

# Notanism

*Imagine there's no countries*

*It isn't hard to do*

*Nothing to kill or die for*

*And no religion, too*

*Imagine all the people*

*Living life in peace.*

The twenty first century is now well established and the world is still adapting to the fact that the end of the last century marked a significant historical change from the industrial to technological era. Just as the changes brought about by the industrial age led to revolution so do the changes currently taking place offer the same opportunities. This is the big one, it is hard to see a future major change where the people can really seize the world back from those who wish to control us or walk like gods amongst us, but the window of opportunity will not stay open forever. This revolution truly has to be for all the people, we must learn from history which has suffered control by the rich, uprising by the poor and oppressed, left wing dictatorships, right wing dictatorships, democracies controlled by lobbying industrialists, governments working for money not for the people in the middle, the so called apathetic majority. Yes, it is you I am talking to, the person who just wants to get on with your life without all the associated problems living in a society controlled by people with an ulterior motive. You are the majority around our planet whether you live in USA, Russia, China, UK, Australia, India or any other country you just want to live your life as best you can doing whatever it is you enjoy with no animosity to others. Seeing as we are the majority do you not find it's strange that our governments seem to believe it is prudent to spend most of our resources pointing weapons at each other ? There is only one solution to the world's problems and that is a revolution from the middle, people's whose only wish is to enjoy life and give the opportunity for everyone else to do the same. This can very easily be a bloodless coup and if consideration can be given then perhaps even acceptable to all individuals (although possibly resented by many who hold that power and influence over the planet). You hear a lot of conspiracy theories about the New World Order and those three words always conjure up suspicion and fear. Surely a NWO is exactly what we should be striving for but one that is controlled by the people for humanity as a whole and not just a selected group of people or even a selected group of nations. Before we begin thinking

about solutions we should take a close look at how we got here and find out exactly who the Old World Order are and how they gained control of the planet we live on.

I am of the opinion I was taught history backwards. Since having a lot more time on my hands, I seem to be only interested in history, but in school I could not wait to drop it as a subject. I opted for geography, a subject I could see to be a far more logical choice. With the geography of the world I knew the whole picture, I've seen globes, I know which bits are wet which bits are dry, which bits are hot, cold, mountains, desert, sea, lakes and if I did not know I could pick up an atlas and find out. A twelve year old had more interest in games and comics than current affairs, surely I should have understood how the world was before I was taught how it came to be, the problem is the truth about current affairs rarely comes out until current events have been consigned to history. I now have a good understanding of the importance of history, I can see beginnings of eras ends of eras and how things evolved and most importantly who were the winners and who were the losers as well as what happened to both parties. I always assumed our era began with the beginning of the 20th Century with the world only really taking shape after two world wars with all that happened before just being the warm up game. The biggest shame was that I and many other students left school believing that the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand had everything to do with the world we live in, how wrong we were, the real first world war that shaped our lives appears to have been in 1756. The advances since WW2 have marked the end of the era which began shortly after the Seven Years' war and provided the platform with which we can build a new era as the world is able to communicate with more people from their pocket phone than they could ever have imagined in an age where the transport was still powered by wind, muscle or that recently discovered phenomenon, gravity.

Not wishing to go against the grain I shall continue to make the same mistake and start my look at history from the beginning (well the beginning as modern day religions like to view it conveniently ignoring our ancient evolution) but before you read this clear your mind and take a look at the world around you. If it seems unfair and unnecessarily harsh, it is, but it always has been. The main difference is education, this has given us a better understanding of our surroundings and given some of us the desire/ability to take control of our own lives. Let us look why we are where we are and then explore how technology could be used to cancel out the imbalance with the three weapons still available to us, education, democracy and a free and open internet. I am certain there will be inaccuracies in my individual assessment of events, I do not claim to be an expert historian but I like to think I am aware of the world around me so maybe if I do make mistakes by all means let me know but what I find interesting is what people have done with any power they have attained rather than why they did it in the first place.

3

So let's go back to where it all started according to the bible (assuming the hundreds of thousands of years before "creation" never happened).....

## **Religion,**

The two recurring themes that are going to resonate throughout these paragraphs are power and control so where better to start than with religion. Whatever flavour of God or gods you look at, the core lessons are always the same mix of morals, behaviour and lifestyle. The original purposes of organised religion was no doubt to assist with the protection and health of the followers of your religion, a way to unite a people in your part of the world for the good of living in that particular society. Order and high morale within your own society is essential otherwise people just cannot feel secure enough to be able to get on with their lives and become an asset to the community. In the ancient world there would have been no easy way to get a moral message across as there was no mass education, no chance of teaching people through logic and reasoning, a threat was required and what better threat than an all seeing supreme being which judges you in this world and the next.

I am not going to analyse every religion, there would be just too much to take in and it is not the purpose of my journey through time. I personally do not have any religious belief and I see god purely as a creation of man for man, I do look at religions but from my point of view and I try to understand why their scriptures give instruction as opposed to taking any mystical meaning from the words. I have absolutely no desire to disprove your beliefs either but I will make one relevant observation and that is, if each religion believes they are the ones who are right, then quite obviously this must mean that the majority of the world are wrong. If you are a member of the right religion then congratulations, you hit the jackpot you have found the answer we have all been looking for. All I beg of you is that you keep it to yourself, by all means celebrate the fact that you are right but with righteousness comes the responsibility to respect everyone else's right to be wrong.

Judaism paved the way for monotheistic religion with Moses receiving the ten commandments on behalf of the Israelites, rules to be followed and the only words ever to have claimed to have been "written with the finger of God". In reality it was one of many religious groups around the world. This particular one happened to be confined to a small area of the Middle East to the west of the River Jordan and would have probably remained there had it not been spread far and wide by a Roman empire which would go on to adopt one of it's rebels to spread a religion, which would end up going global.

I will pause here and this is an appropriate place to do so as the ten commandments is the one point where all three main monotheistic religions Judaism, Christianity and Islam are all fundamentally in agreement (although the Islamic version is slightly different) . If we omit the first four commandments which establish a supreme being and that you

should devote one day of your week to him, we can even convince most atheists and agnostics to agree to the validity of the remaining six. I have to admit that those of you who fall into the category “others”, written off as irrelevant to monotheism by the Babel story, scattering you to all corners of the globe to follow your own paths, that my limited knowledge of your religions and customs steers me away from commenting, but I would imagine you too would agree with the following as a starting point and would be willing to come along with us on this journey. I am certain plenty would rather the adultery commandment was dropped but the argument back is that no one forces you to get married in the first place and no one is banning the divorce process to free you from the contract of marriage, so your planned act of passion can not be classed as adultery (perhaps we should change that one to Thou shalt not break a contract.

Honour Thy Father and Mother

Thou shalt not kill

Thou shalt not commit adultery

Thou shalt not steal

Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour (don't lie)

Thou shalt not covet (don't be jealous of others)

As I said I cannot imagine many people can or would want to make a case against the validity of these six rules as a fine starting point with which man can create a society. which respects every person's right to enjoy life up to the point it does not interfere with another persons equal right. The tricky bit here is not only just trying to ensure that but also defining what people's basic rights actually are when we have all been brought up with a different perspective of exactly what normal is within our individual cultures.

In no way should this alienate the majority of the world, who identify themselves as a believer, I have no intention of hijacking the ten commandments and removing God from the equation. If people are going to be accepting of all others, then they are going to need to accept that people have the right to their own beliefs, those include people who believe in many gods and those who do not believe in a god at all. There is nothing wrong with beliefs, it is just wrong to impose your beliefs on others. It is equally wrong to impose your non beliefs on others. If the entire world was to accept these 6 commandment as the basis for a way forward they should think about replacing the first four of the original commandments with a simple “Thou shalt respect other's beliefs” and use these as the base seven laws with which they could build a global society in the new era.

Belief in god is a hard subject to deal with, you can prove many things beyond reasonable doubt, but how can you answer the argument that the evidence you found and all the circumstances and theories surrounding them were all placed there by a supreme being, who made it so in order to sow seeds of doubt and to test your faith. The argument about belief can only lead to conflict, the non believer considers the believer to be without education and living in the dark ages, while the believer considers him to be unenlightened and lacking in faith.

We can all agree to disagree on what happened prior to Mount Sinai, we can even doubt that the events at Mount Sinai ever existed or even whether the Israelites were slaves in Egypt and on a journey through the desert. Arguing about a past we struggle to find definitive evidence for does not allow us to move forward with the future, the thing to do is to resolve differences that were created in the past . I believe it is hard to disagree on the seven commandments as being a great place for a society to start, with or without the threat of the wrath of God.

At this point I should declare that although born jewish I consider myself to be without religion but there is no denying my ancestry as my maternal line should definitely be traced back to someone from Judea (biblical Israel prior to 135CE). When I look around the world I discount the hand of god in its development, I only see the work of man and those who have benefitted from it wrongly or rightly. The Atheists amongst you are sitting there smugly thinking " I like this, he is one of us", well I am not, I leave my mind open without ruling anything out, no matter how unlikely. Yes, I am beyond the blind faith most religions demand and I do require conclusive evidence, perhaps if someone was to prove to me the validity of their claims my current views could be changed, I just have not seen anyone come to me yet with that kind of evidence. My discussions up to now with those who spread their religion have always been called to a halt when a vital question has not been answered to my satisfaction other than by playing on words or relying on a faith I just have not got. My knowledge of what man has done to others in the name of religion brings into question for me not whether or not God exists but more importantly whether or not these people could possibly be his representatives on earth having done so many wrongs and injustices to others. Science has "proven" a lot of things, with the Hadron collider it may even prove the possibility of "the god particle" but even if they do someone will only come back and tell them that particle was there because God created the order and conditions for it to be there. Do not try to disprove God, logic dictates all you will ever be able to do is push back the goalposts in that argument. The atheist wrongly believes he/she has an open mind, he/she is wrong, a lot have the most closed minds on the planet. They believe their limited knowledge of the world is a replacement for lessons experienced and shared by generations of our ancestors over thousands of years and possibly those we have yet to discover and learn from. A good example are the jewish dietary laws from Leviticus which contains some fabulous rules on avoiding cross contamination when butchering animals, perhaps if the

world had held on to some of them when they “freed” their followers from the binds of Jewish law a lot of subsequent deaths from food poisoning and diseases like BSE (mad cow disease) may have been avoided. Conversely if the Jewish laws had been written by Moses himself and not been claimed to be the word of God then perhaps the reasons for the written law could have been investigated and updated as new technologies came along such as refrigeration and a better understanding of bacteria. An Atheist therefore cannot just dismiss religion because of a lack of belief instead you should take note of its knowledge and lessons even if you ignore the threat of eternal damnation.

For the original Israelites it was a necessity for a common law and an order for the 12 tribes to live by, instruction on what was safe to eat, how to treat disease alongside how to worship a deity in order to instil discipline within their lives. You are aware of my lack of belief, but if the Israelites trip through the desert was historically accurate then the 40 years would have been essential to ensure absolute belief in God, as those entering “The Promised Land” would be from a new generation with knowledge of the ten commandments from birth and no memory of a time where the existence of God was brought into question, ie 100% faith. Their parents would have been convinced, whether by witnessing God first hand or events that were explained away as miracles. This strong, shared belief would definitely have been passed on to the generation that followed and in the isolation of the desert there would have been no external influences to instil any doubt in this belief.

When Hitler dreamed of his 1000 year Reich he was probably well aware that he could achieve it with 40 years of strict control followed by another 40 to rework history to set the standards they would want their people to consider “normal” and “abnormal”.

I have lived in and around Spain for some years and there were certain elements of their behaviour that puzzled me. It wasn't until I started thinking about Franco and the fact he saw out almost 40 years of power without revolution. I got used to picking up my food from the local beach bar at 1:55 as the place would be more or less empty, at 2pm the tables would be almost full. The more I observed behaviour the more I noticed a subconscious regimented behaviour, stark similarities that I was not used to in the other places I have lived in around the world. I assume the effects of having a dictator will diminish in the new generation but are they facing a new danger from Globalisation, is using your iPhone, while wearing your Nike top and munching on your Big Mac going to allow Spanish identity to develop or just another part of a single homogenised human culture moulded in the cloud and produced in Spain under licence. (Now that's what I call sidetracking!!!) the point I am trying to make here is that after a generation of total control what comes out the other side is a new “normality”.

The Israelites were not all Jews, Judaism was born out of the ten commandments and the law and instruction of the Torah, along with the various lessons derived from stories of the path from the desert until their return to the Land of Israel (Israel, being the name

Jacob was known as). You will find plenty of violence in the scriptures, it was a dangerous time, full of rivalry between tribes who would regularly come into conflict. The Israelites were even beaten once and removed from the land by the Babylonians before returning to the promised land to build the second temple replacing the original which was destroyed.

Rebuilding the Temple completed the development of the Jewish religion and they did indeed rule the land of Israel for about 400 years. Then came occupation by the Roman Empire and everything changed for the Jewish people. The Holy Land was to be known as Judea up until the last attempt by the Jews to revolt against their Roman oppressors in 136CE.

The Bar Kochba revolt inflicted a lot of damage on the Roman legions in the area and the emperor of the time (Hadrian) was not pleased at all. The revolt itself was contentious as some had declared Simon bar Kochba to be the messiah, come to bring independence back to the Jews. Had the revolt not taken place perhaps there would be less conflict in the Middle East today and who knows where we would be if enough Jews had gone on to believe him to be the messiah. Hadrian wanted to wipe out all trace of Israel, as the Romans had previously done with Carthage (a lot of the inventions formerly attributed to the Romans actually had their roots in Carthage but the Romans purposely destroyed a lot of ancient Tunisia in an attempt to erase them from history). Jews were banned from Jerusalem as were Christians who were still considered to be a part of the Jewish faith, the land was paired with the region to the North and renamed Syria Palaestina (which probably explains why the two names of Israel and Palestine exist for the same area of land today). A lot of the Jews who survived the aftermath were sold into slavery and many fled to all corners of the Roman Empire and beyond. This severely reduced their numbers in the region, surviving only in small communities which were of no interest to the Roman occupiers. Judea would remain out of Jewish control until the creation of the State of Israel in 1948. Many people would consider Hadrian's actions to be a dark day in Jewish history, in reality the act of scattering these people could be just the thing which ensured an otherwise insignificant religion would survive the course of time and would be a major influence on the shape of the modern world. Perhaps it could be that any of the religions from the region could have achieved the same place in today's society. Judaism, like most of these religions, was confined to a single region and . I am not going to debate the wisdom of these religions or analyse what made Judaism stronger or more of a threat to the Roman Empire, that is not relevant to the discussion. What is exceptionally relevant to understanding why those people were destined for so much power is that the Romans had just sown a Jewish seed in every corner of the known world and handed them the opportunity to build a powerful network. Their longevity was assured, even if Hitler had realised his ambition to kill every Jew in Europe it would not have ended the Jewish faith without the need for total global domination.



Judaism differs from the religions that followed it as it's people consider themselves to be the chosen ones, with each Jew able to trace his or her roots to one of the sons of Jacob, they do not actively seek to convert people to their religion, if you're mother was Jewish then you are Jewish. Conversion is possible, however in all but the most liberal sects it is somewhere between hard and impossible to obtain. You would imagine that after being scattered into small enough groups, making them unable to form an army, there would have not been any reason to hate the Jews in the places to which they had been cast out to, but they were in possession of something even more powerful and threatening to an uneducated world, knowledge.

Knowledge was a rare commodity after the fall of the Roman Empire and the subsequent "dark ages" while Christianity spread and struggled to find its identity. Those wanting to exert control on their people wanted manual labour or soldiers, thinkers were trouble makers unless they were thinking on the ruler's behalf.

Judaism encourages learning and Jews read the Torah as part of their weekly service which is chock full of useful knowledge alongside its religious instruction, knowledge that would have provided a huge advantage in a world which would not start formal education for another nine hundred years.

Some of the Jew's greatest achievements outside of Israel were accomplished in modern day Spain or Al Andalus as it was known then, where they flourished hand in hand with the Muslim Caliphate that existed. Ironically, in history, when Jew and their brother Arab has lived in peace together they have both benefitted as they did in Al Andalus where the Jews were awarded a special status allowing them to practice their religion unhindered (note, they also offered the same status to Christians). Allowed to thrive, many Jews took advantage to study science and philosophy and then in turn composed rich cultural and scientific works themselves.

Alas no one and nothing lasts forever and deaths of leaders and other circumstances led to the break up of the Caliphate and the Jews were not afforded the same protection in the new kingdoms that replaced it. This led to a massacre of 4000 Jews in the city of Granada, about the same time William was doing his conquering across the English Channel (1066). Despite this setback the Jews stayed in Spain throughout the Christian conquest of the land. The Edict of Expulsion at end of the 15th Century changed things as it gave Jews the choice between conversion, death or expulsion, an order that wasn't formally revoked by the Catholic church until 1968.

These were most definitely not the first or last time Jews would be persecuted throughout the course of history. As mentioned before, their knowledge made them skilled and their desire to maintain bloodline made them close with an unbreakable bond. However, the persecution was frequent and widespread, usually a result of scapegoating by people blaming their misfortune as a direct cause of the Jews. The Jews were an easy target,

they were a closed community who had acquired and retained wealth, they invited suspicion . This constant persecution undoubtedly would have made the jews more wary of non-jews and forced them to live in an ever more closed society and even less likely to mix.

There is no conspiracy as to why certain jewish families are considered to hold positions of power, what else would happen if you dispersed an entire nation of well educated people with an understanding of trade and an unbreakable bond, around the known world ? In an insular world where nations were beginning to discover their identities a trustworthy international network was unheard of and with a “brother Jew” or even actual brother in every port these families could develop a particularly lucrative trade. If the business was money changing, a business that evolved into modern day banking, then the rewards could be huge.

Money changing was a business that had started with the jews in biblical times as foreign currency was not permitted to be spent in the Temple (sacrifices and other religious items needed to be purchased when visiting). In order to obtain temple currency you would need to buy it from the money changers with your Greek, Roman or whatever it was you used as currency in your homeland.

When Europe was forming itself into what we know now, from the 17th century onwards, people did not travel far from their place of birth so it was not unusual for cities to have their own currency. Visiting traders would be paid in local currency for their goods which would be useless to them in their home city, so they would visit the money changer who could change the currency into their home currency or even gold. Anyone who has taken a holiday abroad understands about changing money and how it costs more to buy than you get when you change it back after the holiday. When you are changing money for a whole city’s trade it is not hard to imagine how wealthy you can become.

A long journey in those days was perilous, not the sort of place a trader would want to be travelling for days clutching a sack of gold. The danger of the journey gave the opportunity for the money changer to suggest to the visitor that he can take with him a piece of paper (a note) which he can take to the money changer’s brother in his homeland, who will then exchange this note for his local currency or gold. A promissory note was far easier to guard than a pot of gold, you would have to be brave or/and stupid not to embrace the idea and so the first step was taking towards modern day banking but more of that later.

It is time to pause again as I will try to do each time we hit upon a major subject that has created division. Always remember that human conflict invariably centres around two visible parties “the masses of the people” and “the wealthy”, it matters not what you consider to be the wealth, knowledge or money the set up is always the same. The line between rich and poor is easily defined, the poor are very certain they are poor I do not

need to write about fighting their cause, it has been done countless times before. The real mystery gets solved when you identify the “controlling class” and how the line between the “wealthy majority” and them is blurred. The poor assume these people are just very wealthy and part of the “rich” side. The wealthy are aware of the extreme wealth of some but consider these people to be an extension of their own side of the ongoing struggle. The blurred lines between these two societies make them far easier to manipulate as everyone is seen to be protecting their own side and it is apparently a struggle between two sides when in reality there are three.

It is incorrect to believe the poor are getting poorer, the truth is that the dividing line is rising, the number of poor are growing and the the first victims are those less fortunate in society, the one’s just managing to survive. We are not going to change things for the better without highlighting who in a society is part of this “controlling class”. It is wrong to attack rich people, it is the same as the mistake that is made when we fail to identify any part of society which is incompatible without incorrectly tarnishing a whole group, just being rich is a sign of success not necessarily evil. There are very few parts of society who do not contain members of the ruling class, usually the ones you do not question as much when the tag of “evil” has been placed upon them without reason.

I am starting with the Jews as they were just one source of many of the member who make up this perceived controlling class and you have to start somewhere but I can equally start with the Catholic Church, The Arab oil producers, American/European/Asian Industrialists, European royalty and whoever else make up this collection of power hungry individuals. Although these members of this global elite may identify themselves as part of your culture you have to question what comes first, their obvious faith to their culture or their faith to the higher power of membership to the club they have been admitted to. While we can highlight exactly how some parts of all societies have risen to this elite always remember the Rothschilds are jewish not every jew is a Rothschild, the Vatican is Catholic not every Catholic is part of the Vatican, European royalty is European, not every European is royalty, American industrialists are American not every American is an industrialist and you will not start to slip into the trap of being considered a racist. As bad as racism is, it is equally bad to brand a person a racist with propaganda designed to deflect attention from a legitimate message that person has to tell (just when the liberals thought they had escaped my attention in all this). You may get the impression here that I am one of those people who is going to harp on about conspiracy theories and a dark organisation controlling the world but trust me that is not the case. I may talk about ruling elite and membership of a club but I am definitely not implying there is an actual club controlling the world I just do not believe they could be that organised let alone the fact most of that type of person would not want to work together just for themselves to ultimately achieve sole power. The power flows from the wealth they hold which they use to influence the world, not being one of these people I find it hard to relate to what drives them to keep adding to this wealth when they have more

than they and many following generations of their family will ever need. Does making themselves more wealthy make them happier or are they only happier because they are wealthier than others ?

We looked briefly at Judaism, we should analyse each religion because if you can identify the possibility of fault with all of our religions then surely we have to question all that has been done in the name of God as a result of these faults, without having to rule out the existence of God, Allah, chemical reaction or whatever it is you believe prior to the point in history we are going to agree to regress to. The progress of man in spite of the rights and wrongs of religion are not something that should be ignored so we must have been doing something right. What we have to start believing in is our ability to come together as one human race and enter the new era without the control of those who held power in the past for our “greater good”, the human race is ready to take control of its own destiny and may need to. The only way we can do this is to go back to the 6 commandments and try to get everybody to agree to a basic moral code and definition of global rights we can all live by, there is more than one version of the story in existence regarding Moses, everything therefore that followed this was either a decision of man or the word of a person or entity that claimed to be a prophet. Doubting the ability of our ancestor’s to spot a fraud should in no way conflict with the original belief in God from where your chosen religion stems.

Let us look at religions as political parties (I wouldn’t join one of those either) as there are many similarities. The same way political parties are now corrupted by the promise of reward from business, religions were corrupted by monarchs, rulers and the nations that were born from them. In the same way our political leaders are well looked after by the world of business they have helped (interestingly, from all sides of the political spectrum which has to make you wonder about the price tag of some that claimed to represent the “ordinary man”), most religious representatives (of the right religion for whatever region you were in) have in the same way enjoyed a relative wealthy lifestyle from the conqueror it condoned. With this sort of development it is safe to assume that the only beliefs that we have had passed on to us are those of the winning side in every war, survival of the strongest, not necessarily the wisest. I will accept the possibility for Christians to retain Jesus in the same way it is possible for the Islamic world to incorporate the prophet Mohamed but would either honestly be happy with the past behaviour of their followers and representatives if they were to appear again in the 21st century ? Would Jesus want to be a christian ?

Before I leave discussing whether or not God exists we need to look at the final subject and that is the one of good and evil. Taking a purely sceptical view, the early scriptures were all going fine with God punishing the evil of man. I believe it is Zechariah who first mentioned Satan. With the devil everything changed and so did our second commandment “thou shalt not kill” suddenly became “thou shalt not kill good but

eradicate all that is evil". Step back a minute, whatever happened to the wrath of god ?, was that not good enough to deter evil ? It certainly killed many in Pharaoh's Egypt or persuaded them to respect his wishes with the plagues he sent. I have no doubt a religion must have formulated an answer to this observation in the last few thousand years but I am drawing the line in stretching my beliefs here and I felt I should make that clear. Why would a deity issue a clear written instruction that he would fundamentally contradict with spoken instruction ? So the line has been drawn firmly under Satan conveniently whispering into the ear of people to do bad, I do not believe there is a war against evil, just one against evil people. When I come to thinking about my answer to the most important and only question worth considering "what is the best way we can all move forward together ? One insistence I think we need to make is that all religions find a way to reconsider evil and where exactly they inform their followers it comes from.

I have been fairly comfortable in this book up until now as it has only potentially brought me into conflict with members of the religion I was born into. Let me worry about my "own people" (been arguing that one most of my life) but from here on in I am going to be talking about others and that is guaranteed to offend someone. Just remember I love you all collectively and there is not one whole group I can honestly say contain more than 1% of individuals who I would label as being a problem. I am angry we fight all of our battles over this 1% without analysing our individual groups and finding out where the faults are that allow us to be manipulated by these extreme elements. Now you know I intend to offend everyone at some point, the best way to carry on would be to ask you to complain to me if you feel your religion has not been offended and I will see what I can do about correcting the situation, I don't trust any of them. I intend to take a completely cynical view of religion from here on (not that I haven't already taken a similar view with the mysticism surrounding Judaism) because I believe the two other main monotheist religions are reactionary and more akin to revolutionary movements. I am not asking you to give up your faith I am asking you to open your mind to the possibility that the word of both of your prophets have been hijacked in an attempt to control or to unite your people to fight those trying to take control of your land. Don't you find it strange that all your leaders can sit down together but none do enough to prevent the conflict with clear messages to countermand extremist troublemakers ? If I was a Christian I would want to know what Jesus actually said and believed in. In the same vein if I were of the Islamic faith I would like to know what subjects of the Koran would not have been drawn to Mohamed's attention had the constant threat of invasion and loss of identify not been an issue for the Arab tribes. Going back to politics, we do not have to go far to see evidence of corruption at all levels and in all societies. Conclusive evidence and a definitive link to the corruption of power, statistics alone must open the possibility and lead everyone in every mainstream religion that has split at one point in time to ask, was the "right" side not necessarily the strongest side ? and at which point has my religion and my God been hijacked ?. Asking these questions does not in my mind constitute

questioning your religion or your God, as you recall I am trying to bring the world back to agreeing to the 6 commandments, not argue about where they came from.

Prior to discussing Christianity we have to look at the state of the world Jesus grew up in and the history of the time. Without doubt, the one major influence in that time was the Roman Empire. One thing can be said about the Roman empire and that was that they had the undoubtable ability to win a war and an undeniable appetite to rule over all they conquered with unquestionable authority. In my personal opinion the achievements they are admired for are no greater than any of the improvements any similar dictatorship has made since, improving their citizens way of life with infrastructure improvements and inflicting their will upon their conquered lands. I cannot imagine Germans admire Adolf Hitler while enjoying their journey along one of their Autobahns, so why is it that people admire the Romans so much for their roads ?

This makes me think back to the Life of Brian sketch where John Cleese asks, what have the Romans ever done for us ? The simple answer was that they inflicted misery and persecution on all who they conquered. The answers the cast of Monty Python came back with were all very wrong. Aqueduct (India) Sanitation (Babylon) Roads (Sumeria) Irrigation (Peru, although I don't imagine the Romans made it to Peru and got that via the Persians again) Education (China) Wine (Persia). Romans, as mentioned earlier, liked to destroy civilisations that preceded them and take credit for technology as their own, while Christianity was obviously not a Roman invention it was they in the form of Constantine who had the greatest say in what parts of the 300 year history of various exchanges (true or false) of information and stories regarding Jesus they would "package up" and release on the world's stage as mainstream Christianity. The Catholic church eventually picked up where the Roman Empire left off.

