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**HOW THE VENETIAN SYSTEM WAS TRANSPLANTED INTO ENGLAND**

*New Federalist, June 3, 1996*

*.*

NOBLE VENETIAN: ...pray tell us what other prerogatives the King [of England] enjoys in the government; for otherwise, I who am a Venetian, may be apt to think that our Doge, who is called our prince, may have as much power as yours.

*Henry Neville, Plato Redivivus, 1681*

The oligarchical system of Great Britain is not an autochthonous product of English or British history. It represents rather the tradition of the Babylonians, Romans, Byzantines, and Venetians which has been transplanted into the British Isles through a series of upheavals. The status of Britain as the *nation foutué* of modern history is due in particular to the sixteenth and seventeenth century metastasis into England and Scotland of the Venetian oligarchy along with its philosophy, political forms, family fortunes, and imperial geopolitics. The victory of the Venetian party in England between 1509 and 1715 built in turn upon a pre-existing foundation of Byzantine and Venetian influence.

One of the best governments in English history was that of King Alfred the Great, who ruled from 871 to 899. Alfred pursued a policy of literacy, education, and nation-building, and stands as a founder of Old English literature. The Byzantine Empire saw in Alfred a flare-up of the Platonic Christian humanism of the Irish monks and Alcuin of York, the principal adviser to Charlemagne a century earlier. Byzantium accordingly incited Vikings and Varangians, who had been defeated by Alfred the Great, to renew their attacks on England.

Then, in 1066, two armies converged on England. The first was the Norwegian army of King Harold Hardrada ("the pitiless"), a Byzantine general who had served as the commander of the Imperial Guard in Constantinople. Harold Hardrada was killed by the English at Stamford Bridge in 1066. But in that same year the weakened English forces were defeated at Hastings by William of Normandy ("the Conqueror"). Thus began the Norman Yoke, imposed by Norman oligarchs and a century of Norman kings.

The next dynasty, the Plantagenets, featured such figures as Richard I Lionheart, a flamboyant homosexual who avidly participated in the Venetian- sponsored Crusades in the eastern Mediterranean. The Magna Carta extorted from Richard's successor King John in 1215 had nothing to do with political liberties in the modern sense, but protected the license of marauding feudal barons against the central monarchy. The enforcement machinery of the Magna Carta permitted the barons lawfully to wage war upon the King in case their grievances were not settled. Since civil war and private warfare were by far the greatest curses of society at that time, England was held hostage to parasitical feudal overlords that a more centralized (or "absolute") monarchy might have mitigated. The barons, whose sociopathic prerogatives were anchored in the Magna Carta by a license for civil war, were easily the most reactionary element in English society, and were susceptible to easy manipulation by Venice, which had now conquered Byzantium and was approaching the apogee of its power.

Venetian influence in England was mediated by banking. Venetian oligarchs were a guiding force among the Lombard bankers who carried out the "great shearing" of England which led to the bankruptcy of the English King Henry III, who, during the 1250's, repudiated his debts and went bankrupt. The bankruptcy was followed by a large- scale civil war.

It was under Venetian auspices that England started the catastrophic conflict against France known today as the Hundred Years' War. In 1340, King Edward III of England sent an embassy to Doge Gradenigo announcing his intention to wage war on France, and proposing an Anglo-Venetian alliance. Gradenigo accepted Edward III's offer that all Venetians on English soil would receive all the same privileges and immunities enjoyed by Englishmen. The Venetians accepted the privileges, and declined to join in the fighting. Henceforth, English armies laying waste to the French towns and countryside would do so as Venetian surrogates. France was in no position to interfere in the final phase of the rivalry between Venice and Genoa, which was decided in favor of Venice. The degeneracy of English society during these years of Venetian ascendancy is chronicled in the writings of Chaucer - the greatest English writer of the age - who was an ally of the anti-Venetian Dante- Petrarca- Boccaccio grouping.

The Venetians concocted myths to enhance their influence on English society. For the nobility and the court, there was the anti-Christian myth of King Arthur and his Round Table of oligarchs seeking the Holy Grail. For the mute and downtrodden masses, there was the myth of Robin Hood, who by robbing from the rich to give to the poor combined plunder with class struggle.

During the wartime 1370's, the population of England collapsed by 1.5 million souls, from a total of 4 to 2.5 million, because of the Black Death, which itself resulted from Venetian debt service policies. The year 1381 saw an uprising in London and southeast England on a program of abolishing feudal dues, free use of forests, and an end to the tithes or taxes collected by the church. This was called Wat Tyler's rebellion, which ended when Wat was killed by the Mayor of London. Contemporary with this was the rise of Lollardry, the prototype of English Protestantism promoted by John Wycliffe, the Oxford scholastic. Wycliffe's anti-clerical campaign had many easy targets, but his theology was inferior and his stress on every person's right to read and interpret the Bible was designed to spawn a myriad of fundamentalist fanatics.

Lollardry as a social phenomenon had a specific Venetian pedigree, best seen through the prevalence among the Lollard rank and file of the belief that the soul is not immortal and dies with the body. This is the mortalist heresy, and can more accurately be called the Venetian heresy, because of its deep roots within the Venetian oligarchy. Later, beginning in the early sixteenth century, the University of Padua and Pietro Pomponazzi were notorious for their advocacy of mortalism.

In 1377 Wycliffe was saved from prosecution by an uprising of the London mob. Lollardry kept going for centuries as an underground religion for the disinherited kept going by itinerant preachers. During Queen Elizabeth's time, Lollardry lived in the form of sects called the Familists and the Grindletonians. These finally flowed into the Puritan Revolution of the 1640's. Lollardy contained a strong dose of primitive socialism; Lollard leaders like John Ball and "Jack Straw" preached social revolution with slogans such as, "When Adam delved and Eve span, Who was then the gentleman?" This is the ultimate source of that communism which David Urquhardt taught Karl Marx five centuries later. Finally, Lollardry spread into central Europe through the medium of the Hussites of Bohemia and caused a series of wars of religion there. In seventeenth- century England there was a slogan to the effect that Wycliffe begat Hus, Hus begat Luther, and Luther begat truth. There is every reason to view the Lollards as a Venetian pilot project for Luther's 1517 launching of the Reformation during the war of the League of Cambrai.

The English defeat in the Hundred Years' War (1453) left English society in a shambles. This was the setting for the oligarchical chaos and civil war known as the Wars of the Roses, which pitted the House of York with its symbol the white rose against the House of Lancaster with its red rose. Both groupings derived from quarrels among the seven sons of the pro-Venetian Edward III, who had started the wars with France. The Wars of the Roses, fought between 1455 and 1485, brought English society to the point of breakdown.

From this crisis England was saved by the coming of Henry Tudor, the Earl of Richmond, who became king as Henry VII. It was under Henry VII that England began to become a modern state and to participate in the Renaissance progress associated with Medici Florence and the France of Louis XI. The precondition for the revival of England was the suppression of the pro-Venetian oligarchy, the barons. Conveniently, these had been decimated by their own handiwork of civil war. Henry VII set himself up as the Big Policeman against the oligarchs. Henry VII established for the central government an effective monopoly of police and military powers. One of the reasons for the great ineptitude demonstrated by both sides in the English Civil War of the 1640's is that under the Tudors the nobility and gentry had largely forgotten how to wage civil war.

Like that of Louis XI, Henry VII's policy was based on an alliance of the crown with the urban trading and productive classes against the latifundist barons. Barons were excluded from the state administration, which relied rather on city merchants who were much more likely to be loyal to the king. Since the oligarchs routinely intimidated local courts, Henry VII gave new prominence to the court of the Star Chamber, a special royal court designed to impose central authority on the barons. The private armies of oligarchs along with other bandits and pirates were liquidated.

Henry VII was an active dirigist, promoting trading companies to expand overseas commerce. Under the Tudor state, England existed as a nation, with relative internal stability and a clear dynastic succession.

Henry VII's suppression of the oligarchs displeased Venice. Venice also did not like Henry's policy of alliance with Spain, secured by the marriage of his heir to Catherine of Aragon. Henry VII in fact sought good relations with both France and Spain. The Venetians wanted England to become embroiled with both France and Spain. Venice was also fundamentally hostile to the modern nation-state, which Henry was promoting in England. When Henry VII's son Henry VIII turned out to be a murderous pro-Venetian psychotic and satyr, the Venetians were able to re-assert their oligarchical system.

Henry VIII was King of England between 1509 and 1547. His accession to the throne coincided with the outbreak of the War of the League of Cambrai, in which most European states, including France, the Holy Roman Empire (Germany), Spain, and the papacy of Pope Julius II della Rovere joined together in a combination that bid fair to annihilate Venice and its oligarchy. The League of Cambrai was the world war that ushered in the modern era. Henry VIII attracted the attention of the Venetian oligarchy when he - alone among the major rulers of Europe - maintained a pro-Venetian position during the crisis years of 1509-1510, just as Venice was on the brink of destruction. Henry VIII was for a time the formal ally of Venice and Pope Julius. The Venetian oligarchy became intrigued with England.

In 1527, when Henry VIII sought to divorce Catherine of Aragon, the Venetian-controlled University of Padua endorsed Henry's legal arguments. Gasparo Contarini, the dominant political figure of the Venetian oligarchy, sent to the English court a delegation which included his own uncle, Francesco Zorzi. The oligarch and intelligence operative Zorzi, consummately skilled in playing on Henry's lust and paranoia, became the founder of the powerful Rosicrucian, Hermetic, cabalistic, and Freemasonic tradition in the Tudor court. Later, Henry VIII took the momentous step of breaking with the Roman Papacy to become the new Constantine and founder of the Anglican Church. He did this under the explicit advice of Thomas Cromwell, a Venetian agent who had become his chief adviser. Thomas Cromwell was Henry VIII's business agent in the confiscation of the former Catholic monasteries and other church property, which were sold off to rising families. Thomas Cromwell thus served as the midwife to many a line of oligarchs.

Under the impact of the War of the League of Cambrai, the Venetian oligarchy realized the futility of attempting a policy of world domination from the tiny base of a city-state among the lagoons of the northern Adriatic. As was first suggested by the present writer in 1981, the Venetian oligarchy (especially its "giovani" faction around Paolo Sarpi) responded by transferring its family fortunes (fondi), philosophical outlook, and political methods into such states as England, France, and the Netherlands. Soon the Venetians decided that England (and Scotland) was the most suitable site for the New Venice, the future center of a new, world-wide Roman Empire based on maritime supremacy. Success of this policy required oligarchical domination and the degradation of the political system by wiping out any Platonic humanist opposition.

The overall Venetian policy was to foment wars of religion between the Lutherans, Calvinists, and Anglicans on the one hand, and the Jesuit-dominated Catholic Counter- reformation of the Council of Trent on the other. The Venetians had spawned both sides of this conflict, and exercised profound influence over them. The Venetians insisted on the maintenance of a Protestant dynasty and a Protestant state church in England, since this made conflict with the Catholic powers more likely. The Venetians demanded an anti- Spanish policy on the part of London, generally to energize the imperial rivalry with Madrid, and most immediately to prevent the Spanish army stationed in Milan from getting an opportunity to conquer Venice.

The destruction of the English mind was fostered by the Venetians under the banner of murderous religious fanaticism. Under Henry VIII, the English population continued in their traditional Roman Catholicism, which had been established in 644 at the synod of Whitby. Then, in 1534, Henry's and Thomas Cromwell's Act of Supremacy made the Roman Pope anathema. Those who refused to follow Henry VIII down this path, like St. Thomas More and many others, were executed. This first phase of Anglicanism lasted until 1553, when the Catholic Queen Mary I ("Bloody Mary," the daughter of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon) took power. Mary re-established Papal authority and married King Philip of Spain. Bloody Mary's main adviser in her proscriptions was Cardinal Reginald Pole, who had lived in Venice for some years and was part of the immediate circle around Gasparo Contarini. Henry VIII had feared Pole, an heir to the Plantagenets, as a possible pretender, and Pole had done everything to excite Henry's paranoia. Pole incited Bloody Mary to carry out a bloodbath with 300 to 500 prominent victims. These executions of the "Marian martyrs" were immortalized in John Foxe's celebrated Book of Martyrs (1554 ff.), a copy of which was later kept in every church in England and which attained the status of a second Bible among Protestants of all types. The events orchestrated by Pole seemed to many Englishmen to prove the thesis that a Catholic restoration would threaten their lives and property.

Bloody Mary died in 1558 and was succeeded by Elizabeth I, the daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn. From the Catholic point of view Elizabeth was a bastard, so it was sure that she would rule as a Protestant. Elizabeth forcibly restored her father's Anglican or Episcopal Church.

Three times within the span of 25 years the English population was thus coerced into changing their religion under the threat of capital punishment. Three times, the supposedly eternal verities taught by the village parson were turned upside down, clearly because of dynastic ambition and raison d'état. The moral, psychological, and intellectual destruction involved in this process was permanent and immense.

Elizabeth's anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish policies fulfilled the basic Venetian imperatives. The struggle against the Spanish Armada in 1588 also gave these policies an undeniable popularity. Elizabeth was for 40 years under the influence of William Cecil, whom she created First Baron of Burleigh and Lord Treasurer. The Cecils were notorious assets of Venice; their ancestral home at Hatfield house was festooned with Lions of St. Mark. When William Cecil was too old to act as Elizabeth's controller, he was succeeded by his son Robert Cecil, the 1st Earl of Salisbury. The Venetian- Genoese Sir Horatio Pallavicini was an important controller of English state finance.

Elizabeth's economic policies had strong elements of dirigism and mercantilism. The numerous industrial monopolies she promoted had the result of establishing new areas of production in the country. Cecil developed the merchant marine and the navy. There were taxes to support those unable to work, and a detailed regulation of jobs and working conditions. Many of these successful measures were coherent with the Venetian desire to build up England as the new world empire and as a counterweight to the immense power of Spain.

At the death of Elizabeth, Robert Cecil masterminded the installation of the Stuart King of Scotland as King James I of England. Cecil was for a time James' key adviser. James I was a pederast and pedant, an individual of flamboyant depravity, an open homosexual who made his male lovers into the court favorites. In addition to pederasty, James aspired to tyranny.

James I was a leading theoretician of the divine right of kings. He delivered long speeches to the parliament, telling the wealthy latifundists and the Puritan merchant oligarchs of London that they could as little tell him what to do as they could tell God what to do. Policy, said James, was "king's craft" and thus "far above their reach and capacity." James I was an enthusiastic supporter of Paolo Sarpi in Sarpi's 1606 struggle against the Papal Interdict. James I did this in part because he thought he had received his crown directly from God, without any mediation by the Pope. Venetian influence at the Stuart court was accordingly very great. Sarpi even talked of retiring to England.

James was also an occultist. Shakespeare left London not long after the coming of James, and died after unwisely sitting down to drinks with the Aristotelian hack Ben Jonson.

James's feeble pro-Spanish appeasement policy bitterly disappointed Paolo Sarpi, Cecil's boss and the leading Venetian intelligence chief of the era. James made peace with Spain in 1604, ending 19 years of war. Cecil then tried to induce James into an anti-Spanish policy with a planned provocation - Guy Fawkes and the Gunpowder plot of 1605. Sarpi schemed to unleash the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648) as an apocalyptic confrontation between Protestant and Catholic Europe, and he wanted England in the fray. James's adviser, Sir Francis Bacon of the Cecil family, urged James to enter the war against Spain and Austria, but James first attempted to mediate the conflict and then did nothing. Charles I was equally disappointing: He married the Catholic Princess Henrietta Maria of France, and helped France to defeat the French Calvinists or Huguenots - a Venetian asset - in their stronghold of LaRochelle.

The early Stuarts were unable to assert England as a great power because war required taxes, and taxes required the vote of Parliament, which they did not wish to convoke, since it would undercut their claims of divine right. Between 1628 and 1639, Charles I attempted to rule as an autocrat, without calling a Parliament. English naval power grew so weak that even ships bringing coal coastwise from Newcastle upon Tyne to London were not protected from pirates. This outraged the City of London and its Puritan merchants, followers of doctrines derived from Calvin of Geneva.

With their tirades about their own divine right, the early Stuarts were violating a cardinal point of the Venetian political code. Venice was an oligarchy ruled by, at most, a few thousand male nobles. In practice, power belonged to several dozen patrician leaders. But no single patrician was strong enough to dominate all the rest as dictator. The Grand Council (Maggior Consilgio) was the general assembly of the nobility, and elected the Senate or Pregadi. The Grand Council, using a complicated procedure, also elected the Doge or Duke, who occupied the highest post in the state. The Doge was accordingly an elected and limited executive who served for life. This office was never hereditary; when one Doge died, a new one was elected by the Maggior Consiglio. The Doge was surrounded by his cabinet or Collegio, including the ministers (savi) of various departments. Under this system, the Doge was not the leader of a nation and the protector of all the people, as an absolute monarch might be; he was the chief functionary of a consortium of noble families who owned and ran the state for the private profit of their own fondi. For the Venetians, an oligarchy required the weak executive power of a Doge, and this was the system they wanted transplanted into their clone, England.

These issues were prominent in seventeenth-century Europe. Louis XIV of France in his better moments exemplified the benefits of centralistic absolutism, as directed against the pro-Venetian French nobles responsible for the civil wars of the Fronde and the wars of religion. Colbert pursued economic unification by wiping out local interests intent on collecting parasitical taxes. Louis compelled the great nobility to be towel-boys and fixtures at Versailles, while the French departments were ruled by Intendants sent by the king. A little later, in Russia, some of the same issues were fought out between the centralizing absolutist Peter the Great and the great latifundist nobles, known in Russia as the boyars. Real economic and social development was best served by breaking the power of the aristocracy. England, by contrast, was the country where the triumph of the oligarchs was eventually most complete. (This is even clearer if we bear in mind that the English gentry and squires correspond to the level of count in the continental titled aristocracy.) The English gentry were determined that they, and not intendants from the government in Whitehall, would rule in the shires.

When Charles I was forced to call a Parliament in 1640 because he needed money, a conflict between oligarchy and monarchy developed. The House of Commons theoretically represented men with property capable of bringing in 40 shillings per year; this was the threshold of free subjects who had a stake in the state. The Commons were elected by about one-tenth of the people of England. The House of Lords was full of latifundists, but it was estimated that the landowners and merchants of the House of Commons were rich enough to buy the House of Lords three times over. Parliamentary leaders like Pym and Hampden wanted to establish an oligarchy by the surrender of the King to Parliament so they could build up a navy and hasten the looting of the Spanish Empire in the Caribbean. They wanted a more vigorous pursuit of the slave trade. Pym and Hampden asserted Parliamentary authority by passing bills of impeachment and attainder against royal favorites like Strafford and Archbishop Laud, the head of the Church of England, who were both executed. In 1641, Charles I tried to arrest Pym and Hampden. The pro-Venetian City of London, the ports, and the south and east of England rebelled against this botched coup by the stupid King, who fled north. The English Civil War, or Puritan Revolution, was on. Many English were appalled by the miserable level of leadership and wretched programs of both the sides. A contemporary wrote that many people tried to remain neutral because they thought that "both sides raised an unlawful war, or ...could not tell which (if either) was in the right...." The civil war was artificially imposed by two rival London cliques, both under Venetian influence.

England would be the only major European country in which a war of religion would be fought between two pro-Venetian Protestant factions - the Anglican royalist cavaliers and the Parliamentary Puritan Roundheads. One result would be the liquidation of the remaining positive and dirigist features of the Tudor state.

During the first phase of the civil war, (1642-1646), there emerged two factions among the Parliamentarian Roundheads. A more conservative group favored a limited, defensive war against Charles I, followed by a negotiated peace. They hoped to defeat Charles by using a foreign army, preferably the Scottish one, in order to avoid arming the English lower orders. The Scots demanded for England a Presbyterian state church on the model of their own kirk - run by synods of Calvinist elders - but that was what the majority of the Long Parliament wanted anyway. So this faction came to be called the Presbyterians. Among them were the Calvinist town oligarchy of London.

The other group wanted total war and eventually the execution of the King and the end of the monarchy and the House of Lords. This group was willing to accept a standing army of sectarian religious fanatics in order to prevail. This group was called the Independents or Congregationalists. They were favored by Venice. Oliver Cromwell emerged as the leader of this second group.

Oliver Cromwell was a Venetian agent. Prominent in Oliver Cromwell's family tree was the widely hated Venetian agent Thomas Cromwell (1485-1540), Earl of Essex and the author of Henry VIII's decision to break with Rome and found the Church of England. Oliver Cromwell (1599-1658) was descended from Thomas Cromwell's sister. Oliver Cromwell's uncle had married the widow of the Genoese- Venetian financier Sir Horatio Pallavicini. This widow brought two children by her marriage to Pallavicini and married them to her own later Cromwell children. So the Cromwell family was intimately connected to the world of Venetian finance. One of the leading figures of Parliament, John Hampden, was Oliver Cromwell's cousin. Cromwell's home was in the Fens, the large swamp in eastern England. The swamp- dwelling Venetians, true to form, came to choose another swamp- dweller as their prime asset of the moment.

Cromwell ridiculed the weakness of the Parliamentary army, which he said was made up of "decayed tapsters" (elderly waiters). Cromwell's own Ironsides regiment was made up of relatively well-off cavalrymen of heterodox religious views. This regiment was highly effective against the Royalist or Cavalier forces. The Ironsides contained numerous Independents. It also contained many of the more extreme sects. Some of the most important roots of modern communism can be found in the sects represented in Cromwell's Ironsides.

After 1640, the censorship of printed books practically collapsed. The church courts, which prosecuted crimes like heresy and blasphemy broke down. Especially in the City of London, but also in the countryside, a lunatic fringe of radical religious sects began to gather followers. What boiled up reflected the pervasive influence of Venetian kookery in England going back to Wycliffe. Ideas came to the surface which went back to Francesco Zorzi and Edmund Spenser, to Francis Bacon, Robert Fludd, and Bernardino Ochino, one of Contarini's Italian Protestants or *spirituali* who had been active in London around 1550 under Edward VI.

There were the Levellers, radical democrats of the Jeffersonian or sans culotte type, who wanted to expand the franchise for Parliamentary elections - although they would have left half or more without the vote. Apprentices, laborers, and servants would remain disenfranchised. Levellers wanted no monarchy, no House of Lords, no monopolies, no tithes, and no state church. Their petitions sound well today, but so do parts of the Jacobin Club's Declaration of the Rights of Man. Among the Leveller leaders were John Lilburne, Richard Overton, and Sir John Wildman. The latter two were double agents, taking money from Royalists as well as from Thurloe, the director of Cromwell's secret police.

