

Spiknutí z první světové války

 corbettreport.com/wwi

Corbetta

Sledujte na [Archiv](#) / [BitChute](#) / [LBRY](#) / [Minds](#) / [YouTube](#) nebo [si stáhněte mp4](#)

O čem byla první světová válka? Jak to začalo? Kdo vyhrál? A co vyhráli? Nyní, 100 let poté, co zazněly poslední výstřely, tyto otázky stále lámou hlavu historikům i laikům. Ale jak uvidíme, tento zmatek není náhoda historie, ale vlna, která nám byla přetažena přes oči, aby nám zabránila vidět, jaká první světová válka skutečně byla. Toto je příběh první světové války, který jste nečetli v historických knihách. Toto je The WWI Conspiracy.

[KLIKNĚTE ZDE](#) pro německý překlad tohoto dokumentu.

PŘEPIS

Přejít na [část jedna](#) / [část druhá](#) / [část třetí](#)

ČÁST PRVNÍ: ZAČÍT VÁLKU

Sledujte na [BitChute](#) / [DTube](#) / [LBRY](#) / [YouTube](#) nebo si stáhněte [MP3 AUDIO](#) nebo [MP4 VIDEO](#)

[KLIKNĚTE ZDE](#) pro italský překlad tohoto videa

ÚVOD

11. listopadu 1918.

Na celé západní frontě odbíjely hodiny, které měly to štěstí, že unikly čtyřem letům ostřelování, jedenáctou hodinu. A tím skončila první světová válka.

Od 10 hodin do 11 – hodiny pro zastavení bojů – nepřátelské baterie prostě vyvolaly peklo. Ani dělostřelecká předehra k našemu postupu do Argonny na tom nic neměla. Pokusit se o postup nepřicházelo v úvahu. Nebyla to baráž. Byla to záplava.

[. . .]

Nikdy mě nenapadlo nic tak elektrického, jako náhlé zastavení, které přišlo v 11:00. Bylo přesně 10:60 a — řev ustal, jako když motorový vůz narazí do zdi. Výsledné ticho bylo ve srovnání s tím neskutečné. Někde hluboko pod zemí se začali objevovat Němci. Vyšplhali na zábradlí a začali divoce křičet. Házeli k nám své pušky, klobouky, bandoleery, bajonety a zákopové nože. Začali zpívat.

— Poručík Walter A. Davenport, 101. pěší pluk, americká armáda

A stejně tak byl konec. Čtyři roky nejkrvavějšího masakru, jaký kdy svět viděl, se zastavily stejně náhle a matoucí jako jeho začátek. A svět přísahal „Už nikdy více“.

Každý rok pokládáme věnec. Slyšíme „Poslední příspěvek“. Slova „nikdy více“ vyslovujeme jako zaklínadlo. Ale co to *znamená* ?

Abychom na tuto otázku odpověděli, musíme pochopit, co to *byla* první světová válka .

WWI byla exploze, zlomový bod v historii. V doutnající skořápkové díře tohoto velkého kataklyzmatu ležel optimismus průmyslové éry nekonečného pokroku. Staré pravdy o slávě války ležely rozházené po bitevních polích oné „Velké války“ jako padlý voják, který byl ponechán zemřít v Zemi nikoho, a spolu s tím ležely všechny zlomené sny o světovém řádu, který byl zničen. Ať už to víme nebo ne, my zde v 21. století stále žijeme v kráteru oné exploze, oběti první světové války, které teprve nyní začínáme rozumět.

O čem byla první světová válka? Jak to začalo? Kdo vyhrál? A co vyhráli? Nyní, 100 let poté, co zazněly poslední výstřely, tyto otázky stále lámou hlavu historikům i laikům. Ale jak uvidíme, tento zmatek není náhoda historie, ale vlna, která nám byla přetažena přes oči, aby nám zabránila vidět, jaká první světová válka skutečně byla.

Toto je příběh první světové války, který jste nečetli v historických knihách. Toto je **The WWI Conspiracy** .

ČÁST PRVNÍ – ZAČÍT VÁLKU

28. června 1914.

Arcivévoda František Ferdinand, následník rakousko-uherského trůnu, a jeho manželka Sophie jsou v Sarajevu na vojenské inspekci. Zpětně je to riskantní provokace, jako vhození zápalky do sudu s prachem. Srbský nacionalismus stoupá, Balkán se zmítá ve zmatku diplomatických krizí a regionálních válek a napětí mezi královstvím Srbska a Rakousko-Uherskem se má přelít.

Ale navzdory varováním a špatným znamením je bezpečnost královského páru extrémně laxní. Nastoupí do otevřeného sportovního vozu a pokračují v koloně šesti vozů po předem ohlášené trase. Po prohlídce vojenských kasáren se vydávají směrem k radnici na plánované přijetí u starosty. Návštěva probíhá přesně podle plánu a přesně podle plánu.

A pak vybuchne bomba.

Jak nyní víme, kolona byla smrtelná past. Toho rána lemovalo cestu královského páru šest vrahů, ozbrojených bombami a pistolemi. První dva neuspěli, ale třetí, Nedeljko Čabrinović, zpanikařil a hodil svou bombu na složený zadní kryt arcivévodova kabrioletu. Odrazilo se na ulici a explodovalo pod dalším vozem v koloně. Franz Ferdinand a jeho manželka byli nezraněni spěcháni k radnici a míjeli ostatní atentátníky na trase příliš rychle, než aby mohli jednat.

Když arcivévoda jen o vlásek unikl smrti, odvolal zbytek svého naplánovaného itineráře, aby navštívil zraněné z bombardování v nemocnici. Řidič pozoruhodným zvratem osudu svezl dvojici špatnou trasou, a když mu bylo nařízeno zařadit zpětný chod, zastavil vůz

přímo před lahůdkářstvím, kam odešel potenciální atentátník Gavrilo Princip poté, co selhal ve své misi podél silnice. kolona. Tam, jeden a půl metru před Principem, byl arcivévoda s manželkou. Vystřelil dva, oba je zabil.

Ano, dokonce i oficiální historické knihy – knihy napsané a vydané „vítězi“ – uvádějí, že první světová válka začala jako výsledek spiknutí. Koneckonců to bylo – jak se učí všichni prváci – spiknutí s cílem zavraždit arcivévodu Františka Ferdinanda, které vedlo k vypuknutí války.

Tento příběh, oficiální příběh o počátcích 1. světové války, je již dostatečně známý: V roce 1914 byla Evropa propleteným strojkem aliancí a plánů vojenské mobilizace, které, jakmile se daly do pohybu, nevyhnutelně tikaly směrem k úplnému válčení. Atentát na arcivévodu byl pouze záminkou k uvedení hodinového stroje do pohybu a výsledná „červencová krize“ diplomatických a vojenských eskalací vedla s dokonalou předvídatelností ke kontinentální a nakonec i globální válce. V této pečlivě vyčištěné verzi historie začíná první světová válka v Sarajevu 28. června 1914.

Ale tato oficiální historie vynechává tolik skutečného příběhu o nastolení války, že se rovná lži. Ale jedna věc je správná: První světová válka *byla* výsledkem spiknutí.

Abychom pochopili toto spiknutí, musíme se obrátit nikoli na Sarajevo a konkláve srbských nacionalistů plánujících jejich atentát v létě 1914, ale do chladného salonu v Londýně v zimě roku 1891. Tam tři z nejvýznamnějších mužů té doby – muži, jejichž jména si dnes jen matně pamatujeme – podnikají první konkrétní kroky k vytvoření tajné společnosti, o které mezi sebou léta diskutovali. Skupina, která vzejde z tohoto setkání, bude dále využívat bohatství a moc svých členů k utváření běhu dějin a o 23 let později zažene svět do první skutečně globální války.

Jejich plán zní jako výstřední historická fikce. Vytvoří tajnou organizaci věnovanou „rozšíření britské vlády po celém světě“ a „konečnému obnovení Spojených států amerických jako nedílné součásti britského impéria“. Skupina má být strukturována podle řeholního bratrstva (jezuitský řád je opakovaně uváděn jako vzor) rozděleného do dvou kruhů: vnitřního kruhu zvaného „Spolek vyvolených“, který má řídit činnost větší, vnější kruh, nazvaný „Sdružení pomocníků“, kteří nemají vědět o existenci vnitřního kruhu.

„Britská vláda“ a „vnitřní kruhy“ a „tajné společnosti“. Kdyby byl tento plán předložen dnes, mnozí by řekli, že jde o dílo nápaditého spisovatele komiksů. Ale tři muži, kteří se toho zimního odpoledne roku 1891 sešli v Londýně, nebyli pouhými spisovateli komiksů; patřili k nejbohatším a nejvlivnějším mužům v britské společnosti a měli přístup ke zdrojům a kontaktům, aby se tento sen stal skutečností.

Na schůzce toho dne byli přítomni: William T. Stead, slavný redaktor novin, jehož *Pall Mall Gazette* se prosadil jako průkopník bulvární žurnalistiky a jehož *Review of Reviews* mělo obrovský vliv v celém anglicky mluvícím světě; Reginald Brett, později známý jako Lord Esher, historik a politik, který se stal přítelem, důvěrníkem a poradcem královny Viktorie, krále Edwarda VII. a krále Jiřího V., a který byl známý jako jedna z hlavních mocností stojících za trůnem jeho éra; a Cecil Rhodes, nesmírně bohatý diamantový magnát, jehož činy v Jižní Africe a ambice přeměnit africký kontinent by mu tehdejšími satiriky vynesly přezdívku „Colossus“.

Ale Rhodesovy ambice nebyly k smíchu. Jestli měl někdo na světě v té době sílu a schopnosti vytvořit takovou skupinu, byl to Cecil Rhodes.

Richard Grove, historický výzkumník a autor, TragedyAndHope.com.