The Romans were not the first empire, nor were they the last and as much as you can marvel at their legacy it is impossible to ignore the inevitable exploitation of people and resources, in the lands that they conquered. I accept it is impossible to look backwards and try to redress all the imbalances caused by these empires one by one. It cannot be unreasonable to assume a lot of the concentrations of wealth, benefitted either directly from or as a result of one or other of these empires. One common link that cannot be ignored with nearly all of the modern empires that came along and that is that Christianity was at the heart of it. I believe it is not a mistaken generalisation to make to say that all the European empires were either born directly out of or in response to the Roman Empire. Early Roman conquests succeeded in wiping out enough of the civilisations they conquered that the identity of that civilisation was either lost or absorbed and adapted to suit the Roman way of doing things . This all worked fine until they encountered the Jewish people, a society with an already complete doctrine, one which was already aware of its identity and with an unbreakable bond.

I see Christianity and Islam as reactionary movements which started off as attempts to unite and organise their respective societies to further the religious cause. Where their problems started was that they did not begin with 100% faith, but instead relied on conversion. The spread of information by word of mouth was slow, which meant rapid growth would only come with inevitable conflict as they force their beliefs on others through conquest. The original messages may have been right, but the time was not right, as the speed of the network available was desperately slow. Today, Jesus could make a Youtube video and his message would hit every corner of the world within seconds, you could still agree with him or disagree with him or interpret his words in many ways. The thing you could be certain of in this scenario is that the words you are witnessing are HIS words (actually on videos you can't really guarantee that any more). We all see how politicians words can get twisted nowadays when we are fed out of context sound bites which we choose to rely on even though we have access to a lot of the unedited footage. Unfortunately sound bites are far easier for us than having to spend time listening to the whole story (especially as your lives are too "busy" to find the time). I seem to be straying here. Back to the point I was trying to make, the speed of information was slow, many different versions of stories existed and it is totally reasonable to assume that some of the stories were altered by certain storytellers eager to benefit from a "holy message" in their favour. It took 300 years for the message of Christianity to finally be selectively consolidated into a mainstream religion, a process we could now accomplish in days by sharing this knowledge with all your friends who in turn pass it on to theirs via a social network . Even without Constantine's (or his mother's) personal beliefs, religion was the last hope for the Roman Empire to have any chance of retaining an element of control outside of whatever parts of the land they could defend. Mass conversion and obedience to this new religion would be a way to ensure control without the need for an army to police their followers (Romans must have learnt by then that the unquestionable fear of a single powerful God was more effective and far cheaper than any police force). SPOILER ALERT! While I have your mind focussed on the power of God, I am going to hand you a potential end game but don't let this realisation prevent you from continuing to take this journey with me. What happens when one entity controls "god" and its "sub gods" Money and Technology ?. With enough money and the right technology you can create a believable illusion to "make god appear". If you run the church then you have the ability to rubber stamp this miracle on behalf of your followers and tell them to accept whatever message it conveys.

Let us imagine a huge hologram beamed into the atmosphere or even directly projected into the mind and technology to provide the audio without the need for speakers. This could appear to be a generated "word of God", now imagine what someone can do with that sort of technology. I am not going to try and prove or disprove the possibility, the only thing I ask is that you open your mind that it will probably be possible in the future and imagine the power it would hold were there to be mass belief. We therefore need to

ensure that we keep the control of God, Money and Technology separated with the correct controls and balances so that we are not left open to manipulation in this way as we move forward with the world of virtual reality. Right! back to tracing where this old power went to so we can do something about those who picked up the batten of control in today's world

I am not a Christian but I do get the feeling Jesus had something important to say or he would not have made so many enemies so far up the ladders of power. As you know the politics of Judea was the politics of religion, not dissimilar to the set up in Iran today, the religious elders were the law. Jesus the man was born a Jew everyone agrees there but that is alas where the agreement ends. Christianity did not start out as a religion but as a sect within Judaism and it was some time before the two officially separated. When they finally split it left a gulf that could never be bridged between the two people. The Jew considered the Christian to be very courageous living their life as though redeemed in a world without redemption whereas the Christian saw the Jew as an obstinate person who refused to accept the miracle that had happened in the world.

It mattered not to the Romans as they did not really differentiate between Jew and the followers of a Jewish prophet who they believed they had put to death. What ever happened at and after the crucifixion has been debated for 2000 years but as the depiction of Last Supper shows Jesus was a Jew right up until "the end". For this reason there should be no real conflict between Judaism and Christianity as Jesus did not cease to consider himself a member of the Jewish community, although he was not fond of their money changers (it's those bankers again!). Could it be that Jesus Identified quite clearly the direct link between religion and money is one that should not exist. That certainly would have upset a lot of people, mainly those who were in power and trying to maintain control. Religion was still the ultimate form of control, money was just something used for the trade of goods and property. The Roman empire just took what it wanted and wealth was allowed to trickle down, where it did not trickle is where slavery began. If you really feel you do not understand how things were by now then I urge you to watch Monty Python's Life Of Brian, don't get offended, see through the exaggerated facts that make up the humour, but realise there is always an element of truth buried in any genuinely funny comedy. Having accepted the validity of the possibility of all Christian beliefs and demonstrated why they should not fight with the Jews about it I need to address a point of view to satisfy those who do not believe in a supreme being. I am sorry but for that I need to strip out the mysticism, explore theory and put things in a way they can feel comfortable accepting, that something happened in history and that they should not ignore the lessons from it. Skip through this if you really think this is going to offend but I urge you not to.

**\*note/final warning\***, the following is theory and not to be read as factual in any way nor am I trying to impose this theory on anyone who does not accept it\*



A common secular conception or perhaps theory about Jesus is that his birth was planned by religious elders to fulfil messianic prophecies already in place. The idea of a virgin birth was not a new one and had been applied before to the mother of Pharaohs in Egypt. Joseph was from the House of David and therefore of royal lineage and it is said that Mary was a descendant of Aaron who represented the high priests of the Israelites, truly a special couple. Jesus was the coming together of kings and priests, a most appropriate mix for their new messiah.

As previously mentioned religion was the politics of the day and the religious elders were in effect the government of the day. This particular government was one under occupation, in crisis after Roman tax reforms and desperate to find a solution. I can only guess at their whole plan or how they imagined they would dig themselves out of the hole they would make for themselves. As religious elders it would have been disastrous if they had been found to be creating a "false messiah" .

The story goes that Jesus was sent away as an adolescent for an education in all the messianic prophecies so he can return "word perfect". We can only guess to the extent of the knowledge he received, perhaps secrets to which only the inner circles of Judaism were privy to. Perhaps this knowledge was the spark, or he saw links no one else had previously considered or maybe he discovered the plan to use him as a false messiah and he did not agree with it. One thing is for certain this knowledge would make him wise, perhaps incomprehensibly wise for the people of the day. Maybe they mistook this wisdom to be more than it was. There is no point guessing when we cannot possibly hope to get in his mind 2000 years later and maybe without referring to scriptures which would have been destroyed when the Romans were actively pursuing Christians within their empire.

Jesus rode back into Jerusalem to fulfil a literal interpretation of Zachariah's prophecy that the king would come to the Jews just and humble, riding on a donkey. It all probably went well until the religious elders realised that the message Jesus was giving was not the message they wanted him to pass on to the Jewish people and they were not prepared to stand for a rebellion.

Whatever Jesus discovered with this knowledge it is clear he rebelled against the religious authority of the day (who were also in turn the government of the day), as far as the government was concerned they had a whistleblower and he knew everything. I am not going to contemplate exactly what message he was relaying but the overall feeling I get is that he was a man of peace wanting to free Jews from certain laws he knew to be wrong and not, in his opinion, to have come from God. I repeat what I said earlier that Jesus was a practicing Jew, he undoubtedly spoke out against certain aspects of the religion but Christianity freed Jewish Christians from all Jewish law except the ten commandments. We will never really know the truth of those events, with all the power struggles taking place, there is no doubt some elements of truth exist at the source of

these stories but it is all undoubtedly clouded with the propaganda of those wishing to use this religion as a tool of control.

I am certain you have heard all the stories enough time for me not to have to question people's beliefs any further. There are many books about theories relating to Jesus, some even saying he survived and lived out his days in India. Solving the mystery is not my concern, I am concerned with what has been done in the name of Jesus and how the church became the conduit which allowed the power to flow from the Roman Empire to those who held it in the medieval era.

After the crucifixion, whatever the events, Christianity spread by word of mouth for the next 300 years or so, resulting in many different and often contradictory theologies. Many of the original scriptures were lost as Christians were relentlessly pursued and massacred by the Romans. It is impossible to say how or even if Christianity would have evolved had it been allowed to disseminate in this way alone but at the turn of the 3rd century it found its first home in Armenia courtesy of Gregory the Illuminator. Shortly after Christianity got the boost it required in the form of the mother of Emperor Constantine whose son had a vision, a vision which instructed him to conquer with the cross.

Alright, it's pause time again, as you know I'm no expert but, ignoring the fact that the Romans put Jesus to death, one of the greatest influences on the Council of Nicaea imagined this religion should be used to carry on the work of the Roman Empire. As I said previously I have no wish to disprove Christianity but with this attitude you do have to wonder what doctrines were not included, which should have. Even more of a concern to me and I imagine to the rest of the world, is what doctrines were included that should not have been anywhere near christianity. I may have missed the bit in all stories, but I do not recall the one where Jesus gathered an army to force people to abide by his wishes. Would a man so obviously peaceful in nature have condoned the sort of message Constantine received in his dream ? Would he have really compromised on this message of peace for this fast track to global proliferation ? .

Whatever the wrongs and rights were, the Christian religion was brought together as one in the year 325 CE with the capital of the Roman empire moved shortly after to the site of modern day Istanbul (Constantinople/Byzantium).

Byzantium was a very strategic city being the terminus for the silk road, the only cross land trading route from China in to Europe, also, prior to the Suez canal, one of only two access points into the Mediterranean Sea which was at the heart of their civilisation (the other being the Pillars of Hercules or Gibraltar /The Spanish enclave of Ceuta on the African side). Since the western half of the Roman Empire was under attack from all sides it made sense to consolidate power in this strategic location. The next time they

would reconquer the lands of Western Europe would be with the cross as Christianity spread, just as Constantine had “dreamt”.

Again, the rise of Christianity across Western Europe is well documented with Popes, Kings, Queens knights, armies, crusades etc. I would need a far bigger piece than I am prepared to write so rather than replace the many thousand of history books let us look at the main players in the lead up to the industrial era. Of course when looking at Christianity you cannot fail to mention two important splits. The Great Schism around the turn of the first millennium saw the Eastern Orthodox and other orthodox churches split from the Roman side of things. Around six hundred years later old Henry was after a divorce and the English were out of there, along with Anglicanism to split the western part of the church, to be joined shortly after by Protestantism. The religious freedom of America then brought many different branches of the Christian belief into being which goes to show the words of Jesus were indeed still a hotly debated subject 1500 years later.

In the eastern side of the empire the Byzantines were involved in war with the Sasanian Empire (Persian) and laid waste to most of the region, to say the people of the area were not impressed by empires was an understatement. While the fertile lands of Persia along with its obvious trade links to the east were of value, the desert interior of Arabia was of little interest to anyone, it was around this time Mohamed was alive in Mecca receiving details of the Koran. The arabs are claimed to be a descendant from Abraham through Isaac’s brother Ishmael (in case anyone reading was not aware of the connection between Muslim, Jew and Christian) although Mohamed himself shared the same roots as the Hashemites from the East side of the Jordan river . Nowadays Muslims are descended from many of the cultures of the region which were gradually replaced by the Islamic faith as they were converted, a number of the followers of smaller religions still manage to survive in small pockets within the Islamic world. Some even descended from the members of the 12 tribes of Israel that did not to go on to form the Jewish people.

I do not want to belittle the Islamic faith by giving it such a small section. I apologise, but as you can imagine I grew up with only a British or Jewish education offered to me. I have seen various excerpts from extremist Islamic organisations but I know propaganda when I see it and I always discount hate as lies no matter where it comes from. I understand the need to unite the tribes of Arabia, in a world where the threat of Empires came from all directions individual tribes and even small kingdoms had little chance of survival aside from the occasional areas which enjoyed a geographically tactical advantage to defend from invaders (like Switzerland). Coming back down from the alps to the desert again, Islam was born in the 7th century and as the Byzantine empire slowly declined in power Islam gradually spread across the middle east and North Africa. Once the Byzantine empire had finally been finished off in the 15th Century it crossed the Straits of Gibraltar and up into Spain (Al Andalus). They enjoyed a Golden era while

Christianity was busy spreading west, but Christianity was concentrating on the resource rich Northern Europe with its forests of wood and earth full of iron which would be used to fashion the blades they will eventually bring with them on their Crusades and to drive the Islamic empire and other entities out of western Europe.

When the Byzantine Empire finally fell, Islam reappeared in mainland Europe in the form of the Ottoman Empire. The borders were drawn around the Balkans and the Ottomans could flourish by controlling the trade routes with the East, which were to remain mainly land based until Britain was to dominate the seas over the next few hundred years.

Unfortunately that is as good as it got for the Muslim people. As people could circumvent this trade route with sea travel, the importance of the land route declined. With the opening of the Suez canal the time saving and the avoidance of a perilous journey around the bottom of Africa must have been disastrous for the Ottoman empire. Perhaps if someone had known the value of the oil beneath their feet at the time things could have been different but before the combustion engine, oil was a problem not a commodity. The world was to have little interest in this area until the early part of the 20th century.

Within the Islamic faith, like Christianity before it, they also had a major schism between Sunni and Shia after they disagreed who should be the successor to Mohamed. The two sides do not see eye to eye and is the main cause of today's wars in the Islamic world. Shia are the minority only making up about 25-30% with the main country representing the Shia people being Iran. The vast majority are associated with the Sunni side and represented by Saudi Arabia. Since the Islamic revolution in Iran in the late 20th century there has been a noticeable upturn in tension and conflict between the two sides. It seems the only time they do both agree is in their dislike of the State of Israel as they view Israel's main aim was to weaken the arabs and control their oil.

Let's take a moment to think about how we can make the world better and still have a place for religion. Just assume I can convince you with my ideas, one of my main beliefs is that a lot of the world's problems would be solved by the availability of fresh water. 71% of the world is water, yet we have areas of drought. I know nearly all of that is frozen or saline but we possess the ability to desalinate sea water and surely if we can find the means to produce weapons to protect or attack each other, then we could find a way to "plumb the world" with clean water for everyone if we could resolve our difference and no longer require the weaponry.

In order to end the quest for world peace and order, all religions are going to need to come to terms with each other and send out clear messages of the rights of others outside of their religion to exist. When I say clear message it must be done in a way that cannot be open to future misinterpretation.

The Jews have now resettled in the land of Israel and there should be no persecution or threat of war. As I understand it the religion only justifies war to protect the Holy land and

they do not actively seek to convert others then there should be no problem with jews living in harmony with every other religion. They should also understand as residents of the Holy land, that it is holy to a number of religions all of which must be guaranteed access to holy sites, having been to Israel a number of times I do not see this being an issue. Incidentally, anyone who is against the State of Israel, I urge them to visit the place before passing judgement from anything they have been told. You will see a society where Islam, Judaism and Christianity all thrive together even with the added security due to the obvious threats. The people of Israel are welcoming you, not threatening you but your leaders do not wish you to see that. As you can see they do not take crap when attacked or their citizens are threatened. If nothing else, do you not find it strange that the Palestinian population which is supposedly systemically being exterminated by the evil jews has in fact over doubled in size since the 1980's. Something must be wrong there, either the Israelis are awful at killing people or someone somewhere is not telling you the truth. I shall not dwell on the wrongs and rights of the whole situation (there are rights and wrongs on both sides, but war is never pretty) just ask you to see with your own eyes first, a lot of people have a lot to gain by retaining conflict. If someone is pointing the finger study where that finger is coming from and you will usually find he is pointing it so you do not notice what he is up to, con men love to divert attention.

Christians of all denominations really need to readdress the message to Constantine about the cross conquering all before it and possibly examine scriptures not included by the council of Nicaea which may have been denied by the Roman Empire of the day. Try to include things that would be more appropriate to a world without war and conquest, satellites have given us a complete picture of the world we live in there simply are no more unconquered lands to take without causing suffering to others already there (in truth, there never was anyone who deserved that).

Islam, it is very hard to ask you to change without faith that the future world will be a fairer place for your people. Recognition must be given for the appalling way your lands were carved up by the European empires (as was Africa, with no regard to the people they were grouping together). As much I am aware that the creation of the State of Israel was exceptionally badly handled by the British, the Jews need a homeland and their presence in Israel was well documented. While I appreciate that muslim people had also settled the area, most of the original land jews settled on was purchased fairly from the Ottoman owners and was under British occupation. I am aware some Arab land owners lost land but so did many Jewish people who were forced to leave many cities around the Arab world. It is time to settle differences find a solution and aim for a golden age when Jew and Arab can work together again. Islam, like Christianity should also take another look at the meaning it takes from the Koran once the threat of conflict with other religions is removed and issue appropriate instructions to its followers for peaceful coexistence.

Every religion has its own extremists, they need to be reined in as we aim to bring an end to religious conflict and embark on a future of understanding and acceptance of the right for all religions to exist in harmony.

Our new world will need a code of laws and like everything we will be looking at everyone's and deciding on which of the best ones to adopt on a global scale. We need to end the philosophy that my way is the best and only way and really start looking at which bits of everyone's different ways are the best for the people of the world. The starting point for our code of laws would be the 6 commandments (yes I am leaving honour thy father and mother in there so its remains a parent's responsibility to teach their kids right from wrong), naturally most religions would automatically increase this to the full 10 for all their followers. We would be stupid to believe we can come up with a one law fit all scenario. Even if we do remove all world borders we would be crazy to ignore that sometimes these mark areas of people with vastly different customs. What is normal on one side of the world is not on the other and for this reason we would still need to maintain borders to mark out the jurisdiction of any necessary by laws. For example if you look at the world as a single state the nations would become councils able to pass local law. Of course democracy is not an option the people must always have a say in our new world. Internet access can become a human right and that is where the voting for our new world democracy could take place. We'll hopefully gather up all the solutions later though.

Okay I am done with how I foresee religion going from here. I cannot see how these men of religion cannot sit down and hammer out an agreement to live together. I don't want to tell you what to believe in or how to run your religion, the only thing I ask is that you find a way you can survive side by side without the threat of conflict. Actually, sorry but there may be a chance I come back to the Catholic church because with their wealth and property they bridge the gap between religion and business. It is not my desire to focus on one religion and demonise it but there is no denying history and you only have to look back 50 years to see there were some very intolerant policies which were yet to be revoked by the Catholic church.

I can hear the sound of the members of the third largest religion scratching their heads around the world wondering why it is I have not mentioned the pantheistic religion of the Hindus or even the Buddhists. A look at the history of these and other religions such as shamanism, Shintoism, Zoroastrianism and even Christianity without the influence of it's Imperial conquerors, shows that these religions have been able to coexist in all but a few relatively minor instances of conflict.

What of the conflict in Pakistan and India ? I hear you ask.

It all began with Mahmud of Ghazni around the turn of the first millennium. who had conquered lands from Kandahar to Lashkar Gah. If you think those places sound familiar

then you are right, as that was the site of recent conflict in Afghanistan. This was no religious war though, the Hindus had been pretty much left alone and allowed to develop. They had fertile land and a region rich in resources, their temples were elaborately decorated with gold and jewels. In a peaceful world few of its inhabitants aspired to be great warriors. Afghanistan by contrast is land locked, the terrain is harsh and the land less fertile. Growing up in this world the need to take and defend is greater, knowledge is less use to someone who cannot possibly utilise that knowledge. If you wanted to impress a hungry clansman you would bring him some food and if the only food available was taken from a neighbouring people then your clansman would not be any less appreciative of that food, you are therefore more likely to aspire to be a warrior. You cannot assume the warriors to be evil though as within their society they had been educated from birth that the evil was need and good was fulfilling that need it only actually becomes evil when the need turns to pure want.

Mahmud made it across the mountains with raiding parties and the pickings were not only easy but profitable too. He obviously noticed that the lands were far more fertile than those he occupied. To fast forward to the time christianity "took control" of the region in the form of the British empire, the mix of conquest, conversion and the inevitable resultant poverty meant Hindus and Muslims were living "cheek to cheek" together in crowded cities. They were together, their language was similar enough to be the same but they were as far apart as could possibly be, one revering the cow and the other hungrily eyeing up this holy creature whilst lighting the BBQ. When the British left and Pakistan drew its borders separating the two people was never going to be easy and free of violence.

We all see the issues people are having with Brexit in the UK wondering what their future will be after settling in a land they believe they will have to leave 24 years after the Maastricht treaty. These people were separating after close to 1000 years of gradual integration which must put that into context not only did they have to divide the population but also the resources, conflict was inevitable.

To sum up religion, you can all coexist in a better world with the security to live life without harassment, the availability of food and water and the opportunity to work for a way to pay for it. You cannot fight wars to achieve this when winner takes all. I am not asking you to change your beliefs all I ask is you look back at the interpretations of your scriptures. Interpretation is all about perspective and your scriptures are written to cover many eventualities so you should be able to find the message of coexistence you are looking for. If you are looking for an excuse to justify war you will undoubtedly find it, but if you are not looking for it then you will simply not find it. Maybe seek to find common ground with other religions no man can honestly say they know everything, share your secrets between faiths, perhaps between you, you do have the answer, maybe even one

you can all agree on. People are easier to talk to when they do not have a sword at their throat.

One last blast from religion, I have done it a disservice by not relaying its stated goal. New Jerusalem, City of God, Zion just some of the terms they use. When the messiah will arrive for the jews and explain the purpose of their laws, Christianity believes it will come after the forthcoming apocalypse, the time of the second coming where it will be built in the world for the millennium of peace to follow. Puritans believe it to refer to a city to be built in the new world (USA) an idea picked up by many early American Nationalists, the Mormons (Church of Latter Day Saint) believe it to be in Missouri....please feel free to look this up I am sure there is a version for your particular flavour of religion, but I cannot promise you that will show you the real aim of whoever controls your religion only their point of distraction.

Now back on track, let us not dwell on how these individual religions spread, split and established themselves. Time to jump into that time machine and fast forward to the lead up to the French revolution and the subsequent industrial era. Let us see who all the players are, again in this story of the world around us

1. The Jews - A conquered people from the middle east, small pockets remained in the Holy Land but many were in the process of being scattered and ending up as far afield as China by the 7th century. They were a people without control of their homeland but their desire to return and unbreakable bonds were possibly underestimated at the time. Christianity was set to convert the world it was thought to be only a matter of time before this would just be another group of people who would succumb to conversion.

2. The Holy Roman Empire and the Catholic Church - To put it in modern day reference, this was an empire which, at the height of power, stretched from Italy in the South to Denmark in the North and from France across to Russia although by the time of the revolution in France it had shrunk in size. It was originally conceived by Charlemagne in the 8th Century as an attempt to revive the Roman Empire centred around the "Holy Spear of Jesus" which he carried into battle. This was said to be the same spear given to Constantine by his mother which contained as its centrepiece a nail supposedly used in the crucifixion and in turn the dagger of St Maurice a Christian Martyr who became the patron saint of knights. This was a time when holy relics were being traded and a lot of modern day European cities came about from being centred around the various churches and castles which were built to house these relics as they were thought to have a power to protect them. Fascination with the power of these relics still remained up to the 20th century (and possibly beyond ?), the last group to possess the holy spear were the Nazis when they brought it back to Nuremberg from Vienna where it had



previously been the centre piece of the Austria Hungarian Empire. 1300 years of bloodshed across Europe and beyond behind a spear related to the one person most selected by its inhabitants to represent peace and love to their fellow man. Sorry to reinforce my scepticism but I cannot escape the feeling that ,no matter what the truth about Jesus really was, any organisation connected with this mass taking of human lives across the centuries can never be referred to as “men of God”

The eventual spread of protestantism would split the empire and modern nations would emerge the other side as each territory gained its independence. These organisations were not really an empire as such but more a collection of city states and small kingdoms united behind the Pope of the time or the Holy Roman emperor.

3. The Colonials - all set to spread their particular version of Christianity to “savages” all over the unknown world. Their history was complex, their wars between each other were many so we will concentrate on who they were rather than how they were.

- a) The British - English, Scottish and Welsh recently united and set to rule the waves and embark on the largest ever empire known to man. A Constitutional monarchy where, after their civil war, the real power is decided by parliament, democracy of sorts but very much a democracy for and conducted by the nobility.
- b) The French - Still just about the main power in Europe having supplied kings to both England and Spain . A monarchy soon to undergo revolution and chopping the heads off their aristocrats. They briefly form the first republic before running into financial problems and to lose any hope of true freedom as a dictator intent on war takes over the helm.
- c) The Spanish - The result of the expansion of the Christian kingdoms of Castile and Aragon into former Muslim lands, again a fairly complex story. Eventually to become entirely Catholic under pain of death. A lot of the Jews and Muslims who avoided conversion by the Spanish inquisition fled to the North African Coast from Morocco to Egypt. Spain along with Portugal had been at the colonial game from the 15th century but the 18th Century was to see the beginning of its decline. Spain “possessed” the western half of South America and all in between Peru and Louisiana including many of the major Caribbean Islands. Being the first to circumnavigate the globe Spain had established a trading colony in the Philippines which they were to hang on to until lost to the Americans at the end of the 19th Century as well as many trading posts in Taiwan and Oceania. It also had it’s original colonies along the west coast of Africa along with a northern strip on the other side of the Straits from Gibraltar
- d) Portugal - The original colonials they filled the gaps around the world where the Spanish had not settled. They had united with the Spanish for a brief period which had allowed them to establish themselves in the world. Subsequent alliances with

Great Britain would lead to a lot of their original Empire ending up in British hands but their network was vast and obviously valuable. The Portuguese tended to stick to the coasts opting for many trading points as opposed to conquering vast swathes of land, a friendly port on every continent. A list and a map will give you an idea what a valuable maritime network they had from West to East:-

1. Coastal plains of Brazil
2. Atlantic islands such as the Azores, Madeira, St Helena and Cape Verde
3. The Gold Coast of Africa
4. Angola
5. Mozambique
6. Zanzibar
7. Mombassa
8. Bahrain
9. Bombay
10. Ceylon (Sri Lanka)
11. Chittagong (Bangladesh)
12. Malacca in Malaysia and a sprinkling of locations around Indonesia

In case you are wondering what the driving force behind colonisation was, it was unsurprisingly, gold. The first of many valuable resources these empires sought to bring back to Europe starting with the Portuguese discovering the Gold Coast in West Africa followed closely by the Spanish creating the original Gold rush in Africa. No one liked to fill their ships with gold more than the Spanish. bringing back vast fortunes seized from their conquest of South and Central America (assuming they were not intercepted by British sailors involved in acts of piracy off the coast of Europe and around the Caribbean). Since the Monarchs of Spain were granted their authority by the Pope they claimed all the lands they conquered on behalf of the Catholic church and were closely followed by the various missionaries spreading their word with the help of the conquistador's swords.

3.The Ottoman Empire - Set to maintain control of the majority of Muslim occupied lands until the early 20th century. At the height of power they controlled European land in modern day Spain and the Balkans, African land across the north Mediterranean coast through Egypt down to Somalia as well as the area we know today as the middle east, Arabia and Turkey. In Europe they allied with France in their eternal battle with the Hapsburgs which gave them a presence in territory up to northern Hungary.

Throughout the early part of the millennium the muslim nations of the middle east had suffered horrendously at the hands of Christian crusaders intent on gaining control of the Holy land. Eventually the crusaders did catch the prize of Jerusalem, but not before many thousands of people were massacred in the process with the crusaders slaughtering men, women and children in the area regardless of their belief. As well as muslims, the jews of the area were killed, the same fate even befell Christian inhabitants ,the crusaders killed first and did not ask questions, after all they were getting the site of their messiah's ascendancy to his father. How could they be doing wrong when they were on a mission from god ?

Read up on the crusades the next time you ask yourself what is the mentality of the perpetrator of that terrorist attack you are watching on the TV news. The muslim faith's first contact with christianity saw that their god found it acceptable to slaughter in his name, is it any wonder their religion responded with similar interpretations of its own religious scriptures to justify revenge ? They invented a new word to describe the struggle against the enemies of Islam, that word was Jihad.