Sir John Wildman was a land speculator and an agent of the Duke of Buckingham (as Pepys's diary tells us). He plotted against every regime from Cromwell to William III. He was a member of Harrington's Rota Club, a nest of Venetian agents in 1659-1660. He appears as a classic type of Venetian provocateur. Richard Overton was the author of the tract *Mans Mortalitie*, which argues that the soul dies with the body - the Venetian heresy once again. As for Lilburne, he died in jail after becoming a Quaker.

In 1647, with the Royalist forces wiped out, the Presbyterian faction tried to disband the army, and the Levellers responded by electing Agitators - in effect, political commissars - for each regiment. But the Leveller movement was soon crushed by Cromwell.

Other groups owed their continued existence to the pro-toleration policies of the Ironsides, which Cromwell often respected. There were the True Levellers or Diggers, with Gerard Winstanley as main spokesman. Winstanley supported mortalism, the Venetian heresy. The Diggers in 1649 began to form communes to squat on land and cultivate it - three centuries before Chairman Mao. Their idea was primitive communism and the abolition of wage labor. Private property they condemned as one of the results of Adam's Fall. Their program was "Glory Here!," the creation of heaven on earth. With the communist, materialist (and some would say, atheist) Gerard Winstanley, we see the Anglo-Venetian roots of the later Marxism financed and directed by Lord Palmerston's stooge David Urquhardt.

Then came the Ranters, devotees of the antinomian heresy, the free love party. The Ranters, many of whom were ex-Levellers, held that sin and the law had been abolished - at least for the elect - leaving mankind with "perfect freedom and true Libertinism." Some of them thought that fornication and adultery were positive religious duties, necessary to enjoy a maximum of grace. Ranter leaders included Laurence Clarkson and Abiezer Coppe. Clarkson supported mortalism, the Venetian heresy. The Ranter John Robins proclaimed that he was God and agitated to lead 140,000 men to conquer the Holy Land - thus foreshadowing later British policy in the Middle East. Ranters were heavily repressed.

The Quakers, a new sect in those days, had not yet made their pacifist turn. Often Ranters became Quakers. Many of them were highly militaristic troopers in Cromwell's New Model Army. Quakers were heavily represented in the English army that carried out Cromwell's genocide against Ireland. But Quaker James Naylor was cruelly punished for blasphemy after he re-enacted at Bristol Christ's Palm Sunday entry into Jerusalem. In 1657, the Quaker leader George Fox criticized the English army because it had not yet seized Rome. Pacifism was adopted only after the Stuart Restoration, in 1661.

The other group that came out of the Ranter milieu was the Muggletonians, led by John Reeve and Lodowick Muggleton, who claimed that they had been commissioned by God in 1652 to serve as the Two Last Witnesses foretold in Revelations 11. Muggletonians supported mortalism, the Venetian heresy; they were also anti-Trinitarians and materialists. If formal positions on theological issues are counted up, John Milton turns out to have been very close to the Muggletonians. The Muggletonians kept going in Britain until about 1970.

The Fifth Monarchists were radical millenarians, believing that the Second Coming and the Rule of the Saints were close at hand - some thought as close as the Barebones Parliament convened under the Commonwealth in 1653. Some Fifth Monarchists in the Barebones Parliament wanted to re-impose the Mosaic law in place of the English common law, and wanted a Sanhedrin of the Saints to assume state power. Diminishing interest in the New Testament was also documented by the official banning around this time of Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost (Whitsunday), which were all condemned as popish idolatry. The roots of the British Israelite movement are clearly revealed.

There were also the Seekers, who thought all existing religions were inadequate; they claimed they were still looking for the right one. One Seeker was Milton's friend and language teacher Roger Williams, later of Rhode Island. Finally, there were the extreme sectaries, parties of one, unable to get along with any of the above. John Milton was an example of these.

These were the Hydra-like components of the army which was Cromwell's power base. Cromwell attacked all the sects at certain times, but leaned heavily on them at other times. But he always relied for his power upon the army, of which the sectarians were the backbone. In 1648, Colonel Pride, acting for Cromwell, expelled from the Long Parliament some 100 of the most Presbyterian members, some of whom had been negotiating under the table with Charles I, by now a captive of the Army. What was left, was called the Rump Parliament. Cromwell then tried Charles I for treason and executed him on 30 January 1649. The Commonwealth was declared and the monarchy abolished.

Cromwell's problem was now to govern a country in which no elected Parliament could countenance the army and its gun-toting sectarian iconoclasts. The Rump, which harbored its own desires of becoming a ruling oligarchy, was dispersed by Cromwell's troops in 1653. The next Parliament, the Barebones, was a hand-picked selection of the godly, many nominated by Independent congregations. The Barebones was modeled as an oligarchy: it chose a Council of State as its own executive, and was supposed to choose its own successors before it disbanded. Instead, Major-General Thomas Harrison of the New Model Army, convinced he was the Son of God, dominated the proceedings. A moderate faction around Major Gen. Lambert caused the dissolution of the Barebones with a coup de main. For many sectaries, Cromwell suddenly went from being the New Moses to being the small horn of the Antichrist.

Cromwell accepted the Instrument of Government, the first written constitution of England. The franchise was restricted, going up from the old 40-shilling freehold to a personal net worth of 200 pounds, which meant much greater wealth. The Parliament was made more oligarchical. Cromwell was named Lord Protector. The Protector was backed up by a Council of State of generals serving for life. The first Protectorate Parliament refused to fund the standing army (now 57,000 troops) and rebelled against toleration (toleration of the sects), so Cromwell dissolved it in January 1655. This was already Cromwell's third dissolution; he would ultimately make it four.

In March 1655, Cromwell decided in favor of a "thorough" Bonapartist military dictatorship. The country was divided into 11 ad hoc districts, and a major-general of the army was put in charge of each district. The major-generals controlled the local militia, ran the courts, appointed all officials, and suppressed public immorality. All of this was done arbitrarily, with little reference to law. At the same time, secretary Thurloe, the Lavrenti Beria of the regime, extended his secret tentacles into every pore of society and into every country of Europe. The rule of the Major-Generals prefigured European fascism. But they alienated many oligarchs who found this interference far worse than that of Charles I.

The second Protectorate parliament was impelled by desperation to pass the Humble Petition and Advice, which urged Cromwell to take up the crown. But it was a doge's crown, a limited monarchy of the House of Cromwell subject to Parliament. Under pressure from the army generals, Cromwell declined the title of king but accepted all the rest. In February 1658, Cromwell dissolved his last Parliament, and died the same year. His son Richard attempted to rule, but left after a few months. 1659-1660 was a time of great chaos, with the restored Rump alternating with direct army rule. Finally, the army split into pieces; the commander of the winning piece, General Monck, joined the new Parliament in recalling Charles II, the son of the executed Charles I.

Observing these events, the pro-Venetian writer John Milton - who had been Latin secretary to Cromwell's Council of State - lamented that the City of London had concluded that "nothing but kingship can restore trade." Milton's "Ready and Easy Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth," issued in March, 1660, proposed a regime based on a Grand Council along explicitly Venetian lines, with life tenure and co-optation of new members. This could be obtained, Milton thought, by declaring the Rump perpetual and capable of co-opting new members when the old ones died off. Milton had wanted religious tolerance, but he was willing to sacrifice this to obtain an oligarchy without a single-person executive. Milton effusively praised Venice, which had made its "whole aristocracy immovable" with similar methods.

During this time, Milton was close to the Rota Club, a pro-Venetian salon dominated by James Harrington, author of the book *Oceana* and one of the most important Venetian ideologues in England. Harrington was the direct precursor of the great Whig aristocrats of the Venetian Party who were frequently in power after 1688. Other Rota members included Milton's close friend Cyriack Skinner, the economist Sir William Petty, the intelligence operative Sir John Wildman, the Fifth Monarchist Thomas Venner (who had led and would lead abortive uprisings in London), the diarist Samuel Pepys, and Andrew Marvell, poet and member of Parliament. There was also the Rumper Henry Neville, who propagandized Harrington's views in his political dialogue *Plato Redivivus* of 1681. There were Sir John Hoskins, later president of the Royal Society, and Richard Sackville, the Fifth Earl of Dorset. Charles II assumed power later in 1660.

Today some members of the British oligarchy are calling for the end of the monarchy and the creation of a republic. We must recall that the last time this was tried, the result was the fascist dictatorship of Oliver Cromwell and his major-generals. A "republic" in Britain in the early 21st century might turn out to be a military dictatorship rather similar to Cromwell's, with animal rights freaks acting the part of the Ranters and Diggers.

So what had the Puritan Revolution accomplished, beyond killing 500,000 persons? First, Cromwell had founded the British Empire. Between 1651 and 1660 he had added 200 warships to the British Navy, more than the early Stuarts had managed to build during their 40-year tenure. Cromwell's war with the Dutch (1652-1654), which hardly made sense for a Puritan, made plenty of sense in the light of the 1,700 Dutch ships captured. Cromwell set up a convoy system for English merchant vessels, including those bringing coal from Newcastle. The basis of British naval domination was thus laid. After making peace with Holland, Cromwell made war on Spain, in exact conformity with Venetian requirements. Cromwell conquered: Jamaica, St. Helena, Surinam, Dunkirk, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick (in Canada). In addition, he established the status of the Portuguese Empire as a satellite and auxiliary of London. It was under Cromwell that English ships established a permanent presence in the Mediterranean; in his last years, he was considering the conquest of Gibraltar to facilitate this stationing. Jamaica, a center of the slave trade, stood out in what was called the Western Design - making war on Spain in the New World.

Cromwell was also personally responsible for the campaign of genocide and starvation in Ireland that began with the 1649 massacre of the garrison of Drogheda. Cromwell told the Parliament that if he waged war according to international law and the rules of war, the campaign would be too expensive. So Cromwell relied on massacres and famine. Cromwell's genocide eventually killed about one-third of the Irish population. Cromwell also invaded and reduced Scotland, which had switched to the Stuart cause in 1649. This laid the basis for the myth of a "British" people as a label imposed on Irish, Scottish, Welsh, and English victims of an oligarchy not of Englishmen, but of Venetians and their tools. Until 1991 there was talk of a "Soviet" people, but this is now nowhere to be found. Perhaps the fraud of a "British" people will also not survive too long.

Cromwell's rule marked the triumph of free trade, as it was understood at that time. All attempts by government to supervise the quality of production, to fix prices, to maintain jobs and employment, to influence labor- management relations, or to influence wage rates were wholly abandoned. The City of London demanded free trade. It got the abolition of all industrial monopolies, which had previously covered some 700 staple products. Laissez-faire was established in every sphere. Whatever the Restoration Stuarts tried to change in this regard was immediately rolled back after 1688.

In the years after Cromwell, it was estimated that cottagers and paupers, laborers and servants, who had no property and no vote, made up half of the population of England. One-third of all English households were exempted from the Hearth Tax because of their poverty. After 1660, wheat prices were kept artifically high because, it was argued, only fear of starvation could coerce the poor into working.

Under the Restoration, the gentry and latifundists had been released from their feudal dues to the King, but there was no protection for small farmers and tenants. By 1700, the family farm was well on its way to being wiped out in England, giving rise to a landless mass of agricultural day laborers. The English countryside was full of de facto serfs without land. Craftsmen and artisans in the towns were increasingly wiped out by merchant oligarchs and bankers. Through this brutal primitive accumulation, England acquired its propertyless proletariat, forced to live by selling its labor. Usury became thoroughly respectable. This is the world described by Karl Marx, but it was created by Anglo-Venetian finance, and not by modern capitalism. What might be called the middle class of small farmers and independent producers was crushed, while Puritan initiatives in popular education were suppressed. English society assumed the bipolar elite-mass structure which is a hallmark of empires. As for oligarchism, it was estimated in the 1690's that Parliamentary elections were under the effective control of about 2,000 men.

Charles II, who had been deeply impressed by his father's death and the civil war, was tolerated by the oligarchy because he had learned the virtue of caution. But Charles II had not given up on his royal prerogatives. During the 1670's, Charles II became the satellite and toady of Louis XIV of France, who paid him a subsidy which he used to circumvent Parliament. This enraged the Venetian Party. By now, the Venetians wanted to use England against the growing power of France, which had supplanted Spain at the top of their hit list. In 1678, Titus Oates alleged a new "popish plot" in which France, and no longer Spain, was the bogey-man. Charles II announced on his death-bed that he was a Roman Catholic, violating another key point of Venetian doctrine. That his brother and successor James II had also become a Catholic had been known and was the center of political battle for some time. The Whig party, the main vehicle of Venetian rule, made its mark at this time as the group most devoted to a Protestant succession to the English throne. James II was also in the pay of the Sun King.

When the Duke of Monmouth, the illegitimate but Protestant son of Charles II, attempted to land and stage an uprising, he was quickly defeated. In response, James II's lackey Judge Jeffries brought his Bloody Assizes court to the southwest of England, and began an orgy of thousands of death sentences. James II was trying to set up a standing army with Catholic officers, and put a Catholic admiral in charge of the Royal navy. Louis XIV's revocation around this time of the Edict of Nantes, which had provided toleration for Protestants, made it appear plausible to some that James II would now attempt to play the role of Bloody Mary.

The Anglo-Venetians decided that they were fed up with the now-Catholic, pro-French and wholly useless Stuart dynasty. Representatives of some of the leading oligarchical families signed an invitation to the Dutch King, William of Orange, and his Queen Mary, a daughter of James II. John Churchill, the future Duke of Marlborough, was typical of James' former supporters who now went over to support William and Mary. William landed and marched on London. This is called by the British the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688; in reality, it consolidated the powers and prerogatives of the oligarchy, which were expressed in the Bill of Rights of 1689. No taxes could be levied, no army raised, and no laws suspended without the consent of the oligarchy in Parliament. Members of Parliament were guaranteed immunity for their political actions and free speech. Soon, ministers could not stay in office for long without the support of a majority of Parliament. Parliament was supreme over the monarch and the state church. At the same time, seats in Parliament were now bought and sold in a de facto market. The greater the graft to be derived from a seat, the more a seat was worth. Within a few years after the Glorious Revolution there was a Bank of England and a national debt. When George I ascended the throne in 1714, he knew he was a Doge, the primus inter pares of an oligarchy.

The regime that took shape in England after 1688 was the most perfect copy of the Venetian oligarchy that was ever produced. There was a flare-up of resistance during the reign of Queen Anne because of the activity of the Tory Robert Harley and his ally Jonathan Swift; there was also the threat that the Hanoverian succession might bring Leibniz into England. Otherwise the Venetian Party was broadly hegemonic, and Britain was soon the dominant world power. The English masses had been so thoroughly crushed that little was heard from them for one and one half centuries, until the Chartist agitation of the 1840's. The franchise was not substantially expanded until after the American Civil War, with industrial workers getting the vote in 1867 and farm laborers allowed to cast ballots in 1884.

The struggles of seventeenth- century England were thus decisive in parlaying the strong Venetian influence which had existed before 1603 into the long-term domination by the British Venetian Party observable after 1714. These developments are not phenomena of English history per se. They can only be understood as aspects of the infiltration into England of the metastatic Venetian oligarchy, which in its British Imperial guise has remained the menace of mankind.

**END**

**THE BRITISH EMPIRE BID FOR UNDISPUTED WORLD DOMINATION, 1815 - 1870**

*Schiller Institute Food For Peace Conference, Chicago, IL, Feb. 22-23, 1992*

[The following paper is a transcription of a tape recording at the above conference of an oral presentation by Mr. Tarpley.]

I would like to attempt to illustrate the Versailles thesis in a certain amount of detail. I would say to people at the beginning, the best seats are emphatically here in the front part of the auditorium, because if you don't see these maps, it will be a little difficult to follow. So I urge you if you can, come up to the front.

The Versailles thesis has been referred to several times in the course of today's proceedings, and it is, in short, the idea that the world system or world order which is presently collapsing around our ears is rooted above all in the events of the first World War between 1914 and 1918; and then in the Versailles Treaty of 1919, actually in the Peace of Paris of 1919.

The thesis goes on to specify that World War I itself was the consequence of British geopolitical geostrategic decisions that were made in the period around 1870, in the wake of the American Civil War. The British, from 1870 to 1914, actively sought a general conflagration for the purpose of destroying civilization and for preserving the British Empire against the challenges that had emerged.

Now the theme in this is constantly the British quest for the single empire. Lyndon LaRouche referred to it before, I believe - the idea of a single new Roman Empire, an empire that would encompass the entire world, which would be under the ultimate domination of what the British considered to be an Anglo-Saxon master race. It would be oligarchical, colonial, imperialistic, malthusian; [it would] condemn large areas of the world to depopulation, poverty, and so forth, [and would be directed to] the preservation of the British Empire.

As we will see, the British came very close to establishing just such a single empire in the period between 1848 and 1863. That is the period we'll look at in some detail, because it's a period that's very like our own today, a period when the British - the Anglo-Americans - came close to establishing this kind of universal domination, the new Roman Empire.

In the course of this, I will have to simplify some things. We can certainly clarify some of those in the discussion, and I will have to proceed somewhat from the point of view of the British thrust in these directions, and you'll see the areas that pop up. We will also see the irony of history, that if the British between 1850 and 1860 came close to establishing their worldwide dominion, the irony is that the world then blew up in their faces - especially around the events of the American Civil War, the Russian cooperation with Lincoln during the Civil War - to the point where, by about 1870, the British had to fear a convergence of the United States, Russia, and a united Germany, in such a way that the future of the British Empire would have been put in jeopardy, [even] might have been terminated.

In the course of this, as you'll see, - and this is Lyn's [Lyndon LaRouche's] tremendous merit, to be able to do this given the conditions that he's working under - we will develop a radically new view of the last 200 years of history which you will not find in any textbook. Indeed, from the point of view of this concept, you will see what a tissue of lies the history of the last 200 years as presented in Anglo-American sources actually is, particularly the official U.S. version of World War I and World War II, which is a complete tissue of lies. Any idea of German war guilt for World War I has to go out the window, and it has to yield to the idea that World War I was a British creation which the British schemed for the best part of a half century to bring about.

[Display MAP OF EUROPE as redrawn at Congress of Vienna, 1815]

The question is, where do you start some kind of a review like this? We could usefully start it at the time of the American Revolution. What I thought we would do, though, is to skip to the end of the Napoleonic Wars, simply specifying that in the period before 1815 the British were able to extend their colonial domination to vast areas of the world, including India and so forth, with of course the new nation - the United States - standing out as a barrier, as a challenge, to British imperialism. So let us leap to the end of the Napoleonic Wars, what many people know as the Europe of the Congress of Vienna, as you see here. This was Europe as the map was redrawn by the oligarchs gathered at the Congress of Vienna in 1815. So here's our starting point.

Remember that in the world outside of Europe at this point, the British dominate. They rule the seas, their only significant challenge coming from the United States. Here's Congress of Vienna Europe. Notice that Poland is completely submerged, Italy is divided, the Turkish Ottoman Empire extends far into continental Europe, and in the middle of everything you've got this crazy quilt of Germany divided into dozens and dozens of petty states. Notice also that Belgium has been added to the Netherlands.

This is the Europe that you associate with Metternich, Prince Metternich, the guy who was ruling here in Vienna at that time, the chief minister of the Hapsburg Court. This is the Europe of the Holy Alliance. It is a condominium in which the British are obliged to co-exist with Metternich and the kinds of Central European oligarchs that he represents. Metternich is a very, very ugly figure, needless to say. The British are forced to deal with him almost as an equal. However, what you see - and this I think is a characteristic of the period - [is that] after about 1820 the British begin to drop out of the Congress of Vienna system. They stop going to the congresses; they stop signing the declarations; rather, what they do is to assume a position of splendid isolation and at the same time foment revolutions against all of their alleged allies on the continent of Europe. And in particular, the names of Mazzini, Karl Marx, Bakunin, the First International Workingmen's Association, plus all of the French socialists - Louis Blanc, Fourier, and all these other people - [all these constitute] a society of British agents for the destabilization of Metternich and company on the continent of Europe.

The British started a revolution here, in Serbia - they created that revolution in 1817. The British have been allied with Serbia for about two hundred years, and the Serbs have endured a monumental bloodletting as a result, as have the victims of the Serbs. The British created modern Greece in 1821; and the word went out from London that the British oligarchs would support everybody's revolutions, except of course their own. And they fomented these things, and this is what gave birth to the revolutions of 1848.

I have to caveat this, as Al Haig would say, by saying 1848 is also other things. There are a lot of very good people active in 1848, but the general thrust of the British policy is clearly [that] the British were destabilizing Austria, Russia, and Prussia for balance of power purposes.

Let me show you what happened in 1848, in case people have forgotten this. Basically every government in Europe was overthrown. The French July monarchy in the person of bourgeois King Louis Philippe of Orleans was overthrown in favor of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, a British agent and adventurer. Every government in Italy was overthrown; in particular, Mazzini succeeded in creating his Roman republic, and in forcing the pope to flee from Rome. Metternich himself was forced to flee from a revolution in Vienna; you had Kossuth in Hungary; every government in Germany was overthrown - not necessarily the monarch, but certainly the prime ministers; similar things in Spain, and so forth. The only country that escaped this was Russia, where there was no internal revolution.

With one fell swoop, the British had succeeded in overthrowing every government on the continent of Europe, in particular forcing Metternich to disguise himself as an Englishman and flee to London.

[Display NEXT MAP: 1848]

Here is this extremely interesting period between the 1848 revolutions and the turning points of the American Civil War, and this is something you won't find in any history book. This is an absolutely original concept that LaRouche has developed. Let us look at the tremendous worldwide offensive of the British imperialists back in the 1850's.

First of all, free trade. Where did free trade ever come from? Free trade was introduced by the British in 1846 and in the following years. Before that, as you may remember, they had Corn Laws, which set up very high tariffs to keep the price of grain extremely elevated, but this was then turned around, because they could look forward to the idea of being able to loot the world, and therefore they favored free trade.

The British were able to install their puppet, Napoleon III. He had studied the wars of Napoleon I, his ancestor, and had concluded that Napoleon's big mistake was fighting the British. So as so often happens in the history of French imperialism, here's a French imperialist who believes that the way to have a French empire is to be a junior partner to the British. That's exactly what he did. This is then acted out in the Crimean War, where the British and French join together to invade Russia, the only country that had survived those 1848 destabilizations.

