

## Chapter 1

### BRITAIN

Britain's national debt is the longest running and the original having began in 1694 by William of Orange and the privately formed Bank of England, is now;

£425,959,000,000.00 as the total national debt...  
four hundred and twenty five billion, nine hundred and fifty nine million

plus £231,029,000,000  
two hundred and thirty one billion and twenty nine million  
for private non financial corporations.....

plus £261,370,000,000) for Other financial institutions.  
two hundred and sixty one billion three hundred and seventy million.

**This totals £928,358,000,000.00 or (April 2001)**

Nine hundred and twenty eight BILLION, three hundred and fifty eight million, thousands, hundreds and pence

.  
The C.I.A. factbook displays the population of Britain as fifty nine million six hundred and forty seven thousand, seven hundred and ninety as of 07/07/2001.  
(59,647,790)

This totals £15,396.35 for each Man Woman and child.<sup>14</sup>

All of these National debts are still rising and rising and have continued to escalate as 2003 figures are released, especially in the last thirty years, and they apply to every country worldwide.....

A family of four therefore can expect to repay over £60,000.00 if the government cannot repay the staggering 928 billion or so

After all if the government cannot pay who will. In fact we already pay for the National debt in taxation which barely repays even the Interest on the billions ,even though taxation is present in ever increasing new ways Direct or indirect taxation introduced by whichever shade of the governing party is in “office” (red yellow or blue, left or right)The national debt has become a controlling factor in all our lives. It regulates are earnings, and how many hours we need to work to how much we can afford to spend.

Each country around the world has similar statistics, and levels of debt.

There is a much quoted polemic from Meyer Amschel Rothschild, who states

“Let me issue and control a nations money, and I care not who makes its laws”<sup>15</sup>

Given that in 1838 Mr Rothschild placed his five sons in charge of the five big European banks the biggest being the bank of England, we can glean that he reasoned that banking and monetary policy to be the source of power and the law, not as is perceived a state parliament such as the houses of parliament i.e. democracy.

The quote above is also used to support the view that the banking system of the world is run by Jewish or Zionist persons secretly trying to control and dominate the population of the planet.

This view is naturally cited as anti- semetic by Semites and by non – Semites alike whether they realize they are semetic or “other” or not

The fact that this quote by Meyer Amschel Rothschild would still be true spoken by a Gentile or Jew, Zionist or Christian is more to the point.

President James A Garfield speaking in 1881 said  
“whoever controls the volume of money in any country is absolute master of all industry and commerce”.<sup>16</sup> He was shot, within four months of his Inauguration as President.

The President of the Bank of England Sir Josiah Stamp said in the roaring twenties

“the bankers control the earth, take it away from them, but leave them the power to make deposits and at a stroke of a pen they will buy it back again”<sup>17</sup>

Karl Marx in Capital says of the National Debt.

“The system of public credit, i.e. of National debts, whose origins we discover in Genoa and Venice as early as the middle ages took possession of Europe generally during the manufacturing period” (industrial revolution)  
“The colonial system with its maritime trade and commercial wars served as a forcing house for it. Thus it first took root in Holland”<sup>18</sup>

The Bank of Amsterdam founded in 1603, became the model for the Bank of England founded in 1694.

Marx points out quoting William Cobbett (of Rural rides fame) that whilst many public institutions are prefixed by “Royal” as a compensatory measure, the National Debt remains “National”

The national debt is “theirs” formulating the doctrine that a modern nation becomes richer the more deeply in debt it becomes.

Marx states “Public credit becomes the credo of capital”

Therefore indoctrinated the faith moves to good works as Marx adds,

“The public debt becomes one of the most powerful levers of primitive accumulation. As with the stroke of an enchanter's wand, it endows barren money with the power of breeding and thus it turns into capital without the necessity of its exposing itself to the troubles and risks inseparable from its employment in industry or even usury.”<sup>19</sup>

“The loans enable the government to meet the extraordinary expenses, without the taxpayers feeling it immediately, but they necessitate as a consequence increased taxes”<sup>20</sup>

which of course the nation pays increasingly.

“On the other hand, the raising of taxation caused by the accumulation of debts contracted one after another, compels the government always to have recourse to new loans for new extraordinary expenses.”<sup>21</sup>

Therefore the Enchanters wand ...or pen issues a nations money and the barren (non-existent) money appears like rabbits out of a hat breeding accumulatively. The great bankers were simply private speculators who placed themselves beside the government.

The control of this money creating becomes as binding as the law...as Marx continues.

“In Holland therefore where this system was first inaugurated , the great patriot , De Witt, has in his “Maxims” extolled it, as the best system for making the wage labourer submissive, frugal, industrious and over-burdened with Labour”.<sup>22</sup>

Marx states that this system is in itself destructive but lays the true cause of Human misery at the door of slave labour and factory mass production which reduces the workers to little more than “battery hens” chained to the injustice and cruelty of their fellow man.

In “Capital” he is not so concerned with the creation of money but with the mistaken view that many writers place upon it.

However Marx does point out that the system of Public debt is a major cause of creating the conditions of the working classes.

This is because Marx favoured the “Gold system” of banking, which is itself imperfect, but does at least require Human Labour to extract Gold, and accumulate a valuable metal against which the issue of money can be issued.<sup>23</sup>, Yet money created out of nothing, rather than the production of goods and materials, driving the need for money to be created is at the heart of monetary misery, and the current system we all work within.

Whatever standard we use to gauge the rate of exchange, it will eventually lead to the same bubble of the money go round boom and bust.

Gold is perceived as sensible, yet faith is required even here, as issuing money (out of nothing) set against minimum or non-existent gold reserves is just as fraudulent.

Foreign exchanges of national currencies, internationally can also be regulated against this gold system....or so you would hope.

It is not the waving of the enchanters wand which bothers Karl Marx so much as the need to escape from its effects.

Marx traces the roots of “national debt” banking or magically creating money out off nothing to Genoa or the Italians to Holland and Amsterdam,

you will note that it seems to follow the Empire route, as Rome and Spain decreased so Holland's empire increased., its revolution preceded England's, and also directed it. The Dutch Revolution and Republic and the Glorious Revolution preceded the Industrial and French revolutions. The art of banking credit and finance precedes the fate of society.

The art of making money and turning base metal into Gold has long been the enchanter's quest and in the science and metaphysics of Alchemy wisemen have sought this Holy Grail like Jason pursuing the Golden Fleece or Einstein seeking the formulae  $E=MC^2$ .

Alchemy, although it is viewed as turning base metal into Gold, is the pursuit of wealth without Labour whatever form that takes.

When did this first appear and how did it come to be, can the profane look upon it as Sir Josiah Stamp former governor of the Bank of England states

“Banking was conceived in iniquity and born in sin”<sup>24</sup>

resisting the temptation to throw the first stone (having gazed upon the conception for more than was lawful) let us voyeur into the past and briefly indulge.

“Interest was forbidden by two synods (of the Christian church) in 787”<sup>25</sup> but like its thoughts on Christian doctrines it was not formulated into Canon (Universal Church law) until the reign of Edward 3<sup>rd</sup> from 1327 - 1377. The claiming of interest on loans however persisted in its “illegality” throughout the dark and middle ages as

“Even at this period (of Edward 3rd) however we find documents against