relationship between worker and employer becomes completely dehumanized through capitalism, technology, and the state”. [19]

Landauer bitterly opposed Marxists for remaining trapped in this mechanistic mindset and for failing to lead a deep and effective resistance to industrial capitalism.

He complained about their attachment to the notion of “the worker”, adding: “It’s not the dictatorship of the proletariat that should be the slogan, but the abolition of the proletariat”. [20]

Russell Berman and Tim Luke explain that, for Landauer, Marxism was itself “part of the problem posed by industrialization”. [21]

They add: “Marxism, despite its revolutionary appearance, functions in fact as an impediment to socialism. In the light of Landauer’s critique, nineteenth century scientific socialism ceases to appear as a radical critique of the status quo. Rather, behind its revolutionary

pretenses, it buttresses the development of capitalist structures”. [22]

In his booklet *For Socialism*, Landauer was vehemently outspoken against the Marxists who had taken control of the socialist movement of which he considered himself a part.

He described their dogma as “the plague of our times and the curse of the socialist movement” [23] and bemoaned “the grotesque wrongness of their materialist conception of history” [24] in which they reduced everything to “what they call economic and social reality”. [25]

In December 1918 he warned, in a letter, against the Bolshevik variant of Marxism: “A particularly worrying case is that of the Bolsheviks (the Spartacists): pure centralists as were Robespierre et al, who aspire to nothing, to nothing except power; they are preparing the way to a military regime which would be even more monstrous than anything the world has seen until now”. [26]

Landauer also hinted at his disquiet over the growing influence of Marxism, and its modes of thinking, on the anarchist movement.

He referred disparagingly to “the syndicalists and the anarcho-socialists, recently so-called by a pitiful misuse of two noble names” as the Marxists’ “brothers” [27] and specifically extended his condemnation to all Marxists “whether they call themselves Social Democrats

or anarchists”. [28]

From his genuinely radical perspective, the problem with Marxist-influenced thinking was that it showed no way out of the overall system, diverting all radical energy into futile political battles.

Speaking on behalf of real anarchists, he wrote: “We don’t have political aspirations, but rather anti-political aspirations”. [29]

He explained: “We start to make socialism real by ceasing to be slaves of capital. We start to make socialism real when we no longer produce for the market of products as paid workers”. [30]

Producers and consumers were the same people, although in industrial society this reality was hidden behind the structures of employment and wages.

The separation of the two processes and roles, through the involvement of “parasitical” [31] middle-men bosses, had created an absurd situation in which people had to earn wages to buy what they had themselves produced.

It was time to “break the distorting mirror of the intermediary usury” and recreate the direct connection between production and consumption.

“Would the result not be that there would no longer be any merchandise, since there would be no intermediary, no commercial profit, no wages, no ‘money’, no employee, no employer?”. [32]

“Today, of course, capital is usury’s interest



and money, for we have made the sign representing the expected product, in other words the means of exchange, into a king and an extortionist; but the people could immediately overcome this monstrosity by communalising their consumption, organising free reciprocated credit, and they could work for their own needs and exit from ‘capitalism’. They could, if they had the land! Society can only be capitalist because the masses are without land”. [33]

“People and land! Land and freedom! It is only when local people’s institutions (*Volksgemeinden*) own the soil, as they did of old in every country, that the essence of the people (*Volkstum*) and freedom will become real”. [34]

For Landauer, it was the destruction of organic communal cohesion that enabled economic and social subjugation.

“There are links between people that allow them to work and to exchange – or there is the absence of links, which gives birth to parasitism, exploitation and monopoly”. [35]

Landauer was very much opposed to the usual left-wing tendency to merely dream of a future revolution and insisted that the work had to start now, within the existing society.

“We must not say: today we are not free but tomorrow, by who knows what wave of a magic wand, we will be free; we have to say: we all, without exception, have freedom inside us and

we only have to bring it out into exterior reality”. [36]

“We have to start looking around us and search for a space for free initiative, for autonomous creation!” [37]

One of his practical suggestions was for the setting-up of co-operative or communal bread ovens.

At the same time as fighting back against the invasion of the lifeless chemical bread of the food industry, people would thus be restoring traditional crafts and cultures gobbled up by capitalism and encouraging individual diversity – individuality – within the unity. [38]

Landauer’s vision of the action that needed to be taken looked simultaneously forward and backward in time and thus beyond the modern linear concept of history: “Our movement comes from centuries past and reaches towards centuries in the future. [39]

“Our colony can not be built merely on ideas and theory without being attached to an authentic tradition; and it will be all the more beautiful if it is born from the union of the colony-builders with an existing village which agrees to welcome them, which calls upon them, which supports them, which wants, with them, to revive former communal institutions, whose memory has almost been lost”. [40]

Landauer’s use of “mystical” terms like *Geist*

(spirit) and *Seelenhafte* (psyche) forms an inherent part of his anarchism, flowing naturally from the rest of his philosophy.

His vision was based on living human communities, social organisms with their own guiding collective spirit arising from below and from within.

The idea of *Geist* also fed into Landauer's ideas regarding revolution, along with his related concept of *Wahn*, a kind of inebriating resonance which could bring about sudden radical change.

He explained: "*Wahn* is not only every goal, every ideal, every belief in a sense of purpose of life and the world: *Wahn* is every banner followed by mankind; every drumbeat leading mankind into danger; every alliance that unites mankind and creates from a sum of individuals a new structure, an organism". [41]

Landauer said the spark for revolution was always the stupidity, brutality or weakness of rulers, but that "the people, the thinkers, the poets are a powder keg, loaded with spirit and the power of creative destruction". [42]

The energy of *Wahn* would ensure that this powder keg ignited: "There is no need to fear a lack of revolutionaries: they actually arise by a sort of spontaneous generation – namely when the revolution comes.

"The voice of the spirit is the trumpet that will sound again and again and again, as long as

men are together. Injustice will always seek to perpetuate itself; and always as long as men are truly alive, revolt against it will break out”. [43]

Anarchism, said Landauer, was “a collective name for transformative ambitions” [44] and its role was to encourage *Wahn* and help create the resonance of revolution.

In this way it could rid the human social organism of the stifling restrictions imposed by the centralised industrial system and allow it to breathe and flourish in a free and natural way.

As Landauer famously declared: “Anarchy *is* life; the life that awaits us after we have freed ourselves from the yoke”. [45]

[1] Russell Berman & Tim Luke, ‘Introduction’, Gustav Landauer, *For Socialism*, trans. by David J Parent, (St Louis: Telos Press, 1978), p. 8.

[2] Gustav Landauer, ‘Polizisten und Mörder’, 1910, cit. Gaël Cheptou, ‘Pour moi, les morts vivent’, *A Contretemps* (Paris: Numéro 48 – Mai 2014), p. 10.

[3] Landauer, *For Socialism*, pp. 35-36.

[4] Helmut Rüdiger, ‘Ein deutscher freiheitlicher Sozialist: Gustav Landauer’ in Gustav Landauer. *Worte der Würdigung* (Darmstadt: Verlag Die freie Gesellschaft, 1951), pp. 12-26, *A Contretemps*, p. 19.

[5] Cheptou, p. 8.

[6] Peter Marshall, *Demanding the Impossible: A History of Anarchism* (London: Fontana Press, 1993), p. 411.

[7] Cheptou, p. 8.

[8] Gustav Landauer, *Skepsis und Mystik: Versuche im Anschluss an Mauthners Sprachkritik* (Cologne: 2d ed, 1923) p. 7, cit. Charles B. Maurer, *Call to Revolution: The Mystical Anarchism of Gustav Landauer* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1971), p. 69.

[9] Marshall, p. 411.

[10] Gustav Landauer, *Der Sozialist*, 15 July 1911, cit. Marshall, p.

410.

[11] Gustav Landauer, quoted in Eugene Lunn, *The Prophet of Community: The Romantic Socialism of Gustav Landauer* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), pp. 107, 110, cit. Marshall, p. 412.

[12] Landauer, 'Polizisten und Mörder', cit. Cheptou, p. 10.

[13] Gustav Landauer, letter to Gudula Landauer, 30 September, 1918, cit. Christoph Knüppel, 'Sur le sol ferme de la glèbe s'élèvera un jour l'heure de la liberté', *A Contretemps*, p. 30.

[14] Gustav Landauer, letter to Max Nettelau, August 10, 1910, cit. Cheptou, p. 9.

[15] Rudolf Rocker, *Revolucion y regresion (1918-1951)*, cit. Freddy Gomez, 'Gustav Landauer, un anarchiste de l'envers', *A Contretemps*, p. 4.

[16] Gomez, p. 4.

[17] Gustav Landauer, *Aufruf zum Sozialismus* (Berlin: 2nd ed, 1919), pp. 19-20, cit. Charles B. Maurer, *Call to Revolution: The Mystical Anarchism of Gustav Landauer* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1971), p. 93.

[18] Gustav Landauer, 'Das zweite Flugblatt: Was ist zunächst zu tun?', 1909, *A contretemps*, p. 63.

[19] Maurer, pp. 108-109.

[20] Gustav Landauer, Letter to Margarete Susman, 23 November 1918, cit. Rüdiger, p. 18.

[21] Berman & Luke, 'Introduction', *For Socialism*, p. 10.

[22] Berman & Luke, Introduction, *For Socialism*, p. 11.

[23] Landauer, *For Socialism*, p. 32.

[24] Landauer, *For Socialism*, p. 123.

[25] Landauer, *For Socialism*, p. 56.

[26] Gustav Landauer, letter to Margarete Susman, 13 December 1918, cit. Rüdiger, p. 17.

[27] Landauer, *For Socialism*, p. 57.

[28] Landauer, *For Socialism*, p. 82.

[29] Gustav Landauer, 'Quelques mots à propos de l'anarchisme', 1897, *A contretemps*, p. 57.

[30] Landauer, 'Das zweite Flugblatt: Was ist zunächst zu tun?', p. 62.

[31] Landauer, 'Das zweite Flugblatt: Was ist zunächst zu tun?', p. 63.

[32] Landauer, 'Das zweite Flugblatt: Was ist zunächst zu tun?', p. 62.

[33] Gustav Landauer, 'Das dritte Flugblatt: Die Siedlung', 1910, *A*

*contretemps*, p. 68.

[34] Landauer, 'Das zweite Flugblatt: Was ist zunächst zu tun?', p. 63.

[35] Gustav Landauer, 'Individualismus', 1911, cit. Cheptou, p. 11.

[36] Landauer, 'Individualismus', cit. Cheptou, p. 11.

[37] Gustav Landauer, 'Les syndicalistes révolutionnaires français', 1909, p. 65.

[38] Cheptou, p. 11.

[39] Gustav Landauer, 'La Colonie', 1909, *A contretemps*, p. 66.

[40] Landauer, 'La Colonie', p. 67.

[41] Gustav Landauer, *Beginnen: Aufsätze über Sozialismus*, ed. Martin Buber, Cologne, 1924, p. 16, cit. Maurer, p. 92.

[42] Gustav Landauer, 'Die Revolution', 1907, *Revolution and Other Writings: A Political Reader*, ed. and trans. by Gabriel Kuhn, (Oakland: PM Press, 2010) p. 170.

[43] Landauer, *For Socialism*, pp. 82 & 130.

[44] Landauer, Letter to Julius Babb, 15 September, 1904, *Revolution and Other Writings*, p. 304.

[45] Landauer, 'Anarchismus-Sozialismus', 1895, *Revolution and Other Writings*, p. 74.

## POWER AND CORRUPTION: THE PUBLIC-PRIVATE IMPERIAL MAFIA

Chatham House, the name commonly given to The Royal Institute of International Affairs, is an extremely influential “think tank” based in London.

It has enjoyed the patronage of the British monarchy for a century now, with Charles III recently joining the list of royal backers. [1]

Director Bronwen Maddox said on May 9 2024: “Chatham House is delighted to accept the Patronage of The King, a great help in advancing our work on the security, prosperity and sustainability of the world”. [2]

Upcoming events include sessions on “US priorities in the Indo-Pacific”, “Recalibrating our assumptions on cybersecurity” and “Solutions for a world in conflict”. [3]

Readers of the “insider” US historian Professor Carroll Quigley will know that he identified Chatham House as the most important vehicle for the public-private Anglo-American Establishment that he saw dominating the corridors of power on both sides of the Atlantic.

It was formally established in 1920, gaining its Royal charter in 1926, and a sister organisation, the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), was set up in the USA.

Quigley refers to the movers and shakers behind these organisations as the “Milner Group”, because of the key role of journalist turned civil servant Alfred Milner, which seems to have begun after a dinner with Lord Rothschild in 1891. [4]

Quigley relates that Milner later found lucrative employment as “confidential adviser to certain international financiers in London’s financial district”. [5]

He became a member of the board of the London Joint Stock Bank (later the Midland Bank), a director of the Mortgage Company of Egypt and of the Bank of British West Africa, and chairman of the Rothschilds’ Rio Tinto Co.

While Chatham House pretends to be “independent”, Quigley stresses that this is not at all so and warns of the sinister implications of its true function.

“The Milner Group controls the Institute. Once that is established, the picture changes. The influence of Chatham House appears in its true perspective, not as the influence of an autonomous body but as merely one of many instruments in the arsenal of another power.

“When the influence which the Institute



wields is combined with that controlled by the Milner Group in other fields – in education, in administration, in newspapers and periodicals – a really terrifying picture begins to emerge...

“The picture is terrifying because such power, whatever the goals at which it may be directed, is too much to be entrusted safely to any group...

“No country that values its safety should allow what the Milner Group accomplished in Britain – that is, that a small number of men should be able to wield such power in administration and politics, should be given almost complete control over the publication of the documents relating to their actions, should be able to exercise such influence over the avenues of information that create public opinion, and should be able to monopolize so completely the writing and the teaching of the history of their own period”. [6]

At the start of its existence, Chatham House was helped on its way with a gift of £2,000 from Thomas Lamont of J.P. Morgan and the CFR in the USA was also created with J.P. Morgan money. [7]

When you know that J.P. Morgan was a Rothschild front, then you already know where these two organisations came from. [8]

But what about today? What can we find out about the power behind Chatham House in 2024?

Let's start with its presidents, the first of whom is **Baroness Manningham-Buller**.

The Chatham House site states that she “has extensive knowledge of and experience in international security as well as a deep interest in medical research and global health”. [9]

*But what they really mean is that her career exposes the close links between the deep state and Big Pharma!*

Manningham-Buller was director-general of MI5 between 2002 and 2007 – during the period of the Iraq war and the attendant controversy, such as the “dodgy dossier” on weapons of mass destruction and the strange death of dissenting scientist David Kelly. [10]

She was also at the helm of MI5 during the 2005 London terror attack, with which her service is suspected to have been complicit, as I recently set out. [11]

Manningham-Buller was chairman of the council of Imperial College London from 2011 to 2015.

Imperial was, of course, later to be heavily involved in the Covid scam.

Its Covid-19 Response Team, headed by Neil Ferguson, notoriously released a paper in March 2020 warning that health services risked being overwhelmed by the severity of the so-called pandemic – “epidemic suppression is the only viable strategy”. [12]

The report stressed: “In the UK and US context, suppression will minimally require a combination of social distancing of the entire population, home isolation of cases and household quarantine of their family members”.

Manningham-Buller was also a member of the Board of Governors of the Wellcome Trust from 2008 to 2021 and chair of the Wellcome Trust’s Board of Governors from 2015 to 2021.

This British “charity” is closely linked to Big Pharma and its Covid “vaccines”. [13]

Manningham-Buller was – *needless to say!* – an enthusiastic supporter of the full range of Covid-pretextted propaganda and restrictions.

She wrote the foreword to a 2022 report on the work of the Emergency, Preparedness and Response Health Protection Research Unit (EPR HPRU) at King’s College London, in partnership with the UK Health Security Agency, which focused on the use of “behavioural science” during the Covid period. [14]

And she declared: “If anyone had any doubt about the critical importance of behavioural science, those doubts should have been roundly dispelled by the urgent and compelling need for it during the pandemic.

“When asked to chair the Advisory Board of the unit, I accepted at once, partly because of my own background in MI5 – where our in-house behavioural science unit had proved invaluable

over many decades – and partly because of what I saw of the discipline during my dozen years at the Wellcome Trust”.

Manningham-Buller enthused: “In its work on Covid-19 the unit has demonstrated how important and necessary it is. It responded brilliantly to the worst health crisis for many years”.

Another Chatham House president is **Mark Carney**, best known for his role as governor of the Bank of England from 2013 to 2020, following a spell as governor of another central bank, the Bank of Canada, from 2008 to 2013.

Carney constantly hops from one side to the other of the “public-private” entity, having worked at Goldman Sachs as well as at the Canadian Department of Finance. He is also the UN Special Envoy for Climate Action and Finance. [15]

In 2023 he became chairman of Bloomberg Inc., parent company of Bloomberg L.P., the New York financial, software, data, and media company. [16]

He is also chair of Canadian multinational Brookfield Asset Management, [17] where he was put in charge of “impact fund investing”. [18]

If you don’t know what that means, take a look at the Winter Oak page of information about what is more accurately termed “impact slavery”. [19]

Carney has full-spectrum involvement with globalist institutions, [20] including the Hoffman Institute for Global Business and Society, the Bilderberg Group and the World Economic Forum (WEF), where he is on the Foundation Board [21] and on whose site he presents a propaganda video on “accelerating sustainable investment”. [22]

He declares: “We need to transition the energy system on the scale of the industrial revolution, at the speed of the digital transformation”.

Carney has also chaired the Basel-based Financial Stability Board and the Bank for International Settlements’ Committee on the Global Financial System. [23]

A third Chatham House president, **Helen Clark**, is also a faithful servant of the empire, having been prime minister of Commonwealth colony New Zealand from 1999 to 2008. [24]

In March 2002 she was summoned to the USA to visit “Ground Zero”, meet George W. Bush and Paul Wolfowitz and pledge her support for the so-called War on Terror.

Her Labour government was “prone to various scandals, often labelled with the dreaded ‘-gate’ suffix”, as one New Zealand site puts it – [25] these included “corngate”; the Taito Phillip Field corruption affair. [26]

After her stint as PM, Clark switched

effortlessly into being administrator of the UN Development Programme and now co-chairs the World Health Organization's Independent Panel for Pandemic Preparedness and Response.

*And to think that there are those who refuse to see that the Commonwealth, the UN and the WHO are all essentially the same entity...*

The fourth and final Chatham House president, albeit with an "Emeritus" status, is former British Prime Minister **John Major**.