We also got, in terms of a worldwide offensive, a reorganization of British rule in India. This is the famous Sepoy Mutiny of 1857, which led to the end of the direct rule of the British East India Company out there, and the creation of a British Viceroy of India. Prime Minister Disraeli made Queen Victoria the Empress of India.

In China, the Second Opium War fits precisely into this period. This is the British grabbing a whole series of ports and other bases on the coast of China, and it was clear at the time that they were about to go into China to partition the entire country. They wanted to occupy China militarily as they had India.

And Kansas. How does Kansas fit it? Well, Kansas is the beginning of the American Civil War. Bleeding Kansas, with gangs of pro-Confederate and pro-Union, or pro-slavery and pro-abolitionist groups, fighting it out in continuous bloodletting. Filibustering expeditions by proto-Confederates into Latin America, and the creation of this Hapsburg Maximilian Empire in Mexico. You look at this together, [and] there's not one continent of the entire globe where the British are not in a tremendous offensive. The idea is that the single empire, the universal monarchy, is within their grasp.

Now, pause for a second. It's very similar today. If you look at this, it looks like the British on paper have wrapped up the entire world. And you could say, if you look at the map, if you calculate, you could say, well, it really looks like the Anglo-Americans have dominated the world, and that the Anglo-Americans will continue to dominate the world for the next century. But let me just anticipate that it's not going to be so.

[Display MAP OF CRIMEAN WAR]

Here's the Crimean War. Here we are on the Black Sea, and what do we find here? The Ottoman Empire, of course; Russia up here, so who goes in? The British and the French bust through the Bosporus and the Dardanelles, and they actually invaded the Crimea here. This was one of the largest amphibious war operations, the largest up to that time to be sure. And they succeeded in defeating the Russian army, although what they find is that their forces were not significant enough to push further inside the country.

[Display MAP OF BALACLAVA]

This is the city of Balaclava. [Do] you remember Tennyson's "*Charge of the Light Brigade*?" This is one that Fred Wills could quote at great length. The charge of the Light Brigade took place here. This is the British invasion fleet, Anglo-American invasion, and there are some very large Russian forts in the background, and that's what the British threw their Light Brigade against. So here we are in the Crimean War.

[Display MAP OF MEXICO]

Maximilian! Remember him? The Hapsburg heir who was placed on the throne of Mexico by a French army, sent by Louis Napoleon Bonaparte? There he is. The idea was to begin to reintroduce direct colonialism, by British or British puppet states, into Mexico, Central America, and Ibero-America in general, while the U.S. was so tied down by the Civil War that the Monroe Doctrine could not be asserted by Washington.

[Display MAP OF INDIA]

In India, as we saw, the Sepoy Mutiny led to a vast reorganization of British colonialism in the area, sending out a viceroy from London, and before too long Queen Victoria was proclaimed "Empress of India," with this great empire, ruling over maharajahs and other local potentates.

[But] we have to pay special attention to the 1850's in the United States, and Lyn has been very emphatic about this. If you look at the United States in the 1850's, then you have to conclude that the place was a dead duck - lost. Why?

Let's start with the leadership. Let's look at the great series of presidents: Millard Fillmore, starting in the 1850's; Franklin Pierce, the ancestor of Barbara Pierce, Barbara Bush; and James Buchanan. This was the president under whose term the Civil War actually began to break out. (Someone said that this shows that one President Buchanan was enough.) What happened under these [men]? This is typical: Here's Jefferson Davis, wearing his uniform of major general of the United States Army. He was not just a major general; he was the *Secretary of War* under these administrations.

So what you had under presidents like Fillmore, Pierce, and Buchanan [were] Confederate traitors - like Jefferson Davis - members of the British Scottish Rite Freemasons, proto- Confederate slave holders, traitors, the scum of the earth; they could make great careers in the United States Army. And, of course, later on this was the same Jefferson Davis who became the president of the Confederate States of America, that despicable puppet state.

Don't be fooled by the Confederacy. Don't be fooled by that Sir Walter Scott aura of chivalry, and J.E.B. Stuart wrapped up in God knows what he's palmed off as the ethos of the Confederacy. This was based on human slavery, this was one of the most despicable proto-fascist states that has ever been seen on the face of the earth. Davis was the president.

People like Ulysses S. Grant, that you see here, could not make a career in the army. It's interesting to see that while Jefferson Davis was getting promoted, generals like Sherman and Grant were forced out of the U.S. military service. They had to go into business - into the private sector - to try to earn a living.

Here's a typical Confederate. We've talked a lot about him. Judah P. Benjamin, [who] was the secretary of the treasury of the Confederate States of America. At the end of the Civil War, he fled to Britain, where he lived. This is precisely the kind of British imperialist agent that you find in the upper reaches of the Confederate government. He is of course an agent in particular of the Rothschild family of London, and this mixture of what you would have to call Zionism and Confederacy today is what animates an organization like the Anti-Defamation League. That's exactly what this is. The ADL today continues the characteristic mentality of Judah Benjamin.

And then you look in the Union officer corps. How about this guy? He thinks he's Napoleon, or he's checking if he's still got his wallet. That's George McClellan, who in 1861-62 was the commander of all the Union armies. And here he is at Antietam.

This is the battle where McClellan had a good chance to destroy the Confederate Army under Lee. But he refused to do that. McClellan refused to attack on many occasions, because he wanted a negotiated peace. He said, "I can sit down with Robert E. Lee and work this out, and Abraham Lincoln doesn't really belong in this, because he doesn't understand these things the way I do." This is an interchange where Lincoln is basically telling him, "Why didn't you pursue Lee? You could have destroyed him on the battlefield, and you refused to do it. Now the Civil War's going to go on for three more years."

Here's the way this was viewed in a carton of the day. This is pro-McClellan propaganda. Here's Lincoln on the one side, and Jefferson Davis on the other, and here's George P. McClellan who's trying to reconcile them, mediating between them if you will. And of course he was the Democratic presidential candidate in 1864, and if it hadn't been for Sherman at Atlanta and Phil Sheridan in the Shenandoah Valley and the naval battles off Cherbourg, France and Farragut at Mobile Bay, then McClellan might have won, and that would have been the end of the Union - because that was the idea, that the negotiated settlement would leave the Confederate States of America in existence as a British puppet state.

Now let's look at the way in which this world, which seemed lost, blew up in the face of the British.

A reforming czar in Russia, Alexander II. He came in the midst of the Crimean War, just as his country was under tremendous attack. [He] came in with a vast program of reforms, in particular the freeing of the serfs in 1861. Then we've got the turning point year of 1863: the Emancipation Proclamation, the twin Union victories of Gettysburg and Vicksburg especially, and, as we will see, the arrival of the Russian fleets in New York and San Francisco.

The Seven Weeks' War. This is one that's hardly known. This was the [1866] defeat of Austria by Prussia, which was the immediate prelude to the complete unification of Germany [in 1871]. The collapse of Maximilian's Hapsburg Empire in Mexico, [and] German unification completed. And as we've stressed, what came out of these events, this tremendous turnaround of the 1860's, when all seemed to be lost, was a convergence of the United States, Russia, and Prussia - or call it Germany by that time - which attracted the attention of key forces in Japan and China. If you go back to Japan in this period, the reforming forces in Japan divide pretty much between pro- American and pro-German.

Here was a potential for a new combination in the northern hemisphere - the United States, Russia, Prussia, plus China and Japan - that would have been sufficient to dominate the world, and finish off the British Empire once and for all. Let's take a look at how this went.

Of course the principal figure in this is Abraham Lincoln, who administered one of the most severe defeats that British imperialism has ever had to absorb in the last 200 years.

This is Lincoln's ambassador. This is the original Cassius Clay, Cassius Clay of Kentucky. He was the Union ambassador to St. Petersburg at the time of the Civil War, and he secured really the only military assistance from any foreign power for Lincoln and for the Union.

This is Admiral Lisovsky. The photographer here is Mathew Brady, and Mathew Brady, the great Civil War photographer, had his studio in New York City. And here's the Admiral, the commander of the Russian Atlantic Fleet. Did he come all the way to have his picture taken? Obviously not.

The Russian fleet arrived in September and October. It sort of came in one ship after another, over a period of a couple of weeks. In September and October the Russian Atlantic fleet arrived in New York City, and they had been ordered by the Czar to place themselves under the command of Lincoln in the case of war between Britain and France on the one side and the Union on the other. Russia was going to join in that war. They had just fought the Crimean War against the British and the French, and they were ready to continue fighting. Similarly, another Russian fleet came to San Francisco, and spent the winter of 1863-64.

Here is another photograph by Mathew Brady. These are actual sailors of the Russian Atlantic fleet, who came into New York City in the fall of 1863 and played a key role in the saving of the Union. [The photo] was a token of the fact that if, for example, Napoleon III sent an army to fight the United States, then he would probably have to deal with Russia on the continent of Europe. As Gideon Welles, the secretary of the navy for Lincoln in those days, said: "Thank God for the Russians."

Here's that other one that I just mentioned. This is a war you almost never hear about in the United States, a war between Prussia on the one side and Austria on the other. This is the Seven Weeks' War. The Prussian army was capable, within a period of about 50 days, of vanquishing the Austro-Hungarian forces. I think what the interesting thing about this is, this took place in 1866. What has never really been looked into is the relation of Gettysburg on the one side with German unification on the other. Would it have been possible for Germany to achieve unification, if Lincoln had not won the Civil War? I would submit to you that Gettysburg and Vicksburg are key turning points of world history, also in the sense that they opened the door to the unification of Germany.

One interesting fact: The kingdom of Hanover, here, which is of course where the British royal family comes from, was an island. It had ceased to exist as a result of this war. The Prussians simply put an end to the existence of Hanover. I can assure you the British didn't like that, [and] would have done something about this if they had not been so thoroughly defeated in the U.S. Civil War.

Here's unified Germany. Again, if you look at this map with the colors, you can see the crazy quilt that had existed - Bavaria down here, Baden Wurttemburg over here, Mecklenburg- Schwerin, and so forth. This was now brought together as one powerful unified national state by 1871. So, U.S., Russia, and Prussia.

However, the British Empire was of course very powerful at this point. Many people think, they tend to situate the British Empire high point back in the days of George III. Well, these are figures from 1909, and they will show you that in 1909 the British dominated one-quarter of the population of the world [within] the British Empire. One quarter of the world's population was subject to the British Empire, and about one-fifth of the world's land surface. There are other accounts that will tell you it's about 25 percent of the population, and indeed 25 percent of the land surface. Remember that the British Empire got even bigger after the First World War by absorbing German colonies, so much so that the entire coastline of the Indian Ocean was completely British controlled. This was then called "the British Lake."

And there, of course, is the old Brzezinski arc of crisis, which is simply the axis of British colonialism around the Indian Ocean.

What could the continental Europeans do to resist this kind of British domination? Well, this is the railway system on the continent of Europe at about 1900. I think that one interesting thing to us as you look at it is that it's clear there are three key points in the European railroad system: there's Paris, there's Berlin, and there's Vienna. That's Budapest over there - think of that as a kind of second center. The only thing that comes close is Milan, but then you've got the Alps here, with a low density of railroads there.

So it's clear that a European infrastructure and railroad triangle, here, does comprehend the densest area of industrial and infrastructural development. At the same time, there were railroads being built out here into the Russian Empire; in particular, we have to mention here the great Count Sergei Witte, who grew up as an employee of the Russian imperial railway system. He worked first of all in the railway ministry, became transportation minister, and later finance minister. And what he promoted was the building of this Trans-Siberian railway, the greatest infrastructural project of the 19th century, greater even than Lincoln's transcontinental railroad. As you see, it goes all the way from St. Petersburg up here, all the way across Central Asia. The original form of it went across Manchuria to Harbin and then to Vladivostock; later on, a second line was added up here, to avoid Chinese territory. It linked up to the Chinese railway system - for example from Harbin to Beijing and to these other areas here - Darien, Port Arthur, and so forth.

There is also a Russian system, as you see. Just to follow this a little bit, there's a second railway system which is called the Transcaspian, which gets right down to the base of the Caspian Sea, comes right across to Iran, and - look - here's British imperialism in India, coming up against the Russian Empire, with just this little Afghani buffer state in between.

So look at this tremendous ability of Witte's project to reach out and create an actual Eurasian railroad bloc. As was mentioned before, Witte's strategic concept was that France, Germany, and Russia should not fight each other. They should make an alliance against Britain in particular. That would have spared them all the carnage of World War I, and it would have robbed the British of their geopolitical strategy. The British geopolitical strategy, of course, was to dominate the United States, dominate Japan if they could, and then go into the so-called heartland, and play the forces of the heartland against each other, play France against Germany, Germany against Russia, and so on down the line. Witte's strategic concept would have made World War I impossible.

And here's the other great railroad project. This is now the Berlin to Baghdad Railway. You only see the Asia Minor part of it here, the Balkan and Asia Minor parts, but suffice it to say that this started in Berlin, came down here through the Hapsburg dominions, across the Bosporus on barges, went through Anatolia, through what is today Syria, and then into Mesopotamia, Iraq, reached Baghdad, reached Kirkuk, Mosul, Basra, and finally Kuwait. And this was going to be built between about 1900 and 1915. It was never completed. This would have provided an alternate route to India; it would have challenged the British domination of their empire lifeline. This was primarily the idea of Georg von Siemens of the German industrial family, but it was pursued also as a goal of German foreign policy. And if you put together the two maps that I've just shown you, the Trans-Siberian Railway and this Berlin to Baghdad railway, you would have made Berlin the rail hub of the universe, with the ability to call on an entire Eurasian hinterland, and of course this the British were determined to avoid at all costs.

Now some people may ask: If the British decided in 1870 or thereabouts, if Disraeli, Gladstone, Lord John Russell, Queen Victoria, and a few other people sat down at the table and said, "Well, let's have World War I," and they did that in 1870, and that's about what they did, why did it take so long for World War I to come about?

I would simply point to a couple of questions of Bismarck's foreign policy. The guy who superintended the creation of united Germany was, of course, Bismarck. He's a mixed figure: part monster, part *realpolitiker*. Bismarck as a realpolitiker was a great realist. He knew that there could be no general war in Europe as long as Germany and Russia maintained good relations. This picture you see up here is the alliance system created by Bismarck. And you can see the result of it is that Germany has plenty of allies, [and] France has none. France cannot start any wars - [even with] these pro-British governments in Paris - and the British are forced to stay off the continent of Europe pretty much. And I particularly would stress the good relations between Berlin and St. Petersburg, between Germany and Russia, first under the so-called Alliance of the Three Emperors - *Dreikaiserbund* - and then the so-called Reinsurance Treaty.

So from 1870 to 1890 or thereabouts, this is what Europe looked like. The bottom part shows what happened when Bismarck was forced out of the scene [in March, 1890 by] the lunatic Emperor William II (this is the guy you remember from the World War I period) when he came in. Kaiser Wilhelm did not understand; he rejected the importance of an alliance with Russia. This allowed France to make an alliance with Russia in 1894, and very soon after that the British were brought into this, and you have the Triple Entente of Russia, England and France, all directed against Germany. Germany is left with only one real ally, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, [though] this was not a good ally. With allies like this you don't really need enemies, and the way for World War I was actually clear.

The other thing to stress about this is the colonial rivalry in Africa. Lyn has talked about the Fashoda incident of 1898; there it is. The British wanted to unite a strip of territory from Cairo all the way down to the Cape. This was the way the British wanted to put Africa together. There were some French imperialists who said no, we're going to start over here in Dakar, and go to Djibouti; and these two groups clashed in Fashoda, and the mentality that won out on the French side under Theophile Delcasse was the idea that if you want to have an empire, you've got to do it with the British, because you're not strong enough to do it against them; therefore, make a deal with British imperialism. That's the key to the Entente Cordiale of 1904.

With that, everything is ready for World War I. Here you see Europe as it was in July and August of 1914. The Russian Empire, the Ottoman Empire here; the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and as you can see, a very large Germany. The British had played their Eastern Question card; the Eastern Question meant their desire to destabilize the Ottoman, Russian, and Austro-Hungarian Empires.

The thing that we have to stress about the way the war was conducted is that the United States fought on the wrong side. That's one of the key turning points in which the twentieth century went wrong. It was *wrong* for France to ally with the British against Germany, but it was doubly wrong for the United States to go into World War I on the side of the British. The catastrophes of this century would have been avoided to a very large degree if, for example, the United States had refused to back the British, but had rather insisted on arbitrating the war - ending the war by forcing a just peace on all the contending parties. That would have made all the difference. That would have created a much better world than the one that we're confronted with today.

And here's the fighting. You see these fighting fronts? There's a western front over here, there's a tremendous eastern front, an Italian front, there's a Balkan front, there's a Russian-Turkish front out here, and look: even out here there was a Kuwait front. Norman Schwarzkopf, where are you? This was done by the British. They were attacking Baghdad.

And, of course, the reality of World War I is that this is the greatest single tragedy, the greatest single hecatomb of western civilization. Nine million dead. These are French troops getting out of their trucks. They're going to fight the battle of Verdun, where, over a period of 6 or 8 months, more than a million men were killed.

It's about 9 million killed outright, 20 million wounded, and if you add in the Spanish flu of 1919 and a few other things, you get up to the area of about 25 million to 30 million dead as a result of World War I. And the majority of [those were from] Germany and France, the two most developed countries of western Europe.

Here is now the Europe that emerged after the peace of Paris. So this is now Versailles, we're now in the midst of Versailles, bringing World War I to an end. You can see the changes that have been made, a very large Poland up here, a rather large Czechoslovakia, a large Rumania, a fairly large Hungary. Notice also that Yugoslavia has been created. Probably the most typical territorial change of Versailles, this Peace of Paris of 1919, is the existence of Yugoslavia. You can also see the creation of Finland and Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, up here in the Baltics.

The territorial system that came out of this was vastly unpopular. Nobody was really satisfied with all of this. It awakened desires on the part of various groups, nobody liked it. It was fought in particular by Ataturk in Turkey, [and] there was a mass movement in China against the idea that the German colonial possessions were transferred to the Japanese under this same treaty. In Italy there was so much discontent that it led to the rise of fascism. Similarly in Germany, and so on down the line.

Here's Germany as it came out of World War I. Notice the areas that were taken away; and now, of course, the Oder-Neisse line over here is the border of Germany.

I would stress in the Versailles system the way in which the Ottoman Empire was partitioned in 1919. This was all the Ottoman Empire. Everything that you think of as being the Middle East - including Turkey, Israel, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia - all of these were created at the Peace of Paris - in particular the Treaty of Sevres. Israel took a little bit longer to create, but basically the mandate of Palestine under the British is what then later became Israel.

Hungary, Austria: this empire ceased to exist. Austrians, Hungarians, Czechs, Slovaks, Italians, Slovenians, Croatians, and others departed this empire, and I of course have to apologize for this map. This is a U.S., sort of a pro-Woodrow Wilson map, because it lists "Yugoslavs" as Serbs, Croatians, and Slovenes, and of course that's precisely what Yugoslavia was all about. This did not have anything to do with the wishes of those involved. This was a reward to Serbia by the British and their friend, Woodrow Wilson.

And Russia: the Russian Empire was dismembered. Here we see Finland taken off, the Baltic States taken off, Bessarabia, today Moldova taken off, areas in the Transcaucasus taken off. The Russian Empire has already been through one dismemberment in the 20th century. It's now going through the second dismemberment. And we must warn that unless economic dirigistic policies are introduced in these new states to make them viable, to make them prosperous, to make them stable, then as Helga was saying earlier there is every danger that those states will be re-engulfed by a Russian Empire within about 15 or 20 years, or even less. In this [1919] case, it took about 15 or 20 years for the Russian Empire to make its comeback under Stalin.

The other thing about Versailles that I would like to stress very much is the financial arrangements, because here we can really see the degree to which today's world is an extension of the Versailles system.

Germany, under the Treaty of Versailles, was required to pay $32 billion of reparations. It was said that the Germans bore the war guilt, that they were responsible for World War I. Big lie! But the reason for the big lie was that they [therefore] had to pay $32 billion. It's hard to calculate that in today's terms. Those were gold dollars, those were real dollars, maybe $32 trillion is some idea of what that would have meant today, and because of the 5 percent interest rates, this was going to be paid over about 60 to 70 years. By one calculation, the Germans would have wound up their payments about 1990. They would have just finished paying for World War I two years ago. [But the amount owed] was going to go up to about $100 billion because of the accrued interest over the period. So let's say, $100 trillion of reparations.

The French had borrowed $25 billion during the war, and the British and the French had borrowed about $10 billion from the United States. So here's the merry-go-round. Germany of course was not allowed to export. They were kept blockaded for a long time. They had to pay these reparations to the British and the French. Notice that the French had to also pay the British. The French and the British then paid the United States and the Wall Street bankers under the Dawes Plan and the Young Plan, and then refinanced the Germans so that they could keep paying. And that is a system of usury and destruction. It of course meant that the heart of Europe would be economically depressed; that Germany would be depressed economically, that there would be no development of the Third World as a result of European capital goods being sent out. It virtually guaranteed fascism and bolshevism advancing against the middle class societies; and it had within it the seeds of World War II. In other words, what Lord Keynes said about this - that it would require economic slavery in Germany - was absolutely accurate. It was a way of squeezing Germany until you could hear the pips squeak, as Keynes said.

So let's just summarize what we've gone through on this Versailles system.

What we've done here is to compare the Versailles arrangements of 1919 with the Yalta arrangements of 1945, which have now collapsed. The Versailles System had a League of Nations. Who was in the Security Council? The U.S., Britain, France, Italy, and Japan. Those were the Big Five. The U.S. didn't even join it, but the British wanted to run the world that way, as a condominium. And of course under the U.N. we've got the Security Council.

Under Versailles, you have the Bank for International Settlements in Basel, Switzerland. It's still there. This is widely considered today to be more powerful than the IMF and the World Bank and the other institutions that were put up under the Yalta system after the Second World War. We've mentioned the $32 billion in reparations, the $10 billion in war debts, the immense internal debts of all these countries. After the Second World War there was the demontage of German industry, simply taking it out, primarily by the Russians, but above all [by] the conditionalities of the IMF as they have been imposed on the former colonial sector.