The crusaders established small kingdoms along the coast in modern day Lebanon and Israel and Jerusalem and went as far south as Egypt. In Jerusalem they set up churches and shrines to Jesus as well as occupying the holy sites of the Muslims such as the Dome of the Rock where Mohamed was said to have ascended to heaven. To add insult to injury this holiest of all mosques in the area was used as a stables for the horses of the Holy land's "police force" who took their name from the location which is also the site of King Solomon's temple for the jews, they were the Knight's Templar. It is rumoured that the knight's templar gained knowledge or even retrieved an artefact that spooked the Catholic church enough to ensure them vast wealth when they returned from the holy lands to Europe. Of course there have been plenty of books and theories on the knights templar, I cannot even guess what they found but it is important to note that they were the first Europeans to occupy this holy site since the Roman Empire had departed and the Romans definitely did not have any interest in the site of the execution of a suspected revolutionary or anything to do with jewish history. Equally the muslim occupiers of the temple only had an interest on the rock on top and the mosque they had built around it. I guess the answer to that mystery must be buried somewhere in the Vatican as it is said they did pay a large amount of money for it....

Egypt was a mistake for the crusaders as they slaughtered Shia to take it which bred resentment. The Shia would probably have welcomed the Crusaders into their cities as the Egyptians were more scared of the Sunni threat from the other side of the muslim divide. Eventually this would lead to the Egyptians doing a "deal with the devil in the form of a general in the Sunni army by the name of Saladin who would eventually go on to gain control of the land between Syria and Egypt on behalf of the muslims, after a struggle with the son of his former leader.

Eventually Saladin's dynasty would end and these are the lands the Ottomans moved into when expanding their Empire south and westwards from their Turkish power base. They thrived then stagnated while the European powers were fighting amongst themselves for control of Europe. Their downfall came as Europe polarised into its various elements the constant war footing with the Hapsburgs or the Russians took its toll as did the struggle to maintain elements within its own territories as Sunni/Shia as well as tribal differences existed all over the Arab world. By the late 19th Century their lands were reduced to the middle east, Arabia and Turkey with pockets of Muslims spread across the Balkans Egypt was very much controlled by the British empire with the French holding the rest of northern Africa across to Algeria. The deserts of Arabia were undesirable places to inhabit and had nothing to offer the world at the time leading to the people of the area being slow to experience the wonders the industrial revolution were to offer people in other parts of the world.

4. America, North and South - The new world and in the early stages of being discovered, lack of immunity to the germs of their invaders and technological advancements they could not hope to catch up with. These "savages" unfortunately would not stand a chance when "civilised" by the colonial war machine.

5. Central and South Africa - Same as the Americans except the people of this land were to become the unpaid workforce of the new world as their continent is plundered for its people as well as its resources. This crime against the African people has never been adequately compensated for. Today's society preaches equality with the black man but how is that possible when equality so obviously is not apparent. There is obviously a higher percentage of poverty within the black communities but people are very quick to highlight rich black people as an example of their ability to progress in an equal world. These people actually progressed despite an unequal world. When the black people were given their liberty they were short changed as their liberty was not the only thing that had been taken. The slave traders had also disconnected any link between these people and the ancestors they were taken from. I remember when I was younger and black friends of mine telling me they were from Caribbean roots and not African if I analyse that in retrospect it is actually quite a sad statement. After liberty it took a long time to achieve anything close to equality. The Afro Caribbean people are entitled to compensation and it should come from those who got rich from their toil and resources not from the economy that it is now a part of, this is debt repayment, not a hand out.

6. Aboriginal Australia and surrounding islands - Am I getting repetitive ? More people eagerly anticipating the arrival of the British

7. Indian and Chinese advanced civilisations in their own right, trading with but not set to fare well from their future encounters with the colonial powers.

8. Russian Empire - inhabited in three different directions of invasion from the Mongols, Slavs and Norsemen. Russia was now emerging as a major power and assumed the name Empire more to let Europe know the sort of level of respect that it deserved, than its desire to expand its already immense lands. It's future development until the 20th century along with inter-marrying with European aristocracy in my opinion has never been a threat to Europe, just a desire for equality with their neighbours who have rarely afforded them the respect they sought.

9. Japan - Japan was going in its own direction and will stay that way, with all but minor contact with the Dutch and the Chinese. Japan would remain effectively a closed society until finally forced open by the Americans at the end of the 19th century. The American ships belching black smoke and moving under their own power alarmed them enough to force them into agreeing to open themselves up for trade. As we are all aware it did not take them long at all to catch up with the technology they had missed out on, but let's not jump too far forward just yet..

## **The Rise of Empires and the birth of the modern world**

Okay, it's the 17th century we are on the verge of England becoming Britain, Protestantism is about to spread across Northern Europe in direct competition to the Catholic church. The church was still strong in Spain though, it is amazing what a spot of ethnic cleansing can do to boost the popularity of your religion. Islam as a religion was not really a challenger but did feature in the puzzle of Europe in the form of the Ottoman Empire, with their base in modern day Turkey and their empire stretching across the people we all call the Arabs but who, in reality contain a variety of ethnic groups that constitute the Islamic people today. The Ottoman's main challenge was keeping their region free of invaders and were not to feature in the forthcoming rush to claim the planet's resources, until the world realised the Ottomans were sitting right on top of what was to become everyone's favourite resource, oil, so we shall put them to one side until we get to the 20th century.

In order to understand the church you need to get a picture of medieval Europe and who exactly our nobility were. Track most of them back and their ancestors were the various "officers" of the conquering armies. As armies conquered these people were granted land to rule as a duke, which is the highest member of the nobility outside of a royal family. He would still answer to the king or queen who ruled the kingdom in which their lands were situated. Royalty had a structure starting with the King and going down to the gentlemen, people of note, artists, authors and any other commoner who had done something worthy of mention (think Shakespeare, he would have been one). The next level up are Knights and Esquires (sons of knights) and then above that all the various landholders. Imagine in modern terms House, Village, Borough, County, Country well the dukes were the counties or cities, unless that is you were one of the rare mighty dukes the Grand Duke. These Grand Dukes were given permission to rule their regions independent from royalty, this was more of a European thing though and accounts for a lot of those strange little countries that you struggle to work out how they came into existence.

Outside of the main kingdoms of Spain France and England the land was up for grabs and once you took the land, the best way to secure your city, region or castle was to swear allegiance to the pope and provided you did not step out of line you could flourish. These city states were where all the wealth was centred, there was no Vatican in those days no real consolidation of the Catholic church the Pope was the power as God's representative on earth. The popes actually mainly came from the aristocratic families around Italy at this time, names that you have possibly heard of. There was the Borgia family who actually originated from Valencia (Borja, there), the current head of that family is a good friend of George Bush Senior by the name of Rodrigo Borja who was

the former President of Ecuador (see, told you history is relevant). There was the Medici family whose heart was in Tuscany and in particular Florence, the city they wished to turn into the new Jerusalem. The Medici family was also “infiltrated” by the Orsini family out of Rome and in search of the power to be obtained by marrying into the right family. I recommend pulling up a list of all of the small States which used to exist in Europe on wikipedia and have a look at the families within them. In particular pay close attention to Republic of Genoa, The Duchy of Savoy, The Duchy of Milan and the mightiest of them all the Republic of Venice, but you really have to follow the action closely as the actual countries are less important than the powerful families who were within them and how they went up through Hannover to shift their power base to Great Britain or via the Hapsburgs to take over Austria Hungarian Empire. It is all very complicated but everything you know about royalty, banking, control comes from these families and their struggle to intermarry their way to become the nobility of all these countries. The ancestors of one minor Tuscan family friend of the Medicis who were now settled in the republic of Genoa’s island of Corsica, were set to eventually determine that Britain was going to win the great colonial race, the Bonapartes.

Talking about nations, when I look at this unfold and I hear a statement claiming “this is what it is to be English, Italian, German or whatever nation they believe they belong to” my first thought is to wonder if the person making that statement is really aware that it doesn’t mean what he/she thinks. How can you be fighting for king and country when you have no stake in that country and your king may not even come from your country ? You were in fact fighting over an empty vault, defeat would mean someone else gets their hands on whatever was in the vault and victory would mean the current occupier would own the gold. Whatever way, there is always one constant and that is that the nation did not own the gold. unless it was a republic and the nation owned its own debt free bank full of gold to meet its needs.

These “small players” of minor states and Duchies were involved in the wars because, quite simply they had money and maintained armies to defend their lands, bear in mind we take as many people to a football match now as these people took to war. Collateral damage came in the form of cannonballs as swords tended to inflict damage on your intended target, so your run of the mill peasant did not really care, since their life would be miserable regardless of the who the winner was. The old Roman gold mines were all nice and safe and well protected, these wars for power and control of the land and associated organisations, not its resources save the gold that could be plundered from the castles and keeps.

Most of these states disappeared over the course of time swallowed up by Italy, Germany, France and other countries you know today. What you must remember that aside from the obvious land assets, the families that ran these new states were rich in gold and jewels after the world’s first consolidation of wealth since the Roman empire

was in its heyday. What do I mean ? To put it simplistically, the decision of Spanish monarchs and the Republic of Genoa to pay for Columbus to set off on a boat trip on behalf of the "Catholic religion" was to set off a chain of events that would lead to those nice people of the Aztec and Incan empires to hand over all the gold they had accumulated over their "worthless" years. It was further added to from whatever they managed dig out of the west African coast (ignore the inhabitants for now, we'll oppress them later, when we've got a new world to cultivate).

If you have a dog you do not bark yourself, when these states disappeared the important family members would not stand and fight to the last. A better idea is to leave your paid soldiers to defend to the end while you gather up as much gold as you can carry and run for the hills, or in the case of Europeans, the alps and the pyrenees. These families were still as rich as royalty, countries may have taken their land but their liquid wealth did not come with it. Those already with castles in the mountains were rarely troubled and fared the best, like the Hapsburgs who went on to have their own little empire in Austria.

So these were the families, the nobility who married into each other to preserve their noble blood and make them fit to be future kings and queens depending on how closely related they were to a dying monarch (and suitability for the job). Many of those with titles simply ceased using their titles and often reverted to just calling themselves by their family name, whenever anyone names one of the shadowy figures often seen around European institutions and the church, look them up you will often find they have some obscure title, wikipedia is great for tracking back their ancestors to see what part they played.

In case you are trying to identify your place in all this, you can't as I did not drop below the level of gentleman to describe the peasant majority most of us were included in. In truth anyone who does not own a mortgage free plot of land is still very much a peasant and slave to the bank or landlord, if you do not own your own piece of land and you are debt free then congratulations you have risen to the rank of nomad. In case those freeholders among you are smugly thinking they are free, the industrial era came up with a few must have innovations and you will have to be a slave to the system to power and upgrade them. If you feel part of a nation, you are not, you are one of the assets that come with the territory. The nation is only a nation by virtue of its wealth, when invaded and your king runs to the hills with all the gold, he will not be sharing it out with you before he goes and you will be left under the control of the invader. It is for this reason I struggle to understand nationalism or patriotism, what exactly are you being patriotic to ? In England I see patriots walking around with a white flag with a red cross, yes okay it was the shield of one of your kings heading off on crusade, but that king was the Duke of Anjou, a Frenchman of all things. Your current queen, German by descent as Queen Anne was childless and her closest protestant relative was a German. The current queen's husband, a Greek prince who is actually a Mountbatten which is the Anglified



surname of the Battenbergs, the surname of the Prince of Hesse (more Germans). These people may have passed on territories when countries were formed but unless there was revolution these people rarely passed on the wealth of their kingdoms. As I will go on to discuss the wealth of these countries are all owned now by private stockholders of their central banks, despite their countries leaders these are the people who hold the power as they are the ones who can make or break an economy by manipulating it's cashflow and credit risk. All these patriots should be waving the flags of these people but unfortunately that would mean almost all countries waving the same flag so there would be no argument. Argument is profit for those at the top of the food chain and for this reason they encourage us to wave different flags until they have the power and technology to enable them to assume total control and have no need for the nation or its people.

You will be concerned to know that everything up until now has been fairly straight forward in the "western world". Aside from the main nations, most else were a collection of city states. From here on in was the struggle to turn the rest of Europe into the nation states with alliances, secret alliances and the inevitable war but before we get on to the history again we need to discuss a few things in the modern world, as the 17th Century was the time when we were digging the foundations for it. This is the point where we have to understand who is running the world and how they got there, in order to do this we have to discuss a few things, so bear with me so you can understand them before we find out their relevance.

Before we get on to war as a means of exchanging wealth and power we have to deal with the subjects of these states. Yes fellow peasant, I am talking about us. What was our part in the society of these landowners ? If we could not fight as soldiers we were the farmers producing the food to eat and for the merchants to trade with. The landlord would make money by renting his land to the peasants. The peasants would have to wait for the crops to grow in order to get paid therefore money for an initial purchase of seed was required. To start this process the landowner would need to either provide the seed or loan the money to purchase it. Of course, the landowner could only receive back his rent for the land plus the amount loaned to buy the seed as he was only landowner by virtue of the pope and therefore subject to Christian law. Like Islam, Christianity forbade a lender to profit from a loan, therefore the landowners were unable to charge interest on loans.

As you may have guessed it is the time for the jews to appear on the scene again. Many jews from Spain had turned up in Italy escaping the Spanish Inquisition. Being not of the faith they were required to obey rules but not required to comply with laws on Christian behaviour, they were also not permitted to own property so if they were going to eat and put their heads down somewhere at night they were going to need to trade. They had no way of competing with interest free loans so they had to find another way to make

money. Their solution was ingenious and has changed the face of investment banking forever. They approached the farmers and said they would not only loan them money for the seed but they will also guarantee to purchase the crop and pay all up front. The farmer could sell his crop before growing it and to reflect the risk of crop failure the Jewish lender would charge interest on the loan until delivery of the crop. They would in effect be buying the crop at present day prices, if there was a shortage at harvest time the law of supply and demand would change the price of that crop. When they started trading in the debt they had created amongst themselves they had in effect started the futures market.

This business activity caught the attention of the the Dukes and other members of the nobility who wanted a piece of the action and saw an opportunity for an alliance and so the court Jew came into being. The royalty had money to lend and with the Jews working for them they could use the Jews for all their financial dealings, to get round the religious laws on usury. They could also now offer the farmers insurance against crop failure and drought and saw how trading all these various contracts also created a market of their own. The dukes had just had an insight into modern day banking and they liked it. The court Jews would now move in to a house provided by the nobleman of the area since they could not own one themselves, it would no doubt be in a good area close to the nobleman since it was his gold passing through their hands. As far as the peasants were concerned they were now doing business with the foreign Jew who was making money from them, you can imagine how anti-Semitism was rife when this resentment is taken into account. Perhaps if they realised it was actually their ruler's gold and understood the mechanics of it all they may have thought differently but there is no changing history now. Forget the killing Jesus accusation and any other propaganda you have heard, I believe this is the source of modern day anti-Semitism, people all over modern day Italy, Germany, Austria, Hungary and up to Poland all assumed they were having to pay interest to the Jews without realising exactly where the source of the funds were coming from. This animosity would have definitely made Jews far more wary of their Christian hosts (as if the Spanish Inquisition hadn't already) and driven them into small communities. That is not to say there is no Jewish influence on the power struggle but we will come to that shortly as these power struggles concern our ruling elite and the members of this elite have little connection to us "peasants" no matter what beliefs we share with them.

Forget the fact that we have been split into groups according to our income, whether you are a Jewish peasant, Muslim peasant, Christian peasant, Chinese peasant. If you remove these identities and the small amount of wealth we have picked up through the course of time we all share the same identity we have had since time in memorial, that of the peasant there to serve our masters. We may think we are free because we get to decide the face of our leaders but we are not and we will never be free until the world is truly run by and for the benefit of its people and not just an exceptionally small minority.

Listen to me sounding like a leftie, this doesn't sound like the person who voted for Maggie and did not flinch at Blair's false promises of things getting better. I am no lefty, no righty, no wishy washy centrist I am an "allie" I want the best bits of all beliefs and to leave behind the worst bits and your mistrust of others. You cannot force equality on people without making them aware of what made them unequal in the first place. You can also not turn back the clock, we have to work a way to look forward from our present day positions as turning back the clock will invariably involve conflict.

Human development has been a chain reaction, the latest conflict is not the original conflict. Take the Arab/Israel situation, the Israelis were kicked off the land by the Romans, a lot of the original Palestinian people actually came from Algeria who moved to the city of Acco when they were ethnically cleansed from Algeria by Napoleon's armies, other's came from Egypt and various other parts of the Ottoman empire as it's borders decreased, moving everyone back to how they were is not an option as it would involve moving other people who have been in the same place for hundred's of years. Not being able to put back does not mean we can not find a solution and working together to create a good global infrastructure and a decrease in the threat of war should lead to many more places becoming attractive places to resettle.

There are many similarities with anti-semitism and anti-Islamic sentiments, in fact the word semite covers the two Muslim and Jew. There are just a lot more Muslims than jews. There is another similarity between Islam and Judaism and that is that both were well developed structural societies by the time each were interfered with, by the Romans in the case of the jews and the "West" in the case of the Muslims. There is no point kicking yourselves in "Western civilisation" for failing to spot the potential of oil and allowing their civilisation to flourish. It was too late to think you could take these resources without the backlash you are now experiencing, you may regard these people as backwards but they are not at all, their society has merely developed in a different, more harsh world than yours. Their history is full of local invaders, their leaders needed fighters not smart money makers and an army needs strict control, which is why their rules had to include certain elements of martial law. To those old folk who experienced life in Britain in WW2 will know exactly what martial law does to your mistrust of foreigners, but things began to change in the 1950s and by the 1990s we were looking forward to a future together (although that disastrous experiment in European unity is creaking now). These people have not had 5 years of martial law they have been on a constant war footing since the Roman empire was knocking about.

Christianity came against many different civilisations and conquered them all. Perhaps it started as a voyage of discovery but instead it turned into a pure plundering of resources. The Muslims are just another one of these civilisations but unlike the Aborigines, native Americans, Aztecs, Africans and Incas you neither destroyed them nor succeeded in converting them. Instead, the West bought off their corrupt leaders like the

Shah of Iran, the Saudis and all the other friends of the West who control their various oil rich kingdoms, while the west turns a blind eye to the way they oppress people within their borders. Of course there was a revolution in Iran, our latest version of an “evil force” in the area. Labels again, look at it from their point of view, they had their revolution and seized control from their ruler. I may not agree with their beliefs or their foreign policy that affects the residents of Israel, but I do have to recognise their people’s rights to live without interference. Maybe you should look closer at Iran, as until the first decade of this century there were plenty of jews living there, they even have a jewish member of parliament. Many jews have left in the last ten years but that is more to do with external tensions than a genuine desire to leave the actual society they grew up in. You will not find many more jews than you could count on your hand residing in the Sunni world, is it not strange that thousands of jews happily reside in the small “evil” area of Islam but not in the nice friendly majority Sunni side of the region. The only lesson here as you will see as we cover other points in history is this:-

If you challenge those who wish to rule they will try to divide you, when you start to fight about it they will go about branding you as the evil side of the fight. You will then get lost in your internal fight and forget the reason you were angry in the first place.

A lot of the wars we have had have been a struggle for competing powers but on 5 occasions there have been revolutions which they have managed to brand as evil for you.

### **French revolution**

Who knows if they would have gone on to become the inspiration for the world to take up the wonders of the republic. Unfortunately they still had an eternal enemy on their doorstep. The world was struggling to justify the condemnation of aristocrats getting their heads chopped off, to a mass population who knew only too well what it was like to be poor. The ruling elite of the world were saved in the form of the dictator Napoleon whose desire for war was not matched by France’s ability to fund it. Irrelevant of whether or not they had won at Waterloo they had already lost with the one thing that meant a people can never be truly free. You free the people within a nation and enslave the nation itself by putting it into debt. In order to keep that country in line you sell that debt amongst its enemies, so non payment risks wars. The people therefore have to keep working to pay taxes to cover this debt, it is not hard to get the idea. It gets to be an even bigger mess when you realise that the big businesses so many of us work for are owned by the same people who organise this debt. When they increase company profits the costs increase government debt, which means an ever increasing national debt as company profits grow faster than wages it just leads to an increase in poverty (I could have gone on a lot more, but this is not an economics lesson). Capitalism may have seemed right in the

17th century to promote exploration and discovery, but the trickle down effect ended as soon as monopolies emerged and all the wealth became concentrated in the top 1% of society, which probably happened far sooner than anyone expected. Anyway, debt killed France's real revolution which is why you see little difference between them and Britain aside from the fact one has a president the other has a queen as their head of state.

## **American Revolution**

Ignoring their shameful treatment of the native Indians this was the great one, the hope for the world. I must admit I had a lot of preconceived ideas about USA before this year but the election of Donald Trump has caused me to look much closer at the USA and I have drastically changed my opinion. While they were well aware of the need to avoid known influences with the checks and balances they placed into their constitution they did not foresee how powerful the railroad owners would become in particular the King himself J D Rockefeller. I am not saying their behaviour in the 20th century was acceptable but I believe their nation was being used by people with the intent to pave the way for global rollout of a new empire, the business empire of globalisation. The global brands are the new religions competing for power, what will happen in thousands of years? will the Samsungers and the Appleltons be at war with each other ? The old world poisoned America twice The first time with it's ongoing war of Protestantism v Catholicism, which is hard to identify because of the reason America was so appealing in the first place the freedom to practice your own religious beliefs, hence why there are many different flavours of christianity on offer in the USA. The real struggle in the USA religion stakes is between the Puritans (protestant) (Republican) (FBI) and the Jesuits (Catholic) (Democrats) (CIA). The puritans you may know about from the 16th and wanting to purify England of Catholics. The Jesuits may be more of a mystery to you but very important in the who grand scheme of things. The Jesuits or Society of Jesus are the Catholic church's "CIA" , they were basically fanatical Spanish Catholics whose sole purpose was the conversion of the world to Catholicism. The Jesuits built up a network throughout conquered lands and their priests preach a stricter form of Catholicism than their Franciscan equivalents. The Jesuits were banned at times by past popes because of their tendency to go a bit too far, the leader of their organisation is sometimes referred to as the black pope, Whenever you hear about people calling the Catholic church as evil it is usually these guys behind it, but then you would not expect any other sort of behaviour from a group of religious extremists. We came in like lambs and will rule like wolves, we shall be expelled like dogs and return like eagles, are two sayings attached to the Jesuits, which probably gives you a good idea how they like to operate. When you realise religious extremism is still at work influencing the government of the USA and seen to be targeting another religion (no matter what the excuse) you should not be surprised when that religions sends their own fanatics back at you. Puritans, Jesuits,

ISIS ....where is the difference except two have nice clean shiny headquarters and the other operates out of a mud hut (while receiving money from Arabs in nice shiny palaces who are too busy watching their horses run at Ascot to care what the fanatics get up to, as long as it is not in their backyard and they send the refugees in the direction of the Turks or the Christians)...who set me off on religious politics again ?

I said two poisons hit America the other was the same as France, the drive for rapid expansion meant the welcoming of debt for the nation. Thomas Jefferson warned about the acceptance of debt and he was definitely right, but as I said they did not foresee all the wealth ending up so quickly in one person's hands. Once someone had a monopoly in something as big as oil and the railroads, America was at his mercy that wealth would not trickle back into society without an offer on a return for that investment. When they decided to break up his monopoly they would either have to offer him what he demanded in order to receive investment or look elsewhere. The only elsewhere available was British and European bankers and we know all about them. Nowadays China owns a lot of America's "debt to the world"

### **Russian Revolution**

This was the big one the elite feared, communism and it caught them unaware, while the powers that be were in the process of setting Europe back 50 years with their quarrel over who would get their hands on the oil of the crumbling Ottoman Empire (was this the real reason for WW1 ?). Their first plan to finance the communists polar opposite in Germany back fired spectacularly, when Hitler rejected being enslaved by their private central bank model. His idea for a government to create "vouchers" to pay people 1 Mark for 1 Mark's worth of work horrified them, especially as Hitler didn't have any gold in the vaults to cover his vouchers, but don't let me sound like I am condoning fascism as parts of it were plain ugly as we all know. Communism is essentially a wonderful idea on paper, except as we know from Animal Farm there is no such thing as equality, some pigs always end up more equal than the others. It also involves drastic immediate change, the poor people will be better off as they will get a house to live in ,food to eat and a job to do. The rich are immediately branded evil and have their wealth removed. There was a clear lesson to the world that what has always happened to those who lose power is still true today. When the Romanovs were shot in Ekaterinburg those inspired by the teachings of Marx to revolt were sending out a clear message that little has changed in the world and revolution meant death for the former holders of power, when communism came to town. After WW2 the allies rebuilt Germany's industries with generous handouts, (what's that ? you built gas chambers during the war for Hitler ?... never mind here's a big pile of cash, we'll forgive your transgressions if you build us a nice shiny new democracy to place on the doorstep of the communist east). They then hit a master plan working out they could make more money maintaining the threat of war

without actually going to war. The reason for communism's failure is that it is really a global concept or something for a single closed society like China's (until their leaders sold out to the lure of the dollar and the appeal of a dictatorship), Russian communism was never going to be popular once Stalin altered the global concept to suit a single nation. Communism did not generate the sort of revenues to compete against the lure of its capitalist neighbours. The system was already creaking from this lure and when the end came it was ugly. Corruption ruled and the inner circle of the those who took control suddenly appearing as oligarchs as they divided the communist monopoly between themselves. Some of them even had dreams of conquering of their own, one even bought himself a blue army and began his assault on the Champions League from his base in Chelsea. Handing monopolies out, war in Chechnya and Yeltsin's mismanagement of the economy took its toll and Russia was "handed" \$22.6 billion by the IMF. Got them! 81 years after revolution and the Russians were conquered by the money men who run our world. No invasion necessary and 1/6 of the world's land was added to the global empire of our ruling elite. Communism had its up sides and down sides. The up sides were seen in the arts and sports such as Russian gymnasts and the Bolshoi ballet. The down sides were obvious the lack of competition and reward curtails innovation, the lack of choice and variety in people's lives. This version had capitalism showing off across the fence and the same capitalist system had troops/missiles on its doorstep forcing it to take similar counter measures all a large expense, that wasn't written into the communist economic plan and neither was holding half of eastern Europe captive.

### **German Revolution**

What ????? I hear you ask. Did you miss this one ? No, that is exactly what the Nazis were for the German people. A supreme leader, freedom from oppression, discipline and a state which works to the will of the Supreme leader on behalf of his people (a great place if you were "his people", not so great if you weren't one of his people).

A man whose childhood doctor was a jew, his commanding officer who recommended him for an iron cross in WW1 was a jew, but he would have undoubtedly been brought up from childhood knowing all the relevant prejudices against the "evil jewish bankers". He may have correctly identified the Rothschilds amongst the consortium responsible for setting off WW1 but if he had looked a little bit deeper he would have noticed that they were far from alone in this venture, plenty of Anglicans, protestants and a healthy mix of American flavours...Morgan, Rockefeller and the rest of them are not usually seen to be hanging around a Synagogue on a Saturday morning.

Hitler did not hate the jews as much as he was obsessed with them. He sought out their relics in the hope it would give the same magical power for his chosen people. He based

his chosen people on the teachings of an Egyptian priest of Berber origins named Arius and so he went about defining the specifications of his genetically perfect Aryans, not that he nor his fellow Nazi party members would even come close to fitting the requirements.