Less than a year after becoming PM, in 1991, he introduced a mis-named "citizen's charter" which involved adopting a WEF-style "stakeholder approach" to public services – effectively privatisation by stealth. [27]

Major continued Margaret Thatcher's neoliberal agenda, proceeding with the final sell-off of British Coal, as well as electricity-generating companies Powergen and National Power, and also British Rail. [28]

In the light of this, it is perhaps not surprising that his Chatham House profile lists an impressive number of "business interests"! [29]

It names these as: "Senior Advisor to Credit Suisse; Chairman of the International Advisory Board of the National Bank of Kuwait; Chairman of the European Advisory Council of the Emerson Electric Company, St. Louis; and Chairman of the Advisory Board of Global Infrastructure

Partners”.

This last entity is “an infrastructure investment fund making equity and selected debt investments”, set up by Major’s friends at Credit Suisse and by General Electric. [30]

In January 2024 BlackRock announced it was acquiring Global Infrastructure Partners, which it described as “the largest independent infrastructure manager by assets under management globally”, with more than 40 portfolio companies generating over \$75 billion in annual revenue. [31]

It added: “A \$1 trillion market today, infrastructure is forecast to be one of the fastest growing segments of private markets in the years ahead.

“A number of long-term structural trends support an acceleration in infrastructure investment. These include increasing global demand for upgraded digital infrastructure like fiber broadband, cell towers and data centers; renewed investment in logistical hubs such as airports, railroads and shipping ports as supply chains are rewired; and a movement toward decarbonization and energy security in many parts of the world”.

Not mentioned in Major’s Chatham House profile is that in May 2001 he was appointed European chairman of The Carlyle Group, [32] the US-based multinational private equity, asset

management and financial services corporation, founded by William E. Conway Jr., Stephen L. Norris, David Rubenstein, Daniel A. D'Aniello and Greg Rosenbaum. [33]

In one of history's great coincidences, Carlyle's investor conference later that year took place in Washington on September 11, with Major in attendance. [34]

In the weeks following the meeting, it was reported that Shafiq bin Laden had been the "guest of honor", and that the Bin Laden family were investors in Carlyle-managed funds.

An article in *The Economist* (of all places!) commented that you did need not be a "conspiracy theorist" to be concerned about what lay behind Carlyle's success. [35]

It added: "Can a firm that is so deeply embedded in the iron triangle where industry, government and the military converge be good for democracy?"

"Carlyle arguably takes to a new level the military-industrial complex that President Eisenhower feared might 'endanger our liberties or democratic process'".

Major is also on the International Advisory Boards of Israel's Peres Center for Peace and Innovation, whose international governors have included the likes of liquor-trade "philanthropist" Charles Bronfman, Baroness Ariane de Rothschild and the late Sir Evelyn de Rothschild.



[36]

I am now going to take a look at the identity, activities and associations of all 13 trustees of the Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House).

Because Chatham House claims to be a “charity” these are listed on the Charity Commission’s website [37] and I am going to go through the trustees as named at the time of writing, dealing with them in the order in which they are presented.

It’s going to take a while, so feel free to go and make yourself a coffee, or bookmark the article to finish another time.

But please do read what follows at some point: it really does shed light on the identity and nature of those who have grabbed hold of our society.

While Chatham House boasts that the background of its presidents confirms “the connection between Chatham House and policymakers”, [38] the careers and associations of its trustees confirm multiple and undeniable connections within a highly dubious and disturbing public-private global empire.

Current chairman of Chatham House is **Sir Nigel Sheinwald**, a former British diplomat who was Tony Blair’s “foreign policy and defence adviser” from 2003 to 2007, before going on to be the UK’s ambassador to the US from 2007 to

2012. [39]

Chatham House's website also tells us that he is a non-executive director of an asset management company, Invesco, which is very interested in China's Belt and Road Initiative. [40]

This firm is a continuation, after several name changes, of Slater Walker, a British industrial conglomerate turned bank that was at the centre of massive financial and political controversy in the 1970s. [41]

The Bank of England ended up "rescuing the banking activities of Slater Walker" with the help of Sir James Goldsmith, Hambros and "a Rothschild & Co team", as former Rothschild employee Bernie Myers recalls. [42]

Sheinwald [43] is also a senior advisor to Tanium, "a cyber security company", and to "political consultancy" Rasmussen Global. [44]

Founded in 2014 [45] under the name of former NATO chief and Citigroup adviser Anders Fogh Rasmussen, [46] this organisation is very proud of its support for the Zelensky regime in Ukraine.

It enthuses on its website: "When fighting will end, Ukraine is poised to become Europe's biggest and most transformative reconstruction project". [47]

Chatham House's chair is a former director of Raytheon Systems Ltd, [48] the US-based

arms firm that ten years ago won the Israeli contract to supply \$149.3 million's worth of Tamir missiles. [49]

And Sheinwald is also a former director of Shell, [50] the oil giant which, as I have previously outlined, is closely linked to the Rothschilds. [51]

Indeed, a nice illustration of the public-private scope of the Rothschild connections is provided by the fact that Victor Rothschild, who was a pioneer in the biotech sphere, also worked for both Shell and MI5. [52]

One of Sheinwald's fellow Chatham House trustees is **Irene Dörner**, the former president, CEO and managing director of HSBC North America Holdings Inc. [53]

HSBC, originally The Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation, was set up by British bankers as part of imperialist designs on China.

*Wikipedia* notes: "HSBC has been implicated in a number of controversies and the bank has been repeatedly fined for money laundering (sometimes in relation to major criminal organizations such as the Sinaloa cartel) or setting up large scale tax avoidance schemes". [54]

When, in 2015, it decided on a restructuring of its private banking arm, it appointed the Rothschilds to do the job, as the *Financial Times*

reported. [55]

Coincidentally, HSBC's office in Israel is located in Tel Aviv's Rothschild Boulevard, [56] "one of the most expensive streets in the city" and the road in which the Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel was proclaimed on 14 May 1948 by David Ben-Gurion, the executive head of the World Zionist Organization. [57]

Dorner of Chatham House, the proud owner of an "American Banker's Lifetime Achievement Award", was sent to the US Senate in 2014 "to apologise for mistakes that led to a £1.2bn fine for money laundering", reports *The Guardian*. [58]

Her "humiliating appearance" drew public attention to what the US authorities said showed a "pervasively polluted" culture at HSBC, allowing the bank "to move billions around the financial system for Mexican drug lords, terrorists and governments on sanctions lists".

Dorner has also been involved in controversy with regard to another business activity.

She is on the board of Taylor Wimpey, the property development giant that has been concreting over the English countryside for decades. [59]

The company was recently investigated by UK authorities over a business practice described by campaigners as "fleecehold".

Explains the BBC: “Buyers of new homes discovered that they were tied into contracts that saw ground rents become hugely more expensive, with the freehold sometimes having been sold on to a third party.

“Some also faced large fees when they planned to add an extension to their property or even basic home improvements”. [60]

Taylor Wimpey eventually “agreed to abolish ground rents that double every 10 years and instead charge a flat fee”, reported the *Financial Times* in 2021. [61]

Dorner is also chair of Control Risks, a “global risk and strategic consulting firm specializing in political, security and integrity risk”. [62]

It was formed in 1975, as a professional adviser to the insurance industry. States *Wikipedia*: “A subsidiary of insurance broker Hogg Robinson, the firm aimed to minimize their exposure to kidnap and ransom payouts”. [63]

Control Risks was described by journalist Nick Davies in 1987 as “the privatised wing of British security”. [64]

Having previously “succeeded in setting itself up as a new power in the security world with the maximum of discretion”, Control Risks came to the public’s attention in 1977 when two of its operatives were arrested and thrown into prison by a judge in Bogota, Colombia.

Davies added: “In the last two years, the company has drawn a stinging attack from the Irish government over its role after the kidnap of Jennifer Guinness, and a call in the House of Commons for its prosecution over the case of kidnap victim Don Tidey – a call which was rebuffed by the Attorney General, Sir Michael Havers, who said there was no evidence that the company had broken any law”.

Noting the revolving doors between this private firm and members of the security establishment, he remarked: “Its staff list over the years reads like a Who’s Who of the ‘Secret State’.”

Control Risks provided security to Bechtel and Halliburton in Iraq after the 2003 invasion and was reportedly hired by the parents of Madeleine McCann, the British child who famously went missing in Portugal. [65]

Dorner is also a non-executive director of French insurance giant AXA and of Rolls-Royce, which is involved in the production of the F-35 stealth combat aircraft used by Israel in its murderous land-grabbing assault on Gaza. [66]

She is further listed as general manager at Premier Wealth Management Ltd (United Kingdom), chairman at Virgin Money Holdings UK Plc and in-house counsel at Citigroup Global Markets (Algeria). [67]

Another Chatham House trustee with a

banking background is **Alan Houmann**.

He was a top man at the London branch of Citi, [68] the US banking group which was the first contributor to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York in 1913, a year after it was set up. [69]

Scandals involving Citigroup are too numerous to list in full, but here are some examples.

In 1998, it was criticised by the US General Accounting Office for alleged money laundering for a drug-linked Mexican “businessman”, involving “the transfer of millions of dollars through complex financial transactions that hid the funds’ paper trail”. [70]

Two decades later similar concerns around Citigroup’s involvement in Mexican money laundering were still being voiced. [71]

In December 2002, Citigroup paid fines totalling \$400 million in the USA as part of a settlement involving charges that it deceived investors with biased research. [72]

In 2004 it was involved in what *The Guardian* called a “bond selling scandal”. [73]

Its traders sold €11bn of government bonds in less than two minutes and half an hour later the bank bought back €4bn worth of bonds at a lower price, netting a profit of around €17m.

The transactions swamped the market and destabilised prices with the apparent aim being “to kill off some of the smaller dealers”.

In November 2007 it became public [74] that Citigroup was heavily involved in the Terra Securities scandal, [75] which involved selling “very questionable, complex and geared investments” to eight municipalities in Norway.

In August 2008, Citigroup agreed to pay nearly \$18 million in refunds and fines to settle accusations by California Attorney General Jerry Brown that it systematically stole funds from the accounts of credit card customers. [76]

It had used an improper computerized “sweep” feature to move positive balances from card accounts into the bank’s general fund, without telling cardholders.

Brown said: “The company knowingly stole from its customers, mostly poor people and the recently deceased”. [77]

Houmann, of Citi and Chatham House, typifies the public-private connection, having held roles at HM Treasury and been an adviser at the UK’s Financial Services Authority. [78]

He is an associate of Ambassador Partnership LLP, which openly boasts that it is involved in “corporate diplomacy”! [79]

And he was awarded the Freedom of the City of London in 2022, presumably for services to plutocracy.

Chatham House trustee Rob Macaire is chief adviser for UK and international affairs at Rio Tinto, well-known for being a Rothschild entity.



[80]

Macaire worked as a British diplomat “in Bucharest just after the revolution, in Washington DC through 9/11, in Delhi, and then in Nairobi as High Commissioner, after the 2008 post-election violence”. [81]

In 2011 he began a five-year spell as director of government/public affairs and political risk for British multinational oil and gas business BG Group plc, [82] seeing it through its \$70 billion acquisition by the Rothschilds’ Shell empire in 2016. [83]

Macaire then leapt back over to the “public” wing of the imperial operation, being appointed UK ambassador to Iran in 2018. [84]

In 2020 he was arrested by the Iranian authorities on suspicion of stirring up protests against the country’s government [85] and left the post in 2021. [86]

The Chatham House site tells us: “His professional interests have centred around international development, counter-terrorism and extremism, conflict resolution, and the relationship between business and government in international affairs.

“In his current role he is particularly interested in the energy transition and the intersection of public and private sector strategies”. [87]

*Of course he is!*

Chatham House trustee **Herbert Swaniker** is a senior lawyer at the international law firm, Clifford Chance. [88]

There he “advises global organizations on technology-related issues and policy matters, particularly concerning emerging technologies, artificial intelligence, cyber security, privacy and commercial law”.

Clifford Chance has an interesting history, very much linked to the origins of Chatham House as explained by Quigley. [89]

It was created by the merger in 1987 of two London-based law firms – Coward Chance and Clifford-Turner.

Coward Chance derived from a firm established in 1802 by Anthony Brown. Brown’s firm became embroiled in the Panic of 1825, caused by speculation in South American investments, including in the non-existent country of Poyais.

One of the firm’s longest clients was Cecil Rhodes. The firm advised him on his diamond mining business in South Africa, administered his estate after his death and helped set up the Rhodes Scholarships.

As historians Jim Macgregor and Gerry Docherty explain, Rhodes was “intrinsically linked to the powerful House of Rothschild”. [90]

Rhodes was very close to the then Lord Rothschild – in three of his wills he left the

banker as his trustee, in one as his sole trustee – and the two of them were founding members of what Quigley calls the Milner Group, which founded Chatham House, although Rothschild preferred to remain in the background.

The Rhodes Trust, with its transatlantic Rhodes Scholarships, was later to play a key role in extending the group’s influence in the USA.

Chatham House trustee Swaniker is a member both of the EU AI Alliance, [91] a European Commission initiative that declares it is “shaping Europe’s digital future”; [92] and of techUK, keen to “accelerate change” through “Smart Infrastructure and Systems”. [93]

Chatham House trustee **Joanna Cound** is a BlackRock woman. [94] She is co-head of BlackRock’s Global Public Policy Group, a member of BlackRock’s European Executive Committee, its Global Operating Committee and of the BlackRock Group Limited Enterprise Risk Management Committee.

As I reported in ‘Enemies of the People’, recent research into the ultimate ownership of international financial and business power has identified BlackRock, along with State Street and Vanguard, as being at the heart of an interlocking network of global holding companies.

Behind this interlocking network is believed to be the Rothschild empire. [95]

The Rothschilds, of course, don't want people to know this and nowhere is their ultimate control of this global corporate monopoly actually spelled out.

But there have been various trickles of information confirming the Rothschild-BlackRock connection, such as the 2002 news that "Rothschild Australia Asset Management has appointed US-based fund manager BlackRock Inc to manage its global fixed interest portfolios". [96]

"RAAM will outsource the management of its global fixed interest portfolios to BlackRock, as well as acting as BlackRock's agent in Australia.

"As a first step, up to \$300 million of RAAM's diversified funds will be outsourced to BlackRock".

In 2014 we learned that the Rothschilds had launched a BlackRock Select fund [97] and in 2021 Rothschild & Co were "advising" retirement village business Audley Group in a big deal with BlackRock Real Assets. [98]

In 2023, it turned out that BlackRock and longstanding Rothschild front JPMorgan Chase were involved together in "helping the Ukrainian government set up a reconstruction bank to steer public seed capital into rebuilding projects that can attract hundreds of billions of dollars in private investment". [99]

That same year a Rothschild & Co press

release [100] revealed they were working on a 16 billion euro project with Global Infrastructure Partners, which as we have seen is advised by Chatham House president John Major, just months before BlackRock announced it was acquiring the business. [101]

BlackRock/Chatham House stalwart Cound previously worked for Merrill Lynch Investment Managers and for Citibank retail bank in Germany – very much part of the same family of businesses. [102]

Chatham House trustee **Rhodri Williams** is a typical public-private Anglo-American Establishment figure.

The Oxford University product enjoyed a 23-year career as a British diplomat before going to work for American International Group (AIG), the multinational finance and insurance corporation. [103]

In late 2008, the US federal government bailed out AIG for \$180 billion, and technically assumed control, because, says *Wikipedia*, “many believed its failure would endanger the financial integrity of other major firms that were its trading partners—Goldman Sachs, Morgan Stanley, Bank of America and Merrill Lynch, as well as dozens of European banks”. [104]

Williams’ profile on the WEF website says his work involves “developing strategic partnerships with a wide range of external

stakeholders, including governments, international organisations, trade and industry groups and think-tanks”. [105]

Chatham House’s biography of its trustee **David Nussbaum** likewise nicely sums up the nature of the whole endeavour: “Following an executive career in international organizations in the private and NGO sectors, David now has a portfolio of non-executive director and trustee board roles”. [106]

Nussbaum is a member of the Ethical Investment Advisory Group of the Church of England.

The term “ethical” is hard to reconcile with the Church’s activities, given that it is heavily involved in the smart-city UNSDG “impact capitalism” promoted by WEF-linked Ronald Cohen, as I reported last year. [107]

Nussbaum chairs International Alert, an organisation interested in “the impact of peacebuilding” [108] and in “better development and peace outcomes”. [109]

He is also chair of Anthesis, an international consultancy which aims to “guide clients towards sustainable performance through an end-to-end journey that is impact led and solution oriented”. [110]

But his commitment to “sustainability” is somewhat put in question by the fact that he is the senior independent director of Drax Group

plc, [111] the business behind the notorious Drax power station in Selby, England, where vast forests are being burned under the greenwashing “biomass” label. [112]

Say campaigners Axe Drax: “Drax Power Station, in North Yorkshire, burns 25 million trees a year that are shipped in from across the world”. [113]

They add that Drax is “the world’s biggest burner of trees” and “can only operate because of over £6 billion in subsidies taken straight from our energy bills, supposedly for renewable energy”.

The fake-green question can also be asked of Nussbaum’s previous roles as CEO of WWF-UK and chair of WWF’s Global Climate and Energy Initiative.

As I’ve already explained, [114] the WWF was set up by Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, a veteran of the Nazi SS who sat on the steering committee of the Bilderberg Group along with WEF boss Klaus Schwab. [115]

The WWF is notorious for throwing indigenous people off their land on behalf of its big business friends under the false green flag of “conservation” and is today very prominent in the industrial-financial lobby calling for a New Deal for Nature. [116]

President of WWF-UK is Charles III, the Chatham House patron who officially launched

the Great Reset in 2020 and is, of course, head of the ever-so “ethical” Church of England. [117]

The pseudo-green theme continues with the next Chatham House trustee on the list (the ninth of the 13, in case you’re wondering!).

**Sam Alvis** is head of economy at Green Alliance, a London-based “independent think tank and charity”. [118]

It declares: “Since 1979, we have been working with the most influential leaders in business, NGOs and politics to accelerate political action and create transformative policy for a green and prosperous UK”. [119]

This virtue-signalling is, however, rather undermined by the fact that its listed “partners” [120] include the world’s biggest chemicals business, BASF, which, as a 2023 report revealed, is not only responsible for vast amounts of pollution but also “has used its influence to push back against chemicals regulation in the EU”! [121]

Alvis previously worked on EU affairs for the Wellcome Trust, the Big Pharma “charity” with which Chatham House’s deep state president Manningham-Buller is so closely connected.

And his impeccable credentials are completed by the fact that he also worked as a senior adviser at the Tony Blair Institute [122] – for more on that organisation see my November 2023 article, ‘Tony Blair and the Rothschilds’.