RICHARD GROVE : Cecil Rhodes byl také z Británie. Získal vzdělání v Oxfordu, ale do Oxfordu šel až poté, co odešel do Jižní Afriky. Měl staršího bratra, kterého následuje do Jižní Afriky. Starší bratr pracoval v diamantových dolech, a než se tam Rhodes dostane, už to má připravené a jeho bratr říká: „Půjdu kopat do zlatých dolů. Právě našli zlato!“ A tak nechává Cecila Rhodese, svého mladšího bratra – kterému je asi 20 let – s celou touto operací na těžbu diamantů. Rhodes pak jde do Oxfordu, vrací se dolů do Jižní Afriky s pomocí lorda Rothschilda, který měl finanční úsilí za De Beersem a využil této situace. A odtud začnou používat to, co – neexistuje jiný termín než „otrocká práce“, který se později změní v politiku apartheidu v Jižní Africe.

GERRY DOCHERTY : No, Rhodos byl obzvláště důležitý, protože v mnoha ohledech na konci 19. století vážně ztělesnil, kde je kapitalismus [a] kde skutečně leží bohatství.

Gerry Docherty, vědec z první světové války a spoluautor knihy *Hidden History: The Secret Origins of the First World War* .

DOCHERTY : Rhodes měl peníze a měl kontakty. Byl to velký Rothschild a jeho hornické bohatství bylo doslova nevyčísitelné. Chtěl se spojit s Oxfordem, protože Oxford mu dal čest univerzitě vědění, takové moci.

A ve skutečnosti to bylo soustředěno na velmi tajném místě zvaném „All Souls College“. Přesto najdete mnoho odkazů na All Souls College a „lidé za oponou“ a takové fráze [jako] „moc za trůny“. Rhodes byl ústředním bodem při hromadění peněz, aby začal shromažďovat stejně smýšlející lidi s velkým vlivem.

Rhodes se neostýchal svých ambicí a jeho záměry vytvořit takovou skupinu byly mnohým známy. Během svého krátkého života Rhodes otevřeně diskutoval o svých záměrech s mnoha svými společníky, kteří v té době nepřekvapivě patřili mezi nejvlivnější postavy britské společnosti.

Co je pozoruhodnější, tato tajná společnost – která měla ovládat svou moc za trůnem – nebyla vůbec tajemstvím. *The New York Times* dokonce publikoval článek pojednávající o založení skupiny ve vydání listu z 9. dubna 1902, krátce po Rhodesově smrti.

Článek s titulkem „Ideál anglosaské velikosti pana Rhodese“ a s pozoruhodným podtitulem „Věřil, že bohatá tajná společnost by měla pracovat na zajištění světového míru a Britsko-americké federace“,

shrnující tento senzační plán poznámkou že Rhodův „nápad na rozvoj anglicky mluvící rasy byl základem „společnosti okopírované, pokud jde o organizaci, od jezuitů.“ Poznává, že jeho vize zahrnovala sjednocení „Shromáždění Spojených států a naší Dolní sněmovny, aby dosáhnout ‚míru ve světě‘,“ cituje článek Rhodes, který říká: „Jediná věc, která je proveditelná k uskutečnění této myšlenky, je tajná společnost postupně absorbující bohatství světa.“

Tato myšlenka je vyjádřena černobíle v řadě závětí, které Rhodes psal po celý svůj život, závětí, které nejen vytyčily jeho plán na vytvoření takové společnosti a poskytly k tomu finanční prostředky, ale co je ještě pozoruhodnější, byly shromážděny . ve svazku vydaném po jeho smrti spoluspiklencem Williamem T. Steadem.

GROVE : Rhodes také zanechal své velké množství peněz – neměl žádné děti, neoženil se, zemřel v mladém věku – zanechal je ve velmi dobře známé poslední vůli a závěti, z nichž bylo několik různých vydání jmenujících různé dobrodince, jmenovat různé exekutory.

A tak v roce 1902 Cecil Rhodes umírá. Vyšla kniha, která obsahuje jeho poslední vůli. Muž, který napsal knihu, William T. Stead, měl na starosti britskou publikaci s názvem *The Review of Reviews* . Byl součástí skupiny Rhodos' Round Table. Svého času byl vykonavatelem závěti a v té závěti stojí, že běduje nad ztrátou Ameriky od Britského impéria a že by měli zformulovat tajnou společnost s konkrétním cílem přivést Ameriku zpět do Impéria. Potom vyjmenuje všechny země, které musí zahrnout do tohoto seznamu, aby měli světovou nadvládu, aby měli anglicky mluvící unii, aby britská rasa byla vynucenou kulturou ve všech zemích po celém světě.

Vůle obsahuje cíl. Cíl je v průběhu řady let upravován a podporován a využíván k získání podpory. A pak, když v roce 1902 zemře, je tu financování, plán, agenda, pracovní skupiny a všechno se to spustí a pak se to ujme. A za nedlouho později máte první světovou válku a z ní druhou světovou válku a pak máte století kontroly a otroctví, kterému se opravdu dalo zabránit.

Když se v době Rhodosovy smrti v roce 1902 tato „tajná“ společnost rozhodla částečně odhalit, učinila tak pod rouškou míru. Trvali na tom, že svou skupinu vytvořili pouze proto, že toužili po světovém míru, a

pouze z nejušlechtilejších důvodů se snažili „postupně absorbovat bohatství světa“.

Ale na rozdíl od tohoto pacifického veřejného obrazu se skupina od samého počátku zajímala především o válku. Ve skutečnosti jedním z prvních kroků tohoto „kulatého stolu na Rhodu“ (jak jej někteří znali) bylo vmanévrování Britského impéria do války v Jižní Africe. Tato „búrská válka“ z let 1899–1902 by sloužila dvojímu účelu: sjednotila by nesourodé republiky a kolonie Jižní Afriky do jediné jednotky pod britskou imperiální kontrolou a ne náhodou by přinesla bohatá naleziště zlata v Transvaalu. Republic na oběžnou dráhu Rothschildy/Rhodos kontrolované British South Africa Company.

Válka, jak skupina sama přiznala, byla čistě její zásluhou. Hlavním mužem operace byl Sir Alfred Milner, blízký spolupracovník Rhodosu a člen užšího kruhu tajné společnosti, který byl tehdy guvernérem britské Kapské kolonie. Alfred Milner (později 1. vikomt Milner) byl dnes možná nejdůležitější osobností v Británii na úsvitu 20. století. Od Rhodesovy smrti v roce 1902 se stal neoficiálním vedoucím skupiny u kulatého stolu a řídil její operace, přičemž využil obrovské bohatství a vliv exkluzivního členství ve skupině pro své vlastní cíle.

U Milnera neexistovaly žádné výčitky svědomí ani morální lomcování ohledně metod používaných k dosažení těchto cílů. V dopise lordu Robertsovi se Milner mimoděk přiznal, že připravil búrskou válku: „Urychlil jsem krizi, která byla nevyhnutelná, dřív, než bylo příliš pozdě. Není příliš příjemné a v mnoha očích nepříliš chvályhodné podnikání, které z velké části přispělo k rozpoutání války.“

Když Rhodesův spolumyslník a člen vnitřního kruhu tajné společnosti William Stead vznesl námitky proti válce v Jižní Africe, Rhodes mu řekl: „Podpoříte Milnera v jakékoli míře, v níž se může vyhnout válce.“

Žádné takové omezení nedělám. Milnera naprosto bez výhrad podporuji. Říká-li mír, říkám mír; když říká válka, říkám válka. Ať se stane cokoliv, říkám totéž Milnerovi."

Búrská válka, zahrnující nepředstavitelnou brutalitu – včetně smrti 26 000 žen a dětí v prvních (britských) koncentračních táborech na světě – skončila tak, jak Rhodes a jeho společníci zamýšleli: dříve samostatné části Jižní Afriky byly sjednoceny pod britskou kontrolou. Možná ještě důležitější z pohledu tajné společnosti to ponechalo Alfreda Milnera jako Vysokého komisaře nové jihoafrické státní služby, pozici, ze které by vypěstoval tým bystrých, mladých, převážně v Oxfordu vzdělaných mužů, kteří budou pokračovat sloužit skupině a jejím cílům.

A od konce búrské války se tyto cíle stále více soustředily kolem úkolu odstranit to, co Milner a kulatý stůl vnímali jako jedinou největší hrozbu pro Britské impérium: Německo.

DOCHERTY : Takže na začátku to byl vliv – lidé, kteří mohli ovlivnit politiku, lidé, kteří měli peníze na ovlivnění státníků – a sen. Sen o skutečném rozdrčení Německa. Toto bylo základní myšlení této skupiny, když se shromáždila.

Německo. V roce 1871 se dříve samostatné státy dnešního Německa sjednotily do jediné říše pod vládou Wilhelma I. Konsolidace a industrializace sjednoceného Německa zásadně změnila poměr sil v Evropě. Na úsvitu 20. století se Britské impérium ocitlo v nepořádku se svými tradičními francouzskými nepřáteli nebo svými dlouholetými ruskými rivaly o nadvládu nad Evropou, ale s povýšeným Německým impériem. Ekonomicky, technologicky, dokonce i vojensky; pokud by trendy pokračovaly, netrvalo by dlouho a Německo by začalo soupeřit s Britským impériem a dokonce ho předčí.

Pro Alfreda Milnera a skupinu, kterou kolem sebe vytvořil ze staré společnosti Rhodského kulatého stolu, bylo zřejmé, co je třeba udělat: změnit Francii a Rusko z nepřátel na přátele jako způsob izolace a

nakonec i rozdrčení Německa. .

Peter Hof, autor *knihy Dva Edwardové: Jak král Edward VII a ministr zahraničí Sir Edward Gray podnítli první světovou válku* .

PETER HOF : Ano, z britského pohledu se Německo po sjednocení v roce 1871 velmi rychle stalo velmi silným. A postupem času to Brity stále více znepokojovalo a začali si myslet, že Německo představuje výzvu pro jejich světovou hegemonii. A pomalu, ale jistě dospěli k rozhodnutí, že Německu je třeba čelit, stejně jako ke stejnému rozhodnutí ve vztahu k jiným zemím – Španělsku a Portugalsku a především Francii a nyní Německu.

Německé hotové výrobky byly o něco lepší než ty britské, stavěli lodě, které byly o něco lepší než ty britské, a to všechno. Britská elita velmi pomalu dospěla k rozhodnutí, že Německu je třeba čelit, dokud je to ještě možné. Možná by to nebylo možné udělat, kdyby čekali příliš dlouho. A tak vykrytalizovalo rozhodnutí.