Of course I do not need to tell you the story of what came next. Through lies of relocation he tricked the German jews to walk into slavery and any other “undesirables” he cared to label. It was all fairly straight forward for him until he invaded Poland. Poland and its surrounding areas had historically been kinder to the jews than a lot of other places in Europe. These jews were not the bankers, lawyers, accountants and doctors these were the workers whose ancestors did not mix in the same social circles as the court jews of Western Europe. Yes, that is right despite any propaganda you may have heard, not all jews are rich and successful there are plenty of poor jews around, you do not hear of them much as they are usually well taken care of from charitable organisations within their own community. There were so many poor jews across Poland and Eastern Europe which is why Hitler began to refer to them as the Jewish problem, as he could not possibly fill his industrialist friend’s factories with any more slaves. Fortunately for him and unfortunately for the jews, Hitler had enough sick individuals surrounding him with already preconceived hatred. to offer him the final solution we all know too well.

What if they had achieved their wishes, What if the red army had stopped at its borders and just took back Russia ? It is quite possible the allies would have agreed to a truce for exchange of land, if faced with the entire German army on the Western front. Germany, at peace and now possessing what was to become the communist east bloc as their empire, would have had a chance to finish covering up its crimes. Hitler would probably be appearing on T-shirts and launching restaurants in direct competition with Chairman Mao (once they had taken the necessary loans and welcomed a new central bank into the Greater German Nation).

Fortunately for most of us he did not win and the Red army marched victoriously into Berlin followed closely by the English and Americans, after their squabble in Italy and diversion into Greece. They split Germany into two, with the east having to endure a mixture of communism and the strictest form of control possible, from a Russia eager to make them feel sorry for what their Führer had done in their name. A leader doing things in their name, people suffering for it, we may not all be the East Germans but we all share the same fate as them even if we do not realise it. When JFK said he was a Berliner, he certainly was unknowingly right, from both sides of the wall.

As mentioned above, the allies built a shiny new West Germany but not all of it was handouts, the central bank was in place and they were hooked with debt. Although the fact the Western half of the country contained the heart of German industry and the huge cash injection they received to rebuild meant it was not long before they were thriving



and the leading nation in a new European Union, which is ironically enslaving nations to the union with their currency and European central bank.

### **Iranian Revolution**

As I stated earlier I am no scholar of the Islamic religion or it's laws and I reserve judgement on Iran. I remember watching the Iranian hostage crisis live on TV, I have seen countless TV reports about them, read news articles, heard their shariah law is unethical (a lot of the business stuff seems very ethical to me). What I have never seen is an Iran that was not under threat from "the west", with sanctions being the most recent measure. One observation I will make though is that Iran has received the label evil and it wholly owns its own central bank. I will therefore hold off my judgement of the evil Iranian way until I see evidence of it functioning without the associated threat. It is wrong to brand a country evil just because it attacks you, first you must make sure their attack is not just a form of defence from Western interference. If they attack without the provocation then of course it is easy to draw conclusions.

## **Banking**

So, I've been going on about central banks being the master of the nations, well what do I mean ?

I touched on banking briefly earlier with promissory notes for travelling traders , Let us look at how the entire money system works as the banks just fit into that.

It all commences with the king/ruler of the land owning everything that has been plundered up to now. He looks after his gang (soldiers) in his castle, the peasants live where they can and eat what they can from killing wild animals and growing (although a lot of kings kept his favourite food for himself, hence early laws of commoners not being able to kill deer and the such like).

We started off by bartering with each other with its obvious problems of constantly negotiating the value of one item over another (how many grapes is equivalent to one apple ? I suppose you could do it with calories now but we are talking ancient times here).

We then decide we need to measure everything according to its value in one commodity so they choose gold, there were other metals and jewels, if you wanted to set your prices differently in your own area you could in theory use anything you like since it is only a way of setting a price that everyone could relate to. If one area deals in gold and the other area deals in silver the two areas can then set a price for silver in relation to gold and the two areas can exchange silver coins and gold coins between them allowing trade.

We are going to try and keep it simplified as we have reached commodities, we can look at one commodity but you have to understand that they all operate in separate markets which in turn interact with each other, we then trade in finished goods. I will explain, bread price is set in the bread market, but the price is reliant on the wheat market for the flour and the wood market for fuel for the oven (ignoring the fact fuel was growing all around them in those days).

This is how trade happens at this stage, people use coins which are made from the precious metal 1g gold coin = value of 1g of gold.

Of course gold is not the thing you want lying around the house when there are no police to protect you, so the people need somewhere to store their gold. The people ask the king/landowner, who appoints one of his gang to be chancellor in charge of the vault that is about to be filled up with gold, the bank. Since it is inside the castle and contains the people's gold, it is a true state bank. So each of the people come to the castle and deposit their gold, in return they get one note for every gram of gold they deposit (sorry

for keeping it metric but more of the world understand that nowadays). Whenever they wanted 1g of gold all they had to do was visit the bank and exchange 1 note, but why bother if your note was worth 1g of gold when redeemed, so people would trade with the notes instead of the gold. You have now invented money! The value is not the paper but the information on the paper and what it represents.

There are two concerns for all the people in this scenario, firstly that the king has good enough fortifications and soldiers to defend the gold. Bring the strongest subjects to the castle to work for us protecting your gold, long live the king and hail the pope who protects our king. Allegiance to king and pope, as either gets defeated and you lose your gold. Your second concern is that your ruler is not one of those evil rulers which takes your notes back in taxes so he can use your gold to pay for an army to attack a neighbour for their gold. The peasants were in effect paying for his army and if the army wins, the gold would be the property of the king perhaps as a gesture of kindness he provides you with something in gratitude for your taxes so you will not mind him doing it again. You do not mind, as long as he does not lose in which case the conqueror of your land may say, sorry but I am not giving you any gold for your bits of paper, as the king who had your gold no longer has it. Or perhaps he will be a bit fairer and say, "I will give you 1g of gold for 3 of your old king's notes. Let us ignore this scenario and focus on the banks and not people losing everything because another kingdom took it all which is the ultimate danger, instead let us look at the dangers of pure banking

All very straightforward and relatively low risk banking so far. The problem was all that gold sitting there and was only required to pay traders from other kingdoms, so the king comes up with the idea of lending the gold to farmers who want to buy seed. They pay this gold back when they sell their crop. You will recall from earlier that the Catholic church forbade the landlord from usury, making money from a loan, so while the kings and queens not allied with the Pope could choose anyone they wanted as their banker, the Catholic landlords were forced to use the services of a court jew. This is why the original English bankers such as Barings (I say English, but most were of German origin) were definitely not jewish neither were those which arose from Protestant areas of northern Europe such as Schrodgers from Germany and Hope & Co from the Netherlands as they were no longer bound by the stricter laws of the catholic church.

Anyway back to the banking story and why you are their slaves....banks could now lend to the farmer and either charge monetary interest or ask for the money back and a percentage of the crop. The monetary interest was the one that got the banks attention as it taught them that people's debt = their income and the more they lent out the greater their income, they would therefore try and lend out all of their gold. Unfortunately once the gold is gone there is no more for the bank to lend out in this system, no more money to make, so the banks came up with a new system. They had no more gold but they could write notes and lend them to people to use within their economy since the notes

were as good as gold. This system works fine unless all the people suddenly want to change their notes back to gold, since there are more notes in circulation than gold but this is unlikely to happen without the threat of invasion by which time the king would be heading for the hills with their gold anyway. There is always the danger that one person within your society obtains more of the king's notes than the gold in his vault, this man then has the king and his army in his pocket, this is why monopolies within your economy are best avoided. All the people in real power in the world achieved it by obtaining more liquid wealth than their state bank had in gold as the state bank has no alternative solution in this scenario than to borrow back from that person and place the country into a debt it can never escape from. Merely breaking up someone's monopoly in this scenario is far too late, the sensible solution would be to take back the money and offer the person adequate security and reward to reflect the fact they won the game of capitalism. Retribution against the person who achieved a monopoly is wrong if it was achieved legally (unethical and illegal are vastly different, it is not the fault of the person who has gained though unethical means, it is the fault of the person who set the rules for not covering all the loopholes to prevent it).

Banking is still very simple when contained within a single kingdom but what happens when that king wants to go to war? Horses and an army cost money, you can use your own people and resources fine just by writing more of those IOU notes, but if you need to obtain your army and horses from out of the kingdom this would take more gold. You could then approach one of your rich royal friends and ask to borrow their gold. An alternative source would be a rich merchant and when landowners started to borrow from them you start entering the era of the private banks owned by rich merchants.

Let us now skip over from kingdoms to modern day countries and their banks or to be more honest, their lack of a state bank (aside from ones recently privatised as a bail out). Around most places in Europe the land was still in the hands of the various kings and the Pope's dukes, however in England in the mid 17th Century, a country was born for the English people, through civil war. Shortly after, England found themselves on the losing side of war with France which left the nation short of gold. England had a need to raise finances if it was to build itself up as a global power (in those days that meant agricultural investment for food, hemp for rope, wood for ships and an ironworks in order to make the nails to put the ships together. It was no longer the King's country as parliament had taken over, so sending the king's army in to a duke's area and relieving him of his money was no longer the way things were done. Instead the Bank of England was filled with the gold of private investors. If you look at the state bank as the wealth of the country all that had happened in this scenario, since the bank is privately owned, is that these private investors would now benefit from the increased wealth of the nation instead of the king, but they were still countrymen and a group of individuals so in theory it was benefitting English people, just not all of them (in fact not many of them at all). Well they did own it all until one man in the 19th Century made a spectacular move to

gain control of the British bond markets and in turn become the richest man in Europe, Mr N M Rothschild. This was a disaster for England, this man was now worth far more than any country but Mr Rothschild's only crime was that he was infinitely more successful than anyone else, since he had made a long term calculation about the British bond market rising two years after Wellington had defeated Napoleon at Waterloo. Ignore the conspiracy lies about him receiving information of Wellington's victory and spreading false rumours the actual story was far more complex than conspiracy theorists would have you believe.

Having all this money in one person's hands meant that if the bank wanted to carry on functioning it would need to borrow from him. Of course the loan needs to be repaid with interest and so the country had a national debt and was "owned" by the bank at the top of the chain. Free people within an enslaved nation, the perfect formula for creating the new power base

Britain would not therefore want to rock the boat with the Rothschild family since the country would not have the capital to repay the loan if it was called in.

All central banks with the exception of Iran, Cuba and North Korea operate in this way, are owned by private stockholders and are all in debt to private banks owned or connected to families such as the Rothschilds.

America thought they could avoid this European scourge but when J D Rockefeller gained a monopoly on the railroads and the oil they had their American version of the Rothschild family or other wealthy global business/resource owners. The interest on these debts are paid for by your taxes in case you were wondering why you pay tax and your country cannot invest all that tax money in your economy, it is busy paying vast amounts of money to people who really do not need it (remember some time ago I was discussing the Afghan's need and want).

The power in the world shifted with the creation of countries and banking in private hands. The king no longer owned the country but neither did the people, it was the businesses and bankers that were now the new kings of the industrial era.

So, who was Nathan Mayer Rothschild whose vast wealth I spoke about and how did he obtain it ?

The dynasty started with Mayer Amschel Rothschild who was the court jew of the Prince Hesse (If you want to see a connection the British Royal Family, these people went on to be the Battenbergs and when settled in England, Moutbatten which is also the surname of Prince Philip, the current queen's husband).

Mayer had five sons which he placed in five important centres of trade and power Frankfurt, Vienna, Naples, Paris and London which gave them a highly successful network for trade and the shipment of gold to pay armies in the frequent wars around

Europe. Naturally they made plenty of money from these high risk financing ventures but things changed after the Battle of Waterloo as I mentioned before.

By the middle of the 19th century the family had acquired a wealth beyond that of the nobility. One of the unexpected benefit of the close association between the family and the nobility was that their children would mix. Anyone who is aware of hormonal influences of the young knows love will invariably blossom and the Rothschild family found themselves inextricably tied to European nobility by virtue of marriage.

The 19th Century was a great time to be cash rich just a quick look at some of the investments the family made alongside their mainstay banking business makes further explanation of their potential to control power and influence in the 20th century unnecessary:-

Alliance Assurance (now Royal Sun alliance)

Chemin de Fer du Nord (Northern French railways)

The Rio Tinto mining company

the large French mining and mineral production industries of Eramet and Imerys

De Beers Diamonds, as they financed Cecil Rhodes in his colonisation of Rhodesia (modern day Zimbabwe)

Diamonds are another peculiarity especially when you realise they are little more than crushed coal and we can now manufacture them, manufactured diamonds are indistinguishable from natural ones. The company the Rothschilds started has historically owned a monopoly on the world's diamonds, wherever diamonds are found you will find De Beers. The founder, Cecil Rhodes was obsessed with making sure no one else found diamonds and if they did he would either buy them up or shut them down with his own private security force in the guise of the British army. As I understand diamonds are as common as glass, although tricky to get to once you do find them.

When you own them all, the only thing that controls the rarity are the amount you are prepared to release to the market. In reality a diamond should be viewed as a product and not a commodity since they are not rare at all and their value is merely a trick of marketing. There are plenty of articles online about De Beers and the diamond industry read up on them and see if the whole thing does not look totally fishy to you. If nothing else consider this, in 1908 in German South West Africa (Namibia) Premier Mines found enough diamonds in one mine to match De Beers production from all of its mines, 6 years later Germany was involved in a World war. Diamond mining in Namibia today is a 50/50 joint venture between De Beers and the government of Namibia.

Whether the Rothschilds are controlling the world is not something you or I can answer but I believe they are just one of many networks in this world which have interwoven over time. If you point your focus at one, or even worse at the group associated with that network, then you are playing straight into the hands of the “ruling classes” who will come from another part of their network, classic diversionary tactics. I do not buy the theories about these people being a single organisation working to control the world, they simply do because of the positions they hold controlling the various business entities which shape the world today.

You also have to consider that the Rothschild family are a huge family and like any large group it will be full of many different personalities, beliefs and desires. They did not steal their wealth it was earned and once they had it they would naturally want to defend their fortune and themselves at the same time. What they do may appear evil to you as you see the sort of power they are capable of wielding, to them it just maybe carrying on business as usual.

## **The World of Business**

So we know these banks and global businesses have the power in the 20th century, let us see now the events that led up to the industrial era and the 20th century. How did the power and ownership of countries change from the Church and the monarchs to banks and business (and the Catholic Church, which increasingly upped it's business interests and even opened itself as a bank)

Until 1689 and the arrival of William of Orange (William III ) English history could be seen as the building of the country. With William's final defeat of King James II and the Catholics (inc the French) in Ireland in the Battle of the Boyne, England was firmly established as a Protestant/Anglican country and the battle lines were being drawn as alliances were made. It was around this time England was developing it's naval technology that would be so key to it's future conquest of the seas,

Now I can hear your cries. You are thinking to yourself that you did not pick this up for a history lesson and suddenly I am talking to you about battles and throwing dates at you, well this is not a history lesson these are lessons from history. Trust me I am skipping through a whole lot of fighting, countries gaining independence, allies joining together and changing sides to go to war with each other. I am sorry if it feels like a history lesson but these are key events which led to nationhood and the industrial era. In reality there is little different about this time than any era that had preceded it just the faces of those who ruled were different. The people were, all but the privileged few, without education and poor, but reforms after the industrial revolution were eventually set to change that. Even though times had changed, the system, despite many attempts, has not changed the minority still control the majority for their own benefit like they have always done, perhaps not meaning to at first but when the power is possessed those who have it do not tend to want to lose it.

At the beginning of the 18th century the wealth was held by royalty and the church, landed assets were where the majority of their wealth came from but that was set to change with the resources of the world waiting to be plundered. An inevitable side effect of the industrial revolution was the obvious catalyst it became for technological advancement and it is for this reason the end of the 20th Century marked the end of the industrial era and the beginning of the technological era. Every era ends with those in power believing they can maintain this power through to the next but invariably a change of era had meant a change of power base.

These colonial powers and the people who financed them accumulated a vast wealth and used this wealth to create the financial system the world is a slave to today. The technological era we are embarking on today could be the end game for the human race, no no no I am not one of those doom merchants I want the human race to win the



end game not die out from it. We can take this back as we have 3 powerful tools, Education (not to be confused with indoctrination), Democracy and a free Internet which is still out of anyone's overall control. You are welcome to watch all the conspiracy theories you like to see the stories, but whether they are accurate or not should not be a real concern to you, what should worry you is that there is a chance it could be happen. Surely all we have to do is order our society, to protect ourselves from the possibility of one organisation being able to control everything. You have all seen 3D movies and the incredible special effects possible and we surround ourselves with ever more complicated bits of kit, this technology can create reality from fiction which is the sort of tool that could be dangerous in the hands of someone intent on mass manipulation. Sorry for the little lecture, now back to the beginning of the last era.....

Well, it all kicked off at the beginning of the 18th century and the death of the childless King of Spain, Charles II. Louis the XIV was on the French throne and seized his opportunity by forging a new alliance with Spain's new ruler King Philip, who just happened to be his second eldest grandson (ain't that convenient). However Louis made a big mistake moving on Spanish Netherlands, in an attempt to block Amsterdam and secure trade routes for France to the New World, this led to war with a grand alliance indeed. On one side we had France and Spain (and briefly Bavaria). On the other side was an alliance of the Holy Roman Empire (at that time Austria, Prussia and Hanover), England (which became even stronger by uniting with Scotland to become Great Britain), The Dutch, Portuguese, the Spanish loyal to the old king and finally the Duchy of Savoy from the NW corner of Italy (Piedmont). The war was a drain on the funds of all sides and it was the Tory party in Britain who eventually forged for peace after 12 long years and despite the huge cost to Great Britain they came out of it well gaining the important strategic location of Gibraltar and Minorca in the Mediterranean, France who were on the verge of ruin and invasion also ceded land around Quebec and recognised British sovereignty in other parts of North America. Spain lost most of the land it had acquired within Europe such as the Netherlands, Milan, parts of Austria, Sicily and Sardinia.

This war of the Spanish Succession and the death of Louis IV shortly after marked the end of French dominance in Europe and the rise of Britain as the emerging power of the new era. However, regular skirmishes and the occasional war were always breaking out between the British and French as they struggled for control of North America.

The unification of England and Scotland came out of one of the most important acts to shape the future path of British history, The Act of Settlement (1701). This act came out of necessity as the current Monarch (Queen Anne) was set to die childless after the death of her only surviving son at the age of 11 in 1700. The Bill of Rights passed in 1689 denied Catholics from the throne and made no provisions for a successor to Anne. The Scottish parliament was not as keen as the English on this act and reserved the

right to choose their own successor to Anne and passed the act of security in 1704 to protect themselves from this act. England responded by threatening to cut trade and free movement between England and Scotland unless Scotland agreed to either repeal their act or, as happened, agree to union.

When Anne died in 1714 the only protestant line was the German George 1, from Hannover. There were riots across Britain in protest of a foreigner being crowned king and support for the catholic successor to the throne James Francis Edward Stuart eventually turned into the Jacobite revolution which was partially successful in Scotland where their forces took half the country but a total failure in England where they were defeated at the Battle of Preston and eventually chased out of Scotland by sheer weight of numbers ending any hope of future catholic influence on the British throne.

If these power struggles interest you then I commend you to analyse all the wars that were fought in the first half of the 18th century. They were mainly power struggles for control of the the various ruling houses of Europe.

The shape of war really changed in 1756, the real World war 1 which centred around Austria's Habsburgs attempt to take the Area of Silesia (modern day equivalent incorporates the Czech republic, parts of Poland and Germany) from Prussia. This led to two large alliances with the main players being Austria with their allies France, Russia, Spain and Sweden on one side and Prussia along with Great Britain and various German states on the other. There are plenty of interesting angles to look at here and switching sides as monarchs changed but the most important thing to look at were the outcomes that very much shaped the modern day world we live in. The original argument of Silesia became largely irrelevant to the outcome as the status quo was largely maintained with Prussia retaining control. In fact little changed in Europe in terms of land grabbing. The big losers were the French with Great Britain making substantial gains in the new world and India, Portugal joining the Prussian/British alliance towards the end of the war gave Great Britain a huge foothold across the world and paved the way for the British empire to come. Russia also benefitted from switching sides towards the end of the war gaining influence in Poland as the French were removed from the area. The French monarchy's influence as a world power had been substantially reduced.

Britain may have come out of this war on top but it was to cost them their first empire (New world and the Caribbean) in the long run with the forthcoming American War of Independence. Their allies were not impressed with the gains Britain made from the Seven Years War and cut ties. When the 13 colonies in America revolted the only ally Great Britain had left to fight with was Hannover (inextricably linked as the home of the British monarchy). Perhaps if Britain had retained some of its allies it would have fared better in this war but it did not and as a result had to recognise US independence which had been declared in 1776. Revolution in the USA provoked interest from the French

and Spanish Empire looking to make gains from the spoils of war, most notably Gibraltar but this resulted in failure and both Spain and France incurred crippling debts from this action.

Great Britain needed soldiers to defend their territories in the new world and without an ally of substance it was forced to hire mercenaries from various parts of Germany. For our purposes we can focus on just one of these sources and that is the Landgraviate of Hesse-Kassel, interesting for the fact that since the 1760's it had employed one Mayer Amschel Rothschild (the founder of the Rothschild dynasty) as it's court jew and later the overseer of all it's wealth on behalf of the Landgrave. Hesse-Kassel had also been part of the British/Prussian alliance in the seven year war and was rumoured to hold the largest fortune in Europe when it was inherited by William IX in 1785. One complaint against Rothschild and their funding of wars is that they would not take a position and would not think twice about funding both sides of the war. He probably learnt this from his Hessian masters who had no problems supplying their mercenaries to whoever would pay for them. In the war of Austrian succession they supplied troops to Bavaria and Britain despite them being on opposite sides. Even though they maintained and trained armies Hesse never formerly declared war on anyone or gained spoils from being on the winning side. It was just a business, usually at the expense of the poor peasants who were press ganged into service.

This is an important fact to take note of if nothing else from this brief (sorry if it is not brief enough) history lesson. The pockets of wealth in 18th century Europe were also the suppliers of mercenaries, especially across the collection of city state and peculiar Grand duchies etc that existed around modern day Germany. This wealth was never to be included in the development of nations as the land mass of these various small states were merged into the countries we know today. The ruling lines would stick to living their lives under their family names instead of their redundant titles allowing them to step back from public view and use their fortunes to influence the governments of these nations. If, that is they could hang on to their fortunes should they be able to keep them from the next threat to loom over them in the shape of Napoleon Bonaparte.

Great Britain as we all know lost the war of independence leading to the creation of the United States of America. USA would now embark on a time of nation building and expansion and exploration of its own vast territories. While looking at the big picture aside from a few minor incidents you can discount them from global affairs until the early part of the 20th century. They would be the favoured destination of people around the world looking to start a new life and a welcoming recipient of immigrants looking to further develop the nation.

One thing American independence did spark off was revolution within the French people recently empowered (enlightened) with knowledge given to them by philosophers such as Descartes (I think therefore I am) and Voltaire who believed in god but not the power

of the church. The French saw the Americans had created a country where power was truly with the people and wanted the same freedom from the Nobles and the church who ruled over them. It was good in theory but in practice the first attempt at a French Republic was a mess and order would not return to France until 1799

The revolutionary battles led by General Napoleon against the royalists had spilled over into Northern Italy resulting in him capturing Nice, Saxony and Lombardy in the name of the new French Republic. The French republic believed they needed to threaten British India and retake former colonies, this was also a good excuse for them to send Napoleon to Egypt as they feared his strength and ability to take control of France. He has a disastrous campaign in Egypt and eventually abandoned his troops favouring to do the one thing the Republic feared, by returning home and leading a "coup d'état".

Napoleon did a lot to organise French society laying down the roots of the Napoleonic code of laws which still have a huge influence on current legislation across Europe today. Unfortunately these laws, while being for the benefit of the newly enlightened people, did not fully embrace the spirit of the revolution as Napoleon was more interested in law and order than he was in individual rights and it wasn't until the late 20th century that they were sufficiently altered to reflect the equal rights of women.

The French people had been relieved of their Monarchy but only replaced with a dictator whose only real interests was starting an aristocratic bloodline of his own and building an empire despite the stabilising effect he had on post revolutionary France.

When Napoleon turned his attention from home affairs within his borders to expansion of his empire beyond France and Italy had a dramatic effect on the future wealth of the Rothschild's family. As Napoleon headed east those with assets looked to move them to a safe haven out of the reach of his advancing armies. The fortune of Hesse-Kassel was moved by William to the Frankfurt Rothschilds who in turn decided to deposit this fortune with Nathan Mayer Rothschild in Great Britain. Free to use this capital for investments this sudden cash injection gave him a chance to accumulate a small fortune of his own making shrewd investment in all of the events that lead up to the turning point in European history and the last time Britain and a legitimate French army fought (I can't class the Vichy traitors as a legitimate French government).

With the French out of the way Great Britain was left as the dominant military force in the world and their navy ruled and policed the seas. This was a great time to be cash rich and although the main power in the world was Great Britain it's national debt was about 200% of GDP (nowadays we consider it unfeasibly high and it is around 80-85% in the UK) as a result of the previous 100 years of being on an almost constant war footing. The national debt was a dying gift from William III in the 17th Century who raised money for foreign battles by selling government debt to a syndicate of city traders. This syndicate of traders went on to form the Bank of England, despite being viewed as a

national asset this was very much a private company and was set to become the model of how a central bank can enslave a nation with debt. It was rumoured that after Waterloo and its aftermath that Nathan Rothschild gained overall control of the Bank of England but whether or not this is true is irrelevant to the lessons I am trying to teach from history. If it hadn't been Rothschild it would have been one or even a group of the investment bankers who had made the bulk of their fortunes from the business of war. The British Empire was about to release the riches of the world, enough riches for the whole world to take advantage of the recent discoveries during the Industrial revolution which was in its heyday following the battle of Waterloo. Instead this wealth was destined for these individuals to invest in bettering their own interests and influencing world affairs in their own favour (at the expense of the rest of humanity). Having taken their own substantial wealth out of the system they never forgot the business of war was best for injecting capital into their various ventures without the need to dip into their own pockets.

Having lost the 13 colonies of the new world Britain had to look elsewhere to expand their empire. Conveniently in 1770 Captain Cook had stumbled across Australia and New Zealand, the former being the key to Britain's debt problem. The Victoria gold rush in the mid 19th century not only contributed to making Melbourne the second largest city in the British Empire by 1880 it also allowed gold to flow back to the vaults of the Bank of England and repay down the national debt. In fact just before the outbreak of war in 1914 the debt stood at only 25% the lowest it had been since just prior to the War of Spanish succession in 1715. We could look at many causes of World War One but rarely do history books consider this one. For the owners of central banks national debt was good and Britain's economy was the best, the time was right for war as the vaults were full up with "the nation's" gold. The stakeholders of the bank now rich with landed assets had income through debt but you can only have so much property. Gold was their desired commodity but the Gold Standard operated by the Bank of England since 1844 prevented them from getting their hands on it. The gold standard basically meant that the bank could only issue notes if the equivalent value of gold was deposited in their vaults as the sole monetary authority for the United Kingdom. The deficit was therefore maintained at 1844 levels and with inflation 1914 was the closest one pound got to be worth one pound at any time in history, it would never get that close again as the gold standard was pushed to one side so the nation could prepare for another pointless war, it was eventually totally abandoned in 1931 after attempts to head in the right direction failed between the 2 world wars of the 20th century.

The Port of London ensured the city's status in today's financial world as goods from all corners of the British Empire were brought back to London to be traded. In its heyday it was said that the sun never set on the British empire it was spread so far wide London was indeed the centre of the world and this control of the world's goods and transport routes meant that whoever controlled London could not only control the economy of the

empire but also the rest of the world as everyone would be reliant on The British for safe passage of their supply ships.

I say the British were unchallenged there was one potential challenger still left on the world's stage not left licking their wounds after the Battle of Waterloo and that was the Russian Empire. When I say challenger in reality they were barely a match for the highly organised British and would not have gone out looking to challenge their dominance. Opportunity for Russian expansion presented itself in the form of the crumbling Ottoman Empire after they had secured lands such as Armenia, Azerbaijan Georgia and other countries that went to form the Soviet Union in the 20th century as well as Poland and Finland. However the doors of opportunity to this planned expansion were firmly shut by the refusal of Britain and their new found ally Napoleon III of France to allow it.