Continuing this comparison, under Versailles you had a war guilt clause saying that Germany was responsible for World War I, and under Yalta, the same thing. Collective guilt. Every German is responsible for everything that Hitler did. Typical are the geographic changes that I've just mentioned; Yugoslavia is a very typical one. Under Yalta, it's the two Germanys, not simply cut down, but even divided.

And then, look at the Middle East as one example of what this meant for the Third World. Under the League of Nations there were these mandates. The British got the mandate of Palestine. That then became Israel. The British Foreign Office with the Balfour Declaration announced that it was going to create the state of Israel. This was then included in the secret British-French Sykes-Picot accords, and finally the Treaty of Sevres, which was the treaty with the Ottoman Empire.

What does that lead to? To your typical Yalta arrangement of endless wars of Israel against the Arab states. All these Middle East wars, 1948, 1956, 67, 69, 73, the Iran-Iraq War of '80, and finally the Gulf War of 1991. That brings us pretty much up to the present time.

I haven't been able, for reasons of time, to go into certain postwar events that are better known. A couple of things to say in conclusion.

What is the purpose of all this? Why did the British insist on this? The British insist on a world system or a form of organized chaos, which is what you see here, based on an irrational principle of arbitrary power - Oligarchy - the idea that the British royal family, the British House of Lords, and the British aristocracy and oligarchy have the God-given right to rule [as] the Anglo-Saxon master race. And they can inflict suffering on the entire rest of the world in the name of this lunatic, imbecilic principle of their power. Therefore, the purpose of this entire system is to crush humanity. Sure, you can say its really directed against Germany to keep the Germans down, to keep them divided; to keep the Germans and the Russians at each other's throats; to keep the French and the Germans at each other's throats. It also implies that the United States is subjected to colonial rule, which you see.

So all of these great nations are humiliated, each in its own way, by this Versailles System. But the purpose of it ultimately is to crush the entire human race, because one of the effects of this entire system is the poverty and economic backwardness of the developing sector today, which is directly due to these Versailles and Yalta arrangements.

We also have to ask ourselves: What is the center of evil in the world? Well, for a while there was Hitler and the Nazis. This was certainly very evil, Mussolini and the fascists. The Bolshevik Party has gone out of existence - Stalin's party, Lenin's party, is really no longer there. It could be reconstituted, I suppose. Mao and his heirs in China are still in power, but it looks like their future is going to be a limited one. So ultimately you have to ask yourself: What *is* the problem of evil in the 20th century in particular, because it has turned out not to be fundamentally, in the last analysis, any of those, but rather, the British oligarchy. British geopolitical thinking. The idea of dividing the world along these lines, and creating a series of endless wars.

We also have to recall, as we saw back in the 1850's, that when the British seemed to be on the verge of taking everything, that is the moment when the intrinsic weaknesses of their system pop out. This is an Anglo-American system that destroys its enemies, to be sure, but it destroys its sponsors and its owners with an even greater certitude. It's a system that literally devours its own flesh - as you see today, when it looks like the Anglo-Americans are ready to take over the entire world, but at the same time they're collapsing internally so fast that they will not be able to impose any permanent world order of any type.

And I think finally, what it means for us, is that this is a tremendous opportunity, because there is now a complete political and strategic vacuum, and economic vacuum, all around the world. There is a vacuum of ideas, a vacuum of strategy, [and] a political vacuum. Look at the 1992 Democratic candidates for president - the five-pack, the dwarves - and you can see that that is a vacuum of personalities, policies, and ideas. This is now the time to advance to fill that vacuum.

We must take advantage of the fact that the systems that have controlled the world in a certain manner of speaking, for the past 70 to 90 years, that these are now collapsing in front of our eyes, creating tremendous political opportunities.

You cannot engage in politics today unless you have this kind of a scope - unless you go back to the Congress of Vienna, 1848, the British drive toward the single empire, and then that convergence of Lincoln, Alexander II, and united Germany that gave the British such a scare that they started World War I and created the Versailles System.

**END**

**LORD PALMERSTON'S MULTICULTURAL HUMAN ZOO**

*Speaking from the vantage point of Lord Palmerston's British Empire circa 1850, Schiller Institute U.S. President Webster Tarpley chaired the panel on "Lord Palmerston's Multicultural Zoo" at the Schiller Institute's conference on Feb. 20. Tarpley served as tour guide through the centuries, and as the "choral" backdrop to the historical drama, introducing each of the seven speakers in turn and concluding the panel. What follows is Tarpley's introduction. Subtitles have been added.*

I am now standing in the shadow of the Houses of Parliament in the part of London called Westminster. It is the year of grace 1850. Around me lies Victorian London, the London of Dickens and Thackeray, of John Stuart Mill and Thomas Carlyle. This capital city is now the center of the greatest colonial empire the world has ever known, shortly to embrace between one-fifth and one-fourth of the total population and land area of the Earth. Although in theory there are still empires ruled by the French, the Spanish, the Portuguese, the Dutch, the Belgians, and the Danes, all of these, in this year of 1850, are but the satellites of the British Empire. Britain is the mistress of the seas, the empire upon which the sun never sets. It is the new Rome on the banks of the Thames.

The empress is Queen Victoria, who is largely occupied with Prince Albert in her business of breeding new litters of Saxe- Coburg- Gotha to take over the royal houses of Europe. A quarter- century from now Victoria will be made empress of India to reward her for so much breeding. But for all of Victoria's wealth and power, Britain is not really a monarchy; it is an oligarchy on the Venetian model, and the most powerful leader of the British oligarchy in these times, between 1830 and the end of the American Civil War, is Lord Palmerston.

Henry Temple, the third Viscount Palmerston. Palmerston is the man the others - the Russells, Disraelis, and Gladstones - simply cannot match. Palmerston was first a Tory, then a Whig, always a disciple of Jeremy Bentham, and for 35 years there is scarcely a cabinet without Palmerston as foreign secretary or prime minister. In London they call him Lord Cupid, a Regency buck always on the lookout for a new mistress, perfectly at home in a ménage à trois. On the continent they call him Lord Firebrand. The schoolboys of Vienna sing that if the devil has a son, that son is Lord Palmerston. "Pam" is an occultist who loves Satanism and seances. And here, between Big Ben and the Foreign Office, are the haunts of this nineteenth- century devil, Lord Palmerston, old Pam.

**A NEW ROMAN EMPIRE**

It is 1850. Lord Palmerston is engaged in a campaign to make London the undisputed center of a new, worldwide Roman Empire. He is attempting to conquer the world in the way that the British have already conquered India, reducing every other nation to the role of a puppet, client, and fall-guy for British imperial policy. Lord Palmerston's campaign is not a secret. He has declared it here in the Houses of Parliament, saying that wherever in the world a British subject goes, he can flaunt the laws, secure that the British fleet will support him. "Civis Romanus sum, every Briton is a citizen of this new Rome," thundered Lord Palmerston, and with that, the universal empire was proclaimed.

During the Napoleonic Wars, the British managed to conquer most of the world outside of Europe, with the exception of the United States. After 1815, the French - be they restored Bourbons, Orleanists, or Bonapartists - are generally pliant tools of London. But in central and eastern Europe, there was Prince Metternich's Austrian Empire, a very strong land power. There was vast Imperial Russia, under the autocrat Nicholas I or the reformer Alexander II. There was the Kingdom of Prussia. Lord Palmerston likes to call these the "arbitrary powers." Above all, Palmerston hated Metternich, the embodiment and ideologue of the Congress of Vienna system. Metternich presided over one of the most pervasive police states in history. Men said his rule was shored up by a standing army of soldiers, a sitting army of bureaucrats, a kneeling army of priests, and a creeping army of informers.

For Britain to rule the world, the Holy Alliance of Austria, Russia, and Prussia had to be broken up. There is also the matter of the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire. Starting with Lord Byron's Greek Revolution in the 1820s, British policy has been to play the card of national liberation against each of these rival empires.

The imperial theme was sounded in 1846 with the free trade policy, Britain's declaration of intent to loot the world in the name of the pound. Then, in January 1848, Lord Palmerston arranged an insurrection in Sicily, using British networks that went back to Lord Nelson.

That started the great revolutionary year of 1848, and in the course of that year, every government in Europe was toppled, and every monarchy badly shaken, at least for a time. Metternich of Austria and King Louis Philippe of France fled to London, where they now spend their time playing cards. There was war in Italy, civil war in Austria, barricades in Paris, and tumult in Germany. The only exception to the rule was Russia, and now Lord Palmerston is preparing to invade Russia, with the help of his strategic catamite, Napoleon III, also known as Napoleon le Petit. That will start in about three years, and it will be called the Crimean War. As soon as the war against Russia is over, Palmerston and John Stuart Mill at the British East India Company will start the Great Mutiny in India, which some historians will call the Sepoy Rebellion. Muslim soldiers will be told that new cartridges are greased with pig fat, Hindu soldiers will be told the cartridges are greased with cow fat, and the result will be what you would expect. But in the conflagration the British will get rid of the Great Mogul and the Mogul Empire, and impose their direct rule in all of India. Typical John Stuart Mill. He, of course, is the author of "On Liberty."

The British would like to give China the same treatment they are giving India. Since 1842, Palmerston and the East India Company have been waging Opium Wars against the Chinese Empire, partly to get them to open their ports to opium from India, and also as a way to conquer China. Already the British have Hong Kong and the other treaty ports. By 1860, the British will be in Beijing, looting and burning the summer palace of the emperor.

Shortly after that, the British will back Napoleon in his project of putting a Hapsburg archduke on the throne of an ephemeral Mexican Empire - the Maximilian Project. These projects will be closely coordinated with Palmerston's plans to eliminate the only two nations still able to oppose him - the Russia of Alexander II and the United States of Abraham Lincoln. Lord Palmerston will be the evil demiurge of the American Civil War, the mastermind of secession, far more important for the Confederacy than Jefferson Davis or Robert E. Lee. And in the midst of that war, Palmerston will detonate a rebellion in Poland against Russian rule, not for the sake of Poland, but for the sake of starting a general European war against Russia.

But when the Russian fleets sail into New York and San Francisco, when Lee's wave breaks at Gettysburg, when the Stars and Bars are lowered over Vicksburg, the British Empire will be stopped - just short of its goal. Just short - and yet, British hegemony will still be great enough to launch the two world wars of the twentieth century, and the third conflagration that will start in 1991. And as we look forward for a century and a half from 1850, British geopolitics, despite the challenges, despite the defeats, despite the putrefaction of Britain itself, will remain the dominant factor in world affairs.

**PALMERSTON'S THREE STOOGES**

How do the British do it? How can a clique of depraved aristocrats on this tight little island bid to rule the entire world? Don't believe the stories about the workshop of the world; there are some factories here, but Britain lives by looting the colonies. The fleet is formidable, but also overrated, and very vulnerable to serious challenges. The army is third-rate. But the British have learned from the Venetians that the greatest force in history is the force of ideas, and that if you can control culture, you can control the way people think, and then statesmen and fleets and armies will bend to your will.

Take our friend Lord Palmerston. Pam has the Foreign Office, the Home Office, and Whitehall, but when he needed to start the 1848 revolutions, or when the time will come for the American Civil War, he turns to a troika of agents. They are Lord Palmerston's Three Stooges. But instead of Moe, Larry, and Curly, these Three Stooges are named Giuseppe Mazzini, Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, and David Urquhart. These Three Stooges - far more than the Union Jack, Victoria, the bulldog breed, the thin gray line of heroes, and the fleet - are the heart of what is called the British Empire.

We will get to know Lord Palmerston's Three Stooges better. But first, one thing must be understood. Moe, Larry, and Curly often had to work together on this or that project. But their relations were never exactly placid. [Slapstick episode from a "The Three Stooges" movie is shown to the audience.] You understand: Their stock in trade was infantile violence. So do not be surprised if we find Palmerston's Three Stooges lashing out with slanders, knives, and bombs against each other, and even against their august master, Lord Palmerston himself.

Under Lord Palmerston, England supports all revolutions - except her own - and the leading revolutionary in Her Majesty's Secret Service is Giuseppe Mazzini, our first Stooge.

**MAZZINI'S TERRORIST REVOLUTION**

Mazzini has concocted a very effective terrorist belief structure. Mazzini is a Genoese admirer of the diabolical Venetian friar Paolo Sarpi. Mazzini's father was a physician to Queen Victoria's father. For a while Mazzini worked for the Carbonari, one of Napoleon's Freemasonic fronts. Then, in 1831, Mazzini founded his Young Italy secret society. Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, today's President of France, sent him articles for his magazine. Mazzini's cry is "God and the People" [Dio e Popolo], which means that the people are the new God. Populism becomes an ersatz religion. Mazzini teaches that Christianity developed the human individual, but that the era of Christianity, of freedom, of human rights, is now over. From now on, the protagonists of history are not individuals any more, but peoples, understood as racial nationalities. Mazzini is adamant that there are no inalienable human rights. There is only Duty, the duty of thought and action to serve the destiny of the racial collectivities. "Liberty," says Mazzini, "is not the negation of all authority; it is the negation of every authority that fails to represent the Collective Aim of the Nation." There is no individual human soul, only a collective soul. According to Mazzini, the Catholic Church, the papacy, and every other institution which attempts to bring God to man must be abolished. Every national grouping that can be identified must be given independence and self- determination in a centralized dictatorship. In the coming century, Mussolini and the Italian Fascists will repeat many of Mazzini's ideas verbatim.

Mazzini thinks that each modern nation has a "mission": The British would take care of Industry and Colonies; the Poles, leadership of the Slavic world; the Russians, the civilizing of Asia. The French get Action, the Germans get Thought, and so forth. For some strange reason, there is no mission for Ireland, so Mazzini does not support the independence of Ireland. There is only one monarchy which Mazzini supports, because he says it has deep roots among the people: You guessed it, Queen Victoria.

Mazzini preaches an Italian revolution for the Third Rome: After the Rome of the Caesars and the Rome of the Popes comes the Rome of the People. For this, the pope must be driven out. Mazzini has tried to put this into practice just last year. In November 1848, armed Young Italy gangs forced Pope Pius IX to flee from Rome to Naples. From March to June of 1849, Mazzini ruled the Papal States as one of three dictators, all Grand Orient Freemasons. During that time, death squads operated in Rome, Ancona, and other cities. Some churches were sacked, and many confessionals were burned. For Easter 1849, Mazzini staged a monstrous mock Eucharist in the Vatican he called the Novum Pascha, featuring himself, God, and the People. During this time he was planning to set up his own Italian national church on the Anglican model.

The defense of Rome was organized by Giuseppe Garibaldi, who had joined Mazzini's Young Italy in the early 1830s. But a French army sent by fellow Stooge Louis Napoleon drove out Mazzini, Garibaldi, and their supporters. Lord Palmerston said that Mazzini's regime in Rome was "far better than any the Romans have had for centuries."

Right now Mazzini is here in London, enjoying the support of Lord Ashley, the Earl of Shaftesbury, a Protestant fanatic who also happens to be Lord Palmerston's son-in-law. Mazzini's direct access to the British government payroll comes through James Stansfeld, a junior Lord of the Admiralty and a very high official of British intelligence. Last year, Stansfeld provided the money for Mazzini's Roman Republic. Stansfeld's father-in-law, William Henry Ashurst, is another of Mazzini's patrons, as is John Bowring of the Foreign Office, the man who will provoke the second Opium War against China. Bowring is Jeremy Bentham's literary executor. John Stuart Mill of India House is another of Mazzini's friends. Mazzini is close to the protofascist writer Thomas Carlyle, and has been having an affair with Carlyle's wife.

One of Metternich's henchmen has said that Palmerston's policy is to make Italy turbulent, which is bad for Austria, without making her powerful, which would harm England. Mazzini's role in Italy has been that of a marplot, a wrecker, a terrorist, an assassin. His specialty is sending his brainwashed dupes to their deaths in terrorist attacks. He hides out and always succeeds in saving himself. Mazzini travels readily on the continent using false passports, posing as an American, an Englishman, a rabbi.

In the thirties and forties, Mazzini was targeting Piedmont in the north, and the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies in the south. In 1848, he rushed to Milan as soon as the Austrians had been driven out and tried to start trouble. One of Mazzini's agents, General Ramorino, let the Austrian commander Radetzky outflank the Piedmontese and win the battle of Novara. Ramorino was executed for treason, but Piedmont had lost the first war for Italian liberation. The king abdicated, and Mazzini tried to break up Piedmont with a revolt in Genoa. Three years from now, Mazzini will stage an abortive revolt against the Austrians in Milan, mainly to stop Russia from allying with Austria in the Crimean War. A few years after that Mazzini will try another insurrection in Genova, still trying to break up Piedmont. In 1860, he will encourage Garibaldi to sail to Sicily, and then try to provoke a civil war between Garibaldi's dictatorship in the south and Cavour's Piedmontese government in the north. In 1860, he will be thrown out of Naples as a provocateur. By that time, Mazzini will be a hated and reviled figure, but British propaganda and British support will keep him going.

Mazzini is also an assassination bureau. In 1848, there was a chance that Pius IX's very capable reforming minister Pellegrino Rossi could unify Italy and solve the Roman Question in a constructive way, through an Italian confederation, chaired by the pope, arranged with Gioberti, Cavour, and other Piedmontese. Mazzini's agents, members of Young Italy, stabbed Pellegrino Rossi to death. The killer was in touch with Lord Minto, Palmerston's special envoy for Italy.

Stooge violence between Mazzini and Napoleon III is always intense, especially after Napoleon's army finished off Mazzini's Roman Republic. In 1855, a Mazzini agent named Giovanni Pianori will attempt to kill Napoleon III, and a French court will convict Mazzini. Have Napoleon's forces outshone the bungling British in the Crimea? Are the British nervous about Napoleon's new ironclad battleship, when they have none? Attempts to kill Napoleon are financed by the Tibaldi Fund, run by Mazzini and set up by Sir James Stansfeld of the Admiralty.

Later, in February 1858, there will be an attempt to blow up Napoleon by one of Mazzini's closest and best known lieutenants from the Roman Republic, Felice Orsini. Napoleon will get the message that it is time to get busy and start a war against Austria in 1859.

At other times, Mazzini tried to kill King Carlo Alberto of Piedmont. Mazzini's Young Italy is always the party of the dagger, of the stiletto. "In the hands of Judith, the sword which cut short the life of Holofernes was holy; holy was the dagger which Harmodius crowned with roses; holy was the dagger of Brutus; holy the poniard of the Sicilian who began the Vespers; holy the arrow of Tell." Vintage Mazzini. London's future ability to assassinate men like Walter Rathenau, Jurgen Ponto, Aldo Moro, Alfred Herrhausen, Detlev Rohwedder, stretches back in unbroken continuity to the Mazzini networks of today.

Mazzini is actually doing everything he can to prevent Italian unity. When unity comes, 20 years from now, it will come in the form of a highly centralized state dominated by Grand Orient Freemasons. For 30 years the prime ministers will be Mazzini's agents, like DePretis and Crispi. Because of the violent liquidation of the Papal States, the Catholics will refuse to take part in politics. Italy will remain weak, poor, and divided. After Mussolini, the Italian Republican Party will identify with Mazzini, and Ugo LaMalfa and his friends will continue Mazzini's efforts to make sure that Italy is weak and divided, bringing down one government after another, and ruining the economy.

**THE ETHNIC THEME PARKS OF MAZZINI'S ZOO**

Mazzini's work for the British extends far beyond Italy. Like the Foreign Office and the Admiralty which he serves, Mazzini encompasses the world. The Mazzini networks offer us a fascinating array of movements and personalities. There are agents and dupes, professional killers, fellow travelers, and criminal energy types. Mazzini's court of miracles was a public scandal. Leopold of Saxe- Coburg- Gotha, now the king of Belgium, has been complaining to his niece Queen Victoria that in London there is maintained "a sort of menagerie of Kossuths, Mazzinis, Legranges, Ledru-Rollins, etc. ... to let loose occasionally on the continent to render its quiet and prosperity impossible."

Indeed. On Feb. 21, 1854, this crew will come together at the home of the American consul, George Sanders: Mazzini, Felice Orsini, Garibaldi, Louis Kossuth, Arnold Ruge, Ledru-Rollin, Stanley Worcell, Aleksandr Herzen, and U.S. traitor and future President James Buchanan. There will also be a Peabody from the counting house.

We can think of Mazzini as the zookeeper of a universal human zoo. Mazzini's human zoo is divided into theme parks or pavilions, one for each ethnic group. In a normal zoo there is an elephant house, a monkey house, an alligator pond, and the like. In Mazzini's human zoo there is an Italian house, a Russian house, a Hungarian house, a Polish house, an American house. Let us walk through the various theme parks in the zoo and identify some of the specimens.

Young Italy, as we have seen, was founded in 1831, attracting the young sailor Giuseppe Garibaldi and Louis Napoleon. Shortly thereafter there followed Young Poland, whose leaders included the revolutionaries Lelewel and Worcell. Then came Young Germany, featuring Arnold Ruge, who had published some material by an obscure German "red republican" named Karl Marx. This is the Young Germany satirized by Heinrich Heine. In 1834, Mazzini founded "Young Europe," with Italian, Swiss, German, and Polish components. Young Europe was billed as the Holy Alliance of the Peoples, opposed to Metternich's Holy Alliance of despots. By 1835, there was also a Young Switzerland. In that same year Mazzini launched Young France. The guiding light here was Ledru-Rollin, who later became the interior minister in Lamartine's short-lived Second French Republic of 1848. There was also Young Corsica, which was the Mafia.

By the end of this century we will have a Young Argentina (founded by Garibaldi), Young Bosnia, Young India, Young Russia, Young Armenia, Young Egypt, the Young Czechs, plus similar groupings in Romania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Greece. Mazzini is especially interested in creating a south Slavic federation dominated by Belgrade, and for that reason, he has a Serbian organization. That will have to wait for Mazzini's student Woodrow Wilson and the Versailles peace conference of 1919. Right now, a Masonic group in the United States is gearing up to support the pro-slavery doughface Franklin Pierce for President in 1852; they are the radical wing of the Democratic Party, and they call themselves Young America. In the future there will be the Young Turks. And yes, there is also a Palmerston- Mazzini group for Jews, sometimes called Young Israel, and sometimes called B'nai B'rith.