Myslím, že Británie možná přijala německou nadvládu, ale měla něco, co bylo blízko, a to byla Francouzsko-ruská aliance. A mysleli si, že pokud se dokážou připojit k této alianci, pak mají možnost porazit Německo rychle a bez větších problémů. A to je v podstatě to, co udělali.

Ale vytvořit alianci se dvěma z největších britských rivalů a obrátit veřejné mínění proti jednomu z jejich nejdražších kontinentálních přátel nebyl žádný oříšek. K tomu by nebylo zapotřebí nic menšího, než aby se Milner a jeho skupina zmocnili kontroly nad tiskem, armádou a veškerou diplomatickou mašinérií Britského impéria. A to je přesně to, co udělali.

K prvnímu velkému převratu došlo v roce 1899, když byl Milner stále v Jižní Africe a zahájil búrskou válku. Ten rok Milner Group sesadila Donalda Mackenzie Wallace, ředitele zahraničního oddělení v *The Times* , a dosadila svého muže, Ignatius Valentine Chirol. Chirol, bývalý zaměstnanec ministerstva zahraničí s vnitřním přístupem k tamním úředníkům, nejen pomohl zajistit, aby jeden z nevlivnějších tiskových orgánů Říše točil všechny mezinárodní akce ve prospěch tajné společnosti, ale pomohl připravit jeho blízkého osobního přítele

Charlese Hardinga, aby v roce 1904 převzal klíčový post velvyslance v Rusku a v roce 1906 ještě důležitější post stálého podtajemníka na ministerstvu zahraničí.

S Hardingem měla Milnerova skupina nohu ve dveřích na britském ministerstvu zahraničí. Ale potřebovali víc než jen nohu v těch dveřích, pokud měli vyvolat svou válku s Německem. Aby dokončili převrat, potřebovali dosadit jednoho ze svých jako ministra zahraničí. A se jmenováním Edwarda Graye ministrem zahraničí v prosinci 1905 se přesně to stalo.

Sir Edward Gray byl cenným a důvěryhodným spojencem Milner Group. Sdílel jejich protiněmecké cítění a ve své důležité pozici ministra zahraničí neprojevoval vůbec žádné výčitky svědomí, pokud jde o používání tajných dohod a nepřiznaných spojení k dalšímu nachystání půdy pro válku s Německem.

HOF : Stal se ministrem zahraničí v roce 1905, domnívám se, a ministrem zahraničí ve Francii byl samozřejmě Delcassé. A Delcassé byl velmi protiněmecký a byl velmi zapálený pro obnovu Alsaska-Lotrinska, a tak se s králem velmi dobře trefili. A Edward Gray sdílel tento protiněmecký pocit s králem – jak jsem ve své knize vysvětlil, jak k takovému postoji k Německu přišel. Ale v každém případě měl stejný postoj ke králi. Spolupracovali velmi dobře. A Edward Gray velmi otevřeně uznal těžkou roli, kterou král hrál v britské zahraniční politice, a řekl, že to není problém, protože on a král se ve většině otázek shodli, a tak se jim velmi dobře spolupracovalo.

Díly už začínaly zapadat na místo pro Milnera a jeho společníky. S Edwardem Grayem jako ministrem zahraničí, Hardingem jako jeho neobvykle vlivným podsekretářem, Rhodesův spoluspiklenec lord Esher dosazený do funkce zástupce guvernéra hradu Windsor, kde měl králův sluch, a samotného krále – jehož neobvyklý, praktický přístup k zahraniční diplomacie a vlastní nenávisť manželky k Němcům se dokonale shodovala s cíli skupiny – diplomatická scéna byla připravena pro vytvoření Trojité dohody mezi Francií, Ruskem a Velkou Británií. S Francií na západě a Ruskem na východě vytvořila anglická tajná diplomacie dvě kleště německého drtícího svěráku.

Vše, co bylo potřeba, byla událost, kterou mohla skupina roztočit ve svůj prospěch, aby připravila obyvatelstvo na válku proti svým bývalým německým spojencům. Vlivní agenti skupiny v britském tisku se znovu a znovu během desetiletí vedoucího k „Velké válce“ snažili proměnit každý mezinárodní incident v další příklad německého nepřátelství.

Když vypukla rusko-japonská válka, Londýnem se šířily zvěsti, že to byli ve skutečnosti Němci, kdo rozvířil nepřátelství. Vycházela z teorie, že Německo – ve snaze zažehnout konflikt mezi Ruskem a Anglií, která nedávno uzavřela spojení s Japonci – rozdmýchalo válku mezi Ruskem a Japonskem. Pravda byla samozřejmě téměř přesně opačná. Lord Lansdowne vedl tajná jednání s Japonskem před podepsáním formální smlouvy v lednu 1902. Poté, co Japonsko vyčerpalo své rezervy při budování armády, obrátilo se Japonsko na spoluspiklence Cecila Rhodese, lorda Nathana Rothschilda, aby financoval samotnou válku. Britové odepřeli ruskému námořnictvu přístup k Suezskému průplavu a vysoce kvalitnímu uhlí, které *poskytli* Japoncům, a udělali vše, co bylo v jejich silách, aby zajistili, že Japonci rozdrť ruskou flotilu a účinně odstraní svého hlavního evropského konkurenta na Dálném východě. Japonské námořnictvo bylo dokonce postaveno v Británii, ale tato fakta se nedostala do Milnerem kontrolovaného tisku.

Když Rusové v roce 1904 „náhodou“ vystřelili na britské rybářské trawlery v Severním moři, přičemž zabili tři rybáře a několik dalších zranili, britská veřejnost byla pobouřena. Spíše než vybičovat pobouření se však *The Times* a další mluvčí tajné společnosti místo toho pokusili incident překrýt. Mezitím se britské ministerstvo zahraničí ohavně pokusilo obvinít z incidentu Němce a odstartovalo hořkou tiskovou válku mezi Británií a Německem.

Nejnebezpečnější provokace tohoto období se soustředily kolem Maroka, kdy se Francie – povzbuzená tajnými vojenskými ujištěními od Britů a podporovaná britským tiskem – zapojila do řady provokací, opakovaně porušujících ujištění pro Německo, že Maroko zůstane svobodné a otevřené vůči Německý obchod. Na každém kroku Milnerovi akolyti, jak ve vládě, tak v britském tisku, fandili Francouzům a démonizovali každou odpověď Němců, skutečnou nebo domnělou.

DOCHERTY : Vzhledem k tomu, že žijeme ve světě územního rozšiřování, došlo k vykonstruovanému incidentu ohledně Maroka a obvinění, že se Německo tajně snažilo převzít britský/francouzský vliv na Maroko. A to bylo doslova nesmysl, ale stalo se to v incidentu a lidem bylo řečeno: „Připravte se! Raději se připrav na možnost války, protože nám ten Kaiser v Berlíně nebude diktovat!"

Jeden z incidentů – na který bych se musel zmínit, abych přesně určil datum – se týkal hrozby. No, bylo to vylíčeno jako hrozba. Nebyla to o nic větší hrozba, jakou by byla moucha, kdyby v tuto chvíli přišla do vašeho pokoje – dělového člunu sedícího u pobřeží Afriky. A údajně to bylo znamení, že ve skutečnosti Německo bude mít hlubinný přístav a oni ho použijí jako odrazový můstek k přerušení britské lodní dopravy. Když jsme to zkoumali, Jim a já jsme zjistili, že velikost toho takzvaného dělového člunu je fyzicky menší než královská jachta anglického krále. Co? Ale historie to vykreslovala jako obrovskou hrozbu pro Britské impérium a jeho „mužnost“, chcete-li – protože tak viděli sami sebe.

Nakonec se marocké krize obešly bez války, protože navzdory nejlepšímu úsilí Milnera a jeho společníků převládly chladnější hlavy. Podobně balkán sestoupil do války v letech před rokem 1914, ale Evropa jako celek s nimi neklesla. Ale jak dobře víme, členové kulatého stolu v britské vládě, v tisku, v armádě, ve financích, v průmyslu a na dalších mocenských a vlivových pozicích nakonec splnili své přání: Franz Ferdinand byl zavražděn a během měsíce byla nastražena past diplomatických aliancí a tajných vojenských dohod, které byly tak pečlivě připraveny. Evropa byla ve válce.

Při zpětném pohledu jsou machinace, které vedly k válce, mistrovskou třídou toho, jak moc ve společnosti skutečně funguje. Vojenské dohody, které zavázaly Británii – a nakonec i svět – k válce, neměly nic

společného s volenými parlamenty nebo zastupitelskou demokracií. Když konzervativní premiér Arthur Balfour v roce 1905 odstoupil, obratné politické manipulace zajistily, že členové kulatého stolu, včetně Herberta Henryho Asquitha, Edwarda Graye a Richarda Haldanea – tři muži, které liberální vůdce Henry Campbell-Bannerman soukromě obvinil z „uctívání Milnerů“ – hladce vklouzl na klíčové posty v nové liberální vládě a pokračoval ve strategii německého obklíčení, aniž by vynechal jediný krok.

Ve skutečnosti byly podrobnosti o vojenských závazcích Británie vůči Rusku a Francii, a dokonce i samotná jednání, záměrně skryty před členy parlamentu a dokonce i před členy kabinetu, kteří nebyli součástí tajné společnosti. Až v listopadu 1911, celých šest let jednání, se kabinet premiéra Herberta Henryho Asquitha začal dozvídat podrobnosti o těchto dohodách, dohodách, které byly opakovaně a oficiálně popírány v tisku i v parlamentu.

This is how the cabal functioned: efficiently, quietly and, convinced of the righteousness of their cause, completely uncaring about how they achieved their ends. It is to *this* clique, not to the doings of any conspiracy in Sarajevo, that we can attribute the *real* origins of the First World War, with the nine million dead soldiers and seven million dead civilians that lay piled in its wake.

But for this cabal, 1914 was just the start of the story. In keeping with their ultimate vision of a united Anglo-American world order, the jewel in the crown of the Milner Group was to embroil the United States in the war; to unite Britain and America in their conquest of the German foe.