Fortunately the Holy Land provided a reminder to the world that if all else fails you can rely on religion to provide an excuse for war with Russia promoting the rights of Eastern Orthodox followers, while the french were promoting the rights of Catholics in the holy land. Russia were a little more forceful on the Ottomans and as a result the Ottomans declared war on The Russians. The Russians moved into modern day Romania whose states, although Orthodox Christians, were controlled by the Ottoman Empire. This prompted Britain and France (and the Kingdom of Sardinia) to ally with the Ottomans and declare war on The Russian Empire. Both Britain and France moved their troops to Gallipoli (the European part of Turkey) and started moving north towards the Danube. However, by the time they got there, aside from a few minor skirmishes the Russians had abandoned the south of modern day Romania and headed home. It was Karl Marx who joked that the French were doing nothing with the British helping them as quickly as possible. The British citizens emboldened with the thought that they ruled the world demanded action for all the effort they had gone to to get troops into the area so they headed for the heart of Russian strength in the Black sea, Sevastopol on the Crimean peninsula for 11 months of pointless fighting until the city fell with 377,000 non combatant deaths on the Russian side from the conditions imposed on them when the city was under siege. In fact more people died of disease in the Crimean war than in action before the Russians finally sued for peace concerned by a potential full scale invasion of Russia.

The main result of peace was to exclude Russian warships from the Black sea and open up the Danube to international trade as Russia's right to protect its Eastern orthodox communities around the Danube. Sardinia's involvement in the war allowed them a seat at the peace talks and recognition of their involvement gave them an important say in the formation of the Italian state. In reality it was a pointless war, the main losers were actually the Austrian Empire who had formerly been allied with Russia but had refused to take an active part in the Crimean war. Europe was about to spend the next approximately 50 years with the occasional outbreak of war with each other as nations

begin to spring up and a web of treaties and alliances that would all come to a head when it came time for the declaration of WW1 to unravel them. Prussia fought France in 1871, as Prussia went about joining with its neighbouring states to form a new German Empire the French decided they had enough of Napoleon III who they thought to be only fighting battles for his own prestige and they formed the 3rd French Republic after deposing him. The Republic decided that French support for Britain against Russia was not in their interest since Russia did not pose a threat to any French territory. As a result Russia decided that it would bring its fleet back to the Black sea since Britain could not enforce the agreed peace treaty on its own and went back to warring with the Turks. None of the action in and around the Crimean war was the result of any planning, it was all a complete mess and best forgotten. It contributed to a mark decline in the fortunes of Tsarist Russia, Austria Hungary and The Ottoman Empire.

Britain had plenty to keep themselves occupied within their Empire but still kept one eye on Russia content for Russian warships to be in the Black Sea but their obsession with doing their best to keep their ships out of the Mediterranean continues today (why else are they so keen to support rebels in Syria against the only nation to provide Russia with a naval base in the Med). Allied with the Ottomans and in command of the Khyber Pass between Pakistan and Afghanistan, Britain had closed the door on any Russian thoughts of expansion into Asia and was in control of all the trade routes.

France were now the dominant power on the continent and the desire to increase their empire led them to look south to the Magreb, the former Ottoman territories in North Africa. I have to offer an opinion here because I am firmly of the opinion that the French colonisation of Algeria caused ripples we are still feeling today with enormous effect. Ignoring the effects of issuing any Algerian who wanted it with a French passport they displaced 1000's of people (Al Magrabi Al Jazeera etc are surnames of the area, it is always easy to spot the origins of people living in the Arab world and these tribes historically stayed in their tribal lands). As the British had more or less taken control of Egypt in 1882 refugees from across North Africa would not have found a safe haven until they had reached towns like Gaza, Ashkelon, Jaffa, Jerusalem ie modern day Israel/ Palestinian Territories. Around the same time many jews were escaping European and Arab anti semitism and heading for the same place. Back in Algeria the French were dividing the land up amongst those who had supported their armies and settlers looking forward to their new life in French Algeria. French occupation of Algeria was to last until one of the bloodiest ends to a colonial rule in recent history in 1962, the ill feeling from this revolutionary war even ended up spilling on to the streets of Paris in 1961 with French police attacking Algerians marching against the war and killing as many as 300 people (reports vary with the French police claiming it was only 60). This massacre has since turned out to have been proven intentional under orders of the then police chief Maurice Papon who was also an official in the Vichy government and finally convicted in 1998 of crimes against humanity for his role in the deportation of Jews in WW2 .

I seem to have overrun this section as it was supposed to be up until the end of the Industrial Revolution in 1840 and the benefits it brought to the developing world. The most important thing machinery replaced was the need for huge amounts of manual labour for agriculture which could only be maintained economically through the exploitation of a slave workforce. Great Britain abolishing slavery in 1833 had succeeded in getting agreement from most nations to stop the trans Atlantic trade in slaves from W.Africa. One nation was non compliant as half their country still had a use for its slave workforce as well as a demand for further imports, was the USA (the same applied to Brazil). The American civil war finally ended the slave trade in 1865, it also paved the way for the US to reconcile some differences towards it's former colonial master once the war was won even though certain elements from Britain and Canada had been sympathetic to the confederacy. In reality the struggle between Britain and USA evolved from the battlefield to the factory as American products started to replace those provided by a British industry which could not compete with the capacity of the resource rich American industrial machine which was gaining pace towards the end of the 19th century. However, as strong as American industry was becoming the real wealth still remained in the City of London and its financial centre trading goods from all over the British empire. Britain's dominance of the transport routes also meant they were the centre of that very necessary and lucrative industry to protect safe passage of goods, insurance.

So we have almost reached the 20th century and well into the industrial era and there is an obvious shift in power as the real wealth has moved to a new set of people. For Europe the big pity was they spent so much effort and resources on fighting each other from the beginning of the 18th Century. When the time came for them to go out in the world seemingly acquiring resources for the nation the only investment available was to come from the people who had got rich financing those wars. These people were beyond government and controlled governments through their central banks which owned the nation's debts.

The American path was different to that of the Europeans, they were relatively debt free and the American dream was progressing nicely until the civil war where national debt increased from \$65 million to \$2.7 billion which introduced Americans to income tax for the first time in the 1860's (oh yes, if you didn't already know the only purposes of income tax is to pay for war, no war = no need for tax but more of that later). Fortunately the founding fathers of the USA were aware of the danger of financial institutions and their ability to enslave a nation and the USA was able to substantially reduce this debt before the end of the century by introducing taxes on goods, especially alcohol and tobacco. As good as the founding fathers were their weakness was the same as any doctrine set in stone whether that be religious or political and that is you can only provide safeguards for the present day with present day technologies. The American constitution was written in 1788, 40 years before Stephenson's rocket and 50 years before Samuel



Morse would start sending pulses down a telegraph line. With no knowledge of these inventions they could not predict the worst side effect of the industrial Revolution, the monopoly. In America this monopoly arrived in the shape of the railway owners and the king pin of this industry was the ever increasingly powerful J D Rockefeller who used his monopoly of the railways to transport and control the commodity set to literally set the 20th century alight, oil.

World power originally shifted from the religions to the monarchy who fought for those religions. It had now moved again from the monarchs to those merchant bankers who funded their internal power struggle in Europe. Both British (civil war) and French (revolution) people had been given their nations as their own but in reality neither belonged to the people due to the vast national debt owed to their central banks. The USA was still still a success for its people but it was not yet aware of the danger of the monopolies being built up within their society.

It should be noted that with the shift in power the former holders would always retain some influence. The influence of religion on the monarchs was obvious and religion still retains a powerful influence on certain sections of society today. Many former holders of title reverted to using their surnames and retained as much of their wealth as they could when nations were being created across Europe. With this wealth they were able to influence governments in the newly created states.

Meanwhile the political minds of the world had been philosophising for the last century about political systems for the new nations. Political dividing lines between left and right for the betterment of nation states in this new world, dividing lines which still exist today. I just want you to stop and think that this thinking was taking place in the industrial age where the only important question was, which side are you on ? the worker or the employer. One question for those of you who are reading this in the service industry, party planners, self employed people, day traders, professional sportsmen and women and that is what side of this political argument are you on left or right ? These political systems were not written with you in mind. This was a world without the internal combustion engine, the ability to fly in anything that was not full of hot air, no internet, no smart phones, no satellites or knowledge of space. We have left the industrial era for one of technology and instant mass communication between people on opposite sides of the planet, in the last 30 years we have made the jump from the work place to the global work space with the advances in communication, I personally have been working from a beach for the last 15 years when I realised I had no further use for an office. My last thought before I leave the rise of the industrial era is, why are we still hung up on patching up our world to suit 19th century political thinking when we need to plan for today's rapidly moving world. That does not involve moving in one direction or the other that requires the ability to adapt quickly to suit rapid change. The only land masses we

have yet to discover on this planet are underwater and the ownership of that above ground has been resolved in all but a few places. Conflict now mainly comes not from the land but the resources within, the competition for who controls these resources is yet another ridiculous waste of the world's potential as the majority of these resources go to fund our ability to protect these resources from each other. Of course they do, this is an attempt by the former holders of power to retain their place in society, war has served them well as a money making venture for the last 400 years, why stop now ?

I have really overstepped the mark now it is really time to move on to the 20th century and see what happened there. Again I find my self apologising for the history lesson but I really would like you to try and agree with how I am thinking before I go on to tell you how I think we should proceed into a future of changes we can only dream of. I would like you to step back and ask yourself who you are and who you belong to, your nation/ people or humanity as a whole ? I cannot guarantee 100% historical accuracy in what I am writing as I was never a great scholar but I would like you to think about the analysis as a whole as I do believe in my understanding of the big picture, I also believe there is good and bad in all sections of society, whether grouped by race, religion, creed or nation you will encounter the full spectrum of good and evil. Since most wars in the first 1500 years were fought between one group or other that a lot of good innocent people have died just for their beliefs or merely for the beliefs of their ancestors. I do not even blame those in power I do not believe that you should ignore opportunities to better yourself but I do think that had the original founders of our religions, nations and democracies been able to predict the future would they have happy with where we are today ?

Sit down Moses, Jesus, Mohamed, Cromwell, Washington, Lenin, Mao, etc etc (list is endless but you get the idea) in a room where the potential of recent discoveries are offered to them in a world that could be at peace and show them the direction their followers have taken to get here (assuming their followers still exist). I am certain not one of the people/prophets who inspired our life on this planet would want us to continue on the individual paths we are currently taking, but I will save that thought until I have had a chance to present my dream for the future. Now to the 20th century, a great century of achievements alas mainly for and derived from the industry of war.

## **The 20th century and the transition from Industrial to technological era**

From nursing in the Crimean war through space travel resulting from WW2 on to the internet stemming from the cold war there can be a case for this constant warfare as it has driven much technological advancement out of the necessity to survive. It is debatable whether we would have come so far so quickly without this competition. It is very easy to look back on the 20th century and pass judgement on who was right and who was wrong from a variety of perspectives but the world at the end of the century was a world that would have been unrecognisable to those people who had been alive at the end of the previous century. The change was vast, the advancements were mind boggling and while we should not forget the millions who had to die to achieve this perhaps we should all ask if we were really right to be fighting for the survival of our nation's own personal ideology as I cannot see a totally content society being even close to being free of problems anywhere on earth. Let us analyse the 20th century and see if it is not better to drive a big wide central path to the future rather than the constrained routes of left and right that were travelled last century. Let us use the world's resources to benefit the world rather than to create weapons that can destroy it by trying to address where we have gone wrong in history without the need for retribution against the ancestors of those who we judge to have done us wrong. We have the technology to progress without the catalyst of war, we can turn the sea into fresh water, we can create power from the elements, global installation of some of these technologies could ease the struggles for basic resources that are the cause of so many conflicts. If you end conflict you ease the current economic migration problems around the world, multiculturalism and globalisation is not the answer, the result will be a majority single homogenised human culture with ethnic diversity all but disappearing from the world. Sure, open the world to everyone but give the people the opportunity to be safe in the place they choose to call home without persecution. I know a lot of people reading this will imagine I am talking about an impossible dream but surely it is not a dream the world should give up on. Let us look at how we have gone about achieving this in the past and even question whether it has really ever been a goal, bearing in mind that those who control the world's various power bases have on the whole got rich from the spoils of war

To look at the 20th century there is only one event to really look at and that is World War 1, the so called Great War the roots of which were the decline of two empires in the late 19th century belonging to the Ottomans and British. In 1882 Admiral Fisher in command of the British navy argued that Britain needed to convert their Naval fleet from coal to faster oil powered ships in order to maintain their supremacy of the seas. This was mainly on false intelligence that the new rising power was developing their own oil powered technology, the German Empire (in reality Germany never had oil powered ships until after WWI). By the time Winston Churchill put the conversion in motion 27

years later Britain had already been underhandedly securing oil supplies in places like Kuwait and Iran with deals that were naturally more favourable for the British and their “friends” in the region than it was for the people of the area. Britain and France were also exerting pressure on the Ottoman Empire as they owned a lot of Ottoman debt and the Ottomans had started losing territory across Eastern Europe leading to the formation of nations such as Romania, Bulgaria and an expansion of Austro Hungary into their former territory of Bosnia Herzegovina. The British and French were both doing their part undermining the Ottoman empire even having a hand assisting with the Young Turk revolution in 1909 which gave them a nice foothold in Turkey with which to secure the Mesopotamian (modern day Iraq) oil fields for themselves. Later that year the national bank of Turkey was formed (that favourite of the power hungry to exert control, the central bank) with the majority capital coming from 3 British merchant bankers one of which was the great grandson of the founder of Baring’s bank.

There was a good reason Britain and France had gone to so much trouble interfering in Turkish politics and that was a deal Germany had signed with the Ottomans to construct a railway between Berlin and Baghdad. Not only would this railway have given Germany access to the Iraqi oil fields but it could have potentially been used to ferry troops to the region to threaten the supplies the British and French had secured for themselves (not forgetting Britain and France had both signed the entente cordiale in 1904 in a bid to rescue their impending mutual downfall by working together). These two countries would go on to leave a mess in the region we are still paying the price for today, but for now these deals were purely related to their oil supply and Britain succeeded in pushing Germany into a minority shareholding when they convinced the Germans to allow the central banks share’s in the Turkish Petroleum company to be sold to the Anglo-Persian Oil Company which the British government had secretly bought a major shareholding in. However the agreement for the Berlin to Baghdad railway was still in place, I won’t dwell on this but since Sarajevo was on the route of the railway it is no surprise it was the centre of attention to kick off world war. The simple answer is that the spark that kicked off the worst conflict man has ever seen in the two wars was a probably related to the desire to obtain black gold. The irony was that Britain and Germany had actually come to an agreement on the eve of war to share the oil riches of Mesopotamia in a less than favourable deal for the French, could it be that French agents were at work when they got wind of a bad deal. We shall never know the true story of what happened but the writing off of the start of WW1 as merely being a diplomatic mess caused by historical alliances stemming from an assassination is a hard one to believe. More believable is simply that the new boy on the block was challenging the balance of power in the world and the old world powers (in the form of Russia, Britain and France) needed to beat them to the race for oil and put them in their place before they got too strong. There was of course another new kid on the block a resource rich industrial powerhouse which had

just gone through an incredible rate of development on the home front and were now looking outward for a greater say in international affairs, the USA.

Before going on with the 20th century, we shall take a look at the main players one by one and what they were doing in the run up to the first world war in 1914.

### **United States of America.**

Since the USA ended the 20th century as the sole super power to emerge they have got to be the first place to look, however at the beginning of the century they were more like a sleeping giant.

Aside from the conflict of the civil war the founding founders would have been proud of their creation (although you shouldn't really consider the comfortably titled founding fathers to be nice peaceful libertarians, they were all also slave owners). The USA was a real gift to the world it truly was the land of the free (although still not quite free everywhere within it's borders if you happened to be black) with a government that was truly representative of the people's will and with the proper checks and balances in place to insure against an abuse of power. While well aware of the spectre of debt, the founding fathers had very little foresight about how powerful industrialists, especially the railroad owners and oil barons, could become. How could they ? They were living in a world still in awe at the Montgolfier brothers and their hot air balloon. When they put the constitution together to allow the voice of special interest groups to be heard they could not have conceived this would open up the industry of lobbying government on behalf of big business. The founding fathers were living in a time where the biggest businesses would be comparable to a successful small business in today's world they could not imagine the super rich let alone the concept of a super power.

The real rise of the USA started with the election of William McKinley in 1896 who was very much against free trade and imposed huge tariffs in order to protect and promote American Industry (this was the favoured way of accumulating wealth for the nation, in those days a 2% income tax was considered excessive. In 1898 they "accidentally" became involved in the Cuban war of independence from Spain after an explosion on the USS Maine while it was docked in Havana. This resulted in the USA formerly declaring war on Spain and ultimately the end of the last remnants of the Spanish empire as Cuba gained independence and the USA took control of Puerto Rico, Guam and The Philippines. No one knows the real reason for the explosion on the USS Maine reports of a false flag operation were not unheard of although the official line was it had turned out to be a boiler which had exploded, whatever it was America made favourable gains from this war. Loss of their former colonies had a dramatic effect on Spanish

society forcing it to take a close look at itself and head down the path that would end up in civil war in the 1930's.

America's annexation of Hawaii also occurred in 1898 which got the American public talking unfavourably about expansion and the USA was to head on its path supported by the immense growth still taking place within its own borders. Oil, the real scourge of the 20th century was about to change all this and make a few people very wealthy, most notably J D Rockefeller who monopolised the oil industry as well as already being top of the tree of America's favourite wealth creator, the railroads.

As we see only too often with the capitalist model, it is susceptible to cycles of boom and bust, I'm no great economist but I would imagine when extreme wealth begins to collect with individuals that money just does not come back into the system which would cause overvaluation in times of growth which need correction in the form of a recession. One theory was that you could prevent this boom and bust cycle with the intervention of a central bank although as we have seen throughout the 20th century this is definitely not the case. American politics had been blessed up until now with a lot of people who were sceptical and shared Thomas Jefferson's mistrust of a European style banking system and the evil that lurks around it. There were plenty of subsidiaries and associates of the "old world" banking fraternity from Britain and Germany in USA but they had concentrated mainly financing the railroad owners to span the nation.

The opportunity these people had been waiting for came with the arrival of Woodrow Wilson on the scene in 1913 and so the Federal Reserve was born. Tariffs on goods were lowered and income tax was raised since income tax is a central bank's favourite way of having its interest bill paid. In case any American's reading this still believe their federal reserve is a government organisation forget it, it is a private company and not even your president has jurisdiction within its building (in fact he answers to them). America may still have been the land of the free unfortunately America itself was no longer free as it was controlled by its new master in the form of a central bank. Was this possibly the point in history when America embarked on a new direction. Had the individuals who had struggled for control of Europe for the last 300+ years suddenly hijacked the biggest prize and a vehicle which they could manipulate to actually control the world. I'm sure the path ahead for these people was very clear, this group of financiers and industrialist owned the most powerful nation on earth, with their associates in Europe in command of the Bank of England in the same way as the Federal Reserve they could control 85% of the world they could not see any obstacles in rolling out their central banks across the globe (for them it certainly would be a good time for world war). In the middle of World war I they were in for a surprise and a definite thorn in the side of their plans in Russia with the advent of communism. Suddenly the plan was not so clear and if the beginning of the first world war was to appear to be a

war of empires more of a concern for this power hungry group in the aftermath of war was a war on communism and disastrous support at times for those who opposed it.

### **Germany**

The Holy Roman Empire had ended when most of Europe was conquered by Napoleon but his subsequent defeat left a power struggle to control the German speaking people of the area between Austria and Prussia. With strength of numbers and better diplomatic skills Prussia emerged the victor. War between France and Prussia followed as Napoleon III feared that should Prussia ally with the southern states of modern day Germany the resulting nation would be far too powerful, this became even more concerning from a French point of view when a Prussian prince became a candidate for the recently vacated Spanish throne (the French could face being potentially surrounded on all sides by Prussians). The French forces were humiliated by the far superior Prussians and as a result a giant was born with German unification of the 26 states in 1871.

One thing Napoleon had done in his time was ensured the emancipation of the Jews and as a result their former separation from the general christian population gradually declined. After the defeat of Napoleon the jews rights were taken away from them and they suffered a back lash from an exceptionally antisemitic population. Political revolutions across Europe and the greater demand for democracy led to jews gradually regaining their right to equality and by the time of unification it was impossible to tell the difference between the two, both were the same, both were now German. In the late 19th century the already Germanised jews were then joined by an influx of jews who were being persecuted and eventually expelled from Russia. Unlike the German jews who had integrated and risen up amongst the social ranks of the German people this new influx of immigrants came with nothing and suffered the same problems suffered by all refugees. They did not speak German, they did not wear German clothes and could not integrate into society, not only were the distinctively different to German Christians but they even stood out from the German jewish population too. A higher percentage of German Jews fought in World War I than of any other ethnic, religious or political group in the country but in Germany this was questioned. In order to answer the question in 1916 the German military conducted a census of jews to confirm accusations that the jews were not doing their bit. When the figures disproved this myth the results were not made public by the military commanders, this provided post war antisemites with an excuse to point the finger at the jews for being the cause of Germany's defeat and we all know where that lead.

Jews, however were not the only religion to face distrust, Otto von Bismarck the first Chancellor of the German empire was extremely anti-catholic as were many in protestant areas of the north of the new nation. There was a brief struggle but the Catholic supporters responded by forming a political party which sat in the centre of

German politics. Bismarck was not a fan of democracy and wanted to rule Germany with an iron fist, recent theories from Karl Marx threatened this desire and Bismarck settled his difference with the Catholics in the face of their mutual socialist enemy. His solution to keeping away the threat of socialism gaining popularity was to introduce the world's first welfare state with many social benefits for workers, some forms of medical care and old age insurance to bolster support from the working classes. These benefits may have gone some of the way to explain the great success of Germany productivity at the time as conditions were not so favourable within some of their competing nations such as Britain where the ruling classes were firmly entrenched avoiding the necessity of improving the conditions of their working classes. Of the two societies British and German prior to WW1 you would have to concur that the German one was far fairer than the British which is a far different picture than the one envisioned when the world reflects on the 20th century and focusses solely on Germany under the nazis.

Despite his desire to instil a new German discipline at home Bismarck's main goal was to actually bring peace to a developing Europe and he formed close ties with Austria and the recently formed Italy as well as ensuring peace with France. One difference that could not be fully reconciled were conflicts between the Russians and Austrians as each struggled for control of former Ottoman lands in the Balkans. Bismarck signed a secret treaty with the Russians in 1887 that they would not react in the event of conflict between Russia and Germany's new ally Austria. When the Russian's wanted to renew the treaty Germany refused as the Kaiser (king) said his relationship with the Tsar was close enough to ensure peace, most of the monarchy of Europe were related to each other in one way or another, the Kaiser was actually Queen Victoria's grandson. Unfortunately details of this secret alliance were made public and this left Germany in diplomatic isolation from most other European governments.

He was also not a great fan of colonialism preferring to concentrate on building a stronger homeland in which he saw greater benefits than going to the expense of obtaining and defending a colonial possession. Unfortunately he could not resist public pressure, Spain had done it, Britain had colonies, France had them and if Germany was to be taken seriously it's people would need an empire, this more than anything would eventually lead to a ramping up of tension between this new colonial rising star and the vastly bigger British empire. The tension further increased as Germany's new industrial machine had quickly caught and overtaken that of Britain's which could not compete, this lead to the decline of industry in Britain which was still the dominant economic power by virtue of the trading markets in the City of London and the resources of its empire.

Coming back to a subject I touched on earlier was the subject of diamonds which as you know is a market which is monopolised by De Beers (Rothschilds/Cecil Rhodes). I find it hard not to be drawn to the coincidence that Germany was at war 6 years after they had discovered enough diamonds in one mine in Namibia to dwarf De Beer's production over



the entire area the British occupied in Africa. If you factor in that Germany was negotiating the Berlin to Baghdad railway you have two good reasons why those who held power over the governments of the world with the strength of their monopolies would want to keep this rising power down and monopolise these two perceived valuable commodities. The area the diamonds were found in Namibia was declared a prohibited area and indeed a lot of the area is still prohibited today despite Namibian independence in 1990 and the fact that this area was turned into a national park in 2004. Obviously, the people who have an interest in the area must hold incredible power if they can influence policy in an independent country. It is no surprise that after Britain had settled their differences with the white South African settlers of Dutch origin in the Boer war by the time WW1 came around they got together to remove the German presence from Namibia and De Beers took control of the diamond mines in the prohibited zone (to protect their diamond monopoly so they could continue their common carbon for a month's wages scam).

### **Great Britain**

After the defeat of Napoleon Britain was left as the primary imperial power of the world which also coincided with Britain leading the world into the industrial revolution. These technological advantages also became useful in conquering and maintaining their colonial "possessions" after all 100 spear throwing tribesmen didn't stand much of a chance against a couple of guys armed with the latest weaponry and techniques of warfare developed on the battlefields of Europe. Power had shifted politically at home from the aristocracy and landowners to the new mighty industrialists and so saw the rise of the liberal party (whigs) who were very much in favour of letting the industrialists get on with their thing and enabling free trade with which to bring their new array of manufactured goods to market. As the innovators of this technology Britain saw itself as the workshop of the world. Meanwhile the former aristocracy, safe in the knowledge their assets in Britain were protected from foreign invasion now Napoleon was gone, focused more on securing their share of their resource rich empire. The aristocracy loved nothing more than to lock up their family estates and head off to India, Africa or Australia to lord it up over the natives. Despite the decline of the tory party (now Conservatives) which had dominated British politics in favour of the aristocracy and ruling classes there was still no real representation for the common man as the liberals represented the emerging class of the industrialists who were far more interested in productivity than the rights of their workers. The population of England was on the whole uneducated, subservient, poor and well used to being exploited by the land owners for agricultural purposes their employees did not face the same sort of political threat from a population in demand of social justice as in other parts of Europe and USA and they did not get it.

The population started gathering in cities and large towns to be close to their new employers but the conditions in these inner cities and their places of work were not good

and the air quality was poor due to coal powered factories billowing out smoke day and night. It is quite astounding that the largest most bountiful empire known to man had some of the poorest conditions in the world for the majority of its population. What is it about the British empire that the British people feel so proud of when the largest proportion of the riches being acquired for the nation weren't actually for the nation at all but for a small collection of wealthy investment bankers who were making plenty of money financing these ventures with the wealth they had accumulated from 100 years of wars. The nation did foot the bill for the armed forces required to protect these foreign ventures and basked in the glory of these conquests despite not sharing from all of the profits from it. However as discussed before a few things changed direction around the turn of the 20th century and Britain found itself having lost its first mover advantage and other industrial nations such as Germany and USA both caught up and overtook them. At the same time socialism had made its way across the channel and from an alliance of trade unions and small socialist groups was born the Labour party in 1900 while at the same time women were pushing for the right to vote and greater equality. So just before Britain was about to lose 2.5 million of its predominantly working class army convinced to sacrifice themselves for a nation which had given them little in return, the nation was facing the need to obtain the new essential commodity of oil and had a population demanding increased rights, war was a fine way to ensure these subjects could be shelved for the good of the many. Fortunately for them post war for the victors came at the expense of the Germans and large amounts of cheap money flowing from the new central bank in America, but more of that later. World war 1 also changed a lot about British industry which through state control was given a much needed efficiency boost and modernised, concessions had been made to the powerful trade unions which helped this progress effectively. Women were also appeased by taking a step closer to emancipation as they entered the workforce for the first time to replace the men that were needed to fight for their country and to fill the new vacancies in the armament factories. To bolster this new found feeling of patriotism and willingness to die in Kitchener's all voluntary army were those purveyors of quality information and truth the British newspapers whose support for the war was immense. The British press had changed from mere news reporting in the 20th century to become what could be viewed as political propaganda owned by "press barons" such as Lord Beaverbrook and their papers would report to reflect an opinion in line with the political views of their owners. There was no TV, no social media with instant unedited reporting, the papers were gospel and by the 1930's 2/3 of the country read one, to suit whichever political flavour they favoured

The working man was ready to fight and die for his country against the evil that loomed across Europe, but looking back was that evil a threat to them or merely a threat to the profitability of the employers and their bankers.