For Mazzini, a nationality means a race, a fixed array of behavior like a breed of dog or a species of animal. He is not thinking of a national community united by a literate language and a classical culture to which any person can become assimilated through a political choice. For Mazzini, race is unchangeable, and race is destiny. It is a matter of blood and soil. Cats fight dogs, French fight Germans, Germans fight Poles, and so on through all eternity. These hatreds are the main datum of sensory perception.

Each of Mazzini's organizations demands immediate national liberation for its own ethnic group on the basis of aggressive chauvinism and expansionism. Mazzini's warhorse is the Territorial Imperative. Each is obsessed with borders and territory, and each finds a way to oppose and sabotage dirigist economic development. Each one is eager to submerge and repress other national groupings in pursuit of its own mystical destiny. This is Mazzini's racist gospel of universal ethnic cleansing.

We have seen some Italian cages; next comes the Hungarian theme park in the zoo. Our principal specimen here is Louis Kossuth, a leader of the Hungarian revolution of 1848- 49. Kossuth was for free trade. He wanted equal status for Hungarians in the Austrian Empire - equal with the Austrians. But within the Hungarian part of the Hapsburg Empire there were many other national groups - Poles, Ukrainians, Germans, Serbs, Romanians, Croatians, and others. Would they receive political and linguistic autonomy? Kossuth's answer was to ban all official use of the Slavic and Romanian languages in favor of Hungarian. Kossuth was therefore on course for a bloody collision with the Illyrian movement for Greater Croatia, and with the military forces of the Croatian leader Jellacich. There was also conflict with the Serbs. Mazzini had promised the same territories to Hungary, to the Illyrian Croatians, and to his Serbian south Slav entity. Then there was the question of Transylvania, claimed by the Hungarians but also by the Young Romania of Dimitirie Golescu, another Mazzini agent. Young Romania's program was to restore the Kingdom of Dacia as it had existed before the Roman Emperor Trajan. So Young Hungary and Young Romania were pre-programmed to fight to the death over Transylvania, which they did, last year. Because of the ceaseless strife of Hungarians and Croatians, Hungarians and Serbians, Hungarians and Romanians, it proved possible for the Hapsburgs to save their police state with the help of a Russian army.

The ethnic theme houses of the zoo thus sally forth to fight, not only Hapsburgs and Romanovs, but most of all, each other. We will find the same thing in viewing the Polish and Russian pavilions.

The Young Poland of Lelewel and Worcell demands the re-creation of the Polish state and rollback of the 1772-95 partitions of Poland. But they go much further, laying claim to Poland in its old Jagiellonian borders, stretching from the shores of the Baltic to the shores of the Black Sea. This includes an explicit denial that any Ukrainian nation exists. In the orbit of Young Poland is the poet Adam Mickiewicz, a close friend of Mazzini's who was with him last year during the Roman Republic. Mickiewicz argues that Poland is special because it has suffered more than any other nation; Poland is "the Christ among nations." Mickiewicz dreams of uniting all the west and south Slavs against the "tyrant of the north," the "barbarians of the north." By this he means Russia, the main target. Young Poland's program also foreshadows the obvious conflict with Young Germany over Silesia.

Young Russia means the anarchist Mikhail Bakunin and the aristocratic ideologue Aleksandr Herzen. Herzen is an agent of Baron James Rothschild of Paris. Right after the Crimean War, Herzen will start publishing "The Polar Star" and "The Bell," both leak sheets for British secret intelligence that will build up their readership by divulging Russian state secrets. Herzen's obvious target is Czar Alexander II, the ally of Lincoln. Herzen prints the ravings of Bakunin, who preaches pan-Slavism, meaning that Russia will take over all the other Slavic nations. "Out of an ocean of blood and fire there will rise in Moscow high in the sky the star of the revolution to become the guide of liberated mankind." Vintage Bakunin. If Mazzini relies on the stiletto, for Bakunin it is "the peasant's axe" that will bring down the "German" regime in St. Petersburg.

Herzen is interested in sabotaging Alexander II and his policy of real, anti-British reform in Russia. To block real industrial capitalist development, he preaches reliance on the aboriginal Slavic village, the *mir*, with "communal ownership of the land" plus the ancient Slavic workshop, the *artel*. The mir will never build the Trans-Siberian railway. Herzen sees Russia as the "center of crystallization" for the entire Slavic world. Herzen, although he is usually called a "westernizer," is totally hostile to western civilization. He writes of the need for a "new Attila," perhaps Russian, perhaps American, perhaps both, who will be able to tear down the old Europe. In the moment when the British will seem so close to winning everything, Herzen will support Palmerston's Polish insurrection of 1863, and will lose most of his readers. Once the American Civil War is over, the British will have little use for Herzen. By then, London will be betting on the nihilist terrorists of the Narodnaya Volya (People's Will), who will finally kill Alexander II, plus the Russian legal Marxists, all British agents. But already today we can see the conflicts ahead between Young Poland and Young Russia. In the conflicts among Mazzini's national chauvinist operations, we can see the roots of the slaughter of World War I.

Now, let us view the cages in the American theme park in Mazzini's human zoo. This is Young America. The name was popularized in 1845 by Edwin DeLeon, the son of a Scottish Rite, Jewish slave-trading family of Charleston, South Carolina. Edwin DeLeon will later be one of the leaders of the Confederate espionage organization in Europe. The leader of Young America is George N. Sanders, the future editor of the "Democratic Review." Young America's view of Manifest Destiny is a slave empire in Mexico and the Caribbean. In the 1852 election, Young America will back the dark horse doughface Democrat, Franklin Pierce, against the patriot Winfield Scott. Scott's Whig Party will be destroyed. Young America operatives will receive important posts in London, Madrid, Turin, and other European capitals. Here they will support Mazzini and his gang.

Mazzini's American contacts are either proto- Confederates or strict abolitionists, such as William Lloyd Garrison. During the American Civil War, Mazzini will favor both the abolition of slavery *and* the destruction of the Union through secessionism - the London line. This subversion will be showcased during the famous tour of Kossuth in the United States, next year and the year after. Kossuth will be accompanied by Mazzini's moneybags, the Tuscan Freemason Adriano Lemmi. On the eve of the Crimean War, with Palmerston doing everything to isolate Russia, Kossuth's line will be that the "tree of evil and despotism" in Europe "is Russia." Kossuth will try to blame even the problems of Italy on Russia. Despite Kossuth's efforts, the United States will emerge as the only power friendly to Russia during the Crimean conflict. Kossuth will call for the United States to join with England and France in war against Russia - Lord Palmerston's dream scenario.

Kossuth will refuse to call for the abolition of slavery. Kossuth will get on well with the slaveholders, since he will also be attempting to mediate a U.S. seizure of Cuba, which meshes perfectly with the secessionist program.

Mazzini is the zookeeper for all of these theme parks. But there are other zookeepers, and still more theme parks in the human, multicultural zoo. The custodians are Palmerston's two other Stooges, David Urquhart and Napoleon III.

**THE SECOND STOOGE: DAVID URQUHART**

There is also a theme park for the English lower orders. The keeper here is the strange and eccentric Scot, David Urquhart, the most aristocratic of Palmerston's Stooges. Urquhart was chosen for his work directly by Jeremy Bentham, who lavishly praised "our David" in his letters. Urquhart took part in Lord Byron's Greek revolution, but then found he liked Turks better after all. He secured a post at the British Embassy in Constantinople and "went native," becoming an Ottoman pasha in his lifestyle. Urquhart's positive contribution to civilization was his popularization of the Turkish bath. He also kept a harem for some time. Urquhart also thought that late Ottoman feudalism was a model of what civilization ought to be. In Turkey, Urquhart became convinced that all the evil in the world had a single root: Russia, the machinations of the court of St. Petersburg. A very convenient view for Palmerston's Britain, which was always on the verge of war with Russia. For Urquhart, the unification of Italy is a Russian plot. He once met Mazzini, and concluded after ten minutes that Mazzini was a Russian agent! The usual Stooge on Stooge violence again! For this Russophobe, the problem of Great Britain is that Palmerston is a Russian agent, having been recruited by one of his many mistresses, the Russian Countess Lieven. During the years of Chartist agitation, Urquhart bought up working class leaders and drilled them in the litany that all of the problems of the English working man came from Russia via Lord Palmerston. To these workers Urquhart teaches something he calls dialectics. Urquhart will be a member of Parliament and he controls a weekly paper, "The Free Press."

Palmerston understands that his subversive methods will always generate opposition from the Tory gentry and the straight-laced crowd. So he has taken the precaution of institutionalizing that opposition under his own control, with a raving megalomaniac leader to discredit it. Urquhart's demonization of Russia foreshadows something that will be called McCarthyism a century from now. Urquhart's remedy is to go back to the simplicity of character of Merrie England, in the sense of retrogression to bucolic medieval myth. "The people of England were better clothed and fed when there was no commerce and when there were no factories." That is vintage Urquhart.

Does this talk of pre-capitalist economic formations strike a familiar chord? Do you smell a big, fat commie rat?

How interesting that Urquhart should be the controller of British agent Karl Marx, who earns his keep as a writer for Urquhart's paper. David Urquhart is the founder of modern communism! It is Urquhart who will prescribe the plan for "Das Kapital." Marx is a professed admirer of Urquhart - acknowledging his influence more than that of any other living person. Marx will even compose a "Life of Lord Palmerston," based on Urquhart's wild obsession that Pam is a Russian agent of influence. This says enough about Marx's acumen as a political analyst. Marx and Urquhart agree that there is no real absolute profit in capitalism, and that technological progress causes a falling rate of profit.

Another of Urquhart's operatives is Lothar Bucher, a confidant of the German labor leader Lassalle, and later of the Iron Chancellor, Otto von Bismarck himself. After Gettysburg, Urquhart will move to France, and open a theme park for right-wing Catholics; he will meet Pius IX and will join members of Cardinal Newman's Oxford Movement at the First Vatican Council in 1870.

**THE THIRD STOOGE: NAPOLEON III**

Our third Stooge is the current President and soon-to-be emperor of France, Napoleon III, "Napoleon le Petit." As we have seen, he started off as a Carbonaro and terrorist in contact with Mazzini. In 1836, Napoleon tried to parlay his famous name into a successful putsch; he failed and was exiled to America. Then Napoleon was given a private study at the new British Museum reading room and frequented Lord Palmerston. He began work on his book, "Les Idees Napoleoniques." His main idea was that the original Napoleon was not wrong to be an imperialist, but only erred in trying to expand his empire at the expense of Great Britain. There is plenty of room for a French Empire as a junior partner to the British. The preferred form of government would be democratic Caesarism, with frequent plebiscites.

In 1848 Napoleon was working for the British as a special constable - a riot cop - to put down an expected Chartist revolution; he was then shipped to Paris. There Napoleon III used his name to become President, and then organized a coup d'etat that made him emperor. Palmerston quickly endorsed the coup, causing hysteria on the part of the Victoria and Albert palace clique. Palmerston was forced out, but he was soon back, stronger than ever.

After hundreds of years of warfare, France at last had been broken, placed under a more or less dependable British puppet regime. The "western powers," the "Anglo-French," were born. Napoleon III gave Palmerston one indispensable ingredient for his imperial strategy: a powerful land army. Soon an open Anglo-French entente was in full swing. When Victoria came to Paris it was the first such visit by an English sovereign since Henry VI had been crowned King of France in Notre Dame in 1431. When Napoleon joined Palmerston in attacking Russia in the Crimea, it was the first war in 400 years to see France and England on the same side.

The French pavilion of the zoo is being redecorated with a new version of British empiricism: This is positivism, the miserable outlook of Auguste Comte and Ernest Renan. This will lead to the French structuralists, ethnologists, and even deconstructionists of the late twentieth century.

Napoleon III is Palmerston's strategic catamite, usually with as much will of his own as an inflatable sex doll. Think of him as a blow-up British agent. After the Crimea, Palmerston will need a land war against Austria in northern Italy. Napoleon, egged on by Camillo Benso di Cavour who knows how to play the interstices, will oblige with the war of 1859 and the great Battle of Solferino. When the time will come for Maximilian's Mexican adventure, Napoleon will be eager to send a fleet and an army. During the American Civil War, Napoleon's pro-Confederate stance will be even more aggressive than Palmerston's own. In 1870, Bismarck will defeat Napoleon and send him into exile in England. Here Napoleon will plan a comeback after the Paris Commune, but he will need to be seen on horseback, and he has a bladder ailment. The bladder operation designed to make him a man on horseback once again will instead kill him.

Napoleon III calls himself a socialist and will style the latter phase of his regime "the liberal empire." That means all of France as a theme park in the British zoo. In 1860 Napoleon will sign a free trade treaty with the British. Along the way, he will pick up a junior partner colonial empire in Senegal and in Indo-China in 1862, something that will set the stage for the Vietnam War a century later. Under Napoleon, France will build the Suez Canal, only to have it fall under the control of the British. Napoleon III will furnish the prototype for the fascist dictators of the twentieth century. After his defeat in the Franco- Prussian war, he will bequeath to France a party of proto-fascist colonialists and revanchists beating the drum for Alsace- Lorraine, which Napoleon will lose to Bismarck. These revanchists will turn up again in Vichy, the Fourth Republic, and the French Socialist Party of today.

And so it will come to pass that Lord Palmerston will attempt to rule the world through the agency of a triumvirate of Stooges, each one the warden of some pavilions of a human zoo. The reason why must now be confronted.

**THE IDEOLOGY OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM**

The British Empire exists in the mind of its victims. This is the empire of senses, of sense certainty, the empire of empiricism. It is the empire of British philosophical radicalism, of utilitarianism, of hedonistic calculus, existentialism, and pragmatism.

Why are the British liberal imperialists called the Venetian Party? Well, for one thing, they call themselves the Venetian Party. The future prime minister Benjamin Disraeli will write in his novel "Conningsby" that the Whig aristocrats of 1688 wanted "to establish in England a high aristocratic republic on the model of [Venice], making the kings into doges, and with a 'Venetian constitution.'"

During the years after the Council of Florence in 1439, the Venetian enemies of Nicolaus of Cusa plotted to wage war on the Italian High Renaissance and Cusa's ecumenical project. To combat Cusa's Renaissance Platonism, the Venetians of the Rialto and Padua turned to a new-look Aristotelianism, featuring Aristotle's characteristic outlook shorn of its medieval- scholastic and Averroist outgrowths.

This was expressed in the work of Pietro Pomponazzi, and in that of Pomponazzi's pupil, Gasparo Contarini. During the War of the League of Cambrai of 1509-17, an alliance of virtually every power in Europe threatened to wipe out the Venetian oligarchy. The Venetians knew that France or Spain could crush them like so many flies. The Venetians responded by launching the Protestant Reformation with three proto-Stooges - Luther, Calvin, and Henry VIII. At the same time, Contarini and his Jesuits made Aristotle a central component of the Catholic Counter- Reformation and the Council of Trent, and put Dante and Piccolomini on the Index of Prohibited Books. The result was a century and a half of wars of religion, and a "little dark age," culminating in the Great Crisis of the seventeenth century.

Venice was a cancer consciously planning its own metastasis. From their lagoon, the Venetians chose a swamp and an island facing the North Atlantic - Holland and the British Isles. Here the hegemonic Giovani party would relocate their family fortunes, their *fondi*, and their characteristic epistemology. France was also colonized, but the main bets were placed further north. First, Contarini's relative and neighbor Francesco Zorzi was sent to serve as sex adviser to Henry VIII, whose raging libido would be the key to Venetian hopes. Zorzi brought Rosicrucian mysticism and Freemasonry to a land that Venetian bankers had been looting for centuries. The Venetian Party in England grew under the early Stuarts as Francis Bacon and his wife Thomas Hobbes imported the neo- Aristotelianism of Fra Paolo Sarpi, the great Venetian gamemaster of the early 1600s, the architect of the Thirty Years' War.

When James I and Charles I disappointed the Venetians in that Thirty Years' War, Cromwell, Milton, and a menagerie of sectarians were brought to power in an all-Protestant civil war and Commonwealth. This was the time of the Irish genocide and the foundation of the overseas empire in Jamaica. After the depravity of the Restoration, the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688 gave birth to the most perfect imitation of the Venetian oligarchical system ever created. The great Whig and Tory aristocrats set as their goal a new, world- encompassing Roman Empire with its center in London. After the defeat of Leibniz's attempt to save England, Great Britain set off on the path of empire with its new Hanoverian Guelph dynasty.

The War of the Spanish Succession in 1702-13 was the first war fought on a world scale and the last gasp for rivals Spain and Holland. The Peace of Utrecht left the British supreme on the oceans. Louis XIV and Colbert were defeated by divide- and- conquer Venetian geopolitics, as British cash was used to hire states like Brandenburg and Savoy to fight the French. By winning the coveted *asiento*, the monopoly on slave commerce with Spanish America, the British became the biggest slave merchants in the world. The wealth of Bristol and Liverpool would be built on slaves.

After several decades of Walpole and the Hell-Fire Clubs, there came the great war of the mid-eighteenth century, the Austrian Succession followed by the Seven Years' War. This was the end of France as a naval power and worldwide rival for the British. William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, subsidized Frederick the Great of Prussia to win an empire on the plains of Germany. The British took Ft. Louisburg and then seized Quebec City, driving the French out of Canada. The British became the paramount power in India. The British oligarchs of the day, like their successors after 1989, were convinced that they could run wild, violating the laws of nature without penalty, for nothing could now stand against them. But, in loading the American colonies with their prohibitions of settlement and manufacture, their Quebec Act, Stamp Acts, Townsend Acts, and Intolerable Acts, they set the stage for the American Revolution.

In these years William Petty, Earl of Shelburne and Marquis of Lansdowne, gathered a stable of ideologues and operatives, *his* stooges. These were Jeremy Bentham, Adam Smith, Edward Gibbon. These were the founders of British philosophical radicalism, the most primitive form of Aristotle yet devised, and its Siamese twin, free trade. Shelburne was defeated by the superior ability of Hamilton, Franklin, and Washington, but he did succeed in destabilizing and nearly destroying France. The reign of terror in the French Revolution was the work of agents and dupes of Shelburne among the Jacobins, *enrages*, and sans-culottes.

By now British policy was in the hands of Shelburne's student and protégé, William Pitt the Younger. After letting the Jacobin horrors of Bentham's agents brew up for three years, Pitt was able to unite the continental powers against France in the first, second, and third coalitions. Using the armies raised by Lazare Carnot, Napoleon shattered each of these coalitions. Napoleon's final defeat was the work of Scharnhorst, Gneisenau, and the Prussian reformers, but the beneficiaries were the British.

At the Congress of Vienna in 1815, the British were clearly the dominant force, but they were still obliged to make deals with Metternich, Russia, and Prussia. But under the regimes of Castlereagh and Canning, the oligarchical stupidity, greed, and incompetence of Metternich and Co. made possible the revolts and revolutions of 1820, 1825, and 1830. By 1830, Lord Palmerston was ready to take control of the Foreign Office and begin his direct march to undisputed world domination. Metternich was still sitting on the lid of the boiling European cauldron, but Lord Palmerston and his Three Stooges were stoking the flames underneath.

There was a time when the center of oligarchy, usury, and geopolitics was Venice, the group of islands in a lagoon at the top of the Adriatic. In the sixteenth century, in the wake of the war of the League of Cambrai, Venice was a cancer planning its own metastasis. These were the years during which the patrician party known as the Giovani, the Youngsters, began meeting in a salon known as Ridotto Morosini. It is here that the future course of England and Britain was charted.

**Chorus: "The consolidation of the Venetian Party in England and Britain was a question of culture."**

Francisco Zorzi of Venice, the close friend and relative of Gasparo Contarini, who was sent by the Venetian oligarchy to England as the sex advisor to Henry VIII, was a Cabalist and Rosicrucian. In 1529, Zorzi came to London to deliver his opinion, and he remained at the court for the rest of his life, building up an important party of followers - the nucleus of the modern Venetian Party in England. In 1525, Zorzi had published the treatise "De Harmonia Mundi," which uses the cabalistic Sephiroth to expound a mystical, irrationalist outlook and to undercut the influence of Nicolaus of Cusa.

In 1536, when he was at the English court, Zorzi wrote his second major work, "In Scripturam Sacram Problemata." This is a manual of magic, with Zorzi assuring the aspiring wizard that Christian angels will guard him to make sure he does not fall into the hands of demons.

Zorzi was a great influence on certain Elizabethan poets. Sir Philip Sydney was a follower of Zorzi, as was the immensely popular Edmund Spencer, the author of the long narrative poem "The Faerie Queene." Spencer is a key source for the idea of English imperial destiny as God's chosen people, with broad hints of British Israel. Christopher Marlowe and William Shakespeare both attacked Zorzi's influence in such plays as "Doctor Faustus" and "Othello," but the Venetian school was carried on by the Rosicrucian Robert Fludd, and, of course, by Francis Bacon and Thomas Hobbes.

John Milton, the admirer of Paolo Sarpi and apologist for usury, is an example of the pro- Venetian Puritan of the Cromwell Commonwealth period. Milton taught that the Son of God is inferior to the Father, a kind of afterthought, and in any case not necessary. Milton was the contemporary of Sabbatai Zevi, the false messiah from Smyrna, Turkey, whose father was an agent for English Puritan merchants. Did Milton's "Paradise Regained" of 1671 reflect knowledge of Sabbatai Zevi's meteoric career, which burst on the world in 1665?

The British East India Company was founded in 1600. By 1672, adventurers, such as Diamond Pitt, were freebooting around India.

**[Chorus]**

British empiricism started from Francis Bacon's inductive method based on sense certainty, all of which was taken directly from such Venetians as Paul Paruta and Pietro Sarpi. With Bacon is Thomas Hobbes, who wrote of human society as a war of all against all, necessarily dominated by a tyrannical leviathan state. Then came John Locke, for whom the human mind was a blank slate destined to be filled by sense perceptions. Locke's hedonism led him to the conclusion that human freedom was an absurd contradiction in terms. Locke was followed by the solipsist George Berkeley, who denied any basis in reality to our sense impressions: They are a kind of videotape played in each one of our heads by some unknown supernatural agency. Perception was the only existence there was.

Then came the Scots lawyer and diplomat David Hume. For Hume also, there is really no human self, but merely a bundle of changing perceptions. In his "Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding" and other earlier works, Hume attacks the idea of cause and effect. For Hume, there is no necessary connection between a cause and an effect that the human mind can know with certainty; we only have a vague association or habit of thought that one phenomenon has usually been follow by another. But in these same earlier works, Hume had at least accepted the importance of filling the *tabula rasa* of each new human mind with a stock of received ideas of conduct which can be lumped under the heading of morals or custom, including religion.