Across the Atlantic, the next chapter in this hidden history was just getting underway.

PART TWO: THE AMERICAN FRONT

Watch on [BitChute](#) / [DTube](#) / [LBRY](#) / [YouTube](#) or Download the [MP3 AUDIO](#) or [MP4 VIDEO](#)

[CLICK HERE](#) for an Italian translation of this video

May 7, 1915.

“Colonel” Edward Mandell House is on his way to meet with King George V, who ascended to the throne after Edward VII’s death in 1910. Accompanying him is Edward Grey, British foreign secretary and acolyte of the Milner Group. The two speak “of the probability of an ocean liner being sunk” and House informs Grey that “if this were done, a flame of indignation would sweep across America, which would in itself probably carry us into the war.”

An hour later, at Buckingham Palace, King George V inquires about an even more specific event.

“We fell to talking, strangely enough, of the probability of Germany sinking a trans-Atlantic liner, . . . He said, ‘Suppose they should sink the *Lusitania* with American passengers on board. . . .’”

And, by a remarkable coincidence, at 2:00 that afternoon, just hours after these conversations took place, that is precisely what happened.

The *Lusitania*, one of the largest passenger liners in the world, is en route from New York to Liverpool when it is struck by a torpedo from a German U-boat. She sinks to the bottom in minutes, killing 1,198 passengers and crew, including 128 Americans. The disaster—portrayed as a brazen, unexpected attack on an innocent passenger liner—helps to shift public opinion about the war in the US. To the average American, the war suddenly doesn’t feel like a strictly European concern.

Every aspect of the story was, as we now know, a deception. The *Lusitania* was not an innocent passenger liner but an armed merchant cruiser officially listed by the British Admiralty as an auxiliary war ship. It was outfitted with extra armour, designed to carry twelve six-inch guns, and equipped with shell racks for holding ammunition. On its transatlantic voyage the ship was carrying “war materiel”—specifically, more than four million .303 rifle bullets and tons of munitions, including shells, powder, fuses and gun cotton—“in unrefrigerated cargo holds that were dubiously marked cheese, butter and oysters.” This secret manifest was officially denied by the British government for generation after generation, but in 2014—a full 99 years after the event—internal government documents were finally released in which the government admitted the deception.

And, most remarkably of all, by Edward Mandell House’s own account, both Edward Grey and King George V himself were discussing the sinking of the *Lusitania* just hours before the event took place.

It’s a story that provides a window into the secret society’s years-long campaign to draw the United States into World War I. But in order to understand this story, we have to meet Edward Mandell House and the other Milner Group co-conspirators in America.

Strange as it might seem, there was no shortage of such co-conspirators in the US. Some, like the members of the influential Pilgrim Society, founded in 1902 for the “encouragement of Anglo-American good fellowship”—shared Rhodes’ vision of a united Anglo-American world empire; others were simply lured by the promise of money. But whatever their motivation, those sympathetic to the cause of the Round Table included some of the wealthiest and most powerful people in the United States at the time.

Many of these figures were to be found at the heart of Wall Street, in the banking and financial institutions revolving around J.P. Morgan and Company. John Pierpont Morgan, or “Pierpont” as he preferred to be called, was the nucleus of turn-of-the-century America’s banking sector. Getting his start in London in 1857 at his father’s merchant banking firm, the young Pierpont returned to New York in 1858 and embarked on one of the most remarkable careers in the history of the world.

Making his money financing the American robber barons of the late 19th century—from Vanderbilt’s railroads to Adolph Simon Ochs’ purchase of *The New York Times* to the buyout of Carnegie Steel—Morgan amassed a financial empire that, by the 1890s, wielded more power than the United States Treasury itself. He teamed up with his close allies, the House of Rothschild, to bail out the US government during a gold shortage in 1895 and eased the Panic of 1907 (which he helped to precipitate) by locking 120 of the country’s most prestigious bankers in his library and forcing them to reach a deal on a \$25 million loan to keep the banking system afloat.

As we saw in “Century of Enslavement: The History of the Federal Reserve,” Morgan and his associates were only too happy to use the banking crises they helped to create to galvanize public opinion toward the creation of a central bank. . . so long as that central bank was owned and directed by Wall Street, of course.

But their initial plan, the Aldrich Plan, was immediately recognized as a Wall Street ploy. Morgan and his fellow bankers were going to have to find a suitable cover to get their act through Congress, including, preferably, a President with sufficient progressive cover to give the new “Federal Reserve Act” an air of legitimacy. And they found their ideal candidate in the politically unknown President of Princeton University,

Woodrow Wilson, a man who they were about to rocket straight into the White House with the help of their point man and Round Table co-conspirator, Edward Mandell House.

Richard Grove, TragedyandHope.com.

GROVE: Woodrow Wilson was an obscure professor at Princeton University who, from reading all that I've read about him, wasn't the smartest guy, but he was smart enough to pick up when other people had good ideas and then he bumps into this guy named Colonel House.

Colonel House, he grew up in Beaumont, Texas, and Colonel House's dad was like a Rhett Butler type of smuggler privateer pirate during the Confederate war with the Union. So Colonel House: first of all, he's not a colonel. It's just like a title he gave himself to make him seem more than he was. But he did come from a politically connected family in the South that were doing business with the British during the Civil War. So Colonel House in the early 1900s makes Woodrow Wilson his protégé, and Colonel House himself is being puppeted by a few people in the layers of the Anglo-American establishment above him, and so we are left with the public persona of Woodrow Wilson. And here he is.

And he's got this, you know, this whole new Federal Reserve System that's going to come in during his administration, which was also kind of a precursor to getting America into the war because it changed our financial dependency from being self-reliant and printing our own debt-free money to being indentured to international bankers who charge us as they print money out of thin air and charge future generations for it.

The election of Woodrow Wilson once again shows how power operates behind the scenes to subvert the popular vote and the will of the public. Knowing that the stuffy and politically unknown Wilson would have little chance of being elected over the more popular and affable William Howard Taft, Morgan and his banking allies bankrolled Teddy Roosevelt on a third party ticket to split the Republican vote. The strategy worked and the banker's real choice, Woodrow Wilson, came to power with just forty-two percent of the popular vote.

With Wilson in office and Colonel House directing his actions, Morgan and his conspirators get their wish. 1913 saw the passage of both the federal income tax and the Federal Reserve Act, thus consolidating Wall Street's control over the economy. World War One, brewing in Europe just eight months after the creation of the Federal Reserve, was to be the first full test of that power.

But difficult as it had been for the Round Table to coax the British Empire out of its "splendid isolation" from the continent and into the web of alliances that precipitated the war, it would be that much harder for their American fellow travelers to coax the United States out of its own isolationist stance. Although the Spanish-American War had seen the advent of American imperialism, the thought of the US getting involved in "that European war" was still far from the minds of the average American.

A 1914 editorial from *The New York Sun* captures the sentiment of most of America at the time of the outbreak of the war in Europe:

"There is nothing reasonable in such a war as that for which Europe has been making ready, and it would be folly for this country to sacrifice itself to the frenzy of dynastic policies and the clash of ancient hatreds which is urging the Old World to its destruction."

The Sun was by no means unique in its assessment. A vote taken among 367 newspapers throughout the United States in November of 1914 found just 105 pro-Ally and 20 pro-German papers, with the vast majority—242 of them—remaining firmly neutral and recommending that Uncle Sam stay out of the conflict.

Once again, just as they did in Britain, the cabal was going to have to leverage its control of the press and key governmental positions to begin to shape public perception and instill pro-war sentiment. And once again, the full resources of these motivated co-conspirators were brought to bear on the task.

One of the first shells in this barrage of propaganda to penetrate the American consciousness was the “Rape of Belgium,” a catalogue of scarcely believable atrocities allegedly committed by the German forces in their invasion and occupation of Belgium at the start of the war. In a manner that was to become the norm in 20th century propaganda, the stories had a kernel of truth; there is no doubt that there were atrocities committed and civilians murdered by German forces in Belgium. But the propaganda that was spun from those kernels of truth was so over-the-top in its attempts to portray the Germans as inhuman brutes that it serves as a perfect example of war propaganda.

RICHARD GROVE: The American population at that time had a lot of German people in it. Thirty to fifty percent of the population had relations back to Germany, so there had to be this very clever propaganda campaign. It’s known today as “babies on bayonets.” So if you have no interest in World War I but you think it’s interesting to study propaganda so you don’t get fooled again, then type it into your favorite search engine: “babies on bayonets, World War I.” You’ll see hundreds of different posters where the Germans are bayonetting babies and it brings about emotions and it doesn’t give you the details of anything. And emotions drive wars, not facts. Facts are left out and deleted all the time in order to create wars, so I think that putting facts back in might help prevent wars. But I do know that they like to drive people on emotion. The “babies on bayonets” getting America into World War I, that’s a key part of it.

GERRY DOCHERTY: Children who had their arms chopped off. Nuns that were raped. Shocking things, genuinely shocking things. The Canadian officer who was nailed at St. Andrew’s cross on a church door and left there to bleed to death. These were the great myths peddled in order to defame and bring down the whole image of any justification for German action and try and influence America into war.

Gerry Docherty, co-author of [Hidden History: The Secret Origins of the First World War](#).

DOCHERTY: That's not to say that there weren't atrocities on both sides. War is an atrocious event, and there are always victims. Absolutely. And I offer no justification for it. But the lies, the unnecessary abuse of propaganda.

Even when in Britain they decided that they would put together the definitive volume of evidence to present it to the world, the person they asked to do this just so happened to have been former British ambassador to the United States, a man called Bryce, who was very well-liked in the States. And his evidence was published and put forward and there were screeds of stories after stories. But then later it was discovered that in fact the people who took the evidence hadn't been allowed to speak to any of the Belgians directly but in fact what they were doing is they were listening to a middleman or agents who had supposedly taken these stories.

And when one of the official committee said "Hold on, can I speak to someone directly?" "No." "No?" He resigned. He wouldn't allow his name to be put forward with the [official report]. And that's the extent to which this is false history. It's not even acceptable to call it fake news. It's just disgusting.