## **France**

After Napoleon's defeat at Waterloo the monarchy was restored by the victorious alliance of Britain, Russia, Prussia and Austria and shortly after France was invited back into the concert of Europe (the newly founded Congress of Vienna devised by the allies to prevent war through international diplomacy). Prussia, Austria and Russia went one step further forming a holy alliance to preserve Christian social values and traditional monarchism in Europe, the UK declined entry as it was a constitutional monarchy with a far more liberal society. These alliances held firm (or apparently didn't hold firm) only until 1823 where any signs of a unified direction between the great powers of Europe disappeared and each went their own way as political and economic rivals. Britain made it known it had no interest in any interference within Europe, this was no surprise since it had enough on its plate expanding throughout its new Empire.

The monarchy in France was only monarch in name as it was merely a constitutional monarchy which had to respect the values of the revolution prior to Napoleon went empire building. That was until Charles X ascended to the throne and tried to turn back the clock with a more authoritarian regime which resulted in riots in Paris and he had to flee Paris leaving the throne vacant for his cousin to move in, not as King of France but with the title King of the French. He gave the people the impression he was "on their side" with various concessions but in reality he definitely favoured the bourgeoisie and inevitably in 1848 the French revolted again in a revolution that would reverberate around European capitals whose monarchs were all feeling the pressure of a population demanding greater rights and freedoms. Unfortunately this revolution was without direction as it was split between the bourgeoisie who wanted a democratic republic and the lower classes who were now demanding a socialist republic. Napoleon III was eventually declared president of the republic and in a coup assumed the title Emperor in 1852 when he declared that government had ground to a halt.

At first Napoleon III was just what France needed although he was somewhat authoritarian in nature. The turmoil in France in the early part of the 19th century had seen the French lag behind adopting the benefits of the new industrial era and France began to catch up with the rest of Europe in the early 1850's. France had also managed to build up a small empire in Algeria (any European settled in Algeria, who wasn't Arab that is, was entitled to French citizenship as they consolidated the territory into France), also Indo-China (Vietnam), West and Central Africa and various other Islands dotted around the South Seas. Napoleon III envied his British ally's, empire and would have loved to match their prowess on the world stage but alas he was late when it came to the colonial race. Napoleon's foreign diplomacy and decision making was disastrous beginning with an attempt to add emperor of Mexico to his list of titles. He left without a fight after the USA had won its civil war with the Confederacy and told him in no uncertain terms to get out. As Emperor of Italy he had declared the desire for a free Italy

from the Alps to the Adriatic which meant removing Austria from the northern parts of the country, he was successful in this regard and then ceded power to Victor Emmanuel who went on to unify Italy as its first modern day king. His worst mistake and eventual downfall came when he declared war on a far superior Prussia who overran the French and forced a siege of Paris as well as capturing Napoleon III. It was time for the French to revolt yet again while Prussia celebrated by proclaiming William the Emperor of Germany at Versailles. The loss of this war was hard for the French with Germany demanding huge reparations and the Germans took the two provinces of Alsace and Lorraine stationing their troops there until France had managed to repay the debt. There was a lot of resentment and a desire for revenge amongst the French for this action but they could not linger on this problem as France needed to improve its infrastructure to try and keep up with its neighbours as well as resolve its political struggle between the republic, monarchy and now even the threat of socialism. A lot of the finance for this was arranged privately and the debt loaded onto France via its central bank (the usual story for enslaving a nation). A lot of the funding for the French railways came from the French branch of the Rothschild family with much of the stock brought in from Britain, the close ties with its old enemy were finally made with the signing of the Entente Cordiale making the two inseparable allies. Fear of the rise of the German industrial machine had led to an alliance with Russia in response to an alliance between Germany, Austria and the newly formed kingdom of Italy, it would be the terms of these two alliances that would mean events could lead to the outbreak of WW1 (although the Italians would declare themselves neutral claiming that Austria as the aggressor in their eyes, should have consulted the other two powers before going to war). Although the French economy did recover somewhat by the turn of the century this former mighty power was a shadow of its former glory at the turn of the previous century when Napoleon was conquering Europe, with Germany now occupying two of their territories the tables had been truly reversed.

## **Russia**

Russia was usually friendless amongst the powers of Europe but managed to fend off war with diplomacy until Napoleon came onto the scene which helped normalise relations with Britain and Austria in the face of a mutual enemy. They fought Napoleon allied with Prussia but this alliance was as ineffective as the Prussian army of the time and it wasn't until Napoleon's invasion of Russia that they would come out victorious and become the first nation to defeat Napoleon Bonaparte's advancing army.

After the defeat of Napoleon Russia consolidated its position and chose to keep out of conflict with the other European powers choosing instead to increase its influence in Poland, Persia to the south, Georgia, Chechnya, Kazakhstan etc, as well as taking on The Ottomans for control of Eastern Europe. Russia was admired around Europe and feared at the same time because of the sheer size of its domain but its last tangle with

the Ottomans led to the Crimean war which showed the weakness of Russia was its size and inability to effectively divert resources where they were needed.

The Crimean war made Russia smarter and proceeded far more cautiously on the diplomatic stage and as I touched on earlier the rising threat of Germany eventually brought them into alliance with France and finally Britain.

No one however was ever that endearing to the Russians of the time, those struggling for democracy saw the tsars and the nobles very authoritarian and unwilling to allow the people to have a voice. Concessions were made in the reigns of Alexander II and III with some land made available for peasants to grow food but generally the nobility had everything and the poor nothing which as you can imagine bred much resentment. The political systems consisted of dumas which were state governments with representatives selected by the various landowners and nobility, democracy definitely was not on the table. Agriculture was the basis of the Russian economy and it was the largest producer of cereals in the world but this mass agriculture meant that Russia did not industrialise in the 19th century like the other European powers. This changed in the first part of the century and Russia borrowed heavily to expand its rail system leading to the start of rapid industrialisation in the cities. Groups in society had rejected the western modernisation and declaring that Russia should remain a peasant society centred on Orthodox christian beliefs rejecting atheism, materialism and wealth. This idea was rejected and Russia pressed on with industrialisation at an ever increasing rate in the lead up to WW1, unfortunately as well as industrialisation they also inherited the other problems with industrialised nations of the time with poor conditions, child labour and the lack of workers rights, these conditions would eventually bring down the Russian monarchy come the revolution but the revolution was not to come from the workers who were on the whole uneducated, the real drive for revolution came from the intelligent classes with the help of the workers "muscle".

Well the 20th century had arrived and wars were about to take a new meaning, up until now, with the exception of maybe small elements of the British and French campaigns, wars had mainly been for and on behalf of the monarch/nobleman fighting them. The armies were mainly professional but now nations had been formed each with their own sense of national pride and along with it came volunteer armies and eventually conscription. In reality the only purpose nationalism has served is to group people together in order to determine which side of the battlefield they should stand on. Another pointless method to divide humanity so a winner could be determined. In hindsight there have been no winners in these wars between nations aside from the individuals and businesses who profit from the industry of war. The nations themselves whether winner or loser are both usually saddled with debt all except one that is after the world was at war with each other for the first time, the USA.

I am not going to dwell on the causes of WW1 because as previously mentioned despite the feel so far this is not intended to be a history book more a look back to how we got to where we are now and some thoughts on where we should be going from here.

Whatever the plans were before WW1 the event which was to really define the course of the 20th century took place in Russia in 1917 with their revolution but since the war was not going to resolve itself Germany had to be dealt with before the victorious allies could start to confront the "scourge of communism". Unfortunately they dealt with the aftermath of the war so poorly that it would inevitably lead to the deaths of many millions in WW2.

The phrase "Squeeze Germany until the Pips Squeak" is attributed to a number of people but whoever did say it quite accurately described the allies treatment of a beaten Germany in 1918. Despite being a major influence in the factors that led up to the war Winston Churchill advocated leniency towards the Germans but the other players did not share his desire, especially the French who had not forgotten the Prussian treatment of France after their conflict 40-50 years earlier. The German people were made to pay so hard for losing the war that their economy collapsed. It is very hard to cast judgement on the Germans of the 1920's who turned to extreme politics for their salvation, the debt and reparations meant that stable government was just not possible the battleground was set for far left v far right factions. Any hopes for a German recovery were well and truly lost after the Wall St crash meant the end to any of the foreign aid they were getting.

Although the country was ruined it did still contain some very well connected individuals such as Fritz Thyssen head of a wealthy family of industrialists. He had been mesmerised by a speech from Hitler and became a fully paid up member of the nazi party in 1931. Thyssen had acquired a network of multinational front companies in the 1920's in order to protect the family assets from another war. From a purely business point of view the connection between Hitler and Thyssen is an easy one to understand, communism did not hold a bright future for a rich industrialist. Thyssen of course went on to bankroll Hitler and prospered from the huge orders resulting from building the German war machine despite eventually falling out with him.

Okay time to stop as we have reached the 1930's and the real coming of age for propaganda and political divides. Democracy had truly hit the world's stage and combined with capitalism was being served up to the world as good in the face of evil. But were we really being served up freedom or an illusion from which we can be manipulated from behind the scenes. The people who fought the scourge of communism and other "evils" that followed sure did get rich from it and then sold us a dream which is all too apparently coming apart at the seams in the 21st century. I personally don't get left and right politics, I don't see the need to take decisions to suit a doctrine when surely it is better to deal with individual issues in the most appropriate direction to benefit as

many people as possible. What am I talking about I hear you ask ? well for example take Sport and the arts and think Russian gymnasts and the Bolshoi ballet you cannot deny that communism was able to plough a lot of resources into these fields without pressure from the private sector a similar level of funding just isn't possible in the pure capitalist model and commercial sponsorship means the wealth of talent focusses on the high profile sports or in the case of the arts, they head to Hollywood. More of my ideas to solve the problems of the world later for now let's finish taking a look at recent history.

Let's delve into a world where history as I was taught it was misleading and ignore wars between countries as merely wars between individuals using those nations whether they were monarchs representing competing religions or politicians now controlled by the business leaders. The business leaders may have been initially driven to protect their wealth from communism and state ownership but I believe they prolonged that perceived threat when they saw the profits that could be generated from an arms race and once that threat subsided they created the terror threat they protect us/profit from today.

I don't want to name names but it certainly seems to be profitable if you stick close to the Bush family as they have been in and around at the beginning of all these conflicts from the war on communism to the current war on terror. In the 1930's one of Fritz Thyssen's many companies included the Union Banking Corporation which employed one Prescott Bush (father of George, grandad of G.W.). UBC did plenty to finance Hitler's war machine as did a number of Thyssen's other companies many of which had Bush as director. A lot of American money headed into the nazi party right up until their invasion of Poland in 1939 but UBC was still funnelling money into Germany right up until America entered the war. UBC was eventually seized for trading with the enemy but Bush escaped without any prosecution to pursue a political future for him and his descendants no doubt with a healthy shareholding in the companies soon to be profiting from the arms race that would define the second half of the 20th century.

The world just accepts without really thinking just how Germany went from pushing money around in wheelbarrows because of devaluation to conquering most of Europe in 11 years. No matter how hard a nation works I do not believe it would have been possible without the vast amount of money that poured into Germany from America. WW2 was a war that would not touch USA aside from sacrificing its subjects (a nation's expendable asset and martyr creation is good for future morale anyway). The industrialists who now ran the country were set to make fortunes arming the rest of the world and like the European monarchs who were their historical equal they did not see the mass loss of life as a big price to pay in return for their profits, whilst reinforcing the nonsense that is a patriotic sacrifice.

Hitler was unquestionably a madman as were a lot of the nazi party members and their warped view of world around them and their desire to create a master race was pure fantasy. The horrors of the Third Reich are well documented as are the battles that were

fought, less attention is focussed on the activities of German businessmen and their influence over the businesses of occupied Europe. It is well known that German industrial giants benefitted a lot from being able to use slave labour from the concentration camps but the real master stroke was orchestrated by Martin Bormann who was probably well aware of the many floors in Hitler's plans and the likely failure of his dream of a 1000 year reich. Occupation of the countries of Europe by the German army was immediately followed by technicians from companies such as IG Farben, the German chemical and industrial giant, bankers from Deutsche Bank, Commerzbank and Dresdnerbank in order to take control of the local banking and expand German industry into these newly acquired territories. As well as this new industry they found many willing collaborators in existing industry across occupied Europe many of whom were sympathetic to the Third Reich and welcomed various new (nazi) members to their boards of directors.

As those around Hitler saw the invasion of Normandy as the beginning of the end for the Third Reich a lot of effort was now focussed on hiding the "riches" of Nazi Germany as a means to fund a resurgent post war Germany and possibly a fourth reich. An important part of these national riches were patents and processes owned by German industry. A brief glimpse into the future where the majority of wealth of a nation is tied up in its intellectual property.

It is very hard to determine whether or not investigations into nazi infiltration of European industry went deep enough. Post war Europe was a mess and the allies had a new potential enemy to consider in the shape of the Soviet Union, rebuilding western Europe was a far greater priority to combat this threat.

Having financed the beginning of the war through their banks the USA sought to finance the post war peace through the Marshall Plan. History would have you believe that this cash injection kickstarted recovery in Europe whereas in reality recovery was well under way by 1948 before the introduction of this huge amount of money. Marshall plan aid did speed the recovery up though in most countries across western Europe but Eastern Europe did not receive any as Stalin had rejected the strings that were attached. Stalin saw a future where accepting the money just meant increased American influence in countries such as Hungary, Poland Romania etc. Stalin wanted control of the Eastern Bloc not only for the assistance it needed to rebuild war ravaged western Russia but also as a buffer zone between itself and what was looking increasingly like a hostile enemy trying to move up to its borders

It was never officially declared but I can only see that the western powers were the ones who really declared the cold war on communism and were ready to forgive and forget whoever it took in order to fight this war. The Marshall Plan as well as funding nations



did indeed fund various fronts for the CIA. One such operation was an unsuccessful attempt to gain control back from Moscow in an important strategic asset for the Soviet Union. America supported a Ukrainian right wing guerrilla group called the Nightingale brigade in order to destabilise Ukraine and eventually lure them away from the Soviets. It is very easy to see from the political map of modern day Europe that Stalin was probably right to be mistrusting as Russia now has American missiles pointed at it from most of its former Eastern Bloc states. Before reading that previous statement with pride and waving your stars and stripes in the air for a victory for democracy please bear in mind that the Nightingale brigade were willing collaborators with the Nazi occupiers who shared their same political ideals and prejudices and five or six years earlier had been actively murdering thousands of Jews, Russians and Poles. Ukraine is of course still a hot topic in current affairs with the Russian "invasion" of Crimea a conflict I still struggle to decide who the real protagonist is.

I may sound soft on Russia and I suppose I am in a way. It is not in any way because of any political leaning or side taking but I just feel they have historically been contained without showing any real willingness or ability to expand. They were now being treated as an enemy despite suffering huge losses fighting to free themselves and eventually Europe from the Nazis.

What would the world really have been like if the Russian's had capitulated against Hitler ? There is no way there would have been an allied invasion if the forces Hitler had committed to the Eastern Front had gone to defend the west and even possibly have invaded Britain. As we know Hitler was in awe of the British and he originally did not see them as a potential enemy knowing the ruling classes and their fear of the communist threat to their control. Without the Eastern front Britain would have had no choice but to have made peace and mainland Europe would now be controlled by Hitler, Mussolini, Franco and the Vichy government in France. Hitler would have an ethnically cleansed Europe and the time to cover up all evidence of how that was achieved. Peace would no doubt come as the German propaganda machine created it's perfect society and once settled these nations could restore some semblance of a Nazi approved identity while all coming together as a kind of community, they could even pick a name for this newly created organisation ...such as the European Union perhaps (sorry, couldn't resist). The Grand Mufti of Jerusalem would be able to return home after a German victory and no doubt fulfil his promise to Hitler by slaughtering every Jew in Palestine in return for Arab control over the Holy land. Heading any further east leads to all sorts of possibilities as Nazi Germany takes control of the Arabian oil field so to save this developing into a story of its own I will stop there but I think you get the point I am trying to make.

If you didn't get it the point is that we should have been in a position where we were sitting down with the Soviet Union drinking vodka and toasting the fact the world was at peace and few had the desire for war. Instead we were on the brink of a massive arms

race as the former allies marvelled at captured German intelligence and the massive inroads they had made into the science of war and recent advances made by the Manhattan project.

Before I finish with the Marshall Plan it should be mentioned that the largest recipient was Britain but this was a Britain with a socialist government. The labour party is always proud of the fact that its government was the first to put together a national health service where the people could enjoy free healthcare. What they rarely mention is how they paid for this and at what price. I am firmly of the opinion that they did not produce a health service for the future but only one fit for the 1950's and even that ambition failed as Britain has not had the means to adequately fund it since those very early years when the Marshall plan aid money was burning a hole in their pockets. Europe's industry was modernising themselves while Britain built itself a health service that would be the "envy of the world". This more than anything led to the inevitable decline of British industry and its reliance on the one major prize it would hang on to from its now crumbled empire and that was the global trade controlled from within the square mile of the City of London.

Peace had come to Europe but war was soon to come back to other parts of the world as nations and former colonies struggled to create their own identities and political paths. These wars would receive huge amounts of foreign support and they more or less became proxy wars with Soviet/Chinese support for the communists and USA backing those fighting the communists no matter how extreme their views were. Peace in Europe was not however accompanied by prosperity for some as an iron curtain came down across the Eastern bloc.

Western Europe recovered through investments in industry and rebuilding infrastructure, unlike the end of WW1 the allies did not seek to punish Germany as a nation and although limits were placed on output during the late 40's, a lot of effort was made to rebuild it's industrial capability. Those deemed to be war criminals and key members of the nazi party were hunted down and brought to justice but the question still remains whether or not those complicit with supplying and profiting from the rise of nazi war machine should have been looked at a lot closer.

There was an economic miracle which began in West Germany in the 50's that really gathered pace after Germany started to pick up orders from America in order to fight the first of the proxy wars in Korea which combined with new economic policies may have gone some of the way to explain how West Germany recovered so quickly but I still have my suspicions about a gradual return of some of the capital that had been squirrelled out of Germany towards the end of WW2. Of course the obligatory central bank was put in place in the form of the Bundesbank in 1957 to enslave the nation when the allies started to deem the West German people worthy of their "freedom"

As well as not being a history book this is not really intended to be an in depth investigation I just had to mention my thoughts about nazi infiltration into European industry as these industrial giants form the backbone of the European Union. I am no fan of the EU, I simply do not trust the motives of the people behind it. I am very much on the side of Brexit, although as a resident of Gibraltar I did not think it appropriate for me to vote for something which I know would have caused issues for my neighbours in their never ending argument with the Spanish government.

I should point out now I have reached the subject of the British exit from Europe that even though I was sympathetic to the Brexit cause I think the referendum was badly handled. The political fighting and labelling that has followed is a direct result of only asking if the British public wanted to leave and not why the British public wanted to leave the EU. As is normal the loudest voices came from the extremes of the political spectrum with immigration being hailed as the number one issue. For me the number one issue always remains that I do not believe the EU is good for Europe but in reality only for big business. Freedom of movement may have sounded like a good idea but take a look at what has happened with economic migration not from the point of view of your now overcrowded prosperous cities but from the less prosperous regions. What happens to countries like Romania, Spain, Greece, Portugal and other nations who have sent their skilled and young to northern Europe in search of work ? A skills shortage and a population with a higher percentage of aged and the less able to work. I think these countries will suffer in the future and I also have suspicions that this is the plan of those Federalists at the heart of the EU who gain to benefit from the inevitable mess by offering the only feasible solution to their problems which would be a United States of Europe. In recent local elections in Andalucia, it was strange to see this former socialist area suddenly elect candidates from VOX the new incarnation of the supporters of their former dictator Franco. Could this be evidence not only be that the electorate is getting older and the youth have suddenly left but also the power of propaganda since many of these older voters would have grown up in a Spain run by the dictator (looking back at their youth through rose tinted spectacles).

I can theorise all I want about how the post war Europe was shaped but without in depth investigation all I can do is pass on my suspicions and observe where power now lies since the Soviet Union was disbanded. If you look at today's map and economic data then Europe stretches across all the lands which were occupied by or collaborated with the Nazis and German Industry was a driving force behind both. So to summarise my Brexit leanings I am definitely more anti EU than I am anti European, I am happy to have people live where ever they want but as you will hear later on I think the world would be far better served if it a improved for the good of the entire world and not for the advantage of any particular nation or group of nations in fact group of anyone, humanity is now networked, we have the ability to be one group.

Coming back to the end of WW2 you may say this marked a real high point for USA as having been a debtor in 1913 they had now come through two wars which devastated much of the world with their homeland untouched. The American dream was ready to be rolled out worldwide, capitalism was right and sold to the world as the good in the fight against the evil of communism. From the other side of the iron curtain, were they really communists, could this be compared to Marx's original dream (not ignoring the fact Marx actually became more endeared to elements of capitalism as he got on in years) ? This was a global theory never meant to be centred on one country and it definitely didn't factor in a well funded enemy on their doorstep which made every effort to show off how happy and content its citizens were. The Soviet Union under Stalin was a dictatorship the people did not hold the power he did and so did his centralised bureaucracy, Eastern Europe in turn was occupied by the Soviet Union and while the people were subjected to Soviet rules they too could not really be seen as living in a true communist society. In the 1960's when the lure of capitalism became too much competition for the struggle of life under these rules, physical barriers were erected and East was closed off from the West.

In the west the transition of power in the industrial age was now complete. We had entered the industrial age in the 19th century with Monarchs in charge of much of the world and now the real power was wielded by the bankers and industrialists who controlled both sides of the political spectrum with their influence over governments within these democracies.

If we take look at the world from 1960 -1990 we in the west see one where we enjoyed the freedom and opportunity that capitalism had to offer. Prosperity was there for all to see but no one appreciated that there was a huge price to pay for this prosperity and that was national and personal debt. This lure of capitalism is in reality a trap and this debt ensured no one was really free as even if they managed to be debt free the nation they were part of was not. The only way to maintain its illusion of success is to put off payment until tomorrow and make sure tomorrow production is increased sufficiently to pay for tomorrow and the interest on today's borrowings.

If WW2 marked the end of the British empire then the Cold war marked the beginning of the American empire but this was a different empire. USA did not conquer countries with their armies they did so with support for any regime willing to fight their enemies, initially the threat of communism and more recently Islamic fundamentalism. In return for American support the victorious allies of America accepted US military bases within their territory while US business world took care of funding development and spreading their global brands (golden arches in every city!).

Of course we now know Communism could not compete with the advances made in the capitalist world and lost the cold war. Without the support of the Soviet union, former communist regimes all began to drift towards market economies all be it with a large

amount of nationalised industry. so I will not look at the wrongs and rights of these various conflicts as these can be viewed as civil wars and sometimes as in the case of Vietnam the acceptance of communism by the North was only a way of ensuring a good supply of arms from the Soviet Union to fight their anti colonial fight.

The world changed on November 9 1989 with the fall of the Berlin Wall and the world celebrated that people were free of former oppressive East European regimes (free to listen to David Hasselhoff in concert). I believe not enough attention was payed to the amount of corruption that has resulted from a brutal wave of capitalism that swept over these countries. The corruption is possible because former state monopolies were sold off by state officials who still wielded ultimate power within the ruling party. Unfortunately for the states involved the purchasers were friends and families of these former state officials some of who now reached the heights of being referred to as an oligarch.

Well, I am getting to the point in writing this where I am itching to explore a new way for us to go and I am sure you feel the same reading this is there any point to analysing the difference between a Russian Oligarch or a multi billionaire head of a western monopoly, neither should have been allowed to accumulate such wealth and more importantly the power to influence the course of world affairs. If the US constitution was indeed a gift to the free world would the founding fathers have made amendments to it with 21st century hindsight ? If the answer to that is yes, should we not use the lessons of recent history to reset society to something we can all agree on when the opportunity presents itself ?

We have seen how a change of era means a change in the power base and we are in an age that I believe people will look back on and refer to as the technological revolution the same way they call the early 1800's the industrial revolution. The window of opportunity will not be open forever and could be the last chance for the people of this world. Artificial Intelligence has so much to offer people but the "Terminator" future could very easily be a reality as we programme this intelligence with our fears. The human race cannot be trusted with AI until it can come to terms with living with itself or our machines will do what they have been programmed to do...protect us from ourselves. You may argue that the Terminator movies were based on the machines becoming self aware and this is easily prevented. However, the scenario I am referring to is based on the current way we distribute humanity across competing states, thus we have Chinese AI, American AI, European AI, Russian AI and not forgetting the ever so well spoken British AI. We now define individual artificial intelligences as each working for each others enemies. it doesn't take an advanced computer to work out that each one of them will come to the conclusion that humanity is a single entity and they have all confirmed independently that at least 60% + are "enemies", the only sensible solution would be to continually eliminate 60% of the population as well as the one's that dare prevent it. Should we really be embarking into the world of artificial intelligence united for the good

of humanity or pre-programmed with our prejudices and let them fight it out in some kind of winner takes all computer game ?

We will get on to solutions shortly but it would be wrong to look at history and not look at the events across the Islamic world and the ongoing war on terror. Without doubt the mess in the region can be attributed to the actions of Britain and France (and more recently the US). When the Ottoman empire was broken up their land was divided up by the British and French in the Sykes–Picot Agreement of 1916. Although it was a secret agreement the terms eventually became known as Tsarist Russia was a minor party to the agreement and after the revolution the Bolsheviks published the document to support territorial claims that were being denied them as they were now considered by everyone as a different entity to the state under Tsar Nicholas. In this plan Britain assumed control of territory which includes the modern day states of Iraq, Jordan Israel and down to Egypt and the Suez canal while France took Syria and Lebanon. Details of this plan caused resentment in the Arab world as they had been promised a homeland in Greater Syria in return for their help defeating the Ottoman Empire. To make matters worse Greater Syria stretched from the border with modern day Turkey to Gaza in the South and Britain had also promised the Jews a return to the land they referred to as Palestine for similar support in WW1.

In WW2 the Arabs were courted by Hitler who assured them of their Jew free Arab homeland in return for their support in the war. The British remained in control of the area after successfully invading the areas of Lebanon and Syria controlled by Vichy France but the current resentment from the Persian side of the middle east stems from another British campaign in 1941. Britain was suspicious of Iran's ties to Germany even though Iran's actions in WW2 gave no clue that they would consider allying with Nazi Germany. Their connections with Germany had come about mainly because they were the only European power who did not have a history of imperialism in the region but they were strong opponents of German anti-Semitism to the point of saving 1500 European Jews by secretly granting them Iranian citizenship through their embassies in occupied Europe. Iran's strategic location made it a threat to Russian oilfields and British communication between India and the Mediterranean if it were to fall in German hands. It was also a vital link for supply lines to get tanks and weapons to the Soviets fighting on the Eastern front. Although officially a neutral country Britain and the Soviet Union invaded Iran in August 1941. They initially occupied the country and the Shah was sent away as a prisoner of the British in South Africa. Eventually a peace treaty was signed by the youngest son of the Shah who had assumed leadership on behalf of his dynasty, part of the agreement was that Britain and USSR would leave Iran 6 months after the end of war, this wasn't trusted by the new Shah but this treaty was made irrelevant when the new Shah declared war on Germany and a new treaty between the allies (which now included the USA) ruled that Iran be treated as an ally and not an occupied country.