During Hume's later years, the power of the Shelburne faction became dominant in Britain, and Hume's skepticism became bolder and more radical. The later Hume, as in his "Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion," totally repudiated the notion of custom and morality in favor of an unbridled hedonism that points towards the depths of pederasty and degradation inhabited by Jeremy Bentham.

Immanuel Kant, during his long teaching career at Königsberg, Prussia, had been a retailer of Hume's ideas. The two liberals Kant and Hume had a broad common ground in their determination to eradicate the influence of Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz. But when Hume repudiated all notion of custom and traditional morality, even Kant could not follow. Kant responded with the "Critique of Pure Reason" to defend the notion of cause and effect as one of Aristotle's categories, against Hume, who had reached a sub-Aristotelian level. On this basis, Kant was able to defend customary ideas of religion and morality, "*das Sittengesetz*." The Kant-Hume split illustrates why British liberal empiricism tends to be several degrees more rotten than its continental European counterparts.

**[Chorus]**

It is clear that B'nai B'rith is an abject tool of British intelligence, run and directed to serve the interests of British imperial policy, and not the interests of Jews, or even of B'nai B'rith members. The one peculiarity of B'nai B'rith in comparison to the other organizations launched by Palmerston and his three stooges is that B'nai B'rith will be used for a wider variety of tasks in various countries and epochs. Therefore, B'nai B'rith will be more permanent in its continuous organization than its Mazzinian counterparts, among which it stands out as the most specialized.

At the end of this century, one of the tasks assigned to B'nai B'rith will be to direct, with the help of other Mazzinian agents, the dismemberment and partition of the Ottoman Empire. This is the state the British will call the sick man of Europe. Historically, the Ottoman Empire offers surprising tolerance to its ethnic minorities. To blow up the empire, that will have to be changed into brutal oppression on the Mazzini model. In 1862, during the time of the American Civil War, Mazzini will call on all his agents anywhere near Russia to foment revolt as a way of causing trouble for Alexander II. A bit later, with the help of Young Poland, Mazzini will start a Young Ottoman movement out of an Adam Smith translation project in Paris. In 1876, the Young Ottomans will briefly seize power in Constantinople. They will end a debt moratorium, pay off the British, declare free trade, and bring in Anglo-French bankers. They will be quickly overthrown. But the same network will soon make a comeback as the Young Turks, whose rule will finally destroy the Ottoman Empire.

**[Chorus]**

B'nai B'rith networks will have a devastating impact on the culture of the twentieth century. Sigmund Freud, the founder of psychoanalysis, will be a leading member of the B'nai B'rith lodge in Vienna, Austria, during the twilight of the Hapsburg Empire. Freud later will cordially thank the members of that lodge for their support during the arduous early years in psychoanalysis. Indeed, several members of the lodge will provide the initiating cadre who along with Freud will found the quackery of psychoanalysis. This Freud will be a charlatan and a Cabalist. The anti-Semitism of Freud and of B'nai B'rith as an organization of British intelligence at the expense of Jews will be perhaps most clearly documented in Freud's last major work, "Moses and Monotheism." His hatred for creativity and the human mind will be documented in his essay on Leonardo da Vinci, in which he will assert, on the basis of no evidence whatsoever, that Leonardo was a homosexual. Later, the Frankfort Institute for Social Research will be founded with the program of merging Marx with Freud. One of the pillars of the Frankfort school will be Max Horkheimer. After the Second World War, Horkheimer will be instrumental in re- founding and re-organizing B'nai B'rith in Frankfort. The Frankfort school will provide the matrix for the youth culture and counter-culture of the postwar decades in the same way that Mazzini, the high priest of romanticism, has used his youth cults to shape the first half of the nineteenth century.

**[Chorus]**

Today, in 1850, Great Britain and the United States are traditional enemies moving towards their third military conflict after the American Revolution and the War of 1812. During the Civil War, the United States and Russia will together confront Lord Palmerston with a kind of League of Cambrai experience: the spectre of these two great powers arrayed against the British Empire and its stooges in a world war that London would almost certainly lose. After Gettysburg, the British will resign themselves to the continued existence of the United States for some time to come. They will focus their endeavors on using the United States and its power as a weapon in their own hands against Germany, Japan, Russia, and the developing countries. Cultural and financial subjugation will precede military exploitation; the Specie Resumption Act, the control of the US public debt by J.P. Morgan, and the presidencies of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson will mark the way toward the so-called "special relationship," with American muscle working for the brain in London. Under these auspices, British geopolitics will organize two world wars and forty years of cold war.

**[Chorus]**

**CONCLUSION**

Towards the end of the twentieth century, in the storms of the breakdown crisis that will follow the end of the NATO-Warsaw Pact confrontation, human beings will be forced to choose between two conflicting definitions of themselves.

On the one hand, they will be able, as human beings always are [able], to choose creative reason, scientific discovery, and a true world order, of community of principle, of sovereign nations seeking progress through economic development. If the persons of those coming days are able to lift their eyes to the stars, they may be able to cease killing one another in order to possess a few square miles of mud on one small planet. If they are capable of recognizing the inherent universality of the human personality, the equality of each person as *imago viva dei*, then the domain of humanity will be without limit.

But in those same days, the heirs of Mazzini and Lord Palmerston and B'nai B'rith, the servants of a dying Britain, will try to pull the world with them into the abyss. They will say that identity is that of an ethnic group, and that ethnicity controls man's destiny as it does among the animal species. They will tell Americans of the melting pot and so many others who have no ethnic identity that they must acquire a synthetic one. They will re-write history around a thousand false centers to deny that human progress is One. Nor will the minds of little children be exempted from these torments. Others will talk of multiculturalism in a time when the human image will be lacerated and violated and immolated as never before in the face of all the nations. If these voices prevail, then an eon of darkness will surely cover the world. When Palmerston ranted his "Civis Romanus sum!" in the parliament here in Westminster just a short time ago, he thought the empire was made, and that there would never be a reply. But a reply will come, after the British drive will have fallen short, thirteen years from now, when Abraham Lincoln will stand among the new graves and promise that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

**END**

**KING EDWARD VII OF GREAT BRITAIN:**

**EVIL DEMIURGE OF THE TRIPLE ENTENTE AND WORLD WAR I**

*by Webster Tarpley*

"For long years, King Edward wove, with masterly skill, the Nessus robe that was to destroy the German Hercules." - Leipziger Neuste Nachrichten, after the death of Edward VII, May 1910

"What neither Azincourt nor Poitiers could do, the genius of Edward VII realized." - Emile Flourens, La France Conquise, 1906

"There are no frictions between us, there is only rivalry." - Edward VII to State Secretary von Tschirschky of the German Foreign Ministry, at the Cronberg Anglo-German summit, 1906

The Triple Entente is the name given to the alliance among Great Britain, France, and Russia which was formed during the first decade of this century, and which led to the outbreak of the First World War. This Triple Entente was the personal creation of King Edward VII of Britain. The Triple Entente was King Edward's own idea.

It was King Edward who set up the British alliance with Japan, the Russo-Japanese War, and the 1905 Russian Revolution. It was King Edward VII, acting as the autocrat of British foreign policy, who engineered the Entente Cordiale between Britain and France in 1903-04, and who then went on to seal the fateful British-Russian Entente of 1907. It was King Edward who massaged Theodore Roosevelt and other American leaders to help bring about the U.S.-U.K. "special relationship," which dates from the time of his reign. This diplomatic work was masterminded and carried out by King Edward VII personally, with the various British ministers, cabinets, round tables, and other apparatus merely following in his wake. Edward had a geopolitical vision in the Venetian tradition, and it was one of brutal simplicity: the encirclement of Germany with a hostile coalition, followed by a war of annihilation in which many of Britain's erstwhile "allies" - notably France and Russia - would also be decimated and crippled.

Edward VII died in May 1910, before he could see his life's work carried through to completion. But he had created the war alliance of Britain, France, Russia, and Japan, with support from the United States, that would take the field in August 1914. He had created the nightmare world of crossed mobilizations among Germany, France, and Russia. And he had created a network of cothinkers, agents, and dupes in every chancery in England, Europe, and America, who would, when the time came, push the mobilization buttons and launch the war. The madmen of 1914 - Sir Edward Grey, Izvolski, Sazonov, Delcassé, Clemenceau, Poincaré - were all agents of Edward VII's influence. It was Edward's crowd that made sure that the lights went out across Europe, not to be re-illuminated for a generation and more.

Edward VII was also Casanova with a crown, a satyr and sodomist on the throne of England, the royal rake of Edwardian legend. All of this provides useful insight, but is finally beside the point. Edward VII, far more than any other single human being, was the author of the First World War, and thus brought about what is probably the most destructive single event in the history of western civilization. Without Edward's exertions, the war could never have occurred. The Lord of the Isles, as he appeared in Scottish costume at a ball in 1871, was the Lord of the Flies.

And why should we be concerned with these matters today? The main things that have gone wrong with the twentieth century are demonstrably rooted in World War One. World War One opened the door both to the Communism of Lenin and Stalin and to the fascism of Mussolini and Hitler. World War One made possible the entire Versailles system, including reparations, which produced the Great Depression. And finally, World War II, with its greater scale of destruction, was essentially the prolongation of the First World War after two decades of fitful truce. And in our own time, the mad hatters and March hares of the London oligarchy, the Rees-Moggs, Evans-Pritchards, and the Hurds, are proposing a return to the Triple Entente as the shape of things to come.

.

**I. THE ANATOMY OF A MONSTER**

**EDWARD VII, AUTOCRAT**

Edward VII has been hailed by the British as the greatest political activist of the House of Windsor, and as the greatest monarch since William the Conqueror in 1066. He represents the case in which the monarch and the leader of the oligarchy are united in the same person. The result was an autocrat more absolute than the Kaiser or the Czar.

Edward VII's role as dictator of British foreign policy before the war, although denied by recent biographers, was a matter of common knowledge through the 1920s. During the last months of Edward's life, Robert Blatchford, the editor of the Clarion, wrote in the Daily Mail of Dec. 14, 1909 that: "The king and his councilors have strained every nerve to establish Ententes with Russia and with Italy; and have formed an Entente with France, and as well with Japan. Why? To isolate Germany." (Farrer, p. 261)

J.A. Farrer, writing after the cataclysm of World War I, commented that Edward's: "whole reign was a preparation and education for a war accepted as inevitable.... It is now plain that [Edward's] policy, though achieving peace in some directions, was in essence a policy of war, and one that ended in war. The panic of a German invasion, sustained by the Press during the whole decade, failed of such discouragement as might have prevented a needless enmity to arise between us and Germany. The king seems to have shared the popular belief in the will and power of Germany to invade us." (Farrer, p. 5, pp. 261-262)

The leading ambassadors and ministers of the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs clearly recorded their understanding of Edward's project. Here is the view of Baron Greindl, the Belgian ambassador to Berlin, as expressed in April 1906: "One is driven to the conclusion that British foreign policy is directed by the king in person ... there is undoubtedly in England a court policy pursued outside and alongside that of the government." In 1907 Greindl added: "The king of England's visit to the king of Spain is one of the moves in the campaign to isolate Germany that is being personally directed with as much perseverance as success by his Majesty King Edward VII." (Middlemas, pp. 173-174)

Austrian sources confirm the essential view of Edward the Encircler (Eduard der Einkreiser) as the architect of the Entente system. The following example is from the Vienna Neue Freie Presse of April 15, 1907, and came in response to Edward VII's overtures to Russia: "Who can fail to receive the impression that a diplomatic duel is being fought out between England and Germany under the eyes of the world. The king of England ... is no longer afraid of appearing to throw the whole influence of his personality into the scales whenever it is a question of thwarting the aims of German policy. The meeting at Gaeta [of Edward VII with the king of Italy] is another fact connected with the burning jealousy between England and Germany. Already people are asking themselves everywhere: 'What is the meaning of this continual political labor, carried on with open recklessness, whose object is to put a close ring around Germany?'" (Brooke-Shepherd, p. 283)

Born in 1841, Edward VII had the typical Saxe- Coburg- Gotha mug, like the current heir apparent. Edward VII was a pupil of Lord Palmerston, with whom he discussed a Russian alliance during the mid-1860s. The young Edward was also close to Palmerston's stooge Napoleon III, and the Empress Eugenie.

In that 1866 war, Edward's mother, Queen Victoria, sympathized with Prussia. But Edward supported Austria, even when Austria was crushed by Prussia at Königgrätz. In 1866, Edward favored what he called an Anglo-French Entente to contain Prussia. This was already the germ of the London-Paris Entente Cordiale of nearly 40 years later. Hostility to Prussia and later to Germany is thus the one fixed point of Edward VII's career. What is reflected here is classical Venetian geopolitics as applied by the British. For centuries, London's maxim has been to ally with the second strongest continental power to destroy the strongest continental power. Until 1870, the British perceived Russia to be the strongest land power. In the 1870s that abruptly changed with the emergence of a united Germany. Edward VII was quicker than other elements of the British oligarchy to take note of that momentous shift.

Edward visited Canada and the United States in the fall of 1860, helping to give a final push to secession and civil war. In 1862 he was in Egypt and the Middle East. In 1875-76 Edward visited India, where he helped to prepare the Afghan war of 1878, which was waged against the influence of Russia. One of the members of Edward's party on this tour was his fellow rake, lifelong friend, and political ally, Lord Carrington.

**QUEEN VICTORIA: MRS. JOHN BROWN**

Edward's apprenticeship for the monarchy was a long one. In 1861 his father, Prince Albert of Saxe- Coburg- Gotha, died. Edward's mother, Queen Victoria, went into deep mourning and did not emerge from it during the 40 remaining years of her life. The queen was an occultist, as befits a royal house which has always been dominated by Venetians.

Queen Victoria retreated to her castle at Balmoral in the Scottish highlands, 500 miles north of London. The court was organized as a death cult, with every pretense that Albert was still alive. His laundry had to be done, and his nightgown laid out every night. Hot water was brought to his room every morning, and the chamber pot cleaned. There were two guest books, one for the queen, one for Albert, and so on. Victoria made repeated attempts to contact the shade of Prince Albert in the underworld - or the beyond - and these became the origins of the modern British occult bureau. As a result of these seances, the queen became convinced that John Brown, her Scottish gillie (attendant), was a powerful medium through whom the spirit of Albert addressed her. Gossip seeped out from Balmoral to London that John Brown was "the queen's stallion," granted every conjugal privilege, including adjoining bedrooms far from the ladies-in-waiting. A pamphlet about the queen appeared entitled "Mrs. John Brown." Victoria was very like Miss Habisham of Satis House in the Dickens novel "Great Expectations." This was the woman for whom time had stopped when she had lost her husband. When we factor in the frequent orders made for opium and heroin at the local Balmoral pharmacy, we get a picture of Victoria's life in the Highlands. Prim and straight laced it was not.

**EDWARD THE CARESSER**

When Edward VII married, he chose Princess Alexandra of the Danish Royal House, who had her own anti-German revanche complex because of Bismarck's war against Denmark in 1864. Victoria remained in mourning, gazing at a marble bust of Albert. Victoria refused to appear at state occasions, so Edward had to assume these functions, for 40 years. Edward set up a household in Marlborough House in London, and began his career as a royal rake. He became the undisputed leader of British high society. Hence the Edwardian legend of the sybaritic hedonist and sex maniac whose mistresses included Lillie Langtry, Daisy Countess of Warwick, Lady Brooke, Mrs. George Keppel, and others too numerous to mention. Some of the can-can dancers painted by Toulouse- Lautrec had been Edward's girlfriends.

There was a fling with Sarah Bernhardt, the French actress. When Bernhardt was playing in "Fedora" in Paris, Edward told her that he had always wanted to be an actor. The next night, in the scene in which Fedora comes upon the dead body of her lover, few recognized the heir to the British throne: Edward VII had made his stage debut as a cadaver.

Edward's home at Marlborough House in London was also a center of the "Homintern." One of Edward's friends, Lord Arthur Somerset - known to his friends as Podge - was arrested during a police raid in one of London's numerous homosexual brothels. A satire of Edward was written in the style of Tennyson's "Idylls of the King." This was called "Guelpho the Gay - the Coming K." Some recalled a predecessor on the throne, Edward the Confessor. This future king was to go down as Edward the Caresser.

Prince Felix Yussupov was the heir to the biggest fortune in Russia. He was also considered the most beautiful transvestite in Europe. One evening Yussupov, dressed as a woman, attended the theater in Paris. He noted a portly, whiskered gentleman ogling him through an opera glass from one of the box seats. Within minutes, Yussupov received a mash note signed King Edward VII. Remember that Yussupov is the man who assassinated Rasputin, the holy man and reputed German agent, in December 1916, detonating the Russian Revolution a few months later. Here we see the great political importance of King Edward's Homintern.

**THE HOUSE OF JACK THE RIPPER**

Edward VII's first son was Prince Albert Victor Edward, known in the family as Prince Eddy and formally as the Duke of Clarence and Avondale. Prince Eddy, like his father, had been considered mentally impaired in his youth.

Prince Eddy was arrested at least once in a homosexual brothel. His main claim to fame today is that he is the prime suspect in the Jack the Ripper murders. This grisly series of crimes involved the murder of five prostitutes in the Whitechapel- Spitalfields slum of London in 1888-89. At the time of the murders, rumors abounded of the involvement of a member of the royal family, and of an obscure background of Freemasonic intrigue. The papers of the attending physician of the royal family indicate that he had indeed treated Jack the Ripper. A number of exhaustive studies have concluded that this was Prince Eddy. According to some versions, Prince Eddy had contracted syphilis during a trip to the West Indies during his youth, and this had affected his brain. According to others, Prince Eddy was part of a homosexual clique that killed because they hated women. There is no doubt that Prince Eddy answered to the best available description of the Ripper. Young Prince Eddy conveniently died a few years after the Ripper murders ceased.

A quarter of a century ago, a British physician came forward with evidence supporting the thesis that Jack the Ripper was Prince Eddy. A wire service dispatch from the period sums up the allegations made at that time:

"LONDON, Nov. 1, 1970 (AP) - The Sunday Times expressed belief today that Jack the Ripper, infamous London murderer of nearly 100 years ago, was Edward, Duke of Clarence, grandson of Queen Victoria and older brother of George V. The Times was commenting on the statement of an eminent British surgeon who said that the Ripper 'was the heir to power and wealth.' The surgeon, Thomas E.A. Stowell, while claiming to know who the criminal was, refused to identify him in an article to be published tomorrow in The Criminologist.... The Sunday Times, in commenting on Dr. Stowell's article, said there was one name that fitted his evidence. It said: 'It is a sensational name: Edward, Duke of Clarence, grandson of Queen Victoria, brother of George V, and heir to the throne of England. All the points of Dr. Stowell's story fit this man.'" (Spierig, p. 11)

Shortly after having published his article in The Criminologist and thus made his allegations public, Dr. Stowell wrote a letter to the London Times in which he disavowed any intention of identifying Prince Eddy or any other member of the royal family as Jack the Ripper. In this letter Stowell signed himself as "a loyalist and a Royalist." Stowell died mysteriously one day after this letter appeared, and his family promptly burned all his papers.

An American study of the Jack the Ripper mystery was authored by the forensic psychiatrist David Abrahamsen, who sums up his own conclusions as follows: "It is an analysis of the psychological parameters that enabled me to discover that the Ripper murders were perpetrated by Prince Eddy and J.K. Stephen." (Abrahamsen, pp. 103-104) J.K. Stephen had been chosen as a tutor for Prince Eddy, who was mentally impaired. Stephen was a homosexual. He was the son of the pathological woman-hater Fitzjames Stephen. J.K. Stephen's uncle was Sir Leslie Stephen, the writer. There is evidence that J.K. Stephen sexually molested his cousin, best known today by her married name, Virginia Woolf, the novelist. This experience may be related to Virginia Woolf's numerous suicide attempts.

While he was at Cambridge, Prince Eddy was a member of the Apostles secret society. Abrahamsen quotes a maxim of the Apostles: "The love of man for man is greater than that of man for woman, a philosophy known to the Apostles as the higher sodomy." [p. 123] Prince Eddy died on Jan. 14, 1892. J.K. Stephen died in a sanitarium on Feb. 3, 1892.

Prince Eddy's younger brother, the later George V, assumed his place in the succession, married Eddy's former fiancée, Princess May of Teck, and became the father of the Nazi King Edward VIII. If the persistent reports are true, the great-uncle of the current queen was the homicidal maniac Jack the Ripper. Perhaps the recurring dispute about what to call the British royal house - Hanover, Windsor, Guelph, Saxe- Coburg- Gotha, etc. - could be simplified by calling it the House of Jack the Ripper.

Of the existence of a coverup there can be no doubt. One of the main saboteurs of the investigation was a certain Gen. Sir Charles Warren, the chief of the London Metropolitan Police. Warren suppressed evidence, had witnesses intimidated, and was forced to resign amidst a public outcry about Masonic conspiracy. Warren was the master of a new Freemasonic lodge that had recently been created in London. This was the Quatuor Coronati Lodge of Research, number 2076 of the Scottish rite. The Quatuor Coronati lodge had been founded in 1884 with a warrant from the Grand Master of British freemasonry, who happened to be Edward VII.

.

**II. THE HOMICIDAL UNCLE OF EUROPE: EDWARD VII'S NETWORK**

During these years, Edward VII built up an unparalleled personal network of politicians and others who owed their careers to him. They are historically significant because they constituted the international war party up through 1914, and have remained in power through two world wars and the cold war, into the Balkan crisis of the 1990s.

**THE CHURCHILL FAMILY**

One of the habitués of Edward's Marlborough House fast set and a rising member of Parliament during the Disraeli era of the 1870's was Lord Randolph Churchill. Randolph was clearly headed for a great political career when he died of syphilis. Randolph's son was Sir Winston Churchill, who was promoted by Edward VII to a post in the Privy Council. Winston considered himself King Edward's protégé; Edward had urged him to pursue a career in politics and writing. For a time Winston sent the king a daily letter summing up the activities of the House of Commons.