[123]

It is interesting to note, with a general election approaching, that Alvis has also been advising [124] the current Labour Party leadership and has praised Keir Starmer's "environmental" policies. [125]

Trustee number 10 is **Juliet Dryden**, a long-term appreciator of Chatham House who began her career there in the 1990s before going off to work for the United Nations, where her specialities included "donor relations". [126]

She is currently director of the British International Studies Association (BISA).

Although BISA appears, on the surface, to be a merely academic organisation, the illusion of scholarly independence is dispelled by the fact that it holds an annual BISA Model NATO event [127] – a "NATO simulation exercise" [128] – in partnership with the UK's Foreign Commonwealth and Development Office and works closely alongside the British Council. [129]

Officially a wing of the British state, this latter organisation's archived list of "clients" includes AstraZeneca, BAE Systems, Balfour Beatty, Barclays Group, Bloomberg, BP, British Airways, BT Group, Cable & Wireless, Cadbury Schweppes, Deutsche Bank, Ernst and Young, GlaxoSmithKline, HSBC Holdings, IBM, ICI, Lloyds, London Stock Exchange, Marconi, Marks and Spencer, PowerGen, Pricewaterhouse

Coopers, Prudential, Renault, Reuters Holdings plc, Rio Tinto, Rolls-Royce, Royal & Sun Alliance Insurance Group, Shell Group of Companies, Thames Water plc, The Telegraph plc, Virgin Group, Visa International, Vodafone, Volkswagen... Oh, and NM Rothschild and Sons Ltd. [130]

The fact that this British Council “client” list ever existed, plus the fact that it has now been removed from public view, reveals much about the hidden public-private power. [131]

Chatham House trustee number 11 of 13, **Anita Lowenstein Dent**, is the founder and CEO of T2T, Teach2Teach International. [132]

Focused on Africa, it claims it wants to “help lift children and youth out of poverty, minimise early and forced marriage, and provide young people in the most deprived areas with essential skills and optimism for the future”. [133]

In practice, its “ethos” is entirely based on the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, such as Goal 1’s insistence that “economic growth is essential to ensure development is sustainable” or Goal 8’s emphasis that “sustainable economic growth requires societies to create the conditions that allow people to have quality jobs”.

Somewhat inevitably, Lowenstein Dent’s T2T describes young African people as “human capital” [134] and talks about “resilience” and (a

lot!) about “impact”. [135]

T2T’s listed supporters [136] include the Ghana Association of Bankers and St James’s Place Charitable Foundation, which describes itself as “one of the largest corporate foundations in the UK” [137] and which was set up by St. James’s Place plc, formerly J. Rothschild Assurance. [138]

An article on the *Jewish News* website reveals that Lowenstein Dent also devotes much of her time to “a number of Jewish charities, including PJ Library UK and New Israel Fund UK”. [139]

The penultimate trustee on the Chatham House list is an academic, **Andrew Payne**. [140]

He lectures on “foreign policy and security” at City, University of London, and is a research associate at the University of Oxford.

His work examines “the influence of domestic politics on US foreign policy, military strategy and civil–military relations”.

More specifically, Payne is concerned about the way in which “elections powerfully constrain presidential decisions about war and peace”, as he wrote in the *Washington Post*. [141]

In an article for *The US Army War College Quarterly* [142] he mentions that “most voters do not support an increase in defense spending and would prefer to decrease the number of troops stationed across the world”. [143]

But he says the good news for the warmongers is that fears about “international terrorism” can create “majorities in favor of the use of military tools to address this threat”.

Public opposition to war could be reduced, says Payne, by turning to a remote-control approach, involving drones: “By relying on technology over manpower, presidents can redistribute the costs of using force away from the average voter, thereby mitigating domestic constraints...

“More importantly, policymakers may feel more tempted to use force if the available tools are cheaper and less politically controversial”.

Payne is also “a Nonresident Fellow at the Institute for Global Affairs”, [144] a New York organisation which describes its role, in rather familiar language, as “nurturing the next generation of leaders”. [145]

The final trustee is **John Berriman**, [146] a former UK board member and chief operating officer of Pricewaterhouse Coopers UK (PwC), part of the second-largest “professional services network” in the world, with firms in 157 countries. [147]

Berriman’s career there was evidently very much involved with the globalisation agenda, as he was active in more than 20 different countries including Southeast Asia and continental Europe.

Let's hope he didn't get caught up in the goings-on evoked in this statement about PwC in its *Wikipedia* entry: "The firm has been embroiled in a number of corruption controversies and crime scandals. The firm has on multiple occasions been implicated in tax evasion and tax avoidance practices. The company has aided war criminals in evading sanctions". [148]

In 2005, *BusinessWeek* reported that PwC was auditor for the aforementioned AIG, where Berriman's fellow Chatham House trustee Rhodri Williams worked, through the corporation's years of "questionable dealings" and accounting improprieties. [149]

The article asked: "Were misdoings hidden from AIG's longtime auditing firm, PricewaterhouseCoopers, or did the firm turn a blind eye to problems it should have seen?"

Pointing out how "close" the two firms were, it questioned the role of "PwC's long-standing relationship with AIG" in the scandal.

PwC, like HSBC, is also part of Chatham House patron Charles III's rather sinister global network, as I pointed out a couple of years ago. [150]

*It's a small world (order)!*

Berriman is currently an adviser to British-American business law firm Norton Rose Fulbright, whose Frankfurt offices were last year

raided by German prosecutors [151] “as part of their vast investigation into the controversial Cum-Ex scandal that has swept up Wall Street’s biggest banks”. [152]

Money-laundering, financial scandal, arms dealing, “fleeceholding”, government bail-outs, corruption claims, “corporate diplomacy”, tax evasion, tax avoidance, greenwashing scams, land grabs, impact slavery, links to war criminals, terrorists and drug lords...

Chatham House is in many ways a miniature version of the British state itself, and indeed of the global public-private governance as a whole.

Behind a veneer of “royal” respectability lurks something that can only be described as a mafia.

Of course, anyone who sets out the existence and nature of this entity – the criminocracy as I call it – is liable to be insulted from all sides as being “paranoid”, “naive”, “simplistic”, “childish”, a “conspiracy theorist” of the “far left” or “extreme right”, an “enemy of democracy”, a supporter of “terrorism”, a “liar” or an “anti-semitite”.

And yet every time that we hear these smears, and see who they are coming from, we become further aware of the scope, strategies and sensitivities of that very real global crime syndicate.

As I have said many times, the continuation of their illicit worldwide domination depends on most people being unaware of it, hence the hysterical reaction to any accurate description.

The evidence of what these ultra-wealthy vermin are doing is out there to be seized and shared by everyone.

They are few and we are many.

*Let's sweep their evil empire away once and for all with a veritable tsunami of exposure and revolt!*

[1] <https://www.chathamhouse.org/2024/05/chatham-house-granted-royal-patronage-his-majesty-king-charles-iii>

[2] <https://www.chathamhouse.org/2024/05/chatham-house-granted-royal-patronage-his-majesty-king-charles-iii>

[3] <https://www.chathamhouse.org/events/all/research-event/us-priorities-indo-pacific-0>

<https://www.chathamhouse.org/events/all/conference/cyber-2024>

<https://www.chathamhouse.org/events/all/special-event/london-conference-2024>

[4] J. Lee Thompson, *Forgotten Patriot* (New Jersey: Rosemount Publishing, 2007), p. 75, cit. Gerry Docherty and Jim Macgregor, *Hidden History: The Secret Origins of the First World War* (Edinburgh & London: Mainstream Publishing, 2013), p. 27.

[5] Carroll Quigley, *The Anglo-American Establishment: From Rhodes to Cliveden* (Dauphin Publications Inc, 2013), p. 86.

[6] Quigley, p. 198.

[7] Jim Macgregor and Gerry Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony: How the Anglo-American Establishment Deliberately Extended WWI by Three-and-a-Half Years* (Walterville, OR: Trine Day, 2018), p. 502.

[8] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/10/14/a-crime-against-humanity-the-great-reset-of-1914-1918/>

[9] <https://www.chathamhouse.org/about-us/our-people/baroness-manningham-buller>

[10] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/David\\_Kelly\\_\(weapons\\_expert\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/David_Kelly_(weapons_expert))

[11] See 'The nauseating hypocrisy of the murderous criminocrats'.

- [12] <https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/medicine/sph/ide/gida-fellowships/Imperial-College-COVID19-NPI-modelling-16-03-2020.pdf>
- [13] <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2022/jan/11/wellcome-trust-covid-vaccines>
- [14] <https://www.kcl.ac.uk/policy-institute/assets/hpru-annual-review-2022.pdf>
- [15] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mark\\_Carney](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mark_Carney)
- [16] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bloomberg\\_L.P.](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bloomberg_L.P.)
- [17] <https://www.brookfield.com/about-us/leadership/mark-carney>
- [18] <https://www.cbc.ca/news/business/brookfield-carney-1.5700287>
- [19] <https://winteroak.org.uk/impact-slavery/>
- [20] <https://www.brookfield.com/about-us/leadership/mark-carney>
- [21] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mark\\_Carney](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mark_Carney)[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mark\\_Carney](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mark_Carney)
- [22] <https://www.weforum.org/videos/accelerating-sustainable-finance-required-business-transformation-mark-carney/>
- [23] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mark\\_Carney](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mark_Carney)
- [24] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Helen\\_Clark](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Helen_Clark)
- [25] <https://thespinoff.co.nz/politics/22-06-2017/remembering-painter-gate-and-what-bill-english-had-to-say-about-it>
- [26] <https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/crime/2934748/Taito-Phillip-Field-jailed-for-six-years>
- [27] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Citizen%27s\\_Charter](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Citizen%27s_Charter)
- [28] <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2012/mar/29/short-history-of-privatisation>
- [29] <https://www.chathamhouse.org/about-us/our-people/john-major>
- [30] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global\\_Infrastructure\\_Partners](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_Infrastructure_Partners)
- [31] <https://www.blackrock.com/corporate/newsroom/press-releases/article/corporate-one/press-releases/blackRock-agrees-to-acquire-global-infrastructure-partners>
- [32] <https://www.carlyle.com/media-room/news-release-archive/john-major-appointed-european-chairman-carlyle-group>
- [33] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\\_Carlyle\\_Group](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Carlyle_Group)
- [34] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\\_Carlyle\\_Group](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Carlyle_Group)
- [35] [http://www.economist.com/printedition/displayStory.cfm?Story\\_ID=1875084](http://www.economist.com/printedition/displayStory.cfm?Story_ID=1875084)
- [36] <https://peres-center.org/en/the-organization/international->



board2/

[37] <https://register-of-charities.charitycommission.gov.uk/charity-search/-/charity-details/208223/trustees>

[38] <https://www.chathamhouse.org/about-us/our-governance>

[39] <https://www.chathamhouse.org/about-us/our-people/nigel-sheinwald>

[40] <https://www.invesco.com/apac/en/institutional/insights/fixed-income/chinas-belt-and-road-initiative-in-a-post-pandemic-world.html>

[41] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Slater\\_Walker](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Slater_Walker)

[42] <https://alumni.rothschildandco.com/alumni/anon/news/details?id=60>

[43] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nigel\\_Sheinwald](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nigel_Sheinwald)

[44] <https://www.chathamhouse.org/about-us/our-people/nigel-sheinwald>

[45] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rasmussen\\_Global](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rasmussen_Global)

[46] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anders\\_Fogh\\_Rasmussen](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anders_Fogh_Rasmussen)

[47] <https://rasmussenglobal.com/sectors/ukraine/>

[48]

<https://find-and-update.company-information.service.gov.uk/officers/FyFmYDUftnCDenFAW8iw3-J5Y8c/appointments>

[49] <https://www.timesofisrael.com/us-firm-raytheon-wins-149m-iron-dome-contract/>

[50]

<https://find-and-update.company-information.service.gov.uk/officers/Rg-pBeO2zSLTBHy2piv11KmozlY/appointments>

[51]

<https://winteroak.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/enemiesofthepople--1.pdf>

[52] Ibid.

[53] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Irene\\_Dorner](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Irene_Dorner)

[54] <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/HSBC>

[55] <https://www.ft.com/content/fb8b0bc2-a717-11e5-9700-2b669a5aeb83>

[56]

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/HSBC\\_Bank\\_Middle\\_East#/media/File:31.03.09\\_Tel\\_Aviv\\_069\\_Moses\\_House.JPG](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/HSBC_Bank_Middle_East#/media/File:31.03.09_Tel_Aviv_069_Moses_House.JPG)

[57]

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/HSBC\\_Bank\\_Middle\\_East#/media/File:31.03.09\\_Tel\\_Aviv\\_069\\_Moses\\_House.JPG](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/HSBC_Bank_Middle_East#/media/File:31.03.09_Tel_Aviv_069_Moses_House.JPG)

[58] <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2014/jun/16/irene-dorner-hsbc-banker-retires-us-senate-apology>

- [59] <https://www.taylorwimpey.co.uk/corporate/our-company/board-of-directors/irene-dorner>
- [60] <https://www.bbc.com/news/business-54023631>
- [61] <https://www.ft.com/content/3c31a54e-be08-4959-8894-dd0b8cc2fec3>
- [62] <https://www.controlrisks.com/who-we-are/leadership/board-only/irene-dorner>
- [63] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Control\\_Risks](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Control_Risks)
- [64] <https://www.nickdavies.net/1987/06/16/control-risks-the-privatised-wing-of-british-security/>
- [65] <https://www.globalsecurity.org/org/news/2004/040610-iraq-contract.htm>
- [66] <https://www.middleeasteye.net/news/uk-cambridge-trinity-college-investments-israel-war-gaza>
- [67] <https://uk.marketscreener.com/insider/IRENE-DORNER-A0261M/>
- [68] <https://www.chathamhouse.org/about-us/our-people/alan-houmann>
- [69] <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Citigroup>
- [70] <https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/inatl/longterm/mexico/stories/981204.htm>
- [71] [https://cc.bingj.com/cache.aspx?q=citigroup+scandals&d=5001837702285567&mkt=fr-FR&setlang=fr-FR&w=JWiKilpfJpDikpWpm\\_EMx59pIT6pTLPf](https://cc.bingj.com/cache.aspx?q=citigroup+scandals&d=5001837702285567&mkt=fr-FR&setlang=fr-FR&w=JWiKilpfJpDikpWpm_EMx59pIT6pTLPf)
- [72] <https://www.nytimes.com/2003/04/28/business/regulators-finalize-14-billion-wall-st-settlement.html>
- [73] <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2005/feb/01/money1>
- [74] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Terra\\_Securities\\_scandal](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Terra_Securities_scandal)
- [75] [https://everything.explained.today/Eika\\_Gruppen/](https://everything.explained.today/Eika_Gruppen/)
- [76] <https://www.reuters.com/article/sppage012-n26369737-oisbn-idUSN2636973720080826/>
- [77] <https://www.reuters.com/article/sppage012-n26369737-oisbn-idUSN2636973720080826/>
- [78] <https://www.chathamhouse.org/about-us/our-people/alan-houmann>
- [79] <https://www.ambassadorllp.com/who-we-are>
- [80] <https://winteroak.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/enemiesofthepople--1.pdf>
- [81] <https://www.chathamhouse.org/about-us/our-people/rob-macaire>
- [82] <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/change-of-her-majestys->

ambassador-to-iran

[83] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/BG\\_Group](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/BG_Group)

[84] <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/change-of-her-majestys-ambassador-to-iran>

[85] <https://www.lbc.co.uk/news/uk/dominic-raab-condemns-irans-arrest-uk-ambassador/>

[86] <https://www.gov.uk/government/people/rob-macaire>

[87] <https://www.chathamhouse.org/about-us/our-people/rob-macaire>

[88] <https://www.chathamhouse.org/about-us/our-people/herbert-swaniker>

[89] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Clifford\\_Chance](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Clifford_Chance)

[90] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/10/14/a-crime-against-humanity-the-great-reset-of-1914-1918/>

[91]

[https://www.cliffordchance.com/people\\_and\\_places/people/lawyers/gb/herbert-swaniker.html](https://www.cliffordchance.com/people_and_places/people/lawyers/gb/herbert-swaniker.html)

[92] <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/european-ai-alliance>

[93] <https://www.techuk.org/developing-markets/intelligent-infrastructure.html>

[94] <https://www.chathamhouse.org/about-us/our-people/joanna-cound>

[95] <https://childrenshealthdefense.org/defender/blackrock-vanguard-own-big-pharma-media/>

[96] <https://www.afr.com/politics/rothschild-puts-faith-in-blackrock-20020522-k1iew>

[97]

<https://web.archive.org/web/20240502132232/https://www.agefi.fr/patrimoine/les-metiers/un-fonds-rothschild-hdf-is-gere-par-blackrock>

[98] <https://www.audleygroup.com/audley-group-and-blackrock-real-assets-create-new-half-a-billion-pound-joint-venture-2/>

[99] <https://www.ft.com/content/3d6041fb-5747-4564-9874-691742aa52a2>

[100]

[https://web.archive.org/web/20231002041225/https://www.rothschildandco.com/siteassets/publications/rothschild\\_and\\_co/2023/quarterly\\_results/fr\\_randco\\_2023\\_t1\\_cp.pdf](https://web.archive.org/web/20231002041225/https://www.rothschildandco.com/siteassets/publications/rothschild_and_co/2023/quarterly_results/fr_randco_2023_t1_cp.pdf)

[101] <https://www.blackrock.com/corporate/newsroom/press-releases/article/corporate-one/press-releases/blackRock-agrees-to-acquire-global-infrastructure-partners>

[102] <https://www.chathamhouse.org/about-us/our-people/joanna-cound>

count

[103] <https://www.chathamhouse.org/about-us/our-people/rhodri-williams-0>

[104]

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American\\_International\\_Group#2008\\_liquidity\\_crisis\\_and\\_government\\_bailout](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_International_Group#2008_liquidity_crisis_and_government_bailout)

[105] <https://www.weforum.org/people/rhodri-williams/>

[106] <https://www.chathamhouse.org/about-us/our-people/david-nussbaum>

[107] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2023/07/12/the-church-of-england-enslaving-gods-children/>

[108] <https://www.international-alert.org/about/impact/>

[109] <https://twitter.com/intalert/status/1787408633669554531>

[110] <https://www.anthesisgroup.com/about/>

[111] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Drax\\_Group](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Drax_Group)

[112] <https://www.biofuelwatch.org.uk/2021/axe-drax-demonstration-drax-court-case/>

[113] <https://axedrax.uk/>

[114] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/04/15/charles-empire-the-royal-reset-riddle/>