The campaign had its intended effect. Horrified by the stories emerging from Belgium—stories picked up and amplified by the members of the Round Table in the British press, including the influential *Times* and the lurid *Daily Mail*, run by Milner ally Lord Northcliffe—American public opinion began to shift away from viewing the war as a European squabble about an assassinated archduke and toward viewing the war as a struggle against the evil Germans and their "sins against civilization."

The culmination of this propaganda campaign was the release of the "Report of the Committee on Alleged German Outrages," better known as "The Bryce Report," compiled for "His Britannic Majesty's Government" and presided over by Viscount James Bryce, who, not coincidentally, was the former British Ambassador to America and a personal friend of Woodrow Wilson. The report was a sham, based on 1,200 depositions collected by examiners who "had no authority to administer an oath." The committee, which was not allowed to speak to a single witness itself, was tasked merely with sifting through this material and deciding what should be included in the final report.

Unsurprisingly, the very real atrocities that the Germans had committed in Belgium—the burning of Louvain, Andenne and Dinant, for example—were overshadowed by the sensationalist (and completely unverifiable) stories of babies on bayonets and other acts of villainy.

The report itself, concluding that the Germans had systematically and premeditatedly broken the “rules and usages of war” was published on May 12, 1915, just five days after the sinking of *The Lusitania*. Directly between these two events, on May 9, 1915, Colonel House—the man whom Wilson called his “second personality” and his “independent self”—wrote a telegram, which the President dutifully read to his cabinet and was picked up by newspapers across the country.

“America has come to the parting of the ways, when she must determine whether she stands for civilized or uncivilized warfare. We can no longer remain neutral spectators. Our action in this crisis will determine the part we will play when peace is made, and how far we may influence a settlement for the lasting good of humanity. We are being weighed in the balance, and our position amongst nations is being assessed by mankind.”

But despite this all-out propaganda assault, the American public was still largely against entering the war. It was in this context that the same group of Wall Street financiers who had maneuvered Wilson into the White House presided over the 1916 presidential election, one that the country knew would decisively conclude America’s neutrality in the war or its decision to send forces to engage in European combat for the first time in history.

The bankers left nothing to chance. Wilson, who would predictably follow House’s lead on all matters including war, was still their preferred candidate, but his competitor, Charles Evan Hughes, was no less of a Wall Street man. Hughes’ roots were as a Wall Street lawyer; his firm represented the New York, Westchester, and Boston Railroad

Company for J.P. Morgan and Company and the Baptist Bible class that he led boasted many wealthy and influential members, including John D. Rockefeller, Jr.

The affable Hughes was stiff competition for the wooden and charmless Wilson, but such was the importance of American neutrality that “He Kept Us Out of War” actually became the central slogan of the campaign that saw Wilson return to the White House.

DOCHERTY: And then, of course, came the famous election of 1916. Wilson wasn't popular, but Wilson, simply—he had no kind of public persona which warmed people. On the contrary, he was a cold fish. He had dubious links with several of those who were powerful in Wall Street. But his propaganda for the election was “He Kept Us Out of War.” “He was a man, vote for Wilson, he kept us out of war.” And then having promised that he would continue to keep America out of war, and in fact of course within months America was *thrown* into the war by its own government.

“He Kept Us Out of War.” But just as in the British election of 1906—which saw the British public overwhelmingly voting for Henry Campbell-Bannerman's Liberal Party and their platform of peace only to get the Milnerites in the cabinet entering secret agreements to bring about war—so, too, was the American public duped at the ballot box in 1916.

In fact, in the fall of 1915, over one year before the election even took place, Wilson's string-puller, Edward Mandell House, was engaged in a secret negotiation with Edward Grey, the Milnerite heading Britain's foreign office. That negotiation—long hidden from the public but finally revealed when House's papers were published in 1928—shows the lengths to which Grey and House were willing to go to draw America into the war on the side of the Allies and against the Germans.

On October 17, 1915, House drafted a letter to Grey which he called “one of the most important letters I ever wrote.” Before sending it, he split it into two separate, coded messages, to ensure it would not be

readable if it were intercepted. In it, he laid out a plan to steer the US into war with Germany under the false pretense of a “peace conference.”

Dear Sir Edward :

. . . In my opinion, it would be a world-wide calamity if the war should continue to a point where the Allies could not, with the aid of the United States, bring about a peace along the lines you and I have so often discussed.

It is in my mind that, after conferring with your Government, I should proceed to Berlin and tell them that it was the President’s purpose to intervene and stop this destructive war, provided the weight of the United States thrown on the side that accepted our proposal could do it.

I would not let Berlin know, of course, of any understanding had with the Allies, but would rather lead them to think our proposal would be rejected by the Allies. This might induce Berlin to accept the proposal, but, if they did not do so, it would nevertheless be the purpose to intervene. . . .

Perhaps realizing the gravity of what was being proposed, Woodrow Wilson, the man who would later be elected for his ability to keep America out of war, merely added the word “probably” to House’s assurance that America would join the war.

The negotiations for this plan continued throughout the fall of 1915 and winter of 1916. In the end, the British government balked at the proposal because the thought that the Germans might actually accept peace—even a peace of disarmament brokered by the US—was not enough. They wanted to crush Germany completely and nothing less than total defeat would be sufficient. Another pretense would have to be manufactured to embroil the US in the war.

When, on the morning of May 7, 1915, House assured Grey and King George that the sinking of the *Lusitania* would cause “a flame of indignation [to] sweep across America,” he was correct. When he said

it would “probably carry us into war,” he was mistaken. But in the end it was the naval issue that eventually became the pretext for America’s entry into war.

The history books of the period, following the familiar pattern of downplaying Allied provocations and focusing only on the German reactions, highlight the German policy of unrestricted submarine warfare which led to the downing of the *Lusitania*. The practice, which called for German U-boats to attack merchant ships on sight, was in contravention of the international rules of the sea at the time, and was widely abhorred as barbaric. But the policy was not instituted out of any insane blood lust on the part of the Kaiser; it was in response to Britain’s own policy of breaking international rules of the sea.

At the outbreak of war in 1914, the British had used their position of naval superiority to begin a blockade of Germany. That campaign, described as “one of the largest and most complex undertakings attempted by either side during the First World War,” involved the declaration of the whole of the North Sea as a war zone. As a so-called “distant blockade,” involving the indiscriminate mining of an entire region of the high seas, the practice was in direct violation of the Declaration of Paris of 1856. The indiscriminate nature of the blockade—declaring the most basic of supplies, like cotton, and even food itself to be “contraband”—was a violation of the Declaration of London of 1909.

More to the point, as an attempt to starve an entire country into submission, it was a crime against humanity. Eventually reduced to a starvation diet of 1,000 calories a day, tuberculosis, rickets, edema and other maladies began to prey on those Germans who did not succumb to hunger. By the end of the war the National Health Office in Berlin calculated that 763,000 people had died as a direct result of the

blockade. Perversely, the blockade did not end with the war. In fact, with Germany's Baltic coast now effectively added to the blockade, the starvation actually continued and even intensified into 1919.

Faced with protestations from the Austrian ambassador about the illegality of the British blockade, Colonel House, now America's de facto president, merely observed: "He forgets to add that England is not exercising her power in an objectionable way, for it is controlled by a democracy."

This double standard was not the exception but the rule when it came to those in America's East coast establishment, who were hungry to see the US join the Allies on the battlefields of Europe. As historian and author Ralph Raico explained in [a 1983 lecture](#), it was these double standards that led directly to America's entry into the war.

RALPH RAICO: The Wilson Administration now takes the position which will ultimately lead to war. The German government is to be held strictly accountable for the death of any Americans on the high seas regardless of circumstances.

The Germans say, "Well let's see if we can live with this. As long as you're willing to put pressure on the British to have them modify their violations of international law—that is, they're placing food on the list of contraband materials, which had never been done before. The British, as you know, take your merchant ships off the high seas on the way to Rotterdam because they say anything that goes to Rotterdam is going to go to Germany, so they take American ships off the high seas. The British have put cotton—cotton!—on the list of contraband, confiscating these materials. They interfere with letters going to the continent because they think there's military intelligence possibly involved. The British are imposing in many ways on Americans. So if you hold them responsible, we'll behave ourselves as far as submarines go."

This was not to be the case, and the attitude of the Americans towards British violations of neutral rights were quite different. One reason is that the American ambassador to London, Walter Hines Page, was an extreme Anglophile. One time, for instance, he gets a message from the State Department saying, "Tell the British they have to stop interfering with American mail shipments to neutral ports. And the American ambassador goes to the British Foreign Minister Edward Grey and says, "Look at the message I've just got from Washington. Let's get together and try to answer this." This was his attitude. The British were never held to the same standard as the Germans.

At home, Theodore Roosevelt, who in previous years had been a great friend of the Kaiser's and a great admirer of Germany, now says we have to get into this war right away. Besides that, there's a campaign for preparedness for building up the American Navy, drilling American citizens in combat techniques. There's a kind of hysteria, really, that travels over the country considering that there's—at this time, certainly—no chance, no chance of some kind of immediate threat to the United States.

And people like Roosevelt and Wilson begin talking in a very unfortunate way. Wilson says, for instance, "In America we have too many hyphenated Americans"—of course he meant German-Americans, Irish-Americans—"and these people are not totally loyal to our country." Already scapegoats are being looked for and public opinion is being roused.

And this diplomatic negotiation, the exchange of memos, goes on for the next few years. In January of 1917, the Americans, not having been able to budge the British in the least on any British violation of American rights; the British blockade intensifying;

the Germans really feeling hunger in a very literal sense, especially the people on the home front; the Kaiser is persuaded by his Admirals and Generals to begin unrestricted submarine warfare around the British Isles.

The American position by this time had solidified, had become a totally rigid one, and when all is said and done, when you go through all of the back-and-forth memoranda and notes and principles established, the United States went to war against Germany in 1917 for the right of Americans to travel in armed belligerent merchant ships carrying munitions through war zones. Wilson's position was that even in that case the Germans simply had no right to attack the ship as long as there are Americans on the ship. Shall I repeat that? Armed belligerent—that is to say, English—armed English merchant ships carrying munitions could not be fired upon by the Germans as long as there were American citizens on board. And it was for the right of Americans to go into the war zone on such vessels that we finally went to war.