**THE CHAMBERLAINS**

Another of Edward's most important political operatives was Joseph Chamberlain. Chamberlain had been mayor of Birmingham and known for his anti-royalist rhetoric, but he soon became a member of the Marlborough House set. When Edward VII wanted to start the Boer War, he did so through Joseph Chamberlain, who was the Colonial Secretary between 1895 and 1903, serving for years in Lord Salisbury's cabinet. Chamberlain was an architect of the Fashoda crisis with France and of the Boer War. Chamberlain was also the point man for Edward's deception operation of an alliance with Germany. Edward also used Chamberlain to propose the Entente Cordiale to the French. Those who don't know Joseph Chamberlain may know his son, the later Prime Minister Sir Neville Chamberlain, the author of the Munich sellout of 1938.

**SIR EDWARD GREY**

A family servant of Edward VII was Sir Edward Grey, the British Foreign Secretary who actually started World War I. Grey's father was an army officer who had joined the household of Edward VII when he was Prince of Wales. The elder Grey was an equerry, or master of the royal horses. Edward VII was Edward Grey's godfather, and did the traveling while Grey stayed in the Foreign Office to do the clerking. Grey's problem later, in August 1914, was to make Germany think that England would not go to war until the war had actually started. This he did with the help of King Edward's surviving son, George V. At the same time, Grey had to convince the Russians and the French that Britain would indeed honor the Triple Entente and go to war in support of Russian aggression. In his effort to start the war, Grey also had to lie to his own prime minister and cabinet. He finally had to sell the entire result to the House of Commons. Grey was Perfide Albion with an Edwardian pedigree.

**How Edward Grey Started World War 1**

By 1914, even after decades of British geopolitical machinations, it still required all of Sir Edward Grey's perfidy and cunning to detonate the greatest conflagration in world history by exploiting the diplomatic crisis surrounding the assassination of the Austrian heir apparent Archduke Franz Ferdinand on June 28, 1914 in Sarajevo, Bosnia.

Sir Edward Grey had learned an important lesson in the Moroccan crisis of 1911, when Germany sent the warship Panther to Agadir to secure German interests there, which were in conflict with those of France. This lesson was that if Germany clearly perceived in a crisis that there was a direct risk of Anglo- German war, Berlin would back down, frustrating the war party in London. In the Agadir crisis, the British minister Lloyd George had delivered a clear public warning to Berlin, and Germany had replied at once that she was not seeking a permanent presence on the Atlantic coast of Morocco; the crisis was soon resolved.

The German chancellor from 1909 to 1917, Dr. Theobald von Bethmann- Hollweg, was an anglophile and a crony of the Kaiser's student days, anxious to make concessions to London in order to secure peace. Sir Edward Grey declared in 1912 that any differences between England and Germany would never assume dangerous proportions "so long as German policy was directed by" Bethmann- Hollweg.

During the Balkan Wars and the Liman von Sanders affair of 1913, Grey cultivated the illusion of good relations with Germany. By mid-1914, Anglo- German relations were judged by Sir Edward Goschen, the British ambassador to Berlin, as "more friendly and cordial than they had been in years." But it was all a trick by Perfidious Albion.

Some weeks after the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand, the Austrian government, blaming Belgrade, addressed a very harsh ultimatum to Serbia on July 23 demanding sweeping concessions for investigating the crime and the suppression of anti- Austrian agitation. The Russian court slavophiles were demanding war against Austria and Germany in defense of Serbia; these slavophiles were madmen on the strategic offensive who sought a general European war. In Vienna, the leading minister, Count Berchtold, and the chief of staff, Conrad von Hoetzendorff, were determined to use the crisis to smash Serbia, which they saw as a threat to the survival of their empire. Berchtold and Hoetzendorff were madmen on the strategic defensive, even if they assumed the tactical offensive against Serbia. Their aggressive intentions involved Serbia, but not other great powers. When Serbia issued a conciliatory reply to the Austrian ultimatum, Kaiser Wilhelm II and others were relieved and thought that the war danger had receded; but the Vienna madmen seized on minor refusals by Serbia to declare war on July 28.

If Sir Edward Grey had sincerely wished to avoid war, he could have pursued one of two courses of action. The first would have been to warn Germany early in the crisis that in case of general war, Britain would fight on the side of France and Russia. This would have propelled the Kaiser and Bethmann into the strongest efforts to restrain the Vienna madmen, probably forcing them to back down. The other course would have been to warn Paris and especially St. Petersburg that Britain had no intention of being embroiled in world war over the Balkan squabble, and would remain neutral. This would have undercut the St. Petersburg militarists, and would have motivated Paris to act as a restraining influence.

Grey, a disciple of Edward VII, did neither of these things. Instead he maintained a posture of deception designed to make Germany think England would remain neutral, while giving Paris hints that England would support Russia and France. These hints were then passed on to Russian Foreign Minister Sazonov, a British agent, and to Czar Nicholas II. In this way, French revanchistes and Russian slavophiles were subtly encouraged on the path of aggression.

Grey's deception of Germany meant assuming the posture of a mediator rather than a possible party to the conflict. In early and middle July, Grey proposed direct conversations between Vienna and St. Petersburg to avoid war, but dropped this when French President Poincaré, a war-monger, responded that this would be "very dangerous." On July 24, Grey shifted to a proposal for mediation by other great powers of the Austrian- Russian dispute. On July 26, Grey proposed a conference of ambassadors from England, France, Italy, and Germany, which was declined by Germany for various reasons. Grey's charade of war avoidance contributed to complacency in Berlin and a failure to do anything to restrain the Vienna crazies, since, the Kaiser thought, if England did not fight, France and Russia were unlikely to do so either.

Edward VII's son King George V made a vital contribution to the British deception. Late on July 26, King George V told the Kaiser's brother, Prince Henry, who was visiting England, that Britain had "no quarrel with anyone and I hope we shall remain neutral." This was seized upon by the pathetic Kaiser as a binding pledge of British neutrality for which, he said "I have the word of a king; and that is sufficient for me." The gullible Kaiser Wilhelm was kept thoroughly disoriented during the last critical period when Germany could have forced Vienna to back down and avoid general war, before the fateful Russian and Austrian mobilizations of July 30 and 31.

**The Declaration Of War**

It was late on July 29 before any warning of British armed intervention in the looming conflict was received in Berlin. When German forces entered Belgium in the context of the Schlieffen Plan (the German plan for a two-front war against France and Russia), Grey declared war at midnight Aug. 4-5, 1914.

The British were the first of the great powers to mobilize their war machine, in this case the Grand Fleet of the Royal Navy. On July 19, the British had already staged a formidable naval demonstration with a review of the Grand Fleet at Portsmouth. On the afternoon of July 28, Winston Churchill ordered the fleet to proceed during the night at high speed with no lights from Portsmouth through the Straits of Dover to its wartime base of operations at Scapa Flow, north of Scotland. On July 29, the official "warning telegram" was sent out from the Admiralty; the British fleet was now on a full war footing.

The first continental state to mobilize had been Serbia, on July 25. The order of general mobilizations was Serbia, Great Britain, Russia, Austria, France, and, finally, Germany.

**ADMIRAL JACKIE FISHER**

A leading proponent of preventive war against Germany was Edward's protégé Adm. Jackie Fisher, the man who introduced the new battleship called the Dreadnought. Fisher owed his entire career to Edward's patronage. As First Sea Lord after 1904, Fisher was constantly talking about the need for a sneak attack to destroy the German Navy. He called this the need to "Copenhagen" the German fleet, referring to British attacks on the Danish fleet in Copenhagen harbor during the Napoleonic wars. Fisher caused a war scare in November 1904, during frictions with Germany involving the Russo- Japanese war. At this time, his demand for Copenhagening leaked out. During the first Moroccan crisis of 1905, Fisher was at it again, telling Edward that the Royal Navy could "have the German fleet, the Kiel canal, and Schleswig- Holstein within a fortnight." (Magnus, p. 340) In the Balkan crisis of 1908, Fisher again called for Copenhagening. Fisher once expressed his gratitude to Edward for protecting him from his many enemies who, he said, "would have eaten me but for Your Majesty." (Magnus, p. 442)

Nobody in Europe, not the Austrian crazies Berchtold and Hoetzendorf, not the even crazier Russian Grand Duke Nikolai Nikolayevich, was so outspoken a warmonger as Fisher.

**SIR ERNEST CASSELL**

Sir Ernest Cassell typified another group that Edward VII cultivated assiduously: Jewish bankers. As Prince of Wales, Edward had to live on a limited allowance, and he was deeply in debt. Edward accordingly allowed a series of Jewish bankers to buy their way to presentability at court by their benevolent management of his personal finances, with the proviso that Edward would always make a handsome profit. The first of Edward's financial advisers was Baron von Hirsch of Vienna. Then came Sir Ernest Cassell, knighted by Edward. Edward also cultivated the Rothschild and Sassoon families. In short, Edward's personal household finance agency was identical with the leading lights of turn- of-the-century Zionism. Cassell was also a political operative for Edward, becoming the head of the Ottoman National Bank - the Banque Ottomane - at the request of the Young Turk regime in 1909.

**BATTENBERGS AND BASTARDS**

Edward was also a close friend of Prince Louis of Battenberg, who married Princess Victoria, the daughter of Edward's late sister Alice, in 1884. This marks the entrance of the Mountbatten family, including Lord Louis and Prince Philip, onto the British royal scene. Asquith, Balfour, and Lloyd George were all more or less Edward's stooges. Edward's influence also lived on through his bastards, one of whom, Sir Stewart Menzies, was a boss of British secret intelligence who betrayed vital U.S. secrets to the Soviets.

**CLEMENCEAU**

Edward's French network was extensive, and included royalists and oligarchs. The common denominator of Edward's network was *la revanche*, the need for France to exact vengeance from Germany for the loss of the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine in 1871. The central figure was a leftish radical, Georges "Tiger" Clemenceau, France's wartime premier and the chairman of the Peace Conference at Versailles. Clemenceau's talents for overthrowing governments gave the Third French Republic some of its proverbial instability. Clemenceau was attacked from 1892 on as a British agent and paid spy of the British Embassy.

Former French Foreign Minister Emile Flourens saw that the Dreyfus affair was concocted by Edward VII and his agents in order to break French institutional resistance to a dictatorial regime of Clemenceau. Flourens wrote that: "Clemenceau is the pro-consul of the English king, charged with the administration of his province of the Gauls." (Flourens, 1906) Flourens argued that the friends of the late French leader Leon Gambetta were determined to resist Clemenceau. At the same time, in Flourens's view, the French Army simply hated Clemenceau. According to Flourens, Edward VII used the 1890s Panama scandal to wreck the Gambetta political machine, and then unleashed the Dreyfus affair in order to break the resistance of the French Army to Clemenceau.

Flourens also showed how Edward VII was the mastermind of the post-1904 anti-clerical hysteria in France, which included the confiscation of Catholic Church property and the break of diplomatic relations with the Holy See. For Flourens, Edward VII was seeking to shut down the French Catholic foreign missions, which had proved a barrier to British colonial expansion. Edward VII's ultimate goal was to create a schismatic church in France on the Anglican or Presbyterian model, wrote Flourens. "As the schism in England dates from the reign of Henry VIII, so the schism in France will date from the reign of Edward VII." (Flourens, pp. 155-156)

**THÉOPHILE DELCASSÉ**

Delcassé was Edward's partner in the British- French Entente Cordiale of 1903-04. Delcassé had taken office in the British- French confrontation around the Fashoda crisis, when London and Paris had been on the verge of war. Delcassé's view was that France could survive only as a very junior partner of the British.

When Kaiser Wilhelm made his famous visit to Tangier, Morocco in March 1905, France and Germany came to the brink of war. At this time, Edward VII was vacationing on board his yacht in the Mediterranean. During the debate on the Moroccan question in the French National Assembly in April 1905, Delcassé came under heavy attack because of his refusal to seek a modus vivendi with Germany; one of Delcassé's severest critics was the socialist leader Jean Jaurès. When Delcassé was about to be forced into resignation, Edward VII docked his yacht, the Victoria and Albert, at Algiers, and asked the French governor- general to send a telegram to Paris. This was a personal message to Delcassé dated April 23 in which Edward announced that he would be "personally distressed" if Delcassé were to leave office. Edward "strongly urged" Delcassé to remain in office, because of his great political influence but also because of England. As in the case of Alexander Izvolski, Edward VII was not reticent about standing up for his own puppets.

But it became clear that Delcassé had been acting as Edward's minister, not the republic's, and that he had been lying to his ministerial colleagues about the actual danger of war with Germany. Delcassé fell as foreign minister, but stayed on in other posts. Other members of Edward's network in France included Paul Cambon, for many years the French ambassador in London, and Raymond Poincaré, the wartime President and a leading warmonger.

**ALEXANDER IZVOLSKI**

"A plumpish, dandified man, he wore a pearl pin in his white waistcoat, affected white spats, carried a lorgnette, and always trailed a faint touch of violet eau de cologne." So wrote a contemporary of Alexander Petrovich Izvolski, the Russian foreign minister who was Edward's partner for the Anglo- Russian Entente of 1907, which completed the encirclement of Germany. Edward first proposed the Anglo- Russian Entente to Izvolski in 1904, and at that point Izvolski entered Edward's personal service. Izvolski was made Russian foreign minister in May 1906, after Russia's defeat in the Russo- Japanese War; he served under Prime Minister Pyotr Stolypin. With Izvolski, Russian diplomacy gave up all interest in the Far East, made deals with the British for Iran, Afghanistan, and Tibet, and concentrated everything on expansion in the Balkans - the approach that was to lead straight to World War.

When Izvolski's position as Russian foreign minister became weakened as a result of his Buchlau Bargain adventure, Edward VII took the singular step of writing to Czar Nicholas II to endorse the further tenure in office of his own agent. Edward wrote: "You know how anxious I am for the most friendly relations between Russia and England, not only in Asia but also in Europe, and I feel confident that through M. Izvolski these hopes will be realized." (Middlemas, p. 170)

Izvolski had to settle for Russia's embassy in Paris, where he used a special fund to bribe the Paris press to write that France should go to war. In July 1914, Izvolski ran around yelling that it was *his war*. As Lord Bertie, the British ambassador to Paris, confided to his diary: "What a fool Izvolski is! ... At the beginning of the war he claimed to be its author: C'est ma guerre!" (Fay, I, p. 29)

Izvolski was succeeded as Russian foreign minister by Sazonov, another British agent who played a key role in starting the fateful Russian mobilization of July, 1914.

**THEODORE ROOSEVELT**

Edward VII's favorite pen pal was U.S. President Theodore Roosevelt, who was handled from day to day by Cecil Spring-Rice of Sir Edward Grey's Foreign Office. Edward can hardly have been ignorant of the British role in the assassination of President William McKinley. Starting in 1904, Edward wrote Teddy letters about how the two of them had been placed in command "of the two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon race." Teddy wrote back about the need for "understanding between the English-speaking peoples," and discussing his race theories about "our stock." Teddy wrote to Edward his view that "the real interests of the English-speaking peoples are one, alike in the Atlantic and the Pacific." Roosevelt served Edward's goals in his mediation of the Russo- Japanese War, in his support for the British at the Algeciras Conference, and in raising naval disarmament at the Hague Conference. Behind his back, Edward's envoys mocked the U.S. President as a semi-savage who gave primitive lunches at Oyster Bay. Later, Sir Edward Grey exerted a decisive influence on Woodrow Wilson through the intermediary of his key adviser, Col. Edward House.

Edward was called the Uncle of Europe - Uncle Bertie - because so many of Queen Victoria's other children married into the various royal houses, making one European royal family. This, Kaiser Wilhelm of Germany was Edward's nephew. Czar Nicholas II was also his nephew, married to Edward's wife's niece. After 40 years as Prince of Wales, Edward knew Europe like a book. He was personally acquainted with every crowned head, every prominent statesman and minister, and "he could accurately gauge their influence, their processes of thought, their probable action in a given emergency."

**IDEOLOGICAL MANIPULATION**

Emile Flourens found that Edward owed his triumphs primarily to himself, to his "profound knowledge of the human heart and the sagacity with which he could sort out the vices and weaknesses of individuals and peoples and make these into the worst and most destructive of weapons against them." Edward's empire was built on "eternal human folly," on the "intellectual and moral degradation" of the subject populations. Flourens praised Edward's practical understanding of French ideology. Edward knew how to exploit the chauvinism of the Alsace- Lorraine *revanchards* to incite France against Germany. He knew how to play upon the fascination of the Russian slavophiles with the Greater Serbia agitation in the Balkans. He knew how to use the hatred of the Italian *irredentisti* against Austria to detach Italy from the pro-German Triple Alliance. He knew how to drive wedges between Germany and Austria by evoking Vienna's resentments of the 1866 war and Prussian preeminence, and their fear of Serbia. He could exploit an American racist's eagerness to be, like the king, a member of a mythical Anglo-Saxon race. He could use the aspirations of Japanese militarists, for the greater glory of the British Empire. Much of Edward's personal magnetism was exercised during his incessant state visits, where he was able to unleash highly orchestrated outbursts of "Bertiemania." Those who recall the equally implausible Gorbymania of some years back will find the phenomenon familiar.

**KAISER WILHELM II**

Edward's mastery of psychological and ideological manipulation is most evident in his relation with his pathetic and unstable nephew, Kaiser Wilhelm. Edward made a detailed study of Willy's psychological profile, which he knew to be pervaded by feelings of inferiority and incurable anglophilia. As Flourens noted: "Edward VII made an in-depth study of the defects of Wilhelm II. He counted them as his most precious allies." (Flourens, p. 58)

The British and Entente demonization of Wilhelm as the world's chief warmonger was always absurd. Wilhelm felt inferior to British royalty. Wilhelm's greatest secret desire was for acceptance by the British royals. Edward could modulate his own behavior to get the desired result from the Kaiser. If he wanted a public tantrum, he could get that. One British writer, Legge, reports that Edward punched the Kaiser and knocked him down in a meeting.

But if Edward needed to be friendly, he could do that too. During the Boer War, in November 1899, when Britain's diplomatic isolation was at its height, Edward was able to con the Kaiser into making a state visit to Britain. The Boxer Rebellion in China, with its overtone of white racial solidarity against the "yellow peril," was also made to order for duping the Kaiser. In Wilhelm's dockside harangue to the German contingent setting out for Peking, he urged his soldiers on to cruelty against the Chinese:

"Give no quarter! Take no prisoners! Kill him when he falls into your hands! Even as, a thousand years ago, the Huns under their King Attila made such a name for themselves as still resounds in terror through legend and fable, so may the name of Germans resound through Chinese history a thousand years from now." (Cowles, p. 177) This "Huns" speech has provided grist for the London propaganda mill for almost a century, from World War I to the Margaret Thatcher- Nicholas Ridley "Fourth Reich" hysteria of 1989. Not just once, but again and again, the Kaiser muffed opportunities to checkmate Edward's plans.

Edward also played on the Kaiser to sabotage the Berlin to Baghdad railway. At Windsor Castle in 1907, Edward demanded that the British keep control of a section of the railway between Baghdad and the Persian Gulf as a "gate," supposedly to block German troops going to India. The Kaiser was ready to grant such a gate. Otherwise, Edward demanded that all talks about the Baghdad railway should be four-way, with France, Russia, Britain, and Germany involved, so that German proposals would always be voted down 3 to 1.

When the war was finally over, and the Kaiser had lost his throne, the first thing he wanted in exile from the Dutch host was a cup of real English tea.

Edward joked with his French friends that while many prayed to an eternal father, he alone seemed to have an eternal mother. Queen Victoria finally died in 1901, and Edward began his drive to world war.

.

**III. TAILORING AND FITTING THE NESSUS ROBE**

Edward's problem as the twentieth century began was rooted in old Lord Salisbury's policy of British "splendid isolation." On the continent of Europe were two main alliances, the Triple Alliance of Germany and Austria- Hungary, with Italy as an adulterous partner, and opposite to this the Dual Alliance of the France of Hanotaux with the Russia of Count Witte. Britain was a member of neither one. British relations with all the continental powers was bad. Russia had been traditionally hostile since the Crimean War of mid- century. With France, Britain had just been to the brink of war in the Fashoda affair. War had been avoided, but French resentment was very great. Relations between Britain and the United States of President Grover Cleveland were traditionally also bad; a dangerous flare-up had come in the 1895 boundary dispute between Venezuela and British Guyana, when the US had invoked the Monroe Doctrine and forced the British to accept arbitration. Edward had tried to quiet that one with the help of his asset Joseph Pulitzer.

**THE BOER WAR CRISIS**

In the midst of all this, Edward and Joseph Chamberlain had started the Boer War against Transvaal and the Orange Free State, two small states dominated by the Dutch-speaking settlers of the Cape area of South Africa. The British attempt to force the Afrikaners to knuckle under led to the celebrated "Black Week" of December, 1899, with a stunning series of British military defeats on the ground.

A wave of anti-British hatred swept the world as press accounts from the front showed that the bullying imperial colossus had feet of clay. German, French, and Russian newspapers fulminated against London. The Russian government asked Paris and Berlin if they might not consider an intervention to stop the British. Agitation increased when the British responded to their defeats with increased atrocities. The British set up the century's first concentration camps where Afrikaner children were systematically starved to death.

**A CAMBRAI DANGER FOR THE BRITISH EMPIRE**

As a good Venetian, Edward recognized what he was dealing with. It was a Cambrai moment. In 1509, the Venetian oligarchy, after centuries of geopolitical perfidy, had been faced with a united front of virtually every other power in Europe, all wanting to destroy Venice. Edward himself had seen something similar in 1863, when Russia and the United States seemed about to combine to crush the British Empire. Between 1899 and 1902, public opinion in every country, including the US, demanded measures against the British lion. Britain risked a continental league or continental coalition, a new League of Cambrai against the new Venetians in London. Edward's official biographer Sir Sidney Lee makes the danger perceived by London in those days explicit enough:

"The year 1901 and the first part of 1902 found all unofficial Europe sympathizing with the enemies of Great Britain in South Africa, and any serious diplomatic mistake on the part of Britain in those days might have resulted in European swords being flung into the balance act against her." [Lee II. 731] "...there was always a chance, although a remote one, that jealousy of Britain, from which no great European power could be reckoned quite free, might be so stimulated by circumstances as to bring the members of the two alliances together in a combined challenge to Britain's place in the world. Britain was thus isolated, friendless, and engaged in a none too successful or popular war when King Edward ascended the throne.... Lord Salisbury, King Edward's first Prime Minister, had long been wedded to that policy of 'splendid isolation' which had been the constant British tradition through the last forty-five years of Queen Victoria's long reign. Persistence in that policy offered little opportunity of improving the foreign situation as it existed in 1901, and might actually have exposed Britain to the risk of a hostile combination on a well-nigh overwhelming scale." [Lee, II. 116-117]

Gasparo Contarini and the Venetian patricians of his time had responded to the War of the League of Cambrai by launching the Protestant Reformation and the wars of religion. Edward responded to the isolation of the British Empire by launching World War One.