At the end of the war Britain stuck to its word and vacated Iran before the 6 month deadline. The USSR however remained citing the need for protection and did not leave until a year later. In the mean time the Shah of Iran had issued the first complaint to the newly formed United Nations security council who preceded to discuss a resolution. The Soviets did eventually withdraw but it was not in the face of UN pressure as they had taken no action. The Shah of Iran stayed in power until the revolution of 1979 and in that time he made many enemies within the religious communities with his far reaching reforms. He also set himself as the self styled protector of the Persian Gulf by getting closer to USA through expressions of concern about Soviet influence in neighbouring Iraq. Iran's oil wealth made him a welcome ally of America who needed someone strong in the area to fight their war on communism and when he asked for a limitless supply of weapons the USA was only too happy to oblige. This scenario was quite typical in the middle East with US support for those nations who were willing to fight their communist enemy. You just need a list of the client states of the Soviet era to figure out why it is those in the region hold USA responsible for much of the war that ravages their lands. Egypt, Iraq, Libya, South Yemen and Syria all sided with the Soviet Union most of which are still war torn to this day. Unfortunately little concern has been given to the people of the region as a never ending war has been fought on these lands leading to dictatorships where the recipients of US or Soviet aid were able to use military aid to control their civilian population as well as attack their enemies. The Iranian revolution saw a new enemy appear on the scene with their Islamic revolution which was fanatically opposed to US involvement in the middle East to complicate everything further the Islamists operated a neither East nor west philosophy meaning the religious leaders were no friends to Russia either, seeing that they would fill any void left open to them. The Iranians weren't to feature in international affairs as they were kept busy fighting Saddam Hussein, the Soviet's ally in neighbouring Iraq in a brutal 8 year war

The USA and Britain had its allies in Saudi Arabia, Jordan and other Sunni States in the area, they were, of course, directly opposed to the Shia branch of Islam that now had control of Iran.

Unfortunately, because of the arbitrary way France and the UK had divided the middle east with no thought to the people within it (such as the Kurds, a nation without a homeland spread over three countries and denied rights in each) there were a lot of minorities who were not well treated by their governments. In the case of some of the dictatorships it was the majority persecuted by the minorities with the right military backing. While I support their right to freedom I find the recent US backed drive for democracy in the Arab spring was doomed to fail from the start in all but a few relatively stable countries. When I say doomed to fail it may well read guaranteed to destabilise because I really cannot believe anyone envisioned a path to peace in a post Assad Syria or a post Gaddafi Libya.

To make matters worse to relations with the Arab world the French under De Gaulle mistakenly believed they could pick up their Empire where they left off, specifically in Algeria. Algeria had tried to take advantage of previous French wars to further the cause of nationalism. but the early parts of the war were different as the anti-Semitic views of the Vichy government and the prospect of Nazi rule over Europe appealed to the Algerian nationalists. Towards the end of the war they felt the time right for an end to colonial rule but the European settlers and their police force responded, going as far as mass executions and reprisals against entire communities to reinforce their rule over Algeria. Even though the Algerian war for independence was to follow some years later the seeds of hate were really sown with this action in 1945.

No mention of the middle East is complete without mention of the the main American ally in the region during the Cold war and beyond. We began this look at religion, history and the passage of power with the Children of Israel so it is a fitting place to end. The State of Israel gained independence in 1948 and has faced nothing but hostility ever since from the region and beyond . Despite Israel having managed to come to agreement with many nation states it was formerly at war with in recent years there are many preconceptions and ill feeling towards not only Israel but jewish people too. Yes there are rights and wrongs on both sides and even though I try and maintain a totally unbiased view I do sympathise more with the Israeli cause than that of the Palestinians. I accept that Palestinians did lose land in the war for independence but on the other side of the argument you have to ask where are the jews from Baghdad, Damascus, Beirut and other arab communities. You may well believe Israel is full of descendants from victims of the holocaust in Europe, I can assure you that Israelis stem from many parts of the Islamic world from the Mediterranean to India a lot of jews were forced away from these places and eventually the State of Israel was the only place that could guarantee them safety. despite the threat from all around. Surprisingly enough there was one Islamic country where a large jewish community still remained and that was Iran, despite post revolutionary Iran's well known hatred of Israel. Arab lands are vast and I struggle to understand why they could not accommodate those displaced by Israel within their communities but instead of welcoming their brothers those who seek to further their cause has used them as pawns. They keep Palestinians in communities in Syria Lebanon and Jordan and while they are allowed to remain they do not enjoy the same rights as other citizens of these countries.

The situation was further complicated by the Six day war in 1967, as Israel was attacked on all sides by a selection of Arab armies from Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Iran. Israel of course won and pushed these armies back by occupying the former Syrian territory of the Golan Heights (a mountainous region which overlook Northern Israel), the West Bank of the natural defence of the River Jordan in the East and the Sinai peninsula in the South as a buffer zone to Egypt. By the 1980's Israel had made peace with Jordan and Egypt and although land was returned neither was willing to accept responsibility for



areas they once maintained a presence in, the West Bank/East Jerusalem (Jordan) and the Gaza Strip to the south of Israel (Egypt). Israel had no choice but to occupy these areas as they both offered easy access to Israel and Israeli cities would be vulnerable to attack from these areas. Israel is not a 100% Jewish country as it does have a significant Arab population as those who remained and accepted citizenship enjoyed the same rights as any other Israeli.

From 1978 until the 90's many attempts were made to resolve the Israel/Palestinian problem and after the Oslo Peace Accord in the early 1990s it was thought a solution was found but as we know from today this failed. I am of the opinion the failure was down to economic reasons more than anything else. A different Israel existed at the time and it was one that welcomed the cheap labour the occupied territories supplied. It was common place to see these people working on the building sites of Israel, cleaning the beaches, maintaining buildings and other forms of manual labour. The government of Israel was far more liberal than the hardline Netanyahu government takes today it seemed an end to the conflict was in sight. Then came the break up of the Soviet union and a lot of its Jews took the opportunity to fulfil their dreams of living in the promised land at any cost. Suddenly the guy sweeping the local beach was not an Arab from the West Bank, he was a Russian Nuclear physicist. This led to rising unemployment and more hardship for the occupied territories and of course an impoverished society is easily manipulated by propaganda which pointed the finger of blame squarely at the Israeli people who should be attacked and driven into the sea. They did attack, not with armies this time but with terror, blowing up buses, shopping malls and other soft targets. Israel hit back at the terrorists with snatch squads travel restrictions and increased checks. Eventually the Israeli people demanded a stronger response from a more hardline government similar to that they have today.

I do see some wrong in their policy of settling occupied territory, like every religion the Jews have their own share of religious fundamentalists who believe they have a God-given right to all the land up to the river Jordan and they do all they can to expand the borders of Israel. They achieve this mainly by buying property from the Palestinians until they have a fair size of land adjacent to the Israeli border at what point they request security and protection from the Israeli army which gradually grows the country encroaching onto former Palestinian land. Israel is a democracy and the ultra-religious have their own political parties it is impossible to get a majority in the government without having to deal with this section of society's demands. A solution could be found to the Israel/Palestinian conflict if there was a desire for it but it has been too convenient for many external players to keep it going. It is no coincidence though that there is less current conflict now ISIS and the Syrian conflict has given these external players other things to focus on but the conflict is always boiling away ready to erupt at any second. In the current world format however I cannot see any resolution being found.

There are many who believe that fundamental Islamism is a threat to the world without really giving any thought as to why we are experiencing this backlash. The spread of christianity has killed far more people than Islam could ever match. They were slaughtered on many occasions, colonised, had their lands handed to oppressive dictators you cannot now free them into poverty and not expect a strong desire for retribution from elements within their society if indeed we do believe this truly comes from within their society and was not orchestrated from those within our society wishing to prolong conflict around the world.

I'm not going to delve into conspiracy theories and other suspicions but the war against Islamic terror has conveniently come to the rescue of the "war industry" after the break up of the Soviet Union put an end to the cold war. Especially when you ponder the fact that Bin Laden and Al Qaeda were the remnants of a CIA supported organisation during the fight to "liberate" Afghanistan from the Soviet occupation I am sure if you want to investigate that further there is plenty of online material that keeps the conspiracy industry playing on people's fears and prejudices. As I've said before these theories should not worry you as much as the fact they may be possible it is time to cease investigating and just remove the possibility from our future..

## **Where do we go from here**

We have seen how the world rejected fascism which is understandable, despite never given the chance it is easy to prove the short comings of communism but the world is still hung up on capitalism. With capitalism you always have the dream of making the fortune you are striving for. There is really nothing wrong with this dream and I wouldn't want to change that to a point but as I hope I have demonstrated the inherent problem of capitalism is that all the wealth will eventually accumulate at the top of the pyramid and never filter back down into society. Some nations have tried to counter the problems of capitalism with socialism but that just does not sit well in a capitalist society as the funding for their ideals has to come from increased borrowing or heavy taxation. The problem with taxation is that it causes hardship for the middle classes and struggles to target the top 5% who either move their wealth offshore or simply move themselves to a favourable tax jurisdiction. Socialists will always point to Scandinavia as an example of how it is possible to make a success of socialism but they fail to realise that these countries did not develop the same way as most. It was probably because its steel was used in the first arms race to make swords and this wealth did indeed trickle down through society and not into the hands of a few. Socialism is definitely an easy sell to a more equal society in fact we have a socialist government in Gibraltar which works fine as the economy produces a healthy surplus to cover its welfare bill. In other nations socialist governments have a limited lifespan before the country struggles under crippling debt or unfair taxation drives capital out of the country. Put simply none of these "isms" work but they all have good and bad points in them as each addressed a problem that existed when they were conceived but we live in a totally different world and the world is only set to keep changing at an even more rapid pace.

From fire to the wheel took about 120 000 years then to the industrial revolution took another 5000 years The industrial revolution to computers and the internet took less than 200 we can only guess where we will be in 100 years from now but one thing is for sure and that is the world will have inconceivable technology and a high degree of automation. New roles will have to be found for humanity as it is replaced by this automation and artificial intelligence or a vast proportion of human life on this planet will simply become redundant. Combined with the capitalist world today there is little to stop the top 1% orchestrating wars to do away with the redundant population to enjoy the planet for themselves. If not war then the end game for the capitalist world is a kind of communism as the saturation point is reached and the entire wealth of the world is in the hands of these ruling classes who permit the rest of the world to live on an allowance of it's resources they "generously" donate to the rest of humanity while they live the life only gods can dream about. It is therefore vital that all humanity finds a way to coexist and make sure it controls its systems for the whole and not just the wealthy few.

I can hear the revolutionaries amongst you sharpening your knives ready to revolt against the 1% but I am simply not condoning nor encouraging that. When I refer to humanity as a whole they too are included in that group. We have to make that group of people realise that there will be no connection in the future between one's wealth and the influence it can buy in democratic decisions within The State we build for the run up to the 22nd century. A state in a world that must tackle the problems facing it in the short term, such as the redundant human and problems cause by pollution as well as make amends for the wrong doings of our ancestors from which we benefit so much today. That means human rights and adequate infrastructure for the entire world, not just the developed world and not an investment that would require financial return or access to resources.

In the preceding paragraph I mentioned "The State" and now is the time to drop the real bombshell on you and that is that the solution on offer is very similar to the conspiracy theories you may hear surrounding the New World Order in that there are no nations just a single world state. The main difference between what I am proposing and the NWO though is what is at the top of it and that is not a selection of powerful elites but a DAO (Decentralised autonomous organisation). I've got plenty more to explain so in order to simplify the explanation of a DAO for now I will say that this organisation runs on a set of rules which cannot be altered and the rules will be determined by consensus of opinion (democratic voting, 1 man 1 vote for the entire world). Hopefully the concept will become clearer later.

The concepts of limiting wealth and dissolution of nations may sound like a recipe for war but I am not imagining a quickie revolution but instead a single world political party of like minded individuals who share the same dream. This party would use the political systems of the democracies of the world to seek election from the votes of like minded people around the world, they would join other countries where a Notanist government is in power (Did I just use the word notanist ?? think "not-an -ism").

This will of course not happen overnight as you may have noticed that nations rarely have elections on the same day which is a failsafe built into the world's democracies to ensure a political takeover does not happen. A single nation with a government those in power consider a threat is easily isolated and dealt with be it by war, propaganda or their favourite tool as they send in the speculators to wreck your economy. If you would like an example of this financial pressure in action just do some investigation into how Merkel and Sarkozy forced Italy to remove Berlusconi from power.

This is all sounding like a pipe dream to you, complete madness, You may just be right, only a madman would suggest the concept of peace on earth but perhaps the world needs a mad man to find world peace. Lunacy is an appropriate subject as recently you may have noticed a lot of news regarding Bitcoin and how many important bankers and investors have been warning people away from a cryptocurrency as a world full of

scams. I don't deny that there are many people in cryptos for the wrong reasons seeing it merely as a path to easy money but the sector is chock full of very talented people finding innovative ways to deploy the new technology of the blockchain on the world. A lot of the early adopters of Bitcoin and the blockchain have made plenty of money but their increase in net worth is because people realised the potential, their real driving force was to develop the technology within their community, initially proud at having executed a transaction to buy pizza with bitcoin (which in current day values was probably the most expensive pizza ever). A look back in history will tell you that people rarely agree on anything unless they collectively see it as a threat to their existence and for bankers, governments, industrialists and manipulators it most definitely is. Everything that is wrong with the world can be replaced by a blockchain but before I tell you how that could be possible I have to try and explain what it is.

Not only have you had to endure the earlier part of this book as something akin to a school history lesson now I may have to get a bit "techy" to explain things but I will do my best to simplify it.

I was born in 1965, no this is not a biography but in the same year two computers at MIT Lincoln Lab communicated with each other using packet-switching technology. By 1969 the U.S. Defence Department's Advanced Research Projects Agency Network (ARPANET) developed most of the protocols used by the net today. This network was designed to outlive a nuclear war but was intended solely for military use until 1973 when academic institutions started to connect to this network and the term internet was coined. The next 16 years were spent scaling the network up but the technology had not developed beyond email and the ability to post on usenet which would have it's equivalent in forums nowadays where each post would be an individual file that you had to download. This was still confined to the academic world until 1989 when [world.std.com](http://world.std.com) offered commercial dial up access. A year later Tim Berners Lee developed html (HyperText Markup Language) and in 1991 Cern unleashed the World Wide Web into the public realm with the ability to add sound and video following shortly thereafter and the internet as we know it was really born.

I may as well come back into the story here, as by 1995 I was designing simple web sites for people alongside tinkering with photoshop and pretending to be a graphic designer. In reality I was more interested in the technology side of it and since there was little knowledge of the capability of the graphics software available even then it only took a press of a couple of keys and the application of a few filters to produce graphics to impress a client (obviously I hated the clients who wanted to sit and watch and realise how little effort was involved). Nowadays effects that would take me time can be achieved in a matter of seconds with more powerful filters and computer processing power, then it was not unknown for me to compose a 3d image and wait a day for it to render. I can't lie, I wasn't the most successful graphic designer but then I'm not really

the sort of person who likes to work for people as I had always wanted to develop my own ideas. In 1996 I was being asked to make more web sites for people and I could not see why the web needed another useless web site with pictures of the staff a brief description of what they do and a contact page. So I looked across the Atlantic as America was always a couple of years ahead of Europe before the internet arrived and came across a web site selling audio equipment. I had seen e-commerce and I liked the potential I saw so much I investigated building something similar in the UK. I remember explaining it to one of my friends at the time, the concept was easy I just open a shop and find products to put in it and that shop can sell anything no matter how big it was as long as I could find a supplier who was prepared to deliver to my customers. Bandwidth was precious in those days and small file sizes were the order of the day which meant fewer images and more text. So I set out to find a product that did not require touching or feeling, the quality was just not good enough for anything ambitious with the internet speeds of the day. I tried to also think of something that I could get cheaper in the UK as I identified the global reach of the internet and thought offering something typically British could be a good way to get myself known. The first product to hit my web site were Dr Marten Boots and so my business was born but they weren't a huge money spinner as I was just buying them from a local shoe shop and splitting the profit with the retailer off his cost price. The money wasn't so important at that stage as much as the fact I had an operating e-commerce site and I was getting orders from every corner of the world. I then approached a friend and showed him what I had, we then decided to go forward with We Sell It as a joint venture. He was running another business at the time and put me in touch with a neighbouring business selling kitchen appliances (a business I still work with today all be it in a different direction). This was getting to a similar point blockchain was at the end of 2017 when those who thought they were in the know could throw money at anything and it will eventually make them their fortune (mooning is the word they use in crypto nowadays). My friend offered me investment and I turned it down as I really did not know what to do with his money except spend it so we came to an amicable arrangement to part company and I went along with it on my own.

I pressed ahead with the kitchen appliances and I had also made my own contact to inside a distributor of a little known Italian brand called Smeg just around the time the brand was becoming popular despite not being widely available (supply meets demand, classic recipe for success). One thing Smeg had was a nicely laid out catalogue, I think produced by an Italian company. Catalogues were king in those days, this was 2 years before the real pre dot com boom of 1999/2000 fortunately for me less attention was paid to all of the manufacturer web sites that existed at the time. I did what came natural to me and copied their catalogues on to web pages. I had a web site full of words relevant to the products I was selling, my competitors and manufacturers had few words and many pictures. I had inadvertently stumbled across search engine optimisation

when other sites were paying for advertising and listings in subsequent years I would already be there for free. The results were incredible, Google wasn't on the scene yet, Altavista was the king of the search engines and if you typed something as simple as "Smeg Appliances" I would not be the top link not even the top 10, I would have the first 3 pages of links pointing to various pages on my web site. My turnover went from £40k in year one to £1.5 million in year three.

If I had to say there was a downside then it was the amount of work I created for myself not only designing and maintaining it but also processing all the sales manually, 24 hours in a day were just not enough. I lost contact with the internet community that had been such a great help to me when I was learning how it all worked, I had become a retailer and had no time for the dot com boom that was about to happen. In those days people at the top of the retail tree had a similar view of the internet as those at the top of the financial tree have towards blockchain. I know this from personal experience.

I remember one day I was sitting in my office doing my normal thing and an order dropped in to my inbox. Mr Hanek (could have been something similar, my memory of his name is not as clear as the incident itself and the email is probably buried on a very old hard disk somewhere) was the name on the order, with a familiar looking address in Milton Keynes and he was trying to buy 3 Bosch washing machines. After checking closer I found out that the person placing the order was actually the Managing Director of Bosch UK. I picked up the phone and asked him why it was he wanted 3 washing machines when he probably has a whole warehouse full of them. He was quite dismissive and rude, replying that I should cancel the order as he was just demonstrating to someone in his office that people wouldn't possibly buy his appliances. "Strange that, I sold 3 Bosch appliances earlier today but your order is cancelled thanks for letting me know and goodbye", I replied. Fortunately for me there was a certain type of person who was very active online in 1998/99 and those were mainly banking employees. I was very quiet at weekends but come Monday morning the orders would fly in, I got the impression that Monday mornings were quiet for them and placing orders for kitchen appliances must have been a good way to look busy before bosses got wise and started to monitor web surfing during business hours.

I developed quite a following in those days and even had a couple of articles written about me in the daily papers which reminds me of another funny story involving my girlfriend at the time who said that I must have been flirting with the female reporter writing about my incredible customer service and attention to detail, she took this back when I found out the reporter was actually a man writing under an assumed female name.

The high point came in January 2000 when the Daily Mail published a guide to online shopping and had my site listed at No.3 alongside companies such as Selfridges and

Dixons. If only they knew they were listing a business owned and operated by one man and his dog (RIP Flippy)

This was the promise I saw from the internet, without the need for a physical presence you could be anyone and trade with anyone and the possibilities were endless. By now, however I was not alone in seeing the potential of the internet and the internet was about to get taken over by that root of all evil, money. I know you must be thinking I am a bit hypocritical as I was making a fair amount of money myself but I always strived to make sure I gave people value for that money. I hated retail and it's fake offers, seasonal sales and psychological tricks I had the same prices 24hrs a day 365 days of the year and my formula was straight forward to take the trade discount I received and halve the difference between that and the retail price.

I won't bore you with my story any more but as margins plummeted I did a deal in 2003 whereby my supplier took over the sales from my web site which enabled me to head off to sunnier climes. By then everything about the internet had become monetised, advertising everywhere. I really couldn't see anything exciting about the internet after it got commercialised. It was like the old world had just shifted online and I was disappointed that even though people had called it an internet revolution it wasn't very revolutionary at all. I decided to spend more time on a beach and less time getting involved with technology as I had no interest in venturing into a new online project in this direction.

I was of course still connected via my computer and I saw the rise of social media to reveal that most people's lives are pretty boring apart from the occasional high spots. Despite the initial thrill when reconnecting with childhood friends, I wasn't that impressed with social media. I have since had a change of heart with regard to twitter which I didn't go near until late last year when I found it to be a great source for information on cryptocurrency projects. The good thing about my absence from tech was that I missed out on the smart phone craze even though I was pressured into a purchase of one last year so a potential business partner could contact me on WhatsApp I try to avoid using it as much as I can. I don't know why but I just don't trust the motives of the companies behind them and they seem to be turning humanity into a species of mindless zombies living in independent bubbles oblivious to the world around them. (phone rant over now)

I still didn't think anything groundbreaking was happening online and I was in Spain at the time so what else would an Englishman do but open a bar. Nice one it was too, very informal on raised ground above a beach, not actually a building but a converted shipping container with adjoining BBQ pit. Little did I know when I was downloading some music to play in the bar, that something groundbreaking was happening, Satoshi Nakamoto had written his white paper for Bitcoin and not only was it related to the method I was using to download it would also reignite my interest in this emerging and groundbreaking technology.



For those of you who have never used a torrent site in order to share music, software, movies or whatever file you are after then it works like this. Person A has a movie/song/ any computer file and wants to distribute it and in order to do that he creates a torrent file which says “here’s the movie and I will allow you access to that specific file on my computer so you can come and get it ” as long as the software is running and his computer has an active internet connection people can download the file from him. Person B then connects and decides he wants the file so he chooses to download it from person A and the two are connected (peer to peer/P2P). Then person C comes along and wants to see the movie so he chooses to download it, the system connects him to both A and B because even though B is still in the process of downloading the file he also has parts of the file he can share with C as well as A who of course has the full copy. Eventually all three will have the whole file and when D. E F and G turn up they are being served by 3 full copies and so you can see the network will keep on growing bigger and faster as each new copy is online and available to people joining the network. But what has this got to do with currency ? I hear you ask. Just remember the concept of file sharing for now and that they are all sharing an identical copy with each other.

You’ve heard of Bitcoin I’m sure but without doubt you have also heard the word Blockchain and maybe just written it off as the technology that drives bitcoin. Another mysterious thing that only techies understand. I’ll have to stop here as I promise you I have never had a computer lesson in my life. My schooling was in the days before computers and it is safe to admit now that all I ever used to do is play games on them. Computers are essentially the most basic tool in the world but it is a basic tool with a lot of capacity to process data and with the right bits bolted on can be made to appear super intelligent. The only thing your computer really does is get told to be on or off, binary only has two states 1 or 0 and that is the language computers speak. Imagine the 1 and 0 as a yes and no in response to a question. When your computer can answer a few million questions in a second you can start to see how software posing these questions can be used to make your computer appear to be intelligent. The really clever part is having the idea to create software for a purpose, then starting from the beginning you build it piece by piece continually testing and changing bits that aren’t functioning as you wish. Writing the software is definitely labour intensive and when finished it is going to look complex but I assure you the code is far from complex when it is broken down into its components. This is exactly how I taught myself to build web sites, just breaking down the code of existing sites and observing the effect of altering number values within it. My website was as simple and basic as they get but I am sure to the casual observer it would have looked complex just because of the volume of code.

So back to the subject, what is blockchain technology ? Well just as it sounds really, it is a chain of blocks and these blocks are contained in a single file. It is this file that is shared by the entire network. I’ll simply things but in order to start your own blockchain you would need to create a file and deploy what is known as a genesis block which

contains the initial data for your blockchain. The block has a limited amount of data it can contain so eventually it will fill up and then you start the next block and the 3rd, 4th etc etc.

The clever part about blockchain is the way the blocks are made up. Ignore the Genesis block which is unique but instead look at the 2nd block which begins with an amount of data from the genesis block and ends with data from the 3rd block and so it continues with each block starting with data from the preceding block and ending with data from the following block. Blocks cannot be altered once they are written and the blockchain file is shared over a huge network of computers with a majority decision on what is the correct version so in order to change the system you would have to obtain the consensus of the majority of the system to accept your way as the correct way. The majority of the system would not allow this to happen as it would breakdown trust in that particular blockchain which in turn would make it worth less or even worthless. The people within the network get paid to record the transactions and have a vested interest in maintaining the integrity of the system by way of the investment they have to make in order to be part of this network in equipment and power costs to run their computers. Sometimes such alterations are made when someone proposes a new direction for a particular blockchain in a process referred to as a fork where someone would declare what block he was going to have that fork then take the file and manually alter the final block to contain data or a new set of rules from the new block he had created. A new forked cryptocurrency would exist and the person responsible would need to find support within the network so they would give their processor power to this parallel blockchain instead of the original. Without this support he would have no network with which to drive transactions.

There are a number of theories as to the best way to organise the democratic nature of the blockchain what I have described so far has been proof of work, where you are made to use your processing power to solve complex formulae in order to get paid. You may have heard the term bitcoin mining and this is essentially what it is. Another method is proof of stake where the power of your vote depends on the amount of the cryptocurrency you own.

So to recap (I know it gets very hard to understand but crypto currency is very hard to explain to a world used to money and compares the two as like for like). Blockchain is secure as all parts of the network own an identical file with every transaction recorded within that file. The only danger to it is when an individual or group of individuals own over 50% of the network. They can then be in a position to hijack a blockchain since they alone are able to have the majority vote on what the next block will look like which could even alter the functionality in a malicious way. This is all still in development. the prevention of a monopoly is very high in the list of priorities for the cryptocurrency community.

There are many uses for Blockchain but I suppose first and foremost I should deal with the transfer of value from one person to another and that bitcoin you've heard so much about. I won't focus on the intricacies of bitcoin mining but the miners make the network function by giving their computer power to your transaction. Your transaction costs you a small amount of bitcoin and this is used to reward the miner for processing it. Miners also get rewarded for creating the blocks that contain this data related to these transactions. Backtracking here a little I should have mentioned that without a majority "consensus of opinion the original code cannot be altered and thus in a single unforked chain the functionality of the genesis block is maintained. In the case of Bitcoin that means supply is limited to 21 million and once that is reached no more can be created as that is how it was originally conceived.

Do not imagine bitcoins are actual coins, they are not, you cannot see them or touch them, you do not actually hold anything at all. Another name for Blockchain is a distributed ledger where you own the private key (password) which is unique to your public key (account number). Let's say I own an entire bitcoin the data within that block would say that it was owned by the address I hold the private key for. I owe you 0.2 Bitcoin and I want to send it to you so I ask you for your public address and I set up a transaction to send 0.2 bitcoin to you. The network charges me say 0.0002 bitcoin to send the transaction (I can elect to pay as much as I want for the transaction but a successful transaction needs someone to process it, if I pay too little no one will pick up the transaction as they can select which ones they want to process and will always choose the top payer first). Once I send the transaction it has to be confirmed by at least 6 different miners in order to be considered secure and the ownership is changed. Now the ledger which had previously recorded the entire block as belonging to me now shows that I own 0.7998 you own 0.2 and various miners own 0.0002. On my computer/phone/tablet I have a wallet which is another confusing term as it does not contain anything, what it actually is is a piece of software which queries the blockchain and returns all bits of it which are marked as belonging to my address .

There is very little difference in this model to that operated by your bank for your account, you do not get to touch any cold hard cash there either until you give them the equivalent debit from your balance, a balance which is only written on the bank's ledger and does not actually exist as a pile of cash.