SOURCE: The World at War (Ralph Raico).

After months of deliberations and with the situation on the home front becoming increasingly desperate, the German military commanders decided to resume their unrestricted submarine warfare in 1917. As expected, US merchant ships were sunk, including four ships in late March alone. On April 2, 1917, Woodrow Wilson made his historic speech calling for Congress to declare war on Germany and commit US troops to European battlefields for the first time.

The speech, made over one hundred years ago by and for a world that has long since passed away, still resonates with us today. Embedded within it is the rhetoric of warfare that has been employed by president after president, prime minister after prime minister, in country after country and war after war right down to the current day. From it comes many of the phrases that we still recognize today as the language of lofty ideals and noble causes that always accompany the most bloody and ignoble wars.

With a profound sense of the solemn and even tragical character of the step I am taking and of the grave responsibilities which it involves, but in unhesitating obedience to what I deem my constitutional duty, I advise that the Congress declare the recent course of the Imperial German Government to be in fact nothing less than war against the government and people of the United States.

[...]

The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. We have no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been made as secure as the faith and the freedom of nations can make them.

Four days later, on April 6, 1917, the US Congress issued a formal declaration of war against the Imperial German Government.

NARRATOR: Inside the White House, President Woodrow Wilson conferred with advisers and signed the proclamation of war against Germany. [. . .] Everywhere there was cheering and waving of flags. Hindsight or cynicism might make us smile at the thought that this war was sometimes called That Great Adventure. Never again would we see our entry into a major conflict excite so many to such heights of elation. Naive? Probably. But here was a generation of young men not yet saturated by the paralyzing variety of self-analysis and the mock sciences. They believed!

SOURCE: *U.S. ENTERS WORLD WAR I, MILITARY DRAFT – 1917*

All along the Western front, the Allies rejoiced. The Yanks were coming.

House, the Milner Group, the Pilgrims, the Wall Street financiers and all of those who had worked so diligently for so many years to bring Uncle Sam into war had got their wish. And before the war was over, millions more casualties would pile up. Carnage the likes of which the world had never seen before had been fully unleashed.

The trenches and the shelling. The no man's land and the rivers of blood. The starvation and the destruction. The carving up of empires and the eradication of an entire generation of young men.

Why? What was it all for? What did it accomplish? What was the point?

To this day, over 100 years later, we still look back on the horrors of that “Great War” with confusion. For so long we have been told non-answers about incompetent generals and ignorant politicians. “It’s the senselessness of war,” the teachers of this fraudulent and partial history have told us with a shrug.

But, now that the players who worked to set the stage for this carnage have been unmasked, these questions can finally be answered.

PART THREE: A NEW WORLD ORDER

Watch on [BitChute](#) / [DTube](#) / [LBRY](#) / [YouTube](#) or Download the [MP3 AUDIO](#) or [MP4 VIDEO](#)

[CLICK HERE](#) for an Italian translation of this video

February 21, 1916.

A week of rain, wind and heavy fog along the Western Front finally breaks, and for a moment there is silence in the hills north of Verdun. That silence is broken at 7:15 AM when the Germans launch an artillery barrage heralding the start of the largest battle the world had ever seen.

Thousands of projectiles are flying in all directions, some whistling, others howling, others moaning low, and all uniting in one infernal roar. From time to time an aerial torpedo passes, making a noise like a gigantic motor car. With a tremendous thud a giant shell bursts quite close to our observation post, breaking the telephone wire and interrupting all communication with our batteries. A man gets out at once for repairs, crawling along on his stomach through all this place of bursting mines and shells. It seems quite impossible that he should escape in the rain of shell, which exceeds anything imaginable; there has never been such a bombardment in war. Our man seems to be enveloped in explosions, and shelters himself from time to time in the shell craters which honeycomb the ground; finally he reaches a less stormy spot, mends his wires, and then, as it would be madness to try to return, settles down in a big crater and waits for the storm to pass.

Beyond, in the valley, dark masses are moving over the snow-covered ground. It is the German infantry advancing in packed formation along the valley of the attack. They look like a big gray carpet being unrolled over the country. We telephone through to the batteries and the ball begins. The sight is hellish. In the distance, in the valley and upon the slopes, regiments spread out, and as they deploy fresh troops come pouring in. There is a whistle over our heads. It is our first shell. It falls right in the middle of the enemy infantry. We telephone through, telling our batteries of their hit, and a deluge of heavy shells is poured on the enemy. Their position becomes critical. Through glasses we can see men maddened, men covered with earth and blood, falling one upon the other. When the first wave of the assault is decimated, the ground is dotted with heaps of corpses, but the second wave is already pressing on.

This anonymous French staff officer's account of the artillery offensive that opened the Battle of Verdun—recounting the scene as an heroic French communications officer repairs the telephone line to the French artillery batteries, allowing for a counter-strike against the first wave of German infantry—brings a human dimension to a conflict that is beyond human comprehension. The opening salvo of that artillery barrage alone—involving 1,400 guns of all sizes—dropped a staggering 2.5 million shells on a 10-kilometre front near Verdun in northeastern France over five days of nearly uninterrupted carnage, turning an otherwise sleepy countryside into an apocalyptic nightmare of shell holes, craters, torn-out trees, and ruined villages.

By the time the battle finished 10 months later, a million casualties lay in its wake. A million stories of routine bravery, like that of the French communications officer. And Verdun was far from the only sign that the stately, sanitized version of 19th century warfare was a thing of the past. Similar carnage played out at the Somme and Gallipoli and Vimy Ridge and Galicia and a hundred other battlefields. Time and again, the generals threw their men into meat grinders, and time and again the dead bodies lay strewn on the other side of that slaughter.

But how did such bloodshed happen? For what purpose? What did the First World War *mean*?

The simplest explanation is that the mechanization of 20th century armies had changed the logic of warfare itself. In this reading of history, the horrors of World War One were the result of the logic dictated by the technology with which it was fought.

It was the logic of the siege guns that bombarded the enemy from over 100 kilometres away. It was the logic of the poison gas, spearheaded by Bayer and their School for Chemical Warfare in Leverkusen. It was the logic of the tank, the airplane, the machine gun and all of the other mechanized implements of destruction that made mass slaughter a mundane fact of warfare.

But this is only a partial answer. More than just technology was at play in this “Great War,” and military strategy and million-casualty battles were not the only ways that World War One had changed the world forever. Like that unimaginable artillery assault at Verdun, the First World War tore apart all the verities of the Old World, leaving a smouldering wasteland in its wake.

A wasteland that could be reshaped into a New World Order.

For the would-be engineers of society, war—with all of its attendant horrors—was the easiest way to demolish the old traditions and beliefs that lay between them and their goals.

This was recognized early on by Cecil Rhodes and his original clique of co-conspirators. As we have seen, it was less than one decade after the founding of Cecil Rhodes' society to achieve the "peace of the world" that that vision was amended to include war in South Africa, and then amended again to include embroiling the British Empire in a world war.

Many others became willing participants in that conspiracy because they, too, could profit from the destruction and the bloodshed.

And the easiest way to understand this idea is at its most literal level: profit.

War is a racket. It always has been.

It is possibly the oldest, easily the most profitable, surely the most vicious. It is the only one international in scope. It is the only one in which the profits are reckoned in dollars and the losses in lives.

A racket is best described, I believe, as something that is not what it seems to the majority of the people. Only a small "inside" group knows what it is about. It is conducted for the benefit of the very few, at the expense of the very many. Out of war a few people make huge fortunes.

In the World War [One] a mere handful garnered the profits of the conflict. At least 21,000 new millionaires and billionaires were made in the United States during the World War. That many admitted their huge blood gains in their income tax returns. How many other war millionaires falsified their tax returns no one knows.

How many of these war millionaires shouldered a rifle? How many of them dug a trench? How many of them knew what it meant to go hungry in a rat-infested dug-out? How many of them spent sleepless, frightened nights, ducking shells and shrapnel and machine gun bullets? How many of them parried a bayonet thrust of an enemy? How many of them were wounded or killed in battle?

—Major General Smedley Butler

As the most decorated Marine in the history of the United States at the time of his death, Smedley Butler knew of what he spoke. Having seen the minting of those tens of thousands of “new millionaires and billionaires” out of the blood of his fellow soldiers, his famous rallying cry, *War Is A Racket*, has resonated with the public since he first began—in his own memorable words—“trying to educate the soldiers out of the sucker class.”

Indeed, the war profiteering on Wall Street started even before America joined the war. Although, as J.P. Morgan partner Thomas Lamont noted, at the outbreak of the war in Europe, “American citizens were urged to remain neutral in action, in word, and even in thought, our firm had never for one moment been neutral; we didn’t know how to be. From the very start we did everything we could to contribute to the cause of the Allies.” Whatever the personal allegiances that may have motivated the bank’s directors, this was a policy that was to yield dividends for the Morgan bank that even the greediest of bankers could scarcely have dreamed of before the war began.

John Pierpont Morgan himself died in 1913—before the passage of the Federal Reserve Act he had stewarded into existence and before the outbreak of war in Europe—but the House of Morgan stood strong, with the Morgan bank under the helm of his son, John Pierpont Morgan, Jr., maintaining its position as preeminent financier in America. The young Morgan moved quickly to leverage his family’s connections with the London banking community and the Morgan bank signed its first commercial agreement with the British Army Council in January 1915, just four months into the war.

That initial contract—a \$12 million purchase of horses for the British war effort to be brokered in the US by the House of Morgan—was only the beginning. By the end of the war, the Morgan bank had brokered \$3 billion in transactions for the British military—equal to almost half of all

American supplies sold to the Allies in the entire war. Similar arrangements with the French, Russian, Italian, and Canadian governments saw the bank broker billions more in supplies for the Allied war effort.