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

[116] <https://nodealfornature.wixsite.com/info>

[117] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/04/15/charles-empire-the-royal-reset-riddle/>

[118] <https://greenallianceblog.org.uk/2023/03/17/how-can-the-uk-build-its-own-green-industrial-policy/>

[119] <https://green-alliance.org.uk/about/>

[120] <https://green-alliance.org.uk/about/partners/>

[121] <https://corporateeurope.org/en/chemical-romance-politicians-basf>

[122] <https://www.chathamhouse.org/about-us/our-people/sam-alvis>

[123] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2023/11/14/tony-blair-and-the-rothschilds/>

[124] <https://www.chathamhouse.org/about-us/our-people/sam-alvis>

[125] <https://www.chathamhouse.org/about-us/our-people/juliet-dryden>

[126] <https://www.chathamhouse.org/about-us/our-people/juliet-dryden>

[127] <https://www.bisa.ac.uk/news/bisafcd0-model-nato-2023-over-100-students-30-universities>

[128] <https://www.stir.ac.uk/news/2022/march-2022-news/stirling->

politics-student-recognised-at-nato-simulation-event/  
 [129] <https://www.bisa.ac.uk/members/awards-and-prizes/new-voices-cultural-relations-prize>  
 [130] <https://web.archive.org/web/20050620074259/http://www.britishcouncil.org/business-our-business-partners-client-list.htm>  
 [131] <http://www.britishcouncil.org/business-our-business-partners-client-list.htm>  
 [132] <https://www.chathamhouse.org/about-us/our-people/anita-lowenstein-dent>  
 [133] <https://www.t2tinternational.org/history-mission-ethos>  
 [134] <https://www.t2tinternational.org/history-mission-ethos>  
 [135] <https://www.t2tinternational.org/our-work->  
 [136] <https://www.t2tinternational.org/partnersandsupporters>  
 [137] <https://www.sjpfoundation.co.uk/about-us>  
 [138] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/St.\\_James%27s\\_Place\\_plc](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/St._James%27s_Place_plc)  
 [139] <https://www.jewishnews.co.uk/jewish-aid-worker-honoured-by-pm-for-launching-educational-charity-in-ghana/>  
 [140] <https://www.chathamhouse.org/about-us/our-people/andrew-payne>  
 [141] <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2020/01/11/trump-just-deescalated-middle-east-heres-why-we-shouldnt-be-surprised/>  
 [142] <https://press.armywarcollege.edu/parameters/vol54/iss1/8/>  
 [143] <https://press.armywarcollege.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3274&context=parameters>  
 [144] <https://theconversation.com/middle-east-conflict-joe-biden-must-weigh-the-risks-of-using-force-in-an-election-year-222410>  
 [145] <https://instituteforglobalaffairs.org/about/>  
 [146] <https://www.chathamhouse.org/about-us/our-people/john-berriman>  
 [147] <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PwC>  
 [148] <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PwC#Controversies>  
 [149] [https://web.archive.org/web/20050407205849/http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/05\\_15/b3928047\\_mz011.htm](https://web.archive.org/web/20050407205849/http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/05_15/b3928047_mz011.htm)  
 [150] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/04/15/charles-empire-the-royal-reset-riddle/>  
 [151] <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2023-01-17/law-firm-norton-rose-s-frankfurt-offices-raided-in-german-cum-ex-probe>  
 [152] <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/CumEx-Files>

# JOINED DOTS AND SPONTANEOUS SYNCHRONICITY

## 1. Joined dots

Over the last few years I have presented and compiled vast amounts of information on the activities and nature of the thing I call the criminocracy.

Here is a list, with links, of specific subjects that have been covered on the Winter Oak site by me and other contributors:

*Charles III*

*The Commonwealth*

*The Church of England*

*The Pope*

*Tony Blair*

*Chatham House*

*Klaus Schwab*

*The Great Reset*

*The WEF*

*WEF Global Shapers*

*The First World War*

*Ukraine-Russia war*

*Fake terrorism*  
*False-flag terrorism*  
*The climate scam*  
*Development*  
*Sustainable development*  
*BRICS*  
*BRICS and China*  
*China and BRICS*  
*The Olympics*  
*Impact slavery*  
*Ronald Cohen*  
*Smart cities*  
*Smart stations*  
*Eugenics*  
*Vaccines*  
*More on vaccines*  
*Bill Gates*  
*The chemicals industry*  
*Communism*  
*Global governance and the left*  
*Fascism and the left*  
*Funding of left activism*  
*Infiltration*  
*Fake-right opposition*  
*The Edge Fund*  
*Intersectionality*  
*Repression*  
*Global inquisition*  
*Censorship*  
*Manipulation*

*Fake anti-semitism*

*Smears*

*More smears*

*Global corruption*

*The Rothschilds*

*More on the Rothschilds*

To follow the links to these resources, simply go to the online version of this article. [1]

Looking back over all this, I think I can say that the dots have been joined.

Not every single one of them, of course – there is still plenty of detail to be revealed – but enough dots and joinings for an intelligent reader to be able to identify the shape and scale of the criminocratic beast.

Of course there will always be those who, for whatever reason, refuse to acknowledge the existence of what is clearly visible to anyone paying full attention.

Commentators, on social media mainly, try to dispute this reality in a number of ways.

Sometimes they try to redivide the whole picture that has emerged, by claiming that a certain part of it is more important than the rest.

If an article focuses on one area, they claim it is ignoring another. “It’s not that, it’s this!” Labels come into play a lot here.

On other occasions people say that the picture painted does not go far enough, that



those identified are not the real culprits, that there is another level of intrigue that I have somehow always missed.

For instance, there are those who think that the British royal family are the real controllers of the world and merely pretend to be pawns of international bankers.

Why they would want to do that completely evades me – it's hardly going to increase the respect felt for them by their "subjects", is it?

A more common objection is, of course, that the existence of the criminocratic monopoly is simply not possible, that we live in a pluralistic world of competing interests and that it is absurd to imagine that one small group could have taken control over absolutely everything.

I refer these critics to the board game *Monopoly*, and in particular to the end of the game when one player is in an entirely dominant position.

We know that it is just a matter of time before he or she will bankrupt their rivals and "win" the game by achieving the aim as stated in its title.

To certain types, who consider themselves altogether "superior", conspiracy realists like me are apparently simpletons, naive idiots who don't understand how the world really works and, on the basis of paranoid assumptions, have constructed a fantasy version that answers some

emotional need or intellectual deficiency.

My answer to these critics would be to invite them to read all the detail in the articles above and then to honestly reconsider their judgement.

But I know that most will never do that. If they were really interested in the truth, they would have discovered it already.

Finally, there are those critics whose “arguments” amount simply to insults.

As I have often pointed out, it is possible these days to be accused of “anti-semitism” on the basis of nothing at all.

To use the word “banksters”, to speak of financial parasites, or of an octopus of global control are all deemed to be “anti-semitic” by inquisitors who seem unaware of the extent to which this judgement itself reinforces the connection they are supposedly challenging.

To criticise Israel or Zionism is treated by these censors as being the same thing as hating Jews, even when those making the criticism are themselves Jews – of the “self-hating” variety, evidently.

To even mention the Rothschilds is to commit a cardinal sin from this blinkered perspective.

To ask, as I am now doing, how a “Jewish” label can automatically exempt an individual or group from all public scrutiny is regarded, by their twisted logic, as further aggravation of the

same “offence”!

For me, the real crime would be to avoid seeing, or describing, the criminocratic conspiracy for fear of facing such criticism and smears.

Only when we have accurately identified the oppressors of humankind can we ever hope to topple them.

## **2. Spontaneous synchronicity**

The other day somebody asked me how we could ever reasonably expect to break free from the system and create our own parallel societies, given the scale and ferocity of the violence with which that system has always forced everyone into its “inclusive” slave-camp world.

My response was that, in order to be successful, this breaking-away would have to take place nearly everywhere at the same time, leaving the system without the resources to suppress everyone at once.

When the other person quite reasonably queried whether this scenario could ever really happen, my reply was based on my understanding that the human species is not merely an umbrella term designating billions of separate individual human beings, but is itself a living organism.

We all know the term “Zeitgeist”, referring

to the spirit of the times, the ideas in the collective air at any given moment.

We have also perhaps heard about the apparently strange synchronicity of people inventing the same thing, or having the same insight, at the same time in different parts of the world.

This only makes sense if we see individuals, for all our necessary sense of subjective self, as ultimately cells of larger bodies – these are not just humankind, in fact, but also the totality of our world and indeed the living cosmos as a whole.

The dots are all already joined, and always have been – it is only our awareness of the connections that can be lost.

While most people's lives are usually focused on individual survival and well-being, there are moments when they are filled with the overwhelming urge – the need, even – to stand up against a great evil happening in the outside world.

When they go out into the streets, they find that there are thousands more like them, who have appeared through what Gustav Landauer called “a sort of spontaneous generation”.

This spontaneous synchronicity is, I believe, a manifestation of the collective spirit overriding individual subjectivity at a moment of great crisis or danger, allowing the people to rise

together at one time with one voice.

I have seen this happen on a few occasions in my life – such as with the massive rejection of the Iraq war by the British public, the vast support and enthusiasm for the Gilets Jaunes uprising in France, [2] the pro-freedom protests everywhere from 2020 [3] and today the worldwide outrage against Israel and the Zionist establishment that supports it.

All these revolts were and are, in fact, *against the very same criminocracy* – despite the ongoing efforts from certain quarters to separate, in our minds, the last two.

Growing awareness of the nature of the ruling mafia also brings us deeper understanding of what our resistance represents and what is at stake.

After I had written the first half of this article, I came across a powerful piece by the Palestinian author and activist Susan Abulhawa.

She writes: “Power adapted since the 1960s, creating new stops, levers, gates and gatekeepers.

“They lulled us back into their system, rebooted it with greater cruelty and corruption, and retooled it with distractions and celebrity worship while they consolidated and concentrated power in the hands of a tiny minority...

“All dots are connecting now. All the borders

fade, leaving us united to confront this greedy genocidal minority everywhere.

“If we allow the wheels of this genocidal Zionist engine to keep turning, there will be no more limits to fascism”. [4]

[1] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2024/05/24/joined-dots-and-spontaneous-synchronicity/>

[2] <https://winteroak.org.uk/the-gilets-jaunes/>

[3] <https://winteroak.org.uk/the-great-resist/>

[4]

<https://electronicintifada.net/content/gaza-our-moment-truth/46401>

## WARS, RESETS AND THE GLOBAL CRIMINOCRACY

Over the last few years, I have been doing a bit of research into the connections and parallels between the Great Reset and war.

Although my focus has been mostly on the First World War, I have come to the conclusion – shocking for some, perhaps, but utterly unsurprising for others – that the agenda behind all modern wars is the same as that behind the Great Reset, Fourth Industrial Revolution, New World Order or whatever else you choose to call it.

This agenda – a long-term and multi-faceted agenda – is that of the entity I have taken to calling the criminocracy, a global mafia which, as I explained in my booklet ‘Enemies of the People’, is dominated by the Rothschild financial and industrial empire.

The overall aim is the consolidation and expansion of the criminocracy’s power and wealth, the two terms being virtually synonymous in this corrupted era that René Guénon termed the Reign of Quantity.

We can break this down into three aspects:

Short-term goals – ie: given that the whole thing is ultimately about money, *immediate financial advantage*.

Medium-term goals – ie: the setting-up of *forthcoming financial advantage*.

Long-term goals – the creation of the social conditions which will be to the *financial advantage of the criminocracy in decades to come*.

As far as short-term financial advantages to the Great Reset are concerned, as reflected in its initial Covid phase, they are quite obvious.

Firstly there were the profits from the sale of the so-called vaccines themselves – purchased and indemnified across the world by public authorities in an atmosphere in which there was no room for democratic scrutiny or debate.

Secondly, there was all the new equipment that could be sold, again globally, on the back of the so-called pandemic: face masks, plastic screens, handwash, signage, PCR tests and so on.

Thirdly there was the financial advantage gained by large businesses, particularly those operating online, from the lockdowns that severely affected smaller businesses.

In fact, Klaus Schwab of the WEF openly boasted about this in his 2020 book *Covid-19: The Great Reset*.

He wrote: “In the US, Amazon and Walmart hired a combined 250,000 workers to keep up



with the increase in demand and built massive infrastructure to deliver online. This accelerating growth of e-commerce means that the giants of the online retail industry are likely to emerge from the crisis even stronger than they were in the pre-pandemic era... It is not by accident that firms like Alibaba, Amazon, Netflix or Zoom emerged as ‘winners’ from the lockdowns”. [1]

In terms of war the most obvious cause of quick profit is from sales of armaments.

The arms trade is a key part of the criminocratic empire – as revealed by the term “military-industrial complex”.

At the time of the First World War, for example, Britain’s arms trade was controlled by a monopolising ring based around Vickers Ltd; Armstrong, Whitworth and Co Ltd; John Brown and Co Ltd; Cammell, Laird & Co, and the Nobel Dynamite Trust.

Historians Gerry Docherty and Jim Macgregor, who show how the criminocrats created and prolonged the war for their own profit, note: “The ring equated to a vast financial network in which apparently independent firms were strengthened by absorption and linked together by an intricate system of joint shareholding and common directorships.

“It was an industry that challenged the Treasury, influenced the Admiralty, maintained high prices and manipulated public opinion”. [2]

War also calls for vast amounts of raw materials, not just to manufacture the guns, ammunition, tanks, ships and aircraft, and all the associated paraphernalia, but also to transport goods and men over oceans and continents.

The Rothschild gang's dominant role in the global oil industry, as well as in iron and steel and in railways, meant their cash tills were ringing heartily from this huge surge in demand – on both sides of the 1914-18 conflict.

There are other aspects of immediate financial gain, in the past and in the present, that are hard to identify with precision, because they fall into the realm of clearly criminal behaviour and thus are even more carefully concealed than other forms of skullduggery.

Two centuries ago, during the Napoleonic wars, the Rothschilds took advantage of food shortages and spiralling prices to operate on the black market in their home city of Frankfurt and sold provisions to armies at a considerable profit.

British goods, including cotton fabric, sugar, indigo and tobacco, were also transported across the Channel, via the Rothschilds' warehouses, in defiance of Napoleon's blockade.

War-related sanctions can be a profitable affair for those with the right contacts.

“Humanitarian” relief in wartime is often a convenient cover for massive and highly dubious

transfers of money.

Docherty and Macgregor explain how, in the First World War, “aid” to Belgium amounted to “one of the world’s greatest con jobs”. [3]

The Commission for Relief in Belgium hailed itself as “the greatest humanitarian undertaking that the world had ever seen”. [4]

It later claimed to have spent over \$13,000,000,000 on relief for the people of Belgium, a truly staggering figure for the period.

The man in charge was Herbert Clark Hoover, later president of the USA, whom the two authors do not hesitate to describe as “a confidence trickster and a crook”. [5]

With a certain inevitability, it turns out that he was deeply connected to the circles that had planned the very disaster which he was now allegedly alleviating.

Explain Docherty and Macgregor: “The American-born mining engineer lived in London for years and was a business colleague of the Rothschilds... He held shares in the Rothschilds’ Rio Tinto Company and was associated with the same all-powerful Rothschild dynasty which invested in his Zinc Corporation”. [6]

“When Herbert Hoover negotiated the massive loans for Belgian Relief from Allied governments he used the J.P. Morgan organizations in America, co-ordinated through Morgan Guaranty Trust of New York which, in

turn, made the requisite transfer to London”. [7]

“Financial muscle was never far from his center of power. The Morgan/Rothschild axis was wrapped around the entire project”. [8]

According to a report from the Kiel Institute for the World Economy earlier this year, 2024, global aid to Ukraine had already reached \$278 billion, and billions more dollars are being lined up. [9]

It is interesting to note that, back in 2007, *The New York Times* predicted that a member of the young Rothschild generation, Nathaniel, “may become the richest Rothschild of them all” thanks to “bold bets in this era’s new-money investment vehicles” and the family’s traditional geopolitical foresight. [10]

It added: “The man in line to be the fifth Baron Rothschild is close to becoming a billionaire through a web of private equity investments in Ukraine”.

The medium-term source of financial profit from such grandiose rackets arises from the huge amounts of public money that are thrown into them under the pretext of an “emergency”.

The “magic money tree” of public spending suddenly becomes infinitely bountiful when faced with the all-eclipsing “crisis” of pandemic, war, terrorism or climate change.

For instance, the British government estimates the total cost of its Covid-19 measures

as ranging from £310 billion to £410 billion. [11]

Some of the most expensive schemes included the Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme (sometimes called the furlough scheme) and NHS Test and Trace.

As to the key question of where exactly this money came from, with tax revenue down because of lockdowns, it reports that it increased borrowing to £313 billion in 2020/21 alone.

*Borrowing from the global bankers, that is.*

Lucrative loans to governments for waging wars have been part of the Rothschilds' racketeering playbook since Napoleonic times.

Historian Niall Ferguson notes that the banking family found themselves "repeatedly on both sides of decisive conflicts which were to recast the map of Europe". [12]

The aftermath of war was also a great source of profit. In 1871, the Rothschilds were on hand to lend massive amounts of money to the French state to pay off its reparations after defeat to Prussia, in what Ferguson describes as "the biggest financial operation of the century". [13]

The post-war dividend also comes from loans and contracts for the "building back better" of devastated countries.

The third way in which the criminocrats profit from wars, as from the Great Reset, is the long-term effect such events have on society.

The cash-starved states involved, up to the

neck in debt, have no choice but to go along with the bankers' idea of how best to rebuild their countries.

After both world wars, the idea of a "post-war" reality, to which people had to adapt, was used to ramp up industrialism and modernity, destroying traditional agriculture and communities and declaring old ways of thinking and living as being unsuited to the brave new normal.

Schwab hoped that Covid would have the same effect, creating a new historical separation between "the pre-pandemic era" and "the post-pandemic world". [14]

All such showcase events, including most so-called "revolutions" and so-called terrorist attacks like 9/11, are, in my view, merely "shock and awe" operations designed to push traumatised populations further into the prison-camp society favoured by the criminocrats.

Rootless, helpless, disorientated, brainwashed people, entirely dependent on the system for their every need, cut off from each other, from nature, from reality and from spiritual belonging, are the ideal fodder for the criminocrats' money-making machine.

With this in mind, it is not surprising that in each case we see the same means being rolled out to ensure that populations go along with the agenda.

Most obvious is the full-on propaganda from all the state and corporate media.

In 2020 it was the tone and extent of this propaganda, as encountered via French state radio, that indicated to me that the Covid “pandemic” was a psy-ops.