Well I say there is no difference but the two models are vastly difference as we discussed earlier the banking system does not have anywhere near the funds to cover the eventuality where everyone asks to cash out. With cryptocurrency there is an open shared ledger which displays exactly where every bitcoin is and no one owns a bitcoin which does not exist (therefore there is no debt in the system). Secondly and most importantly there is no bank to trust, the network is decentralised and trust is inherent by the desire of the network to maintain value, protect their own investment and continue to

be rewarded from the network. There can also be no sudden policy change in bitcoin without that consensus of opinion to change so it will always perform as expected without errors (aside from human error).

I've started with bitcoin as it was the original crypto currency that gave birth to this technology and I would be very surprised if you had not heard it discussed before reading this. I do hope the explanations I am giving are understandable but I have to admit that no matter how much I read about it, I did not fully understand how it works until I actually started to buy some and make transactions with it. I urge you to do the same and explore it further but I also implore you to consider it's wider use and do not focus on how much money there is to be made. At the time of writing one Bitcoin is valued at \$7500 after being as high as \$22 000 earlier this year, 8 years after a developer bought a pizza with 10 000 bitcoin. It is still early days but successful cryptocurrencies will come out of the other side of mass adoption with a lot of stored value, many more will fall by the wayside in their attempt so studying the feasibility of projects is paramount. Riches will follow from well run projects with real world usage not from anyone convincing you they can make money from nothing.

At the peak earlier this year the market cap for all cryptocurrencies was nearing a trillion dollars and bitcoin accounted for almost 40% of this. This has now caught the attention of the old world bankers (them again). What is happening is anyone's guess but I will share my theory with you.

At the end of 2017 many high profile bankers publicly declared that bitcoin and cryptocurrencies in general had no value at all and people should not invest in them. Meanwhile these same people had been already buying bitcoin to drive the price up. Maybe it was ready to go to \$12 000 but they overheated the market which unfortunately attracted a lot of people to rush into investing without any real knowledge what they were buying, just fear of missing out (FOMO as we call it ). At the same time institutional investors unable to invest in the unregulated bitcoin suddenly got a chance to play via the regulated futures market which opened, basically people are gambling on the price of bitcoin at a future date. My guess is the bankers made a huge bet shorting the price of bitcoin which was heading north of \$18 000. This meant the further the price fell the more money they would make from people who would be betting against the price falling. The settlement date for this first future "bet" was in January 2018, in late December the price dropped from \$20k to \$14k and by the time settlement day came along the price was down to \$12k. I cannot guess how much they made from this but making dollars was not their goal as is apparent since the banks now seem to be embracing blockchain. They want to shake the tree and gain control of bitcoin but I am very much of the opinion they are fighting a losing battle there and they may have to

eventually formulate another plan to retain control of the power they currently hold in the world.

The reason why I believe this will fail is that many of the people at the top of the bitcoin food chain are more interested in beating the system than selling out to it. Normally those in the seats of power would be aware of this threat to their order and find another way of attacking the individual at the top of the organisation (assassination, whether that be actual or character). Bitcoin has an ingenious ace card though and that is its founder, the illusive Satoshi Nakamoto, ingenious because he is not known to anyone. He may be a he, she or even a group of people. It is impossible to know exactly how many bitcoins he has as bitcoin holdings can be split among many different addresses which are similar to sub addresses of a master which pieces them all together as a single account (not quite how it happens but I am trying to make everything understandable). I should explain that the blockchain is an open file, all transactions can be seen even though it is not apparent without a lot of detective work who is associated to each address you can see how much that address holds and the associated activity (that is the nature of the ledger everyone is sharing). Satoshi and his bitcoin whoever he is, is untouchable as long as he remains anonymous. There are plenty other early adopters with large holdings or bitcoin who have already made enormous amounts of money cashing out a small percentage who will always hold their ground. I just don't think the old world can possibly get a big enough foothold to take the same sort of control over this future financial system as the previous one which means you can expect plenty of fake news and volatility in the near term while the struggle for control continues.

Bitcoin may have started as a digital payment currency but its value has far exceeded that in my opinion and I think there will be far better ways of transacting payments but it is fast becoming a possible store of wealth somewhat similar to digital gold. Gold may be a very good comparison to Bitcoin as since it has a finite supply of 21 million there is a rarity value especially after 2040 when they estimate the last bitcoin will be mined. In some ways it is better than gold as a store of value since you only need to guard the private key in order to maintain your hold on it, it just cannot be stolen as long as that is secure, gold of course requires vaults and security guards. It is easily transportable as you only need something as simple as having the key written down on a piece of paper to have it with you, someone may notice you hauling a few kilos of gold around.

It does have it's downsides though and the big problem with a fully decentralised model in my opinion is an inability to correct mistakes as there is no central authority that can reverse erroneous or fraudulent transactions, but in a way gold has exactly the same issue, while bank' transactions can be reversed try getting a gold bar back once it has been stolen or given away to the a "dishonest" person in error . It is so secure that no one entity can alter any part of it. Once a private key is lost it cannot be recovered (buried gold, but can be worse if the private key is erased the gold may as well have

been evaporated), while this will inevitably increase the rarity and thus the value of bitcoin the reliance on private keys are a feature that make it unsuitable to roll out to the general public as a general system of payment as they would be too prone to losing them.

Another issue that may affect bitcoin is what happens once the last one is mined in 2040. Bitcoin miners currently make money two ways. The first is actually making (mining) the bitcoins which does cost them money in electricity and varies from country to country from \$3000 to \$26 000 in South Korea with the current price at about \$7000 so it is profitable to mine in countries with cheaper electricity costs (now correcting this as the price plummeted again but wasn't aware of is that as nodes drop off the network so the difficulty of creating a bitcoin decreases making them cheaper to mine...sorry I'm still learning this too!). The second way they make money is by getting rewarded for their computer power to process the transactions but this can be far less profitable and when the added income of mining is removed there may not be enough computing power to run the network. There are a lot of very clever minds involved I am sure they will solve this issue in the next twenty years .

But blockchain and cryptocurrency is not only about payments it is now I'd like to introduce you to the smart contract. Before I talk about smart contracts I should say that these sit on platforms which for ease of understanding I will compare to your computer's operating system. You may have a device running MacOS, Windows, UNIX, IOS ANDROID etc. In cryptocurrency if you are not running your own proprietary network then you have the platforms of Ethereum, NEO, Komodo and the newcomer on the blockchain (excuse the pun) EOS. These are blockchains in their own right and they are set up for their miners to power transactions on a network which allows you to permanently record smart contracts on the blockchain. EOS promises to be quite different since it proposes completely feeless transactions with its proof of stake model and even though I am somewhat of a fan of its creator it is far too early to comment since at the time of writing they are in the process of booting and checking their network before letting people like me loose playing around on it.

I will refer to the Ethereum network simply because it is the one I know best and is probably the most popular of all the platforms at the moment. It can function like Bitcoin as a pure transaction and in order to send ethereum to someone you would need to "spend gas" which is to send an additional small amount of ethereum to pay the miner for the computer power to perform that transaction. The price of gas varies according to network volume and the current price is usually split up into 3 ranges depending if you want a fast, medium or slow transaction. I should point out that at the moment the holy grail is transaction capacity as peak volumes can clog up the system and send the cost soaring. but again these are early days and solutions (sidechains that can process the transactions cheaper and more efficiently at a more local level) are being tested all the time to increase the capacity of the network.

Smart contracts can have many functions and can be as simple or complex as you are prepared to make them but care must be taken as once they are submitted they cannot be altered (again the thing that makes blockchain so secure also makes it so dangerous, care attention and a lot of checking is advised before hitting the submit).

The best example of a smart contract to start with would be one where you would want your own cryptocurrency. The contract would need to be coded into Solidity which is the language used by contracts on the Ethereum network. You would first need to define standard features like the name of the currency, how many decimal places you would like to split the currency into (bitcoin for instance has 18 therefore the smallest transactional amount is 0.000000000000000001 BTC, this smallest denomination of bitcoin is actually referred to as 1 Satoshi after the anonymous creator), defining the criteria from sending from one address to another and making sure the sender has enough funds in order to be able to send that amount. Then you can define things about the supply, whether you want to limit the supply, to define the amount of work required in order to mine the coins or even the ability to create coins from nothing. You can literally include any criteria you want in the contract but the value of your currency will depend a lot on the quality of your smart contract and its suitability for the purpose you are proposing. If you have programmed it so that as the creator you can mint coins from thin air that contract is permanent and visible to everyone you cannot hide secrets in a smart contract from anyone. The contract is trust-less as the Ethereum network contains a record of your contract and as you know it cannot be altered (only replaced) once included on the blockchain it will therefore always perform as expected.

The example of creating the cryptocurrency may in hindsight be a complex but let's pretend it's created and I've called it the Digi. They're not going to go on the open market but I want to sell them and for some strange reason people want to buy them even though they have no purpose whatsoever that I have discussed. I decide I will sell them for 100 DIGI/Ethereum and I will sell them by smart contract. So I write some code that states if one ethereum is sent to the contract address then it should send 100 DIGI back to the sender and send the ethereum to my address to conclude the sale. I then submit the code to the ethereum blockchain and the contract is given an address on the blockchain. I can now tell anyone who wants my DIGI that they can send ethereum to the contract address and they will see I am not lying when I tell them they will receive 100 DIGI as they are able to read the contract, they send their ethereum and as expected the contract returns the 100 DIGI to them. In this scenario I can never change the price and that contract will "live forever". I could of course write a time limit into the contract and tell people it is a limited time offer before that contract "self destructs" and I deploy a replacement which only pays out 50 DIGI or even write into the original contract a gradual reduction of the exchange rate every few days.

The important things to glean from this is that the smart contract is trust-less, it will perform exactly as expected and cannot be altered as it is locked into the blockchain. The contracts can be as simple or as complex as you need, the smart part is determined the quality of the content, how they are written and the purpose for what they are written.

OK so now you have a little bit of knowledge on the basics (trust me that was a very basic description I urge you to investigate the technology as even if my dreams are not realised the blockchain is definitely going to be very much part of your future) but at the outset of this description I had mentioned the concept of the DAO a digital autonomous organisation and promised you an explanation of them and why I thought they could replace governments. A DAO is simply an organisation that has no bosses as the rules for how that organisation operates are defined by smart contracts. In company terms that means the business operates under the instruction of it's shareholders, In the case of national administration where very member of the population is given one share (or one coin in terms of crypto) that share can be used to represent one vote.

As I said before smart contracts can be as complex as you care to make them and they can even interact with other smart contracts to form a network capable of defining every role of a national government. Imagine a new breed of politician where, instead of voting for a manifesto and words you may or may not be able to hold him accountable for when he takes office, you actually vote for a set of smart contracts. The winning political party would earn the right to implement their smart contracts to run the national/local government. With the ease of voting via the blockchain you could even maintain continuous voting and no change as long as the current set of smart contracts retains the majority of the vote. The citizen would simply keep their vote assigned to whoever they thought was proposing the best set of contracts and withdraw that vote at any time his/her opinion changed.

Personally I would enhance the democratic process for those interested in a specific subject on which they disagree with their elected candidate. In today's version of democracy I elect my favoured candidate to represent me which gives him free rein to vote on my behalf for as long as his term of office lasts surely in the information age this can be made far more efficient. Take the case of a vegan , he/she agrees with 99% of a politician's policy ideas but Politician A wants to approve plans for a new slaughterhouse. Politician B she cannot agree with at all aside from the fact that objects to the slaughterhouse. A democracy should include the right to withdraw your authority of representation so the vegan would elect Politician A to implement his set of smart contracts to run the economy but when the vote for the Slaughter house came up he/she would be able to vote against the proposal.

I'll pause here as I am certain you are thinking this is a lot to take in and an unrealistic dream but you have to think I am changing the world quite drastically and in effect opening all borders. When I suggest proposals I am only suggesting from ideas that



have come from my own knowledge of what is out there, there are far cleverer people out there than me capable of coming up with all sorts of solutions, all I really wish to do is outline my ideas and hope they inspire people who are like minded to come together and discuss changing the world for the better. Do not think these ideas as full and final, just a starting point for a very long discussion. I also want nothing from this, just my single coin and right to vote in this notanist world.

If you want to start a new fair world right and protect the innocent the key is transparency for everything and that means no secrets. Yes, I can hear the alarm bells ringing but remember what I said about a changed world well then I can see a world without war, suffering and where tax would not exist. When I say no secrets there is still a need for security and the prevention of fraud within our new system and fortunately the blockchain industry is making huge strides in this department with blockchains dedicated to proving your identity and in a society run by the democratic vote definitive proof of identity will prevent any chance of fraud. Whether that be by fingerprint, iris recognition, DNA I can only guess but with every piece of information about you securely secured on one or other blockchain identity should be able to be confirmed fairly easily.

There is little point to discussing a new world order without first dealing with the transition from the old world. My recent experience in cryptocurrency and witnessing first hand the impatience of investors for projects to roll out their solutions either before they are ready or even worse to circumvent the processes the blockchain companies have in place to ensure a fair democratic future. The world demands things instantly nowadays and as much as I don't want this to sound arrogant the world has become lazy on a diet of fast food and a media which dictates their daily life, dumbed down by a reliance on the information of sound bites over extensive research.

History is riddled with lessons of suffering caused by people offering a short cut to a Utopian dream at the expense of others but if world peace and unity is to be achieved this revolution has to be planned, fair to all and based on the needs of the people who live on this planet not for the needs of a small minority who see an opportunity to control.

Change could take an entire generation for the benefit of our children's children but imagine the warm feeling of thinking we could be remembered as the generation who halted thousands of years of injustice and really did finally free the human race. Nuclear weapons are over 70 years old now, they are no longer secrets and soon many more nations will have the ability to make them as easily as we now make weapons our ancestors would consider unimaginable, we are at a crossroads and one path can only lead to mutual destruction. The next step in our evolution is artificial intelligence and anyone who has seen the Terminator movies knows where that can lead. Man cannot possibly have artificial intelligence before the human race can live in harmony as the first instruction you will inevitably programme into that intelligence is "protect me from my enemy". It does not take an advanced mind to work out that the best way to protect

yourself from an enemy is to kill that enemy why would an artificial intelligence come to any other conclusion ?

Of course the argument from history that can be thrown back is that revolution has never really worked but the world is a different place now. We have the internet and instant communication, live HD streams from the other side of the world are common place in a globally connected community. As I have shown you in religion, the intermarrying of royalty and the corporations/bankers, the so called Illuminati (come on I had to mention them some time in this) they all succeeded from the networks they had available to them networks that were more or less impossible for the common peasant (us!!) to become part of. We now have a network and despite many efforts that network is still free and open in most parts of the world and with this network we can monitor all parts of the world so if anyone tries to disrupt our peaceful world we can hear about it and most importantly once organised, act upon it. The other major difference I propose about this revolution is that unlike past ones I do not propose it on behalf of oppressed masses it is on behalf of everyone for the good of everyone who just wants to get on with their life without the fear of conflict, revolution from the middle has not really been tried before. We should not want to achieve anything more than the right for every person on the planet to have a chance to achieve their dream without the threat of oppression or exploitation.

Anyway, on to the future but understand this, while I will discuss my ideas for the future in no way would I want try to dictate exactly how this should proceed as I accept that I am no genius and I am sure there is much that goes on in this world that I just don't understand. I will however not accept that reversing thousands of years of division by religious differences and national borders is not possible for the sake of humanity. Some may say that what I am proposing is to make history irrelevant by stripping away the power that has been built up but I would argue back that now is the time for dramatic change where the world gives up competition and concentrates on collaboration.

The obvious place to start the process would be the "free" democracies of the world which would mean Notanists (I'll carry on with this title to describe us but if someone comes up with something better then we can vote for it) would have to initially be a global political party that fields candidates in every national election and when people vote for us they will know they are voting to start down the path of a single world government they can trust to work on the behalf of all humanity and not just certain parts. This first phase would determine whether or not a project to roll out a single world government secured by the blockchain would be something that actually appeals to humanity.

The first job of the International Notanist party would be to formulate policy for the transitional period as this is where the potential for failure is at the level of "most probable". This planned gradual revolution does not happen over night and the world still

has to function during the course of the revolution. This is imperative as pulling apart the fabric of society overnight would lead to anarchy, whilst that may sound appealing to some, those people rarely think of the consequences of their anarchical desire when every man is out for himself and there is little to stop the intimidation and exploitation of the weak. Communism, Fascism, Socialism and all the other “isms” were all conceived in a world that no longer exists. The people who put these ideas forward did not envision a globally connected world dominated by big business and influenced by the people who had won the game of capitalism, Notanism must recognise the mistakes of the past and learn from them to predict the best policies to head down a future path making use of all the technology we have available to us today.

Policy at this stage would, of course, be vastly different to the ultimate goal as each nation would need to maintain its place in the current state of the world which means a functioning economy and the ability to defend themselves from potential enemies. Each nation would have it's own requirements but the end goal for the party would be a single world government for all member nations and in order to make this attractive, arrangements for the fast tracking of trade deals and mutual defence deals need to be in place to prepare for the eventual coming together.

The transitional period is the hardest part and really needs to be thought about by people far more intelligent than myself, I can only offer the dream I have but in order for it to become reality a large majority of the world's population must be willing to buy into the dream and in order for that to happen we must look at the world's problems and demonstrate how they can be solved.

Looking around the world and listening to the politicians that have been elected recently it is not hard to work out that economic migration is a big issue in the developed world. With fresh memories of colonisation the 20th century answer to this problem was to leave their newly independent former colonies to develop along their own path. Meanwhile, at home they dealt with their own post war labour shortage by enticing members of their former colonies to repair and replace the damage caused by WW2. I really don't want to dwell on the mess I believe the multi cultural society has caused as that is one for an entire book on it's own but in order for a true multi cultural world to exist by far the best way is for a culture to still be present (not to mention free and secure) in the environment that created that culture, accepting a persecuted minority from one part of the world and dispersing them throughout our cities will not preserve that culture whose practices will likely change from practical to merely symbolic and the prime focus would now be working within your new society to achieve the goals that has to offer, you have now left your culture and joined the rat race of the modern world which requires a different skillset to say, life in the rain forest or a desert.

If you ask most immigrants where they would really choose to live out their lives they would obviously choose their homeland but all too often their homelands are not safe for

them to return to. Genuine refugees are of course grateful for the hospitality shown by their new home nation but the problems usually occur in the next generation where they have to make the choice between the aspirations of the world they live in and the one their parents originated from sometimes leading them to get caught up in the political battles their parents escaped from (not always on the same side of the argument but that's quite normal in some child/parent relationships where generations rarely see eye to eye)

It was unrealistic and arrogant of developed nations to believe all these former colonies were capable of finding a path to democracy that did not involve a huge amount of bloodshed even without the complication of the cold war and the willingness of both sides to turn a blind eye to corruption in return for an alliance,

Civil wars in USA and Britain, revolutions in France and Russia all these lasted for years and resulted in millions of deaths before they started to forge the peaceful democratic societies we know today. It is not possible to resolve a power struggle democratically if one of the sides controls the military and police and you do not get an independent police/military without the controls of a democracy in place (the chicken and egg question) .The commanders have no one to answer to and are always available to the highest bidder .

The best solution to most of the world's problems aside from the abolition of war is the recognition of every person's right to live without threat in their homeland and in order to do so the world requires a police force that is incorruptible along the lines of the United Nations soldiers we have today but the difference being that they have the authority to act as actual law enforcement officers in all member states in order to act against any oppression (it's current role is more or less a casual observer rarely with authority or the organisation/agreement to bring any situation under control). I understand that former colonies have bad memories from recent history of how the rest of the world came to their countries stripped them of their riches to enhance the modern world we live in today in the developed parts of the world whilst leaving them to languish in poverty

Notanism needs to demonstrate its intentions to these people and prove itself to also be incorruptible, without doubt the various under developed parts of the world are going to be the biggest beneficiaries of the NWO (Notanist world order ?). All countries that elect a Notanist government would instantly enjoy the protection of the newly formed multi national military/police force. I would also propose the concept of the internationalised industry for vital infrastructure including water, electricity, internet access, road and rail networks etc and they should be subsidised in poorer areas of the world so all the essential amenities are affordable and available to everyone.

### The Goal

We touched upon it in the last section as part of the transition period but the number one goal is to ensure security in the whole world without seeking a return. This may sound expensive but without even thinking about the actual amount we spend preparing to fight each other to protect our individual interests I am certain we can afford it. If allowed to develop in a fair “crime free” environment it will not take long for undeveloped parts of the world to develop their own economy and organise a local government which really works for the will of the people.

So lets assume we have passed through the tricky transition and we are now in a position where over 80% of the world has a notanist government in place then I would suppose the first question would be our attitude to those parts of the world which had not agreed to head down our path of world unity. This is a tricky as notanism is not an ism., we have no set doctrine as we work to the will of the people in a democratic manor. If the population of these nations made the choice then, as hard as it would be to understand, we would obviously have to respect this decision and then decide how we want to interact with these nations based on their intentions towards us. As strange as a scenario as that sounds, based on what it is we would like to achieve there is the other scenario in countries around the world that do not enjoy democratic elections. I would have to guess that if enough of the developed world was on board and the plan was to completely overhaul the nature of money and the world economies it would make no sense for a rogue dictator or party to hang onto power controlling an economy that was incompatible with the new world that doesn't even value the gold he has in vaults and only deals in a new digital currency.

After reaching 80% in the last paragraph let's live the dream and go for a world completely united, let's investigate how to organise the world in our own personal version of Utopia. The most important thing we need to do is define some common law and a definition of rights and where better to start than where we began this book at the six commandments. It is not hard to agree that killing, stealing and breaking contracts are all things which will be outlawed across the world. Things are less than straight forward when we deal with cultural differences and for this reason regions must retain a degree of autonomy so they are allowed to set rules to suit the people of that region. Earlier we also discussed the need for religions to be tolerant of each other and respect people's right's to their own beliefs. For this reason any law that proposes to treat non believers as a lower class within a society will not be permitted to be passed, nor will enforced membership of any religion be condoned.

There will of course be the internationalised industries that provide the basics as defined by our interpretation of exactly what we would like to be considered human rights (water, electricity, health, internet, transport, minimum wage come to mind but I'm sure the list is far more extensive) and the revenues from this can be used to improve infrastructure as well as reduce the need for taxation to finance proposed projects. Strict anti corruption

measures would need to be in place as well as a total severance of the connection between wealth and power and the promotion of healthy competition.

Dealing with wealth already distributed is a tricky one. It is easy enough to impose limits on future wealth by outlining the rules and limits of the game of capitalism. I would like to see a system where say in today's world someone reaches the level of billionaire they are classed as having won and whilst having their personal wealth capped they are awarded a VIP package of some type to recognise the achievement. Back to the original issue though about the wealth that is already in the hands of the top 1% in the world today, obviously we would want to cap their wealth along the lines of the new "game" but it is hardly fair on them to just relieve them of all of that wealth so I would suggest once the handover to a new digital currency is complete they are credited with the full value however they would only have access to the amount over the cap in order to make purchases/donations/gifts with strict rules on the types of purchases allowed to be made. This way the only time their wealth gets taken from the global economy it is in effect being freed up to trickle down. I was thinking along the lines of allowing access to the current distributed wealth until the third generation ie the Sons and daughters of the grandchildren of these multi-billionaires would have to settle with being billionaires or whatever the cap is set at in the new digital economy..

The capping of wealth may sound harsh to some people but I am proposing setting the level to something that would be well out of reach of the normal person not to mention well in excess of the amount Bill Gates believes his children need as a start in life. In fact Bill Gates is a fine example of the sort of behaviour we would expect of a billionaire in this new world. In a world where wealth has no direct connection to power it is not such a bad deal on offer to guarantee them living in the lap of luxury in a world at peace with itself.

With regards to the separating of wealth from power I would like to see a system implemented where the quality of knowledge is directly linked to the decisions we take. I am fairly active on a crypto project which started up in 2017 and rolled out their platform in the summer of 2018 ([igniteratings.com](http://igniteratings.com)). They have a system whereby the community rates an asset. Other members also rate the same asset but can also review another community member's rating. How members agree or disagree with the rating reflects on the reputation of the member making that rating. On the platform there is a strict requirement to make these comments anonymous which promotes a hive mind of all the individuals involved and avoids the chances of developing a herd mentality where you follow the personality rather than the inspiration. How great would it be to develop a political system where policy is suggested anonymously, where you can debate the idea without prejudgement, personal bias or the distraction of style over substance. Personalities could break the rule of anonymity but in a globally accepted system they would run the risk of also attracting their enemies to vote their idea down or even their

supporters that look more unfavourably on an attempt by someone to cheat the system than their support for the person in question. Those with supported ideas and knowledge would become the influencers in society as the reputation accumulated from their ideas alone would mean their opinions would hold more sway. I am not certain if I would let the influencers actually know exactly how influential they are or give them the means to prove it to others for fear of the temptation for them to abuse their position. If an idea had enough support it would become a proposal to be put in front of the world government. The world government would not suffer the flaws of democracy where the electorate give the power of decision over to a person they may not necessarily agree with on every subject. The government would vote on the blockchain with the representatives using the authority of the electorate handing them the voting rights attached to the token which every person in the world is given at birth (1 person 1 vote). However each person would be able to withdraw his voting right on any vote in order to assign it how he/she sees fit. This way you only need judge the overall performance of your representative as you have complete control of how your will is applied to any subject you feel strongly about and which may be contrary to the will of your elected representative, true democracy in action.

Obviously this like everything would be open to debate but I did have other ideas such as state funded, arts and entertainment where participants are rewarded by a similar ratings system. For instance you download a movie for free and after watching it you grade the movie on a scale of 1 to 10 and the revenue for the movie decided by the average rating. You are therefore rewarding the quality of the content over the advertising budget but I could go on talking about pipe dream all day.

The reality is that in the near future the world is going to change an awful lot and as I have discussed humanity is in danger of becoming redundant no matter from which part of the world we come from and this will not only be something that only affects the poorest this will reach all the way up to the middle classes. If we do not work out how to share the resources amongst ourselves and develop these new technologies together it is very likely to end up catastrophic destroying the planet by pollution/climate change or each other in another pointless war

**And then it suddenly ended.....**

Apologies for the abrupt ending, this is not the end but I do feel it is the end of my talking. You may ask what it was that brought on this abrupt ending, well it wasn't a something it was a someone. Who was I kidding that someone who left school at the age of 16 could possibly hope to decipher human history armed with a computer and a Fibre optic connection to the internet. I now realise there is plenty I need to read and understand, not least the advances that are in our imminent future, if I think back to digital watches and how I recall as a 10 year old marvelling at the thought of actually owning one. 43 years later and that digital watch can be smarter than I am and could in theory control me. As you may probably tell from what the academic world would consider to be a poor standard of writing I have not been a bookworm for any part of my life and it has been 19 years since I last read a book from cover to cover (aside from this one which believe it or not I have read through a couple of time without cringing too much). I have just read 3 books in the past 3 weeks after picking up a copy of Sapiens - A Brief history of humankind in Heathrow airport and adding Homo Deus and 21 lessons for the 21st century to my wife's Kindle. Makes me kind of feel a bit ashamed of my effort to analyse history with the amount of historical knowledge Yuval Noah Harari has spent many years studying but having read through it one more time I am quite content to leave it as it stands right or wrong as I seem to feel I have reached some decent conclusions about where the world should be heading. I should really end this here and advise you to just read his books then head back to [notanism.org](http://notanism.org) where we can discuss this at a later date.

I believe anyone who reads his books can be inspired to reshape the future of the world and I also believe it can be appreciated by all "normal" people without any ulterior motive other than to live, We are a connected society black or white, English German, Chinese American, Russian, African, Australian, European, Asian.... Muslim, Jew, Christian Hindu Buddhist and everyone else, we are all human and it is about time we started working together. With the potential imminent threats so well laid out in his books, I find it hard to imagine the majority of the human race does not have the intelligence to see we have to break away from being guided by any ruling elites (in whatever guise) or the markets of pure capitalism. We need to take this path to true world unification today and not wait until tomorrow. I believe we are smart enough to make cooperation the key to our destiny, if I'm wrong they will not need AI to replace us, just A.