But this game of war financing was not without its risks. If the Allied powers were to lose the war, the Morgan bank and the other major Wall Street banks would lose the interest on all of the credit they had extended to them. By 1917, the situation was dire. The British government's overdraft with Morgan stood at over \$400 million dollars, and it was not clear that they would even win the war, let alone be in a position to repay all their debts when the fighting was over.

In April 1917, just eight days after the US declared war on Germany, Congress passed the War Loan Act, extending \$1 billion in credit to the Allies. The first payment of \$200 million went to the British and the entire amount was immediately handed over to Morgan as partial payment on their debt to the bank. When, a few days later, \$100 million was parceled out to the French government, it, too, was promptly returned to the Morgan coffers. But the debts continued to mount, and throughout 1917 and 1918, the US Treasury—aided by the Pilgrims Society member and avowed Anglophile Benjamin Strong, president of the newly-created Federal Reserve—quietly paid off the Allied powers' war debts to J.P. Morgan.

DOCHERTY: What I think is interesting is also the bankers' viewpoint here. America was so deeply involved in that war financing. There was so much money which could only really be repaid as long as Britain and France won. But had they lost, the loss on the American financial stock exchange's top market—your great industrial giants—would have been horrendous. So America was deeply involved. Not the people, as is ever the case. Not the ordinary citizen who cares. But the financial establishment who had, if you like, treated the entire thing as they might a casino and put all the money on one end of the board and it had to come good for them.

So all of this is going on. I mean, I personally feel that the American people don't realize just how far duped they were by your Carnegies, your J.P. Morgans, your great bankers, your Rockefellers, by the multi-multimillionaires who emerged from that war. Because they were the ones who made the profits, not those who lost their sons, lost their grandsons, whose lives were ruined forever by war.

After America officially entered the war, the good times for the Wall Street bankers got even better. Bernard Baruch—the powerful financier who personally led Woodrow Wilson into Democratic Party headquarters in New York “like a poodle on a string” to receive his marching orders during the 1912 election—was appointed to head the newly created “War Industries Board.”

With war hysteria at its height, Baruch and the fellow Wall Street financiers and industrialists who populated the board were given unprecedented powers over manufacture and production throughout the American economy, including the ability to set quotas, fix prices, standardize products, and, as a subsequent congressional investigation showed, pad costs so that the true size of the fortunes that the war profiteers extracted from the blood of the dead soldiers was hidden from the public.

Spending government funds at an annual rate of \$10 billion, the board minted many new millionaires in the American economy—millionaires who, like Samuel Prescott Bush of the infamous Bush family, happened to sit on the War Industries Board. Bernard Baruch himself was said to have personally profited from his position as head of the War Industries Board to the tune of \$200 million.

The extent of government intervention in the economy would have been unthinkable just a few years before. The National War Labor Board was set up to mediate labor disputes. The Food and Fuel Control Act was passed to give the government control over the distribution and sale of food and fuel. The Army Appropriations Act of 1916 set up the Council of National Defense, populated by Baruch and other prominent financiers and industrialists, who oversaw private sector coordination with the government in transportation, industrial and farm production, financial support for the war, and public morale. In his memoirs at the end of his life, Bernard Baruch openly gloated:

The [War Industries Board] experience had a great influence upon the thinking of business and government. [The] WIB had demonstrated the effectiveness of industrial cooperation and the advantage of government planning and direction. We helped inter the extreme dogmas of laissez faire, which had for so long molded American economic and political thought. Our experience taught that government direction of the economy need not be inefficient or undemocratic, and suggested that in time of danger it was imperative.

But it was not merely to line the pockets of the well-connected that the war was fought. More fundamentally, it was a chance to change the very consciousness of an entire generation of young men and women.

For the class of would-be social engineers that arose in the Progressive Era—from economist Richard T. Ely to journalist Herbert Croly to philosopher John Dewey—the “Great War” was not a horrific loss of life or a vision of the barbarism that was possible in the age of mechanized warfare, but an opportunity to change people’s perceptions and attitudes about government, the economy, and social responsibility.

Dewey, for example, wrote of “The Social Possibilities of War.”

In every warring country there has been the same demand that in the time of great national stress production for profit be subordinated to production for use. Legal possession and individual property rights have had to give way before social requirements. The old conception of the absoluteness of private property has received the world over a blow from which it will never wholly recover.

All countries on all sides of the world conflict responded in the same way: by maximizing their control over the economy, over manufacturing and industry, over infrastructure, and even over the minds of their own citizens.

Germany had its *Kriegssozialismus*, or war socialism, which placed control of the entire German nation, including its economy, its newspapers, and, through conscription—its people—under the strict control of the Army. In Russia, the Bolsheviks used this German “war socialism” as a basis for their organization of the nascent Soviet Union. In Canada, the government rushed to nationalize railways, outlaw alcohol, institute official censorship of newspapers, levy conscription, and, infamously, introduce a personal income tax as a “temporary war time measure” that continues to this day.

The British government soon recognized that control of the economy was not enough; the war at home meant control of information itself. At the outbreak of war, they set up the War Propaganda Bureau at Wellington House. The bureau’s initial purpose was to persuade America to enter the war, but that mandate soon expanded to shape and mold public opinion in favour of the war effort and of the government itself.

On September 2, 1914, the head of the War Propaganda Bureau invited twenty-five of Britain’s most influential authors to a top secret meeting. Among those present at the meeting: G. K. Chesterton, Ford Madox Ford, Thomas Hardy, Rudyard Kipling, Arthur Conan Doyle, Arnold Bennett and H. G. Wells. Not revealed until decades after the war ended, many of those present agreed to write propaganda material promoting the government’s position on the war, which the government would get commercial printing houses, including Oxford University Press, to publish as seemingly independent works.

Under the secret agreement, Arthur Conan Doyle wrote *To Arms!* John Masefield wrote *Gallipoli* and *The Old Front Line*. Mary Humphrey Ward wrote *England's Effort* and *Towards the Goal*. Rudyard Kipling wrote *The New Army in Training*. G. K. Chesterton wrote *The Barbarism of Berlin*. In total, the Bureau published over 1,160 propaganda pamphlets over the course of the war.

Hillaire Belloc later rationalized his work in service of the government: “It is sometimes necessary to lie damnably in the interests of the nation.” War correspondent William Beach Thomas was not so successful in the battle against his own conscience: “I was thoroughly and deeply ashamed of what I had written for the good reason that it was untrue . . . [T]he vulgarity of enormous headlines and the enormity of one’s own name did not lessen the shame.”

But the Bureau’s efforts were not confined to the literary world. Film, visual art, recruitment posters; no medium for swaying the hearts and minds of the public was overlooked. By 1918, the government’s efforts to shape perception of the war—now officially centralized under a “Minister of Information,” Lord Beaverbrook—was the most finely tuned purveyor of propaganda the world had yet seen. Even foreign propaganda, like the infamous Uncle Sam that went beyond a recruitment poster to become a staple of American government iconography, was based on a British propaganda poster featuring Lord Kitchener.

Control of the economy. Control of populations. Control of territory. Control of information. World War One was a boon for all of those who wanted to consolidate control of the many in the hands of the few. This was the vision that united all those participants in the conspiracies that led to the war itself. Beyond Cecil Rhodes and his secret society, there

was a broader vision of global control for the would-be rulers of society who were seeking what tyrants had lusted after since the dawn of civilization: control of the world.

World War One was merely the first salvo in this clique's attempt to create not a reordering of this society or that economy, but a New World Order.

GROVE: What World War One allowed these globalists, these Anglophiles, these people who wanted the English-speaking union to reign over the whole world, what it allowed them to do, was militarize American thinking. And what I mean by that is there was a whistle blower called Norman Dodd. He was the head researcher for the Reese committee that looked into how nonprofit foundations were influencing American education away from freedom. And what they found was the Carnegie [Endowment] for International Peace was seeking to understand how to make America a wartime economy, how to take the state apparatus over, how to change education to get people to continually consume, how to have arms production ramp up.

And then once this happened in World War One, if you look at what happened in the 1920s, you've got people like Major General Smedley Butler, who is using the US military to advance corporate interest in Central and South America and doing some very caustic things to the indigenous people, insofar as these were not American policies really before the Spanish-American War in 1898. Meaning that going and taking foreign military action was not part of the diplomatic strategy of America prior to our engagement with the British Empire in the late 1800s and as it ramped up after Cecil Rhodes's death. So what these people gained was the foothold for world government from which they could get through globalism, what they called a "New World Order."

The creation of this "New World Order" was no mere parlor game. It meant a complete redrawing of the map. The collapse of empires and monarchies. The transformation of the political, social, and economic life of entire swaths of the globe. Much of this change was to take place in Paris in 1919 as the victors divvied up the spoils of war. But some of it, like the fall of the Romanovs and the rise of the Bolsheviks in Russia, was to take place during the war itself.

In hindsight, the fall of the Russian Empire in the midst of the First World War seems inevitable. Unrest had been in the air since Russia's defeat by the Japanese in 1905, and the ferocity of the fighting on the Eastern Front, coupled with the economic hardship—which hit Russia's overcrowded, overworked urban poor particularly hard—made the country ripe for revolt. That revolt happened during the so-called “February Revolution,” when Czar Nicholas was swept from power and a provisional government installed in his place.

But that provisional government—which continued to prosecute the war at the behest of its French and British allies—was competing for control of the country with the Petrograd Soviet, a rival power structure set up by the socialists in the Russian capital. The struggle for control between the two bodies led to riots, protests, and, ultimately, battles in the street.

Russia in the spring of 1917 was a powder keg waiting to explode. And in April of that year, two matches, one called Vladimir Lenin and one called Leon Trotsky, were thrown directly into that powder keg by both sides of the Great War.

Vladimir Lenin, a Russian communist revolutionary who had been living in political exile in Switzerland, saw in the February Revolution his chance to push through a Marxist revolution in his homeland. But although for the first time in decades his return to that homeland was politically possible, the war made the journey itself an impossibility. Famously, he was able to broker a deal with the German General Staff to allow Lenin and dozens of other revolutionaries to cross through Germany on their way to Petrograd.