This propaganda has to go so far as to create a sense of absolute moral conviction in the population and thus a conditioned fear or hatred of anyone who refuses to toe the line.

In times of war, dissenters and doubters are portrayed as cowards, traitors, fifth-columnists working on behalf of the despised enemy and during the Covid scam we were represented as irresponsible and selfish idiots, putting the lives of others at risk and perhaps following some insidious “far-right” agenda.

To help impose this moral conformity, the system deploys groups which it apparently does not control and whose positions carry moral weight with certain key parts of the population.

During Covid, the “left” not only echoed every part of the official narratives concerning lockdowns, social distancing and so-called vaccines, but also adopted a very aggressive stance towards dissidents, vilifying and ostracising anyone, even from their own ranks, who dared sympathise with pro-freedom protesters – as I myself experienced, in fact.

During the First World War, one of the

groups wheeled out to support the criminocratic agenda was a wing of the Suffragette movement.

Apparently in return for agreeing to stop their militant activities, Emmeline and Christabel Pankhurst were handed a government grant.

Emmeline declared her support for the war effort and began to demand military conscription for British men, while Christabel Pankhurst demanded the “internment of all people of enemy race, men and women, young and old, found on these shores”. [15]

And the suffragettes were among those women who handed white feathers to males not in uniform, including teenage boys as young as 16.

Along with propaganda, comes censorship, considered quite normal and acceptable in times of war and justified during so-called pandemics in the name of the public good.

But today the mission of the “fact-checkers” introduced during Covid is evolving into a broader attempt to defend the criminocratic agenda.

With so-called “hate” laws being hurriedly rolled out all over the place, the main target seems to be those of us who have seen through the lies and propaganda, who have joined the dots to make out the shape of the long-term plan being imposed on us by duplicitous means.



We are described as “conspiracy theorists”, which apparently automatically means we are “far right”. Our commitment to truth and freedom is interpreted as “hate” and identifying the leading role of the Rothschilds in the criminocratic empire amounts, necessarily it seems, to so-called “anti-semitism”.

The reality is, of course, very different. It is that control of our national and international institutions, as well as of the entire industrial-financial system, has fallen, by foul means, into the hands of a veritable mafia.

Because this global domination is profoundly anti-democratic and entirely illegitimate – based as it is on criminal activity and the concealment of that wrong-doing – it has to be kept secret.

The criminocracy knows that there can never be clear-sighted and united opposition to its rule while people remain trapped in its tricks and illusions and fail to even recognise its existence, let alone start talking about how to bring it down.

Our most important first task is therefore to expose its activities, to break down the multiple walls of its defences, to ignore its threats and taboos and to shout from the rooftops what it is and what it is doing to us.

[1] Klaus Schwab, Thierry Malleret, *Covid-19: The Great Reset* (Geneva: WEF, 2020), e-book. Edition 1.0, 63%.

[2] Gerry Docherty and Jim Macgregor, *Hidden History: The Secret*

*Origins of the First World War* (Edinburgh & London: Mainstream Publishing, 2013), p. 139.

[3] Jim Macgregor and Gerry Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony: How the Anglo-American Establishment Deliberately Extended WWI by Three-and-a-Half Years* (Walterville, OR: Trine Day, 2018), p. 233.

[4] George H Nash, *Herbert Hoover The Great Humanitarian 1914-1917*, p. x, cit. Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 202.

[5] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 204.

[6] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, pp. 204-05.

[7] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 229.

[8] Macgregor and Docherty, *Prolonging the Agony*, p. 231.

[9] <https://www.usnews.com/news/best-countries/articles/these-countries-have-committed-the-most-aid-to-ukraine>

[10]

<https://www.nytimes.com/2007/03/09/business/09rothschild.html>

[11] <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-9309/>

[12] Niall Ferguson, *The House of Rothschild: The World's Greatest Banker 1849-1999* (New York: Penguin, 2000), p. 89.

[13] Ferguson, p. 205.

[14] Schwab, 89%, 90%

[15] <https://spartacus-educational.com/WpankhurstE.htm>

## EVIL BEYOND WORDS

In a previous phase of my existence I used to pen regular film reviews for the local paper at which I worked.

I got into the habit of writing these as soon as possible after I had seen the film in question, so that I would still be in touch with the impression that it had made on me and remember the salient details.

So it's somewhat surprising for me to realise that I have taken several weeks to write about the film I am going to describe.

What has happened, I think, is that it made a very deep impression on me that I have needed time to fully process.

*Les Survivantes* ('the female survivors', literally, or perhaps better rendered as 'the women who survived') [1] is a new French documentary from director Pierre Barnérias, known for his 2020 exposé of the Covid scam, *Hold-Up*. [2]

Given the vitriol and censorship aimed at that film, and given the even more controversial subject matter of *Les Survivantes*, I would have

expected only to have been able to view it via some rebellious non-corporate website.

So it was a little surreal to find myself sitting down to watch it at a massive multiplex cinema in an out-of-town commercial zone in Nîmes.

The subject of the film is the abuse of children: not just sexual abuse, including violent rape, but also the torture of children, the dismembering and murdering of children and the forcing of children to watch and participate in the abuse, torture, dismembering and murdering of other children.

It has taken me a month to be able even to write that sentence, so it is hard to imagine how difficult it must have been for the survivors of such activity to talk in public about what they experienced.

Indeed, as one of them explained, part of the purpose of the activity – in particular the forced participation – was to traumatise and shame them into a lifelong silence that these women have now broken.

An important aspect of the film is that these crimes were not carried out by random individuals but by a network – when they met up, some of the eight women realised they had been abused by the same individuals in different locations across France, Belgium and Switzerland.

As the survivors told their stories, the nature of this network became increasingly apparent – there was talk of powerful people, politicians, heads of state and billionaires.

A former employee of Crédit Suisse (which cropped up in my recent article on the Rothschilds’ Chatham House operation) described how he had walked out of a party hosted by his banker boss when it started to involve a simulated satanic child sacrifice involving the banker’s daughter.

Just in case there was any lingering doubt, the caption at the end of the film refers to the network being run by “global financial power”.

We have, of course, all heard about Jeffrey Epstein or Jimmy Savile, with dark rumours about activities even less acceptable than sex with underage girls and boys.

But I for one never wanted to think about this too much, didn’t really want to emotionally embrace its reality, even though I accepted it intellectually.

*Les Survivantes* forced me to think about it, to feel it through the words of little girls who had suffered, survived and somehow found the courage, as women, to tell the world what had happened.

I know I was not the only person who walked out of the cinema desperately suppressing the desire to burst into angry tears.

In the subsequent weeks, the shock of what was described in the film has percolated into my thinking.

I thought I was being pretty hard-line in the language I use to describe the circles involved in all this, using labels like “criminocrats” or “mafia” and adjectives like “corrupt”, “odious” or “vile”.

However, I now realise I have been letting them off the hook. They’re worse than any of that.

It is already difficult to understand how anyone could deliberately cause the deaths of millions of people in wars, deliberately poison them with toxic drugs, deliberately destroy the natural world, polluting land, air and water, deliberately wreck communities and cultures, cynically enslave and exploit people across the world.

But how can we digest the fact that members of this same global financial power also enjoy raping, torturing, dismembering and murdering little children?

What words can we use to describe what they are? Even “Satanist”, which is presumably how they regard themselves, seems too weak.

I’ve always thought that mere human beings can no more be entirely evil than they can be entirely good.

Now I’m not so sure.

[1] <https://lessurvivantes-lefilm.com/>

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

## A SELF-CONSCIOUS PHILOSOPHY OF RESISTANCE

There have always been two prongs to my writing – as well as analysing and exposing the criminocratic agenda, I try to counter it with a coherent alternative worldview.

I have often pointed out that these two prongs belong to one and the same political pitchfork, but I think I got this across particularly clearly in the talk I gave in Edinburgh, Scotland, in May 2024.

There I described how the philosophy that I call organic radicalism can be regarded as the ideological counterpart to the understanding and critique of corrupt contemporary society that the system labels “conspiracy theory”.

Once somebody has seen through one particular set of official lies they find themselves in a different political dimension.

As well as becoming aware of the truth hidden by the specific manipulation they have seen through, they also grasp the broader context of those lies.

They start to see how our understanding of



reality is restricted and distorted by the system and also for what purposes this is carried out in so many areas of life.

The further they look into all this, the more they become horribly aware that everything most people think is true, is fake.

They realise that we are all living inside a vast racket, a scam, an artifice that has been manufactured to exploit us, to reduce and restrict us, to steal from us, to disempower us, to rule over us.

Ultimately we are imprisoned within this machine by violence, disguised as the “legitimate” monopoly of force held by criminal organisations calling themselves “states” and claiming to represent “the nation”.

As Leo Tolstoy wrote in ‘The Slavery of Our Times’ in 1900: “Laws are rules, made by people who govern by means of organized violence, for non-compliance with which the non-complier is subjected to blows, to loss of liberty, or even to being murdered”.

Our rulers like to remind us from time to time of the potential violence that is always at their disposal and evidently take a sadistic delight in so doing.

Whether this takes the form of sending in militarised cops to attack unarmed protesters, or forcing people to undergo dehumanising “security” checks when they enter public

buildings or board a plane, the message of physical domination is the same.

Mostly, however, the system relies on mind control to keep us compliant.

The racket is vast and sophisticated and uses layer after layer of lies to dupe us.

It features major narratives such as “progress” – the idea that our progressive separation from nature and community under the system’s industrial tyranny is both good and inevitable – or such as the myth that we live in a democracy in which the enslaved majority make the decisions, rather than the tiny minority of slavemasters.

The racket also involves the construction of taboos around any questioning of its narratives, not just moral taboos that present dissident approaches as bad and dangerous but also intellectual taboos that insist that it is simply ridiculous, unthinkable even, to propose a future for humankind other than that being handed out to us by the system.

Moreover, inside the broad framework of the racket’s false reality is a great entanglement of lesser narratives, all designed to obfuscate the nature of the racket, to misdirect, mislead and divide, and to “nudge” us into changing our beliefs and behaviour in directions that will benefit the racketeers.

The other day I wrote about the way in

which wars and other “shock and awe” events are used to shunt us further along the dark and deadly path of “modernisation”.

But we are also constantly being drip-fed material that maintains and accelerates our departure from healthy, natural, lives into the battery-hen existence of the modern slave.

I don’t think it is mere coincidence that the term “progressive” is used to describe ideas which aid the advance of industrial “progress” by breaking down traditional social structures and denying the validity of centuries-old wisdom that would have acted as a defensive social barrier against the criminocratic assault.

Awareness of this phenomenon is central to the newly-emerging political philosophy that I call “organic radicalism”.

As I said in the Edinburgh talk, it is a “sussed” point of view, a 21st century perspective that takes into account everything that has happened since “classic” ideologies such as Marxism were formulated.

Organic radicalism takes on board the insights of the Situationist Guy Debord, who saw the existence of the Great Racket, [3] which he termed the Spectacle.

But it goes further, in that it is also fuelled by our questioning of key events that have taken place in recent decades, such as 9/11 and the “war on terror”, the climate scam, weaponised

“anti-semitism” claims, transgenderism and of course everything around Covid.

Yes, the roots of organic radicalism are in traditional wisdom and our belonging to the natural world, but the philosophy is also built on an understanding of how and why that belonging-based wisdom – our witness – [4] has been deliberately eroded.

Organic radicalism is a self-conscious philosophy, that knows why its ideas have been marginalised and smeared by the racketeers and thus understands why these ideas have to be put back at the centre of our collective imagination.

It sees the scam, exposes the lies and presents the antidote.

[1] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qiq0XsZpDzs>  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pC18QQZo\\_jk](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pC18QQZo_jk)

[2] <https://orgrad.wordpress.com/>

[3] <https://winteroak.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/the-great-racket.pdf>

[4] <https://winteroak.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/the-withway-paul-cudenec.pdf>

## ELECTORAL FRAUD: THE ILLUSION OF DEMOCRACY

With big elections looming up all over the place, I thought this would be a good moment to remind people of what a fraud they are, on many levels.

### **i. Captured parties.**

It has become very obvious to very many people, particularly since Covid, that the main political parties everywhere are all controlled by the criminocracy. No politicians are allowed anywhere near power unless they are signed up to the whole agenda of totalitarian “sustainable development”, public-private “partnership”, pouring money into Ukraine and pretending that Israel is not carrying out mass murder in Gaza. Control of the political parties has been in place for a very long time indeed, not just by means of bribery and blackmail but also through infiltration by the public-funded “intelligence” services set up to serve the criminocrats’ interests. Even the smallest and most insignificant political group is targeted and it is

only a matter of time before any new initiative, no matter how genuine, will be taken over. If it cannot be successfully turned in a direction that suits the powers-that-shouldn't-be, it will be destroyed from the inside by bitter disputes and splits, playing on existing fault lines and personal weaknesses.

## ii. Why parties anyway?

A month or two ago, some friends and I secured a meeting with our local *député* (member of parliament), who is in the main left-wing opposition party, La France insoumise, to ask him some questions. High on our list was the threat of the WHO treaty, giving unprecedented control to a global body in the case of a future “pandemic”. Since he hadn't even heard of the issue, one of our group explained it all to him and then asked him whether he agreed with us, in principle, that this was a worrying prospect. He wouldn't give a personal opinion, insisting that he was committed to a collective outlook and that, basically, he would have to go and find out what the party line was before he could answer. This raises the question of to what extent an MP belonging to a political party really represents the people who elected him, or whether he in fact represents the party whose line he defends and which is in turn controlled by other interests.

What is the purpose of the party system if not to prevent representatives from speaking and voting from their own convictions, or in response to the views of their constituents?

### **iii. The problem with representation**

A deeper problem here is that of representation itself. When a population accepts to be “represented” by a politician they are essentially handing him a blank cheque to act as he (or his party) sees fit. He is under no legal obligation to carry out the promises on which he got elected and, when some new issue arises, is not expected to return to his constituents to seek their opinion. This clearly does not amount to democracy. One of the big demands of the Gilets Jaunes here in France in 2018-19 was for citizens to have the right to call for a referendum on important issues, with the direct voice of the public thus taking precedence over the indirect filter of the controlled “representative”.

### **iv. The shaping of opinion**

There are issues even with this notion of direct democracy, though. One of these is the way that public opinion is itself moulded by mass media that are owned by the same criminocrats who control the political parties and, thus, the elected

representatives. Covid showed us how effectively the majority can be conned by constant full-spectrum propaganda. These techniques could equally be used to sway a referendum. At election times, “opinion polls” relayed by corporate media form part of the manipulation, their real aim being not to reflect public opinion, but to shape it. If, for instance, a “problem” party was doing well and clearly had a chance of coming to power, the polls would announce instead that they had virtually no support and that people would do better to vote for one of the lesser-of-two-evils options. No real democracy seems possible without an independent media to properly inform the public.

## **v. Centralised society**

A further barrier to democracy is the centralised nature of our societies – centralised nationally, transnationally (such as Europe) and globally. Power flows from the top downwards, not from the people upwards, as would be the case in an actual democracy. Agendas are imposed, institutionally, and elected representatives on any level can do very little to affect them, even if they wanted to. The prime example of this is the “development” and “economic growth” which is the motor of the criminocracy’s expanding wealth and power. The “need” for this has been written



into the structure of our social organisation to the extent that public opposition to some new proposed monstrosity will always come up against a centrally-imposed brick wall. Real democracy would involve the localisation of decision-making, the end of global corporate imperialism and the restoration to communities of the right to shape their own destinies.

## **vi. A rigged game**

Given everything I have been describing, do the criminocrats ever need to physically “fix” an election? I don’t know, but I am sure that if they felt the need, and had the ability, they would do so. We should not be so naïve as to imagine that they would simply stand back and watch, with a wistful shrug, if a population anywhere voted in a government that represented a genuine threat to their power and interests. If the worst comes to the worst, there is always the option of assassinating troublesome political leaders. Or of declaring yet another “emergency”, suspending elections and switching to the kind of direct authoritarian rule favoured in Nazi Germany or the USSR. At the end of the day, their “democracy” is merely a device with which to distract and control us and, while it has served their purposes well, they do not consider it indispensable.

## EXPOSED: HOW THE CLIMATE RACKETEERS AIM TO FORCE US INTO SMART GULAGS

Shocking evidence is emerging from Australia and New Zealand of how the climate scam is being used to impose a techno-totalitarian smart-city future.

The criminocratic global imperialists often use their Commonwealth colonies to try out the most insidious escalations of their tyranny – think of Canada, New Zealand and Australia during Covid.

We can therefore assume that this is going to be the blueprint for the roll-out of their Fourth Industrial Revolution agenda across the world.

The sinister scheme in question, called “Managed Retreat”, has been exposed by independent researcher Kate Mason on her excellent Substack blog aimed at “deconstructing 4IR narratives”. [1]

The idea is that exaggerated “modelling” of the imagined effects of “climate change” is being used to define certain areas as unsuitable for human settlement.

Working hand in hand with the state is the insurance industry – long a central part of the corrupt criminocratic empire – which deems homes in these areas to be “uninsurable”.

Banks are also playing their part (*of course!*) saying they are unwilling to provide mortgages for these “uninsurable” properties.

In her latest article, Kate refers to a TV report about Kensington Banks, near Melbourne city centre, which has been newly declared a flood zone. [2]

She writes: “Property prices are expected to plummet by 20 percent. I think that’s rather conservative – who is going to buy in a flood zone? Unless it’s a developer who will raze it all to the ground and build a Smart Resilient complex”.

Meanwhile, in New Zealand, residents are up in arms about attempts to impose “retreat” from coastal areas under the pretext of a predicted rise in sea levels.

As a media report shows, they are not buying the scaremongering climate propaganda. [3]

Tim Rees said: “I’ve lived by Paraparaumu Beach since 1965 and the beach is actually getting bigger. For 45 years I’ve dived off Kāpiti Island and the rocks are still at the same height at low tide”.

Added Tania Lees: “The science isn’t settled

and there is no consensus. We don't believe the sea levels are rising significantly and [that] we will all be flooded."

Central and local government couldn't fund "a process on this scale", she said. "So far, the ratepayers have paid in excess of \$4 million for the Takutai Kāpiti process.

"We simply can't afford to spend more. If implemented, managed retreat would be in excess of \$1 billion".

As for the agenda behind all this, Kate writes: "Finding the information on climate change modelling and insurance has joined the dots for me regarding the enormous amount of pack and stack housing developments going ahead in Australia.

"They're going to need to put us all somewhere when our houses are uninsurable and we have to sell them for a pittance.