**PERFIDE ALBION**

The first imperative for Edward was a deception operation, designed to dupe and neutralize Germany, the natural centerpiece of any continental coalition against England. This was the mission of Joseph Chamberlain, a member of Lord Salisbury's cabinet. In his celebrated speech at Leicester in November, 1899, Chamberlain said, "No far-seeing statesman could be content with England's permanent isolation on the continent of Europe.... The natural alliance is between ourselves and the German Empire.... Both interest and racial sentiment unite the two peoples, and a new Triple Alliance between [sic] Germany, England, and the United States would correspond with the sentimental tie that already binds Teutons and Anglo-Saxons together." [Lee, II. 117]

The rhetoric of a racist alliance was designed to entice the Kaiser, who was so eager to be accepted among the Anglo-Saxons. Wilhelm was advised by the Chancellor, Prince von Buelow, who was slippery as an eel, and by the grey eminence of the German Foreign Ministry, Baron von Holstein. Were these men British agents or British dupes? Were they part of a homosexual court cabal? In any case, Berlin sought an Anglo-German deal, but with hard bargaining. The Berlin consensus was that Britain needed Germany, and as time went on the price that London would have to pay for German help would only increase. The Kaiser's policy was to move slowly towards a deal with London. Von Buelow and Holstein stressed that a British alliance with either France or Russia was simply impossible, given the existing frictions.

And so, Wilhelm and his advisors let slip the great opportunity for a continental bloc, which would have meshed with the efforts of Hanotaux and Wittle. Wilhelm was chasing the chimera of an accord with London which was nothing but a racist deception ploy. In January, 1901, in town for Queen Victoria's funeral, the Kaiser was still proposing an "Anglo-German alliance, [the British] to keep the sea and [Germany] the land; with such an alliance, not a mouse could stir in Europe without our permission...." Even after 1918, the Kaiser was still repeating that he had saved Britain from a French- German- Russian combine during the Boer War.

**THE RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR AND 1905 RUSSIAN REVOLUTION**

The Kaiser was constantly babbling about the "yellow peril" in the Far East, but the first ally Edward got for himself was Japan. Edward wished to use Japan as his Asian torpedo against Russia. The Japanese wanted Russia to stop encroaching on what they considered their sphere of influence in China and Korea. But sections of the Russian oligarchy hostile to Witte refused to respect Korea, and the Japanese were looking for an ally. The critical moment came when the former Prime Minister, Marquis Ito, visited London in December, 1901. Edward saw to it that Ito was socially lionized and decorated, and an Anglo- Japanese treaty was signed within a month. Both partners were in a hurry because Witte's Trans-Siberian railway was nearing completion, and that would vastly increase Russian power in the Far East. The key clause was that if Japan went to war in the Far East against a single power, Britain would observe a benevolent neutrality. This meant that if Japan and Russia came to war, the British would prevent any other Europeans from helping Russia. This gave Japan a free hand for Admiral Togo's sneak attack on the Russian base of Port Arthur in early 1904.

King Edward did everything but go to war against Russia. When Russia lost their fleet in the Far East, they embarked on the desperate gamble of sending their Baltic squadron around the world to fight the Japanese. In October, 1904, the Russian ships, steaming through the North Sea, fired on some British fishing trawlers, sinking one of them. The Russian admiral thought they were Japanese torpedo boats. In this Dogger Bank incident, Edward at first went to the brink of war and demanded that the Royal Navy stop the Russian ships, seize the Russian admiral, and punish him. Later, Edward backed down.

In order to reach the Far East, the Russian fleet required logistical assistance, since there was nowhere to get coal. The Kaiser was now in the mood to court Russia, so German ships did the coaling. The British press thereupon demanded that the Royal Navy stop the Germans from delivering the coal. At the same time, Admiral Fisher began popping off about Copenhagening the Germans. But this was all a circus, set up by Edward for his diplomatic aims. The Russians came out of the war with one capital ship left. But Edward wanted a disaster, not just a defeat, for Russia - a disaster that was beyond the power of Japan to inflict. To procure the disaster he wanted, Edward unleashed British intelligence and all of its assets - boyars, democrats, communists, Zionists, the works. This produced a civil war which went on into 1906, crippling Russia as a military power.

In the meantime, Edward had sealed his pact with France.

**THE ANGLO-FRENCH ENTENTE CORDIALE OF 1904**

At first Edward was not popular in France, because of centuries of conflict, and because of Fashoda, for which he was blamed personally. Indeed, for a time Edward's image in the Paris press was decidedly bad. Joseph Chamberlain, who had terrified the French with his pro-German line, took the message to the French: Edward was willing to trade Egypt for Morocco to get a deal with France. This was a very unequal barter. Since the 1880's, the British presence in Egypt had been officially temporary, ostensibly a matter of restoring order in the name of the other European powers; the British would then get out. They had no intention of getting out, but instead wanted the whole Nile Valley. But the French, the builders of the Suez Canal, still had some rights. However, if the French caved in, the British position in Egypt would be unassailable, at least by Europeans. Morocco was much different. The Moroccan government was stronger, and there were strong competing claims by Germany and Spain. In fact, the idea of French preeminence in Morocco placed France on a collision course with Germany once again.

But French society had been weakened by Edward's Dreyfus affair, and with the help of Delcassé, Clemenceau, and Cambon, the deal was signed. Edward also contributed a tour de force of personal diplomacy, his visit to Paris in the spring of 1903. Here Bertie turned on the charm, with speeches in French about friendship while recalling his own sentimental association with Paris, Biarritz, and the Riviera. With the press doubtless well paid, the Parisian dandies and gratins turned anglophile overnight in an explosion of Bertiemania that was crowned by Edward's appearance at Longchamp, the race track, with President Loubet, of puppet of Clemenceau. This Bertiemania started France on the road that led to Verdun, with 6 million casualties, proportionally the highest of any belligerent.

Edward had designed the Morocco gambit in the hope that Germany would quickly take the bait and challenge the new French domination in Morocco. Prince von Buelow gave Edward exactly the crisis he needed. Von Buelow told the Kaiser that Germany should challenge France in Morocco, both to defend commercial interests and to show France that the British alliance was worthless. If France was the continental dagger now in the hands of England, von Buelow argued, it was time to knock that dagger out of British hands. Von Buelow convinced the witless Kaiser to undertake the lunatic adventure of a visit - like Uncle Bertie - but to Tangier, Morocco, where the Kaiser landed in March, 1905. This led to the predictable confrontation between France and Germany. Delcassé decided to hang tough and go to the brink. When the real immediate risk of a war with Germany became clear to Delcassé's colleagues in the government, Delcassé was fired. But this crisis succeeded in heating up the revanche syndrome in France once more, and directing all the hatred against Germany. Especially because their ally Russia was crippled, and still at war with Japan, the French were thrown completely into the arms of Edward. At the same time, secret conventions were signed for a division of labor between the British and French fleets, and planning was begun for the future British Expeditionary Force.

This first Moroccan crisis was a serious attempt by Edward to start war, despite the fact that France's ally, Russia, was crippled. Edward may have had a promise of support from Denmark, as well. It is certain that Edward was urging France to go all the way. Under the Dual Alliance, Russia would have had to join France in war like it or not. But the French cabinet pulled back.

**BJOERKJOE: THE IMPOTENT REVOLT OF TWO DOOMED NEPHEWS**

In the midst of all these events, Kaiser Wilhelm and Tsar Nicholas II met at Bjoerkjoe, a Baltic fjord in Finland. This was a poignant moment, the last abortive revolt of the two doomed nephews of Edward VII - the revolt of cousin Willy and cousin Nicky. Nicholas was very unhappy with his French alliance, since France had done nothing to help him against Japan, and had concentrated on courting Uncle Bertie. The Kaiser had momentarily returned to his continental league sloganeering. As the two conversed, it became clear to the Kaiser that they shared a common ground of resentment against Uncle Bertie. Here is the Kaiser's narrative, as sent to his chancellor, von Buelow:

"Our talk then turned on England, and it very soon appeared that the Tsar feels a deep personal anger at England and the King. He called Edward VII the greatest 'mischief- maker' and the most dangerous and deceptive intriguer in the world. I could only agree with him, adding that I especially had had to suffer from his intrigues in recent years. He has a passion for plotting against every power, of making 'a little agreement,' whereupon the Tsar interrupted me, striking the table with his fist: 'Well, I can only say he shall not get one from me, and never in my life against Germany or you, my word of honor upon it!'" [Fay 175]

The Kaiser proposed that the two cousins join in a "little agreement" of their own to stymie Edward. The Tsar accepted, and signed a draft treaty of mutual defense which the Kaiser pulled from his pocket. The two tearfully pledged friendship. But these two borderline psychotics were unable to imagine a community of principle based on economic development, since that would have contradicted oligarchism, and both demented cousins were oligarchical to the core.

Still, if the idea of Russo-German cooperation had been exploited, the World War could not have occurred in the form which it finally assumed in 1914. But when the Kaiser told von Buelow about his talks, the chancellor threatened to resign, in response to which the Kaiser threatened to commit suicide if jilted. The Russian response was more complicated, but the opportunity drifted away. Within 2 years, Russia would be England's ally.

**AIMING AT ENCIRCLEMENT**

Edward VII left no stone unturned in his efforts to isolate Germany. Edward VII was a prime mover in the dissolution of the personal union of the crowns of Norway and Sweden which gave rise to an independent Norway under British sponsorship in 1905. To underline his point, Edward saw to it that his son in law, the Danish Prince Charles (who had married Edward's third daughter, Maud) became King of the newly independent Norway with the name of Haakon VII. Because of his marriage with the anti-German princess Alexandra, Edward was confident that no support for Germany would be forthcoming from Copenhagen.

Spain was an important country with an ancient grievance against the British: Gibraltar, which the redcoats had occupied since 1704 and the War of the Spanish Succession. In a general European war, there was a clear potential for Spain to join Germany against the Entente. In the face of modern artillery, the British would have been hard pressed to defend Gibraltar. If Spain had also conducted hostilities against France, there was the threat that many French divisions might be tied down in costly attacks on the natural fortress of the Pyrenees. In this latter case, France would have been encircled and confronted with a two-front war. Edward VII pacified Spain by marrying one of his nieces to the Spanish King; this niece converted to Catholicism for the occasion.

To Portugal, Britain's oldest ally, Edward gave worthless promises about British support for the integrity of the Portuguese colonial empire. Portugal duly entered World War I on the side of the British.

**THE ANGLO-RUSSIAN ENTENTE**

On the same day in April, 1904 on which the Anglo-French entente had come into effect, Edward VII had met with his agent Izvolski to propose an Anglo-Russian combination. The big crises of the Russo-Japanese war were still months ahead, but Edward moved fast. With the help of Izvolski, Edward cut a deal with Russia that divided Iran into spheres of influence, while Afghanistan and Tibet were both neutralized, much to the disadvantage of Russia. The Russian Slavophiles got nothing tangible about their eternal goal of Constantinople.

The Anglo-Russian entente was signed in September, 1907. In June, 1908, Edward VII sailed to Reval for an ocean-going state visit to Tsar Nicholas. Admiral Jackie Fisher was there, urging Stolypin to build up his land forces facing Germany. The meeting of uncle and nephew was the grimmest of portents, foreshadowing Russia's nine million casualties in World War I - the most of any belligerent - with more than three quarters of all Russian soldiers ending up killed, wounded, or missing. This set the stage for the revolutions of 1917 and the Bolshevik regime.

But for Edward, the important thing was that Germany was now encircled. The ring had been closed. Bismarck's old nightmare of the coalitions (*le cauchemar des coalitions*) and a two-front war was now reality. With the help of Izvolski, Edward embarked at once on a new attempt to start general war. This started with Izvolski's Buchlau Bargain with Austria, made in September, 1908, and revealed a month later. By this deal Austria was given the go-ahead to formally annex Bosnia- Herzegovina, which had been occupied by Austria after the Congress of Berlin, but not annexed. In exchange Russia was supposed to get the right to send warships through the straits, but this was blocked by the British. But when Austria annexed Bosnia- Herzegovina, Serbia, which wanted Bosnia- Herzegovina, protested. Austria and Serbia went to the brink of war, mobilizing their armies. Germany restrained Austria, and Russia felt too weak for war. Germany actually mediated the dispute. But Edward's agents soon concocted a legend that Germany had humiliated Russia with the threat of war.

As a result of this Balkan crisis of 1908-1909, the Russian Slavophiles turned their rage more and more against Germany, which they saw as blocking their desired path of expansion into the Balkans. The greater Serbia agitators went wild. The Austrian government concluded that Serbia was a threat to its existence, and had to be crushed. This was the pattern which, after a second Moroccan crisis of 1911 much like the first, and after the Balkan wars, led to war in 1914.

Behind the Buchlau Bargain and the Balkan crisis of 1908-1909 was - King Edward. Russian war with Germany had been on his agenda with the Tsar in Reval. In August, 1908, Edward had met with Izvolski and Clemenceau at Marienbad, just before Izvolski made the bargain. During the same month Edward also met with Franz Joseph, the Austrian Emperor, in Bad Ischl. Edward had every reason to start a crisis. If Germany had repudiated Austria, Germany would have emerged totally isolated, with no allies at all left. If Germany supported Austria, the result would be either immediate war, or increased tensions that could turn into war soon.

**SPLITTING THE TRIPLE ALLIANCE**

One of Edward's last memorable outings was his 1909 visit with King Victor Emmanuel, held at Baiae near Naples on April 29, 1909. Here Edward VII briefed his agent, Italian Foreign Minister Tittoni on what he saw as the alarming growth of the Austro- Hungarian fleet, the navy of a power to which Italy was theoretically allied, but to which it was in reality a rival.

This was the meeting in which Edward VII made his famous toast to the "alliance" between Italy and Britain. Modern pedantic scholars have portrayed this as a blundering gaffe by Edward VII, allegedly proving that the King was a bungler in diplomacy. In the light of subsequent history, it is clear that Edward VII's toast to an Anglo- Italian alliance was perhaps a boastful indiscretion, but it was an error that came from knowing too much, not too little. It is likely that during this visit, Edward VII had secured from the Italian monarch and ministers commitments which rendered Italy's participation in the Triple Alliance wholly inoperative - commitments which withstood the test of 1914, and which were followed by Italy's entry into the war on the side of the Allies in May, 1915, in return for compensations purveyed by Theophile Delcassé. Edward's achievement meant that World War I would be fought not by three powers against three, as the alliance patterns might have suggested, but by four powers against two.

If Edward VII had had his way, it would have been five powers against an isolated Germany. Edward VII never abandoned an Austrian option, which, if it had succeeded, would have left Berlin with no allies at all. An official in the entourage of Austrian Emperor Franz Joseph was Baron Albert Margutti, who was on hand for each of the Bad Ischl meetings between Franz Joseph and Edward. Margutti wrote that, starting with the 1905 meeting, Edward VII began trying to entice Franz Joseph away from his German alliance, offering a series of vaguely defined compensations if he were to do so. [See Margutti, The Emperor Franz Joseph and His Times, pp. 259-261.] The last of these Bad Ischl meetings came in August, 1908, just before the Buchlau Bargain. At this conference, Edward is reported to have pressed Franz Joseph to intercede with Berlin to stop the planned German fleet expansion. After this meeting, Franz Joseph is reported to have muttered, "After all, I am a German prince."

The war would come soon, but not soon enough for Edward. The old roué died in May, 1910. At the time a Leipzig newspaper wrote that he had skillfully woven the Nessus robe to destroy the German Hercules. Recall that in the old Greek myth, the hero Hercules could not be killed by any living man. But Hercules was killed by the centaur Nessus, who had tried to rape Dejaniera, the wife of Hercules. The dying Nessus told Dejaniera to soak Hercules' robe in his centaur blood, and dress him in it if he should ever seem unfaithful. Dejaniera later did this, and the poisoned blood of Nessus, the sex-crazed old centaur, finally killed Hercules.

For a few moments during early August, 1914, the Kaiser realized what had happened:

"England, Russia, and France have agreed among themselves... after laying the foundation of the casus foederis for us through Austria... to take the Austro-Serbian conflict for an excuse for waging a war of extermination against us.... *That is the real naked situation slowly and cleverly set going by Edward VII* and... finally brought to a conclusion by George V.... So the famous encirclement of Germany has finally become a fact, despite every effort of our politicians and diplomats to prevent it. The net has been suddenly thrown over our head, and England sneeringly reaps the most brilliant success of her persistently prosecuted anti-German world policy against which we have proved ourselves helpless, while she twists the noose of our political and economic destruction out of our fidelity to Austria, as we squirm isolated in the net. A great achievement, which arouses the admiration even of him who is to be destroyed as its result! *Edward VII is stronger after his death than am I who am still alive!* And there have been people who believed that England could be won over or pacified, by this or that puny measure!!!" [emphasis added; in Cowles, p. 347, from Kautsky Documents]

In 1915 a pamphlet was issued in Berlin by the military writer Reinhold Wagner. The pamphlet was entitled "The Greatest Criminal Against Humanity in the Twentieth Century: King Edward VII of England." With admirable conciseness, Wagner formulated his indictment of the deceased British monarch: "The greatest criminal against humankind which the twentieth century has seen so far was King Edward VII of England. For he was the one, he was the one, who has instigated the world war of today." Despite everything that has happened in this tormented world since 1915, Wagner's case is still overwhelmingly compelling.

From Edward's time to our own, the British monarchy has successfully weathered three storms. One was the "republican" agitation of circa 1870, reflecting the dissatisfaction with Victoria as a royal recluse, and with Edward, the heir apparent, as a rake. Then came 1916-1918, when British troops began to die in large numbers on the western front in King Edward's World War I, which caused a wave of hatred of all things German, including the royal family, which had to take the absurd name of "Windsor" to cover up their German origins. This was when George V refused to accept the Tsar, because of the fear of an even greater political reaction. Then came the Edward VIII crisis of 1937, which reflected the fact that the King was a Nazi. Now, since 1991-92, we have the Charles-Diana crisis, which reflects a deeper breakdown in the Versailles system. There is no reason to assume that the British monarchy, having weathered all these storms, will be easily swept away. We must rather conclude that the royals will stop at nothing, including a military coup, a fascist dictatorship, or World War III, to avoid giving up power.

The historical truth about Edward VII simplifies the question of what and who caused World War I. The world war was caused by Edward VII, his geopolitics, his diplomacy, his agents, and his alliance system. A clause in the Versailles treaty specifies that Germany bears the entire guilt for World War I. This is a patent absurdity. The world war was caused by Edward VII, as we have seen. The dismantling of the Versailles system must therefore include the revision of the treaty to specify British war guilt in the person of Edward.

France, Russia, Japan, the United States, and other great nations were used by Edward VII as geopolitical pawns, and they have suffered immeasurably as a result. Ninety years after Edward's ententes, citizens and statesmen must learn the lesson of how the British monarchy and oligarchy orchestrated the catastrophe of 1914.

**THE WAR GUILT CLAUSE OF THE VERSAILLES TREATY, 1919**

The entire international public order of the post-1919 era, including the League of Nations and, by extension, the United Nations, has been based on the absurd lie that Germany was solely responsible for the outbreak of World War I. This finding was officially reported to the Paris Peace Conference at the close of the war by a "Commission on the Responsibility of the Authors of the War," which was chaired by the American Secretary of State, Robert Lansing. Lansing refused to allow any Germans to take part in his deliberations, and the commission ignored a new "German White Book" compiled in 1919 by Hans Delbrueck, Professor Mendelssohn- Bartholdy, Count Montgelas, and Max Weber, which contained enough evidence to show that the thesis of exclusive German war guilt was untenable. The kernel of Lansing's conclusions was as follows:

"The war was premeditated by the Central Powers together with their allies, Turkey and Bulgaria, and was the result of acts deliberately committed in order to make it unavoidable. Germany, in agreement with Austria- Hungary, deliberately worked to defeat all the many conciliatory proposals made by the Entente Powers."

This false verdict was then incorporated into the infamous Article 231 of the Treaty of Versailles, which alleges:

"The Allied and Associated Governments affirm, and Germany accepts, the responsibility of Germany and her allies for causing all the loss and damage to which the Allied and Associated Governments and their nationals have been subjected as a consequence of the war imposed upon them by the aggression of Germany and her allies."

The German delegates were coerced into signing the Versailles Treaty by threats of renewed war and by the economic blockade still imposed on Germany after the armistice by the fleets of the Entente. The thesis of exclusive German war guilt was required by the Entente as a premise for the Carthaginian peace imposed on the Central Powers, which included the demand for more than $32 billion in war reparations, especially to France, plus interest for servicing this debt over decades into the future.

In the years after the war, documentary evidence was published which further undermined the Big Lie of Versailles. This included Karl Kautsky's "Out break of the World War" (New York, 1924), the Soviet "Materials for the History of Franco- Russian Relations from 1910 to 1914" (Moscow, 1922), the "Austrian Red Book of 1919," and the diary of Baron Schilling of the Russian Foreign Ministry (edited by W.C. Bridge, London, 1925).

The false verdict of Versailles had already become a scandal in America during the 1920's, when historians like H.E. Barnes and others demanded the revision of the war guilt clause. Typical is this conclusion from the academic historian Sidney B. Fay of Harvard in 1930: "...the verdict of the Versailles Treaty that Germany and her allies were responsible for the War, in view of the evidence now available, is historically unsound. It should therefore be revised. However, because of the popular feeling widespread in some Entente countries, it is doubtful whether a formal and legal revision is as yet practicable. There must first come a further revision by historical scholars, and through them of public opinion."

Now, after fascism, a second world conflict, the cold war, and the fall of the communist regimes in Europe, the time has come to reopen the Versailles Treaty. The Treaty must be revised to specify the war guilt of an international conspiracy masterminded first by King Edward VII of England, and after him by Sir Edward Grey, of which figures like Izvolski, Sazonov, and Clemenceau were participants. The center of war guilt must be fixed in London.

.
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