Germany's reasoning in permitting the infamous “sealed train” ride of Lenin and his compatriots is, as a matter of war strategy, straightforward. If a band of revolutionaries could get back to Russia and bog down the provisional government, then the German Army

fighting that government would benefit. If the revolutionaries actually came to power and took Russia out of the war altogether, so much the better.

But the curious other side of this story, the one demonstrating how Lenin's fellow communist revolutionary, Leon Trotsky, was shepherded from New York—where he had been living well beyond the means of his income as a writer for socialist periodicals—through Canada—where he was stopped and identified as a revolutionary en route to Russia—and on to Petrograd, is altogether more incredible. And, unsurprisingly, that story is mostly avoided by historians of the First World War.

One of the scholars who did not shy away from the story was Antony Sutton, author of *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*, whose meticulous research of State Department documents, Canadian government records, and other historical artifacts pieced together the details of Trotsky's unlikely journey.

ANTHONY C. SUTTON: Trotsky was in New York. He had no income. I summed his income for the year he was in New York; it was about six hundred dollars, yet he lived in an apartment, he had a chauffeured limousine, he had a refrigerator, which was very rare in those days.

He left New York and went to Canada on his way to the revolution. He had \$10,000 in gold on him. He didn't earn more than six hundred dollars in New York. He was financed out of New York, there's no question about that. The British took him off the ship in Halifax, Canada. I got the Canadian archives; they knew who he was. They knew who Trotsky was, they knew he was going to start a revolution in Russia. Instructions from London came to put Trotsky back on the boat with his party and allow them to go forward.

So there is no question that Woodrow Wilson—who issued the passport for Trotsky—and the New York financiers—who financed Trotsky—and the British Foreign Office allowed Trotsky to perform his part in the revolution.

SOURCE: *Wall Street Funded the Bolshevik Revolution – Professor Antony Sutton*

After succeeding in pushing through the Bolshevik Revolution in November of 1917, one of Trotsky's first acts in his new position as People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs was to publish the "Secret Treaties and Understandings" that Russia had signed with France and Britain. These documents revealed the secret negotiations in which the Entente powers had agreed to carve up the colonial world after the war. The stash of documents included agreements on "The Partition of Asiatic Turkey," creating the modern Middle East out of the remnants of the Ottoman Empire; "The Treaty With Italy," promising conquered territory to the Italian government in exchange for their military aid in the campaign against Austria-Hungary; a treaty "Re-Drawing the Frontiers of Germany," promising France its long-held wish of reacquiring Alsace-Lorraine and recognizing "Russia's complete liberty in establishing her Western frontiers"; diplomatic documents relating to Japan's own territorial aspirations; and a host of other treaties, agreements, and negotiations.

One of these agreements, the Sykes-Picot Agreement between Britain and France, which was signed in May 1916, has grown in infamy over the decades. The agreement divided modern-day Turkey, Jordan, Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon among the Triple Entente and, although the revelation of the agreement caused much embarrassment for the British and the French and forced them to publicly back away from the Sykes-Picot map, served as the basis for some of the arbitrary lines on the map of the modern-day Middle East, including the border between Syria and Iraq. In recent years, ISIS has claimed that part of their mission is to "put the final nail in the coffin of the Sykes-Picot conspiracy."

Other territorial conspiracies—like the Balfour Declaration, signed by Arthur Balfour, then acting as Foreign Secretary for the British Government, and addressed to Lord Walter Rothschild, one of the co-conspirators in Cecil Rhodes original secret society—are less well-

known today. The Balfour Declaration also played an important role in shaping the modern world by announcing British support for the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine, which was not under British mandate at the time. Even less well-known is that the document did not originate from Balfour but from Lord Rothschild himself and was sent to fellow Round Table conspirator Alfred Milner for revision before being delivered.

GROVE: So this was Lord—he's known as Lord Walter Rothschild, and professionally he's a zoologist. He inherits a lot of wealth in a very high status family. He pursues his art and his science and his scientific theories and research. But he has zoological museums and he's collecting specimens. And he's famously the Rothschild that's riding the giant tortoise and leading him around with a piece of lettuce on his stick, and there's a piece of lettuce hanging out of the tortoise's mouth. And I've always used that: here's the metaphor for the bankers, like they're leading people around with stimulus-response. This turtle, this tortoise, can't ask questions. It can't question its obedience. So that's Lord Walter Rothschild.

Why is he important? Well, he and his family are some of the early financiers and backers of Cecil Rhodes and promoters of his last will and testament. And in the question of America being brought back into the British Empire, there are newspaper articles—there is one in 1902 where Lord Rothschild is saying, you know, “This would be a good thing to have America back in the British Empire.” He's also the Lord Rothschild to whom the Balfour Declaration is addressed.

So in 1917 there's a letter of agreement sent from the British government—from Arthur Balfour—to Lord Rothschild. Now Lord Rothschild and Arthur Balfour, they know each other. They have a long history together and there's a lot of Fabian socialists in this whole story of what led up to World War One. Specifically with Balfour, he's acting as an agent of the British government, saying, “We are gonna give away this land that's not really ours, and we're gonna give it to you guys in your group.” The problem is the British had also promised that same land to the Arabs, so now the Balfour Declaration is going against some of the foreign policy plans that they've already promised to these other countries.

The other interesting thing about the Balfour Declaration is it just had its hundredth anniversary, so they last year had a site that had the whole history of the Balfour Declaration. You could see the originals from Lord Rothschild and going to Lord Milner for changes and coming through Arthur Balfour and then being sent back as an official letter from the monarchy, basically. So that's interesting. But there's also interviews where the current Lord Rothschild—Lord Jacob Rothschild—comments on his ancestors' history and how they brought about the Jewish state in 1947–48 because of the Balfour Declaration.

So there's a lot of history to unpack there, but most people, again, they're not aware of the document let alone the very interesting history behind it let alone what that really means in the bigger story.

Over two decades after Cecil Rhodes launched the secret society that would engineer this so-called “Great War,” the likes of Alfred Milner and Walter Rothschild were still at it, conspiring to use the war they had brought about to further their own geopolitical agenda. But by the time of the Armistice in November 1918, that group of conspirators had greatly expanded, and the scale of their agenda had grown along with it. This was no small circle of friends who had embroiled the world in the first truly global war, but a loosely knit network of overlapping interests separated by oceans and united in a shared vision for a new world order.

Milner, Rothschild, Grey, Wilson, House, Morgan, Baruch, and literally scores of others had each had their part to play in this story. Some were witting conspirators, others merely seeking to maximize the opportunities that war afforded them to reach their own political and financial ends. But to the extent that those behind the WWI conspiracy shared a vision, it was the same desire that had motivated men throughout history: the chance to reshape the world in their own image.

INTERVIEWER: Just tell us again: why?

SUTTON: Why? You won't find this in the textbooks. Why is to bring about, I suspect, a planned, controlled world society in which you and I won't find the freedoms to believe and think and do as we believe.

SOURCE: *Wall Street Funded the Bolshevik Revolution – Professor Antony Sutton*

DOCHERTY: War is an instrument of massive change, we know that. It is an instrument of massive change in particular for those who are defeated. In a war where everyone is defeated, then it's simply an element of massive change, and that's a very deep, thought-provoking concept. But if everyone loses, or if everyone except “us”—depending on who the “us” are—loses, then “we” are going to be in a position to reconstruct in our image.

RAICO: Altogether in the war, who knows, some 10 or 12 million people died. People experienced things—both in combat and the people back home understanding what was happening—that dazed them. That stunned them. You know, it's almost as if, for a few generations, the peoples of Europe had been increased, sort of like a flock of sheep by their shepherds. OK? Through industrialization. Through the spread of liberal ideas and institutions. Through the decrease of infant mortality. The raising of standards of living. The population of Europe was enormously greater than it had ever been before. And now the time came to slaughter some part of the sheep for the purposes of the ones who were in control.

SOURCE: *The World at War (Ralph Raico)*.

For the ones in control, World War One had been the birth pangs of a New World Order. And now, the midwives of this monstrosity slouched towards Paris to take part in its delivery.

THE END (OF THE BEGINNING)

All over the world on November 11, 1918, people were celebrating, dancing in the streets, drinking champagne, hailing the Armistice that meant the end of the war. But at the front there was no celebration. Many soldiers believed the Armistice only a temporary measure and that the war would soon go on. As night came, the quietness, unearthly in its penetration, began to eat into their souls. The men sat around log fires, the first they had ever had at the front. They were trying to reassure themselves that there were no enemy batteries spying on them from the next hill and no German bombing planes approaching to blast them out of existence. They talked in low tones. They were nervous.

After the long months of intense strain, of keying themselves up to the daily mortal danger, of thinking always in terms of war and the enemy, the abrupt release from it all was physical and psychological agony. Some suffered a total nervous collapse. Some, of a steadier temperament, began to hope they would someday return to home and the embrace of loved ones. Some could think only of the crude little crosses that marked the graves of their comrades. Some fell into an exhausted sleep. All were bewildered by the sudden meaninglessness of their existence as soldiers – and through their teeming memories paraded that swiftly moving cavalcade of Cantigny, Soissons, St. Mihiel, the Meuse-Argonne and Sedan.

What was to come next? They did not know – and hardly cared. Their minds were numbed by the shock of peace. The past consumed their whole consciousness. The present did not exist-and the future was inconceivable.

–Colonel Thomas R. Gowenlock, 1st Division, US Army.

Little did those troops know how right they were. As the public rejoiced in the outbreak of peace after four years of the bloodiest carnage that the human race had ever endured, the very same conspirators that had brought about this nightmare were already converging in Paris for the next stage of their conspiracy. There, behind closed doors, they would begin their process of carving up the world to suit their interests, laying the groundwork and preparing the public consciousness for a new international order, setting the stage for an even more brutal conflict in the future, and bringing the battle-weary soldiers' worst fears for the future to fruition. And all in the name of "peace."

The French General, Ferdinand Foch, famously remarked after the Treaty of Versailles that “This is not a peace. It is an armistice for 20 years.” As we now know, his pronouncement was precisely accurate.

The armistice on November 11, 1918, may have marked the end of the war, but it was not the end of the story. It was not even the beginning of the end. It was, at best, the end of the beginning.

TO BE CONTINUED. . .