"It is clear that this is 'Resilient' Smart Cities. Everything hooked up to the internet and data collected, stored and used as modelling to dictate increasingly dystopian government measures of control and enforcement". [4]

By way of confirmation, she reveals that the Insurance Council of Australia, involved in Managed Retreat, works within the Public Private Partnership model and adheres to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, even being a foundation member of the United

Nations Principles for Sustainable Insurance.

The UN's smart gulag agenda was paraded in their 80-page booklet entitled 'Centering People in Smart Cities: A playbook for local and regional governments', as we reported in 2022. [5]

Also in 2022, a body called the Australian Climate Council released a study which estimated that 1 in 25 of all homes and commercial buildings in the country would become effectively uninsurable by 2030 because of "worsening extreme weather events".

River flooding posed the biggest risk, according to the study, with flash flooding and bushfires identified as the other main hazards contributing to properties becoming "uninsurable".

As well as calling for "managed relocations", the report stressed the need for "upscaling public investments in resilience" and to "support communities to 'build back better'".

It declared: "Towns, cities and communities must be rebuilt – where appropriate to do so – in a way that takes into account the inevitable future changes in climate and makes them more resilient".

It comes as little surprise that this report was proudly showcased on the website of the World Economic Forum... [6]

[1] <https://kate739.substack.com/>

- [2] <https://kate739.substack.com/p/managed-retreat-australia>
- [3] <https://www.nzherald.co.nz/kapiti-news/news/strong-viewpoints-as-kapiti-coast-district-council-receives-advisory-panels-recommendations-for-coastal-adaption-pathways/ZH46KU72ZJBQDPE6DFJDLXBREQ/>
- [4] <https://kate739.substack.com/p/1-in-25-australian-homes-uninsurable>
- [5] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/07/11/the-acorn-75/>
- [6] <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2022/06/climate-change-australia-insurance-crisis/>

## THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL GUILT COMPLEX

When the smoke cleared in Europe in 1945 it revealed a continent in physical and psychological ruins.

Millions lay dead from the second terrible war in a couple of decades; surviving populations were traumatised by bombing raids and invasions; great cities had been reduced to rubble and the US and Soviet military empires were dividing up the spoils between them, imposing economic, cultural and political control over their respective spheres of influence.

Added to that was a sense of guilt for what people had learned about the concentration camps – this was centred on Germans, of course, but shared by the rest of Europe, the West, humankind even.

This guilt smoothed the way for the long-planned creation of the Zionist state on Palestinian soil, reining back criticism of the project and its supporters.

The spectre of the Nazi regime and its crimes was also used to discredit political

movements that could plausibly be accused of sharing some aspect of its ideology.

Any nationalistic tendencies – whether against US domination, European centralisation or the power of transnational corporations and institutions – could easily be demonised as a resurgence of the Hitlerian horrors.

This device was later extended to non-nationalist criticism of the international financial system – we were told that using the term “banksters” was hate speech and that any reference to a global financial mafia was clearly an anti-semitic trope.

Even environmentalism (the real, nature-loving, kind) has been depicted as a slippery slope to fascism, as I have previously described at some length. [1]

This ridiculous claim is based on the fact that the Nazis, like today’s climate racketeers, used “green” language to initially sell their ultra-industrialist project to the public.

The “anti-semitic” smears have become increasingly far-fetched in recent years.

Anyone speaking up against the mass-murdering ethnic cleansing in Palestine, no matter how obviously non-Nazi and non-racist they are, is treated as if they were personally responsible for events at Auschwitz 80 years ago.

And any challenging of general official agendas is now likely to be met with the same



hysterical response, as I reported at the beginning of this year.

There I described how the EU Strategy on Combating Antisemitism and Fostering Jewish Life (2021-2030) justified its claims that anti-semitism was on the rise by applying the label to questioning of the Covid “pandemic”.

The authors of that report, the Institute for Strategic Dialogue (whose dubious connections I detailed in the article), is also one of several Zionist organisations behind a more recent document.

*Conspiracy Theories: A Guide for Members of Parliament and Candidates* [2] basically warns that the rule of the global military-industrial complex is threatened by people finding out what it is and what it is up to.

It phrases it slightly differently, of course: “Conspiracy theories can pose a danger to democracies, public health, social cohesion, public safety and more; they reduce trust in democratic institutions, in governments, and in mainstream, regulated media outlets. Conspiracy theories can also reduce political participation and conformity to the rule of law”.

I won’t go into all the detail, because it is similar to that in the EU report, but it represents a startling culmination of the way in which allegations of “anti-semitism” are used to defend the dominant system.

Needless to say, it continues to plug the lie that even to challenge the activities and influence of specific Jewish individuals amounts to hostility to all Jews.

Thus, in a section describing anti-semitism, it states: “The Rothschild family, a wealthy Jewish family that rose to prominence for its success in banking, has also become synonymous in far-right and far-left circles, with corrupt Jewish power that seeks global domination and undermines governments and existing social order”.

But it goes even further by effectively coming up with an all-embracing conspiracy theory of its own – namely that anti-semitism lies behind all conspiracy theories!

It also triumphantly produces a diagram to show how it thinks this works.

It regards questioning of Covid-19, The Great Reset, 5G, 15-minute cities, the climate agenda and global control as all revolving around anti-semitism, placed in the centre.

The accompanying notes, unsurprisingly, do not justify this conclusion.

For instance, the category “The Great Reset” is awarded the anti-semitism tag on the basis of the following description: “Originally a plan by the World Economic Forum to encourage governments to move toward fairer and more sustainable policies. Highjacked [sic] by

conspiracy theories claiming the plan is used to control populations and economies to benefit a small group of powerful people”.

Anti-semitism can only be identified here if the “small group of powerful people” is automatically assumed to be Jewish.

Given that the authors of the document would no doubt argue that this assumption is anti-semitic, why do they themselves make it?

Could it be because they are well aware that there is indeed a small group of powerful people behind the Great Reset agenda and that, while they are not all Jewish, they are all beholden to Rothschild-dominated (and thus Zionist) interests?

The same applies to the whole of their framing of anti-semitism as uniting all varieties of what they term conspiracy theory. When they hear people expose fake pandemics, smart cities and global totalitarianism, they know full well that their own Zionist mafia network is behind them and they therefore hear criticism of that entity.

So they simply wheel out the labels they always use to silence criticism, regardless of the fact that this criticism is not based on hostility to Jews but on hostility to criminocracy and that describing reality cannot logically be termed either “conspiracy theory” or “anti-semitic”.

I see this as an expression of their own guilt

– and a projection of that guilt on to those whom they smear as conspiracy theorists.

The authors of the report know, deep down, that they themselves are liars with callous contempt for anyone not belonging to their in-group (including anti-Zionist Jews).

So they accuse their enemies – those they feel are threatening their control – of faults that are really their own.

In the grimy and distorting mirror of their own guilty consciences, those of us who seek to discover and share the truth in the interests of freedom and humanity are therefore depicted as spreading “misinformation” and being motivated by “hate”.

Although this gaslighting projection of guilt is not meant to be an admission, it effectively plays that role.

Because the guilt is projected, it is also inverted and thus their diagram labels the factor uniting all the various conspiracies as “anti-semitism”, the term they use to smear opponents of Zionism.

*Might the inversion be inverted by imagining the term in the centre to be “Zionism”?*

Since October 2023, the Zionist affiliation of worldwide power has been plainer than ever to see and this kind of propaganda merely confirms what many already suspected.

As for the additional hypocrisy of dishonestly

tainting your political opponents with a supposed ideological connection to a genocide from eight decades ago, while fervently cheering on one that's happening right now in 2024... well, it defies description.

The louder the propagandists shout that talking about the global criminocracy is anti-semitic, the clearer the reality becomes.

Their desperate and panicky narrative does not speak of a confident and stable world governance.

Instead it tells us of a massive criminal endeavour that has arrogantly been pushed too far, too soon.

The greedy and over-fed globalist serpent has tied itself in knots of lies, has swallowed its own scaly tail, is choking on its own culpability and is spewing forth the awful truth that had to be kept hidden from its mind-manipulated victims.

[1] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2018/07/10/organic-radicalism-bringing-down-the-fascist-machine/>

[2]

<https://www.isdglobal.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/Conspiracy-Theories-Guide.pdf>

## ESCAPING THE INDUSTRIAL NIGHTMARE

Whatever happens in Sunday's bitterly divisive parliamentary elections in France, we can be sure that the next government will be committed to economic growth and technological progress.

As the excellent monthly newspaper *La Décroissance* ("Degrowth") never ceases to point out, politicians from all sides of the supposedly all-embracing "political spectrum" (*including so-called "greens"!*) speak as one in condemning the absurd, reactionary suggestion that the future shape of the country should not be dictated by the endless quest for yet more profit and production.

Fortunately there is a significant undercurrent of French thinking that fundamentally challenges the narrative spun by the many heads of the financial-industrial Hydra.

The fact that there even exists a monthly (and very widely available) newspaper promoting degrowth is an indication of the significance of this movement, as is the anger that it seems to

incite not just on the mainstream wing of the criminocracy, but also among its pseudo-radical proxies, who use all the usual smear techniques to attack it.

Because the ideas voiced by this undercurrent are generally not accessible to the English-speaking world, I thought I would write reviews of two recent books issued from that milieu.

The first of these, that I will describe in this article, is interesting in that it comes from the traditional anarchist movement – Les Editions du Monde Libertaire, the publishing wing of the Fédération Anarchiste.

I tried to get UK anarchists interested in degrowth a decade ago, but didn't meet with much enthusiasm, despite what is for me an obvious ideological compatibility.

In *La Décroissance libertaire, une étape cruciale* ('Libertarian degrowth, a crucial step'), [1] Jean-Pierre Tertrais concedes that, historically, mainstream anarchism has tended to take the "scientific" (and Marxist) line of supporting "the development of the productive forces".

Indeed, there were one or two points in his book where I feared that he himself was shying away from an outright condemnation of what Jacques Ellul called Technik!

But he continues: "Libertarians [by which he

means anarchists] have often been the first to express suspicion regarding the growing grip of Technik on everyday life". [2]

"Only libertarian principles have the capacity to get humanity out of the dead end in which it has gone astray: refusal of authority; rejection of all domination and exploitation; free association of producers; mutual aid and co-operation, federalism..." [3]

I was pleased to see that Tertrais cites not only Ellul, but also fellow organic radical inspirations William Morris, John Ruskin, Henry David Thoreau, Leo Tolstoy, Peter Kropotkin, Gustav Landauer, Emma Goldman, Voltairine de Cleyre and George Orwell.

And he shares the orgrad conviction that we can learn much from the pre-industrial past when imagining a healthy future beyond the current nightmare.

He says it's not a question of believing in a lost "golden age" but of understanding the appeal and advantages of a society based on craftsmanship and connection to the natural elements.

Tertrais describes "a rough life, but one attuned to the rhythms of plant, animal and human life, punctuated with solidarity, camp fires, festivals" and founded on "the choice of keeping a balance between a social group and the territory it occupies, whose resources are always



limited”. [4]

He contrasts this with the artificial and alienated lives that we are forced to lead in the modern industrial prison-camp world.

“This race for growth, founded on the exacerbation of a climate of competition, on permanent injunctions to go beyond our limits, contributes largely to the ‘alienation’ of the human being, to dependence on techno-science, to exhausted workers (stress, burn-out, depression, suicide) with degraded health (modern pathologies, civilisational diseases)”. [5]

In the face of this, he is scathing about those who claim that the “solution” to contemporary problems can come from racing even further down the road to industrial expansion, with their absurd claims that “we need more growth to repair the damage caused by growth, more Technik to correct the ravages of Technik!”. [6]

And he condemns the “techno-optimism” of the political classes, with their calls for “carbon neutrality”, resilient smart cities and proposals to modify the climate.

Under “sustainable development”, he observes, consumption continues to rise and “green” technologies depend on rare resources like lithium and cobalt whose extraction involves odious exploitation of workers and serious pollution of the natural world. [7]

Tertrais correctly identifies the very concept

of “development” as being a primary source of the evil afflicting our world and describes how it fuels global imperialism.

The official narrative declares that “under-developed” countries are lagging behind and have to be helped to “catch up” with fully industrialised countries.

“This notion expresses the cultural imperialism of the western civilisational model and hides (badly) a post-colonial system for exploiting the resources and labour force of the global south to feed the hyper-consumerism of the north”. [8]

As I mentioned, the central importance, to the system, of the development/progress narrative is such that it cannot tolerate anyone challenging it.

Tertrais remarks: “Those who question the political, social and philosophical implications of technology are instantly accused of ‘technophobia’, obscurantism... of wanting to return to the candle”. [9]

“Massive adherence to productivism and the glorification of technological progress have prevented any critical perspective.

“The hyper-technologisation of our ways of life comes with countless ‘side effects’. Machines, which were supposed to free us from wearisome or constraining tasks, from the inconveniences of everyday life, have – despite the services they

can occasionally provide – ended up producing a diminished human being”. [10]

So how does the author propose that we get out of all this?

In fact, he thinks the process is already beginning, with increasing numbers of people dropping out of their jobs and/or turning their backs on city life and seeking a different existence in the countryside.

He says that 600,000 to 800,000 people moved out of conurbations in France between 2015 and 2018, with Covid no doubt increasing that figure. [11]

How long that will be allowed to continue, with the global “managed retreat” agenda of forcing people out of the countryside and into smart cities, remains to be seen!

Tertrais writes about the importance of “going back to real life”, [12] and rediscovering a “DIY” style of living, including gardening, repairing, clothes-making and cooking. [13]

This would involve “listening to our real needs, living with little but with intensity, turning our backs on success, ‘progress’ (TV, computer, car...), prioritising family life, personal blossoming, rediscovering know-how and a sense of scale, reconnecting with nature, learning to manage our own time, enjoying the richness of social interactions, the sense of being useful...” [14]

This, though, is just the start, he explains.

“If the original motivation is not revolutionary as such, it can expand and assume a political dimension: questioning of paid work, hierarchy, competition, the market, an interest in self-organised collectives, forms of mutual aid, civil disobedience or popular education”. [15]

Anti-industrialism in France is not just an idea, but also a physical movement, which is probably best known for the ZAD (Zone à Défendre, “Zone to Defend”) which successfully occupied an area of land near Nantes and permanently prevented the construction of a new airport.

Currently there are important struggles being waged against a new motorway near Toulouse and against industrial-scale reservoirs that are being built all over the place.

Tertrais notes that those involved are “predominantly young people who, between hope and rage, have decided to break with a society whose values they reject and who seek to live otherwise”. [16]

He says the younger generation in France are politicised in a different way to their elders, “with two guiding values, freedom and respect”. [17]

While part of this struggle is essentially defensive – such as protecting allotments, opposing the expansion of a quarry or the

concreting-over of the countryside [18] – there is also a pro-active aspect, taking the fight to the system.

Writes Tertrais: “Sabotage, which emerges from civil disobedience and direct action, is a growing craze.

“Faced with the limits of polite protest, more and more activists are turning to it... pipelines, surveillance cameras, speed cameras, phone masts (170 sabotaged in one year), transport infrastructure... the damage is accelerating”. [19]

“For so long considered unacceptable by public opinion, sabotage seems more and more legitimate”. [20]

[1] Jean-Pierre Tertrais, *La Décroissance libertaire, une étape cruciale* (Paris: Editions du Monde Libertaire, 2023). All subsequent page references are to this work.

[2] p. 98.

[3] p. 8.

[4] pp. 54-55.

[5] p. 33.

[6] p. 38.

[7] p. 95.

[8] p. 20.

[9] p. 91.

[10] p. 96.

[11] p. 102.

[12] p. 80.

[13] p. 57.

[14] p. 104.

[15] p. 104.

[16] p. 119.

[17] p. 113.

[18] p. 118.

[19] pp. 119-120.

[20] p. 120.

## DELIBERATE DISPOSSESSION AND OUR STRUGGLE FOR AUTONOMY

People across the world being “locked down” in digital prisons during the Covid period was not a one-off event but “the culmination of tendencies which have been at work for a long time”, [1] says French author Aurélien Berlan.

The message of *Terre et liberté: la quête d'autonomie contre le fantasme de délivrance* (‘Land and freedom: the quest for autonomy against the fantasy of deliverance’) is that we have been dispossessed and disempowered – systematically reduced to total dependency on an industrial system that does not wish us well.

When one also considers the war on small farmers being conducted under the same Great Reset banner, and the sinister “managed retreat” project to clear people out of the countryside and into smart cities, [2] his warning rings even more true.

Berlan writes: “In the 20th century, the working classes of industrialised nations became dependent, for their subsistence, on a system over which they had no control, contrary to the

ruling classes. And as the latter also controlled the state, they had their hands on the power to police and to feed.

“We can understand the feeling of powerlessness that has become so widespread today. Consumer society is based on the delegation of our material existence and we have become its hostages”. [3]

Because modern lives depend on industrial infrastructure like the electricity grid and transport networks, we are in thrall to the “big state and industrial organisations that operate them”, [4] he says.

Our loss of autonomy is reflected in the standardisation of life and culture: “The more we live somewhere in the same way as everywhere else (when we eat the same world food, when we follow the same fashions, etc), the more our way of life is heteronomous, dependent on the global market”. [5]

“Industrial development led to radical transformations in the means by which culture was spread. The emergence of mass media gradually penetrated to the heart of society, even into the private realm...

“This allowed state and Capital to invite themselves into each and every household and turn family intimacy into mere proximity: the life of the family was no longer centred on itself, but turned towards the consumption of ‘cultural



content' produced elsewhere in an industrial manner.

"Mass media were, basically, the Trojan Horse through which the private sphere was invaded by social forces advancing cultural standardisation". [6]

This globalising standardisation is closely linked to the drive for "economies of scale" – "as production increases, our activities are organised on a scale beyond the scope of our control and representation, being shaped by social macrostructures and destructive technology". [7]

"While knowing that this is leading to disaster, we cannot see how to get out of it: we are its prisoners, materially and mentally, individually and collectively". [8]

The general assumption that there is no other way than growth and expansion, more and more quantity and profit, is a key element in our mental imprisonment.

Writes Berlan: "In the supposed 'energy transition' that the industrial states boast about pushing, it is never a question of reducing the consumption of energy, but only of modifying the place of a certain source of energy in the overall energy production, which, like GDP, is regarded as having to grow". [9]

Providing this energy has always required, he says, some form of slavery, whether the millions of miners working themselves into an

early grave to dig up coal, or the contemporary extraction, in equally terrible conditions, of the rare metals needed for the production of “clean” energy. [10]

Individuals, says Berlan, are also trapped inside “the vast industrial machine of Capital” [11] by the requirement to have money: “the means of satisfying all needs, it thus becomes that of which we are all always in need”. [12]

In order to obtain money, we work for wages, signing a contract of employment which, in fact, amounts to a “contract of subordination”. He writes: “Employees are required to follow the directives of their employer during paid hours. This is why paid employment was long considered a new form of slavery”. [13]

Berlan underlines this connection by referring to the history of black slaves emancipated in the USA. An initiative in 1865 to give each freed family 40 acres and a mule, so they could be self-sufficient, was overturned.

“The slaves had to sell their labour to their previous masters, who were given back the redistributed land. The formally-freed blacks had no other choice beyond enduring another century of exploitation and racial segregation in the South, or migrating to the North, where industrialists were waiting with open arms to exploit them in their factories”. [14]

He observes, on a general level, that “to be

able to exist and choose our lives in complete freedom; we must have the means to live and have control over the conditions of our lives”. [15]

Otherwise, he says, we will be “at the mercy of the system and of those who run it”. [16]

Berlan points out that our lives are today totally shaped by a structure that has made itself indispensable in many different ways.

The most important of these is our food supply, of course. Not many regions, let alone families or individuals, can claim to be self-sufficient in this respect.

But the problem is even wider. The author points out, for example, that while it is easy enough to say that having a motor vehicle is not a real “need”, those living outside big towns and cities can find their everyday activities difficult without one – because they are living in a world that has been designed and built around the use of that means of transport. [17]

So how did we get here? How did those who run the system manage to successfully reduce us to a state of dependence, and thus enslavement, to their machine?

Berlan describes several intertwining strands in this process, ranging from the philosophical to the physical, and it seems clear to me that they add up to one overall act of deliberate dispossession.

The main narrative that has steered us

down the path of industrial slavery is that it in fact amounts to liberation, explains the author.

Its “progress” has supposedly freed us from the need to do all that tiresome work of growing our own food, fetching and chopping wood or washing our clothes by hand.

The modern person feels that their life is easier, more comfortable and more advanced – thanks to all the infrastructure surrounding them, they can fulfil their own individual potential in other ways, goes the story.

The industrial system is thus everywhere “accepted and perceived as favourable to freedom”. [18]

But, as we saw to such a shocking extent with the Covid totalitarianism and the ongoing threat of smart-city digital slavery, this is the inversion of the truth: our freedom is anathema to the system.

While assuring us it is liberating us, the industrial machine is actually imposing what Berlan calls “the domination of industrial organisations and the oligarchies that run them”. [19]

Not seeing this fundamental contradiction between narrative and reality requires a real leap of faith.

“Belief in Progress by means of technoscience has performed the same function, in the modern era, as religions: convincing the exploited

to be patient by saturating them with illusory promises of the ‘radiant future’ that lies before them”. [20]

Berlan traces back the idea of being “freed” from everyday subsistence tasks to the desire of ruling groups, throughout history, to achieve just this.

Their way of doing so was, of course, to get other people to do the work for them, while they got on with their “superior” activities.

How? The most obvious means, which has always lurked behind the justifying rhetoric, is physical compulsion of one kind or another.

If you deprive people of their means of self-sufficiency, such as by enclosing the common land which had always been available to them and their ancestors, they are forced to seek survival in another way.

The deliberate nature of this historical dispossession is beyond doubt and Berlan turns to industrial-imperialist Britain for confirmation of the agenda.

“The central question for the modern dominant classes was to know how to push the poor into work, how to put them at their service.

“In England and elsewhere they passed brutal laws so as to force them, under threat of death or imprisonment in public workhouses, to take on paid work”. [21]

Berlan refers to a proposal for the reform of

the Poor Law presented to the British government in 1697 by the liberal John Locke in which he outlined how to achieve “the setting of the poor on work”. [22]

Here Locke declared that people reduced to begging in order to eat – “idle vagabonds” – should be arrested, sentenced to hard labour or forcibly conscripted into the navy.

Locke pointed to the profitable potential (a million pounds in eight years, he calculated) of forcing 100,000 English peasants into “labour in the woollen or other manufacture”.

He added: “The children of labouring people are an ordinary burden to the parish, and are usually maintained in idleness, so that their labour is also generally lost to the public till they are twelve or fourteen year old”.

To cash in on the human capital of children between three and fourteen years old, Locke proposed enslaving them in “working schools”, again involving “woollen manufacture”.

He enthused: “The children will be kept in much better order, be better provided for, and from infancy be inured to work, which is of no small consequence to the making of them sober and industrious all their lives after”.

Locke identified the added bonus that their mothers would thereby also be “liberated” to work for the nascent industrial system.

A century later, in 1786, Joseph Townsend

was keen to starve the English serfs into participation in industrial society.

He wrote: “Hunger will tame the fiercest animals, it will teach decency and civility, obedience and subjection, to the most brutish, the most obstinate, and the most perverse”. [23]

In France, in 1825, liberal Charles Dunoyer addressed the problem of finding potential workers for the new factories, suggesting that those targeted, “no longer having the basis on which to look after themselves and procure the means of living, will be obliged to hire out their services”. [24]

And, back in Britain, in 1835, Andrew Ure gloated in his pro-industrialist book *The Philosophy of Manufactures*: “When capital enlists science; in her service, the refractory hand of labour will always be taught docility”. [25]

The same authoritarian fervour had been in evidence when the Luddite revolt between 1811 and 1817 led the panicking British Crown to introduce the death sentence for machine-breaking, notes Berlan. [26]

With all this in mind, it is ironic, not to say tragic, that the ruling-class enthusiasm for industrialism has been so enthusiastically shared by their supposed enemies on the “left”.

This was not always the case, Berlan notes. Before the industrial revolution, popular

movements were not calling for the labouring classes to be relieved of the need for physical effort.

Instead, their complaints revolved around the oppression and over-work inflicted on them by those in power who considered such tasks beneath them, he says.

“To this end, they demanded free access to the means of subsistence allowing them to meet their needs”. [27]

He illustrates this with reference to the “12 articles” put forward by German peasant insurrectionaries in 1525, which focused on the abolition of certain forms of domination and certain taxes, and demanded the freedom to hunt and fish, along with the restoration of common land.

Berlan concludes: “Emancipation, for the working classes, was thus not about being freed from tasks linked to everyday life, but about abolishing relationships of domination”. [28]

Even in the 19th century, French peasants were resisting the methods being deliberately deployed to force them into industrial thralldom.

In the Ariège region, the long-running “Demoiselles” revolt declared war “against the state which was depriving them, with new forestry laws, of their ancient usage rights such as gathering wood or grazing animals – which amounted to preventing them from living by



their own means, on the basis of local resources”.  
[29]

The contemporary left’s love of industrialism seems to have been based on the mistaken belief that, in using machines to exploit the forces of nature, industrialism was not exploiting human beings.

Berlan writes: “The domination of nature opens up the fantastical possibility of a complete and universal deliverance, compatible with the ideal of liberty and equality for every individual”.  
[30]

He says left-wingers “share the same ‘industrial religion’ as liberals: faith in economic and techno-scientific development.

“For Marxists, emancipation is identified with industrial progress: and the left as a whole takes it as read that it was steam power that liberated the blacks and the washing machine that emancipated women”. [31]

“This led to them theoretically separating capitalism (reduced to private property, source of the oppression) from industry (mass production, which they saw as emancipatory), even though, for two and a half centuries, capitalism’s expansion has in practice been identified with the industrialisation of production”. [32]

The left has always been fully on board the post-WW2 bandwagon of “development” says Berlan, describing this as “the official ideology of

the West”, the “new name for Progress”. [33]

*Strangely, many leftists fail to see that it is also the new name for imperialism!*

Peoples on the receiving end are certainly well aware of this. Berlan quotes one indigenous activist in Colombia as declaring in 2016: “We are fighting to not have roads and electricity – this form of self-destruction that is called ‘development’ is precisely what we want to avoid”. [34]

Indeed, he says, development everywhere really amounts to “internal colonisation”, [35] with the external occupying force being that of rapacious global Capital.

I would not want to give the impression that *Terre et liberté* focuses exclusively on the oppression of the industrial system and the failure of the left to challenge it.

Berlan writes that his book is “an invitation to dream otherwise” [36] and underpinning his critique of contemporary modernity is a vision for a non-industrial future.

Like Jean-Pierre Tertrais, whose book I recently reviewed, he cites several organic radical inspirations – William Morris, George Orwell, Gustav Landauer, Gerrard Winstanley and Mohandas Gandhi.

This desire for a different way of existing has already been physically expressed in France with the ZADs (‘Zones to Defend’) that have

sprung up in opposition to various industrial projects.

Berlan says this movement “bears witness to a desire to win back the freedom of which we have been dispossessed by the capitalist system with unfailing state support”. [37]

This is the freedom to feed ourselves without lining the pockets of the agro-industrial cartels; to live in cabins that don’t conform to planning norms or to cure ourselves with frowned-upon natural remedies.

It is “a freedom intimately connected to the land, following on from all those political movements of the 19th or 20th centuries who, from Mexican revolutionaries to Russian ‘populists’, via the Spanish anarchists, took as their rallying cry ‘Land and Freedom!’”. [38]

The aim is autonomy: to be independent, as a community, of any outside system, of the money through which it exercises its control and thus of the need to perform paid labour for that system so as to simply be able to stay alive.

One of the features of this other – and always possible – world would be the disappearance of “work” in the sense of the current wage slavery.

What would “work” mean, anyway, when we had removed the element of compulsion that makes it so objectionable?

Berlan remarks: “For a professional

musician, music would be work and digging the soil leisure, while for a farmer the opposite would be the case”. [39]

Localisation is also important, a scaling-down of production and social organisation to a level at which “direct democracy can make sense”. [40]

Berlan identifies an alternative to old “capitalist” and “communist” models in the idea of traditional local markets regulated by what he calls a “moral economy”. [41]

He finds inspiration in Alexandre Chayanov’s descriptions of the domestic economy of traditional Russian peasantry, which was based on a balance, varying from family to family, between “the degree of satisfaction of needs and the degree of hardness of work”. [42]

To get out of the current industrial-totalitarian bind, we therefore need to “rethink our needs, rediscover know-how that technology has caused us to lose, learn again to live locally”. [43]

The trouble is, of course, as Berlan points out, [44] that the industrial system doesn’t want us to escape its grip.

It did not spend centuries purposefully dispossessing us of our autonomy and self-sufficiency simply to let us slip away back into the fields and woods that our ancestors knew.

Anyone calling for genuine freedom, for

autonomy, for the relocalisation of both production and decision-making, can only ever be seen as an “enemy”. [45]

The system regards us as its property, its slaves, and will use all the considerable means at its disposal to keep us in chains.

On the physical level, Berlan says anyone trying to break free will necessarily find themselves “in open conflict with industrial society and its governance”. [46]

He warns: “Subsistence cannot make us free if we are not able to take care of our own defence”. [47]

On a pro-active note, he adds: “The secession involved in no longer feeding the mega-machine is not enough: we also have to sabotage it”. [48]

Some *ideological* self-defence, and counter-attack, is likewise badly needed.

As well as using the myth of a “liberating” progress to advance its agenda, the system has also long deployed it to condemn any “backward-looking”, “reactionary” or “utopian” calls for an exit from industrialism. [49]

Subsistence living – balancing our needs and means in harmony with our own desires and with nature – is presented as an undesirable condition.

It is associated with poverty – painted as amounting to not having enough to live on, rather than simply having enough. [50]

The idea of reducing our needs has been declared impossible by our industrialist rulers, because it “contradicts their idol – development”, [51] says Berlan, and history has been rewritten to suit the narrative.

“It’s the science dedicated to this idol, the economy, that created the notion of a subsistence economy so as to contrast it to the market economy, supposedly the source of ‘abundance’.

“As development presupposes the commodification of resources – thus their appropriation by a minority who get rich while the majority, dispossessed of their means of living, sink into misery – the idea had to be established that the entire past was afflicted with scarcity”. [52]

Anti-industrial ideas have been consigned to oblivion by “dominant thinking, even supposedly radical” [53] with, for instance, prominent social critic Michel Foucault disqualifying (in 1979) all criticism of consumer society as akin to Nazism! [54]

Meanwhile, recuperation of environmental language by pro-system authoritarians has served to further discredit the anti-industrial outlook in the minds of many.

Berlan comments: “If we want to stop worsening the socio-ecological disaster, it is not freedom that has to be restricted, as suggested by so many intellectuals and ‘personalities’ with

all their calls for an environmental state of emergency, or even an environmental dictatorship.

“Giving unlimited power to the pyromaniacs in power will never transform them into firefighters”. [55]

I should mention that Berlan was recently one of several targets for a ridiculous smear attack in an anonymous booklet published on various left-wing French websites, which I have previously dissected. [56]

It basically depicts the anti-industrial movement in France as “reactionary” and tainted with connections to various “right-wingers”, as well to as a notoriously “anti-semitic” English dissident whose words you are currently reading!

Does anyone seriously think that there is no link between the left’s historical complicity with industrialism, its general enthusiasm for the globalist “sustainable development” scam and its smear attacks directed against the anti-industrialist movement?

To what extent one can even separate the industrial-financial agenda from that of the historical “left” is a moot point, as I explained in ‘The false red flag’.

But it seems quite clear to me that the apparent angle of attack – a virtue-signalling “radical” leftist one – is fake and that the real perspective of the booklet is that of the industrial

system itself, seeking to discredit people it regards as a threat.

We have to realise, when we look at the techno-authoritarian world we live in today, that it did not come into being by chance.

Each step our society has taken on the road to this industrial prison has been taken on purpose, to drag us in that direction.

As Berlan shows, our ancestors were deliberately dispossessed of their means of living so as to force them into industrial servitude.

The myth of technological liberation, of the easier, happier life provided by so-called Progress, has been deliberately drummed into us until it seems to most to be self-evidently true.

Likewise, the dismissal of calls for autonomy, the stigmatisation of anti-industrial thinking, has been deliberately orchestrated to protect the industrialist programme.

And if all this has been done deliberately, this means that some entity has been behind it.

Berlan points to the existence of this entity on several occasions, writing about “the industrial supermarket of the globalised economy”, [57] submission to “the global market (that’s to say to the industrial powers that dominate it)” [58] and “big private and public organisations and the industrial system that they constitute”. [59]

He correctly states that modern capitalism



and colonialism are one and the same thing [60] and that we are living in a world system “that the powerful have constructed in their own interests”. [61]

It is important, in my view, to be able to combine a theoretical understanding of historical processes with an awareness of the very real physical groups pulling the strings behind the scenes.

Both realms of insight are crucial and their coherent combination essential.

It is not enough to have identified the dangers of the Great Reset, the “sustainable development” and Fourth Industrial Revolution agenda currently being imposed on us by the WEF-UN-Rothschild mafia, without grasping that this is the culmination of a centuries-long process of globalist imperialism and that the First, Second and Third Industrial Revolutions were the stepping stones that got us where we are today.

Equally, it is not enough to have completely understood the historical background, but to shy away from making the link to specific current-day threats or plans for fear of being labelled a “conspiracy theorist”, or to avoid mentioning particular industrial-financial individuals or networks lest this identify you as a so-called “anti-semite”.

We need to build a broad dissident outlook

that takes a holistic approach, combining historical with contemporary insights; detail with overview; a critique of the methods and lies of the criminocrats' dark enslaving empire with a solid and powerful alternative worldview of its own.

It is only by properly describing – to ourselves and to the outside world – the identity and methods of the enemy who has dispossessed us and, alongside this, our own vision of a free future, that we can we hope to conjure into being a resistance movement to replace the failed 19th and 20th century models that helped lead us into this dreadful trap.

[1] Aurélien Berlan, *Terre et liberté: la quête d'autonomie contre le fantasme de délivrance* (St-Michel-de-Vax: Editions La Lenteur, 2021), pp. 140-41. Subsequent page references are to that work.

[2] 'Exposed: how the climate racketeers aim to force us into smart gulags'.

[3] p. 127.

[4] p. 126.

[5] pp. 193-94.

[6] pp. 43-44.

[7] p. 155.

[8] p. 10.

[9] p. 120.

[10] p. 121.

[11] p. 20.

[12] p. 19.

[13] p. 43.

[14] p. 159.

[15] p. 166.

[16] p. 166.

[17] p. 180.

[18] p. 53.

- [19] p. 104.
- [20] p. 81.
- [21] p. 91.
- [22]
- [https://oll-resources.s3.us-east-2.amazonaws.com/oll3/store/titles/2331/Locke\\_PoorLawReform1697.pdf](https://oll-resources.s3.us-east-2.amazonaws.com/oll3/store/titles/2331/Locke_PoorLawReform1697.pdf)
- [23] <http://pombo.free.fr/townsend1786p.pdf>
- [24] Charles Dunoyer, *L'industrie et la morale considérées dans leurs rapports avec la liberté* (Paris: Sautélet, 1825), p. 373, cit. p. 116.
- [25] <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=hvd.32044010389476&seq=392&q1=science>
- [26] p. 107.
- [27] p. 144.
- [28] pp. 144-45.
- [29] p. 145.
- [30] p. 96.
- [31] p. 70.
- [32] p. 10.
- [33] p. 122.
- [34] p. 123.
- [35] p. 124.
- [36] p. 213.
- [37] p. 17.
- [38] p. 17.
- [39] p. 134.
- [40] p. 155.
- [41] p. 165.
- [42] p. 181.
- [43] p. 207.
- [44] p. 212.
- [45] p. 156.
- [46] p. 196.
- [47] p. 196.
- [48] p. 212.
- [49] p. 13.
- [50] p. 162.
- [51] p. 163.
- [52] p. 163.
- [53] p. 149.
- [54] p. 20.
- [55] p. 204.

[56] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2023/12/02/targeted-and-smeared-by-the-fake-left-thought-police/>

[57] p. 164.

[58] p. 157.

[59] p. 170.

[60] p. 157.

[61] p. 172.

## ORGANIC RADICALISM: CHALLENGING THE SYSTEM TO ITS CORE

The global criminocracy's ongoing domination of our societies depends on deceit – constant, blatant deceit in every sphere.

Its biggest lie of all is that there is no alternative to the dehumanised, centralised and degraded future it has lined up for us.

It depicts never-ending industrial “development” as inevitable and necessary, a path of improvement for humankind that forms part of our species' evolution.

If we cannot see through this deceitful narrative, the myth of Progress, we are not going to be able to understand or challenge the criminocracy's techno-totalitarian agenda.

This, of course, has long been a big failing of the “left”.

Having apparently failed to notice the extremely close links between industrialism and the money power it supposedly opposes, the “left” has enthusiastically embraced a “progressive” approach that aids the advance of the juggernaut

of development, now additionally swallowing the absurd claim that this disastrous and ever-accelerating process of destruction can magically become “sustainable”.

The changes in human behaviour that were needed to turn us into helpless victims of the Machine have generally been made under the “progressive” banner.

Old-fashioned values had to be swept away, traditional ways of living abandoned, colourful and distinctive cultures eliminated to enable the construction of grey and uniform modernity.

The “progressive” programme even involves the denial of important aspects of physical reality.

It regards it as “naïve” to be aware of human belonging to nature, “dangerous” to understand that we are born with innate qualities and not as blank slates on which can be written the demands of our industrial slavemasters and “transphobic” to insist that there is such a thing as a woman.

The attitudes of the “left” are so deeply shaped by “progressive” industrial assumptions that it does not represent a real opposition to the system – and, in my opinion, never will do so.

What other possible opposition can we identify?

The “green” movement *should* be leading the charge against industrialism and its myth of

Progress.

But much of it has been turned round 180 degrees and transformed into the climate-obsessed marketing wing of the “renewable” energy industry.

We certainly cannot hope to find thinking that inspires resistance to the horrors of the Fourth Industrial Revolution on the mainstream “right”, whose commitment to the “prosperity”, “growth” and “innovation” of the development agenda is paraded for all to see.

Sadly, this is also the case for many of those who stood up for truth and freedom in the face of the Covid manipulation.

They remain stuck on the details of that one event, and the specific role of the WEF and WHO, and fail to see the overall picture of the industrial-military-pharmaceutical complex behind it.

Moreover, because they have noticed the way in which the contemporary environmentalist movement is being used to advance the Great Reset, they often take an anti-environmentalist line which leads them to applaud the industrial activities of the globalist system they are meant to be opposing.

Given the dominance of that system, and in particular its unlimited access to money, it is perhaps unsurprising that all potential opposition movements seem to eventually turn

into operations that support the system and attack its enemies!

It is therefore of utmost importance to nurture and promote a solid and coherent political philosophy that can act as a foundation for an emerging political resistance movement and prevent it from being hijacked and diverted.

This philosophy already largely exists, in fact, although there is a further dimension that needs to be added, as I will explain later.

It is, however, a hidden philosophy, an underground river of thought not visible from the streets and shopping malls of the modern world.

I call this philosophy “organic radicalism” and in 2019 I launched a website which features profiles of more than 90 thinkers whom I regard as belonging to this tradition. [1]

These thinkers are not necessarily themselves invisible – it is, rather, the multiple interconnections between the thinkers and the overall coherence of the organic radical idea that have been hidden from view.

I would say that this idea is, at its heart, just traditional human wisdom – the values, ethics and common sense that had to be pushed aside to make way for the onward march of Profit and Progress.

It is also the understanding that everything is connected, forms part of one reality, in contrast to the fragmented outlook favoured by



modernity.

So the orgrad thinkers include, for example, a couple of ancient philosophers who presented the holistic vision of reality common to all pre-modern thinking and stressed the wholeness and essential rightness of the cosmos, the idea of natural organic order.

The Taoist Chuang Tzu, who lived in China 2,300 years ago, asked: “If the nature of everything under Heaven is not distorted, if the world’s Virtue is not despoiled, then what need is there to govern the world?”

And Plotinus, the Greek philosopher born and raised in Egypt in the third century AD and who spent the last part of his life in Rome, wrote: “The Universe is a self-accordant entity, its members everywhere clashing but the total being the manifestation of a Reason-Principle”.

The similarity of their philosophies, arising from completely different cultures, is itself a manifestation of the underlying universal reason and order that they were describing.

Some of those included on the organic radical site present this same understanding in scientific terms.

The German vitalist Hans Driesch was one of the first non-Jewish university professors to be stripped of his post when the Nazis came to power in 1933.

He explained his holistic vision by stating:

“The object is not the mere sum of its attributes: it is their unity – it is all the attributes together”.

And British scientist Kit Pedler wrote: “Scientists who try to take nature to bits ... and claim in the end that they will understand the whole of nature because they understand all of its parts are called ‘reductionists’.

“Scientists who have taken nature to bits and then claim that their study of the parts reveals a whole which is greater than the sum of the parts are called ‘holists’”.

As another scientist, Fritjof Capra, explains, this kind of analysis complements, rather than contradicts, metaphysical or spiritual interpretations.

He says that his philosophy is one in which “the cosmos is seen as one inseparable reality – for ever in motion, alive, organic; spiritual and material at the same time”.

The same belief was being expressed 500 years ago by physician and nature philosopher Paracelsus, another organic radical inspiration.

He said: “Nature, made of the Universe, is one and its origin can only be the eternal Unity. It is a vast organism in which natural things harmonise and sympathise between themselves”.

Animating everything, he said, was “the vital energy of the Universe (*Spiritus Mundi*)”, a “fundamental, invisible, vital, vitalising force”.

The 17th century English revolutionary

Gerrard Winstanley, who was acquainted with Paracelsus's ideas, wrote about "the law of nature" which "does move both man and beast in their actions; or that causes grass, trees, corn and all plants to grow in their several reasons; and whatsoever any body does, he does it as he is moved by this inward law".

A century later, the artist and poet William Blake was challenging the new industrial world with his own holistic vision, which emphasised the sacredness and interconnectedness of all life.

"Every thing that lives, Lives not alone, nor for itself", he wrote. "Every thing that lives is Holy".

And around the same time in Germany, Novalis was using the term "magical idealism" to describe his concept of the world soul, in which all of nature was seen as a single organism.

As industrialism tightened its grip on Europe, this holistic concept of nature necessarily developed into a political critique of society.

We can see this with the "anti-capitalist Romanticism" identified by Michael Löwy as flourishing in central European Jewish intellectual circles before the First World War.

He says their shared outlook revolved around "a cultural critique of modern capitalist civilization in the name of pre-modern or pre-capitalist values".

They were revolting “against the quantification and mechanisation of life, the reification of social relationships, the dissolution of community and, above all – the disenchantment of the world”.

Generally, anti-industrialist thinking occupies, needless to say, a central place in organic radical thought.

Today dismissed as marginal, it in fact boasts an impressive political heritage and has been expounded by important thinkers like John Ruskin, Henry David Thoreau, William Morris, Leo Tolstoy, Jacques Ellul and, towards the end of his life, Guy Debord.

Morris, for instance, famously stated: “Apart from the desire to produce beautiful things, the leading passion of my life has been and is hatred of modern civilization”.

Tolstoy, for his part, condemned the factory system and repeatedly warned that the Russian people should stay on the land, and avoid the industrial civilization of the West.

This same insight surfaced in India with the anti-industrialism led by Mohandas Gandhi and the Kumarappa brothers, which identified an alternative to Western capitalism or socialism in what they called “villagism”.

Gandhi, influenced by Tolstoy, wrote in 1909: “Machinery has begun to desolate Europe. Ruination is now knocking at the English gates.

Machinery is the chief symbol of modern civilization; it represents a great sin... Railways accentuate the evil nature of man. Bad men fulfil their designs with greater rapidity”.

A parallel thread in anti-industrial spirituality emerged with the Perennialist or Traditionalist movement founded by René Guénon and Ananda Coomaraswamy.

While best known now for their metaphysical writing, they were both appalled by Western imperialism and the way in which it everywhere imposed its exploitative, productivist, industrial way of life.

In his 1927 book *The Crisis of the Modern World*, Guénon described the concept of “civilization” as a pretext designed to fool the public, “mere moralistic hypocrisy, serving as a mask for designs of conquest or economic ambitions”.

I should also mention the considerable anarchist influence on organic radicalism, with many representatives of that political tradition featured on the site.

But they are not included simply because they are anarchists – even though I have a background in the anarchist movement and still call myself an anarchist, despite my serious differences with many of those today using that label.

They are there because they have something

to contribute to the wider organic radical perspective.

Peter Kropotkin, for instance, not only described law and capital as twins who had “advanced, hand in hand, sustaining one another with the suffering of mankind”, but also wrote that Mutual Aid, Justice and Morality were a “universal law of organic evolution” rooted in our minds “with all the force of an inborn instinct”.

German-Jewish anarchist Gustav Landauer condemned industrial capitalist “unculture” and has been described as representing “a left-wing form of the *völkisch* current in thought”.

Emma Goldman, mainly remembered today for her feminism, published a journal called *Mother Earth* and equated the anarchist ideal with “natural law... which asserts itself freely and spontaneously without any external force, in harmony with the requirements of nature”.

The English anarchist intellectual and poet Herbert Read condemned mechanical civilization and declared: “Deep down my attitude is a protest against the fate that has made me a poet in an industrial age”.

What fascinates me is the way that the various strands of thinking intertwine and interlock, lending to organic radicalism a solidity and cohesion that might appear surprising for a philosophy that is not officially deemed to exist!

In general, spirituality, anti-industrialism

and opposition to the dominant order come together time and time again, to the point that they appear to be one and the same thing.

The usual political-philosophical firewalls melt away when you know that the Perennialist Guénon was introduced to Sufi spirituality by the anarchist Ivan Aguéli; that fellow Perennialist Coomaraswamy was an anarchist; that Carl Jung was greatly influenced by the anarchist Otto Gross and was a friend of another anarchist, Herbert Read.

I am intrigued by the way that neurobiologist Constantin von Monakow's aim of "a naturalization of morality" is so close to the anarchism set out by Kropotkin, particularly in his last, uncompleted, book *Ethics: Origin and Development*, in which he described nature as "the first ethical teacher of man".

My own lifelong sense of affinity with the Middle Ages feels vindicated by the fact that it was shared not just by Kropotkin, who described the medieval city as "a natural growth in the full sense of the word", but also by the sociologist Ferdinand Tönnies – an important organic radical thinker who compared the healthy organic *Gemeinschaft* (community) of that previous period with the artificial *Gesellschaft* (society) of modern times.

Attraction to the Middle Ages was also a corollary of Ruskin and Morris's distaste for

industrial modernity, with the Gothic tradition representing for them an aesthetic expression of a culture rooted in nature and organicity.

Morris was greatly inspired by the 1885 novel *After London* written by another orgrad inspiration, Richard Jefferies.

This was an early work of post-apocalyptic science fiction, in which industrial civilization has collapsed and the capital of the British empire has disappeared beneath an oozing, toxic swamp, to be replaced by something resembling the medieval world.

Morris wrote to a friend that “absurd hopes” filled his heart as he read the book, adding: “I have no more faith than a grain of mustard seed in the future history of ‘civilization’, which I know now is doomed to destruction, probably before very long: what a joy it is to think of!”.

Indeed, it is thought that Jefferies’ book inspired Morris’s own novel *News from Nowhere*, which was published five years later, in 1890, and was described by Kropotkin – yet another connection! – as a “romance of the future” and “perhaps the most thoroughly and deeply Anarchistic conception of future society that has ever been written”. [2]

The organic radical yearning for the Middle Ages is not really backward-looking at all, but is looking forward to an uncorrupted future, free from the dark rule of industrial criminocracy.



Löwy explains this with regard to Walter Benjamin, whose deconstruction of the ideology of progress was, he says, carried out not in the name of conservation or of restoration, but of revolution.

“The archaic societies of *Urgeschichte* [the distant past] feature a harmony between man and nature which has been destroyed by ‘progress’ and is in need of reinstatement in the emancipated society of the future”.

The writer Patrick Marcolini makes the same point regarding the “medieval inspiration” that he identifies behind the thinking of Debord and his fellow Situationists.

He writes: “All the types of gift-based sociality – friendship, love, hospitality, mutual aid and solidarity – were the relational forms which most faithfully prefigured the society which the Situationists wanted to reach by revolution. In this, medieval civilization offered them a real model”.

There are so many interconnections between the thinkers featured on the orgrad site that I can only scratch the surface here.

Gandhi was influenced not only by Tolstoy, but also by Ruskin, Thoreau and Kropotkin.

Fredy Perlman was inspired by Blake, even using his art to illustrate his own work, and translated Debord’s *La Société du spectacle* into English.

Tönnies was an influence on Landauer, Martin Buber and Jacques Camatte, who refers approvingly to him in his 1973 essay 'Against Domestication'.

George Orwell was persuaded to join the International Anti-Fascist Solidarity Committee by Emma Goldman and he there came into contact with anarchists such as Read – that friend of Jung – and John Cowper Powys, a writer converted to anarchism by Goldman and also influenced by orgrad thinkers Plotinus, Paracelsus, Goethe, Blake, Ruskin and... Jung!

Suffice to say that if I could present these links in the form of a diagram – *a task of which I am totally incapable!* – the resulting mesh would physically display the reality of a philosophical tradition that contemporary society refuses to recognise.

Some of those featured on the site have been aware of the ideological overview – Löwy, for instance, as I have already explained.

The late American writer Theodore Roszak, as well as quoting Morris, Kropotkin and Coomaraswamy, called for a “new radicalism” in which “quality and not quantity becomes the touchstone of social value”.

He said “an urgent project of the times” was the resurrection of a “supposedly defunct tradition”, an ancient way of knowing and thinking that he termed “Old Gnosis”, whose

experience of nature was one of “living communion”.

Roszak held out the vision of a post-industrial future which would involve “a graceful symbiosis of people and nature, an organic community”.

And fellow American Charlene Spretnak, now in her late 70s, was greatly inspired by Ruskin and Morris, whose work she discovered by chance while visiting England.

In her 1997 book *The Resurgence of the Real* she describes “an extraordinary period of discovery for me, a communion that shaped me, somehow, from then on”.

Spretnak identifies an underground philosophy, in opposition to modernity, that surfaces from time to time in history, only to be forced underground again by the dominant system.

She writes: “A substantive tradition stands behind the contemporary resurgence of body, nature, and place, which, if better understood, could be a source of inspiration.

“That lineage includes the Romantic movement, the Arts and Crafts movement, the cosmological and spiritual quests in schools of painting, the counter-modern Modernists, Gandhi’s Constructive Program, and the counterculture”.

She explains that repression of these

critiques of modernity is achieved partly through the way in which the historical myth of “progress” is presented.

“The complex transition from the holistic (but hierarchical) medieval worldview to the modern mechanistic one came to be expressed as a simplistic reduction holding great allure: the passage from the Dark Ages to the Enlightenment. Has there ever been such a starkly black and white framing of history?”

As we have seen, the organic radical project aims to reclaim the holistic heritage of the past and use it to inspire the quest for a future outside of the industrial criminocratic nightmare.

But the additional element, to which I referred earlier, is an awareness of how and why the thread of thinking described by Löwy, Roszak and Spretnak has been pushed out of sight.

I explored one aspect of this in an article I wrote six years ago, in July 2018 – the first occasion on which I used the term “organic radicalism”, in fact. [3]

Here I explained how continuous efforts had been made to smear any kind of pro-nature and organic thinking as “Nazi” and thus as unacceptable to the “anti-fascist” left.

This kind of propaganda is, of course, deliberately misleading and one of the main culprits, Alexander Reid Ross, has subsequently

been revealed to be linked to the CIA. [4]

The reality is that while the Nazi regime in Germany used nature-loving language to garner support from a nature-loving people, their actual agenda was ultra-industrialist.

Is it a coincidence that the same trick is currently being pulled again by an “environmentalist” movement promoting the new, 21st century, phase of industrial development? I don’t think so.

The reason why genuine environmentalism – pro-nature organic thinking – has to be smeared and attacked is that it represents an obvious threat to the criminocrats’ industrialist project.

If environmentalists were mobilising against phoney “sustainable” technologies, rather than promoting them, the industrialists’ advance would at the very least be slowed down.

More widely speaking, *all* the attitudes and ways of thinking that form part of the organic radical outlook represent potential barriers to the ongoing march of development and the Great Industrial Racket.

The global criminocrats can’t have people clinging to old-fashioned beliefs in the importance of local community, culture and connection to place!

They can’t allow them to nurture traditional values that might lead them to reject transhumanism, eugenics and artificial food!

They can't tolerate the revival of ethical codes that regard the selfish pursuit of individual gain as morally wrong, that explicitly reject usury and exploitation!

They can't put up with people questioning the narrative of Progress, asking whether it is really such a good idea to continue with its programme of ever-accelerating production and destruction!

They can't stomach the presence in their prison-camp world of people who value freedom more than convenience or social acceptance, who regard speaking the truth as a sacred duty that should never be shirked!

They know that the way of thinking that I call organic radicalism is their enemy and that is why they do their best to make it disappear.

We, for our part, have to take on board this realisation and embrace it within our philosophy.

Organic radicalism is not just the revival of a certain political tradition, but a revival that is very conscious of what it is doing.

It is a political philosophy that understands why its thinking has been marginalised, why it has been deemed unacceptable by those who control contemporary society.

The American radical environmentalist Judi Bari, yet another orgrad inspiration, wrote that basing a political belief system on "ancient native wisdom" is, in the context of today's industrial

society, “profoundly revolutionary, challenging the system to its core”.

This is the task of the organic radical project – to broadcast and amplify this new-old way of thinking, to put it on the map as a real tradition, as a valid and significant political position.

It is only with this solid philosophical grounding that we can hope to grow an effective new movement of resistance against the vile criminocracy.

[1] <https://orgrad.wordpress.com/a-z-of-thinkers/> All subsequent orgrad references can be found via this page.

[2] <https://www.marxists.org/archive//morris/obits/kropotkin.htm>

[3]

<https://winteroak.org.uk/2018/07/10/organic-radicalism-bringing-down-the-fascist-machine/>

[4] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2023/10/28/how-intelligence-agents-hijacked-the-u-s-anarchist-movement-and-steered-it-into-a-dead-end/>

## Also by Paul Cudenec

### NON-FICTION

*The Anarchist Revelation*

*Antibodies, Anarchangels and Other Essays*

*The Stifled Soul of Humankind*

*Forms of Freedom*

*Nature, Essence and Anarchy*

*The Green One*

*Fascism Rebranded*

*The Withway*

*The Great Racket*

*Converging Against the Criminocrats*

*Our Quest for Freedom*

### FICTION

*The Fakir of Florence*

*No Such Place as Asha*

*Enemies of the Modern World*

*The Good in Our Hearts*

All these titles are available to download for free via the Winter Oak website ([winteroak.org.uk](http://winteroak.org.uk)) as well as to buy from booksellers. To get in touch with Winter Oak email [winteroak@greenmail.net](mailto:winteroak@greenmail.net) or follow @winteroakpress on X/Twitter.

Paul Cudenec's work can also be found at [paulcudenec.substack.com](http://paulcudenec.substack.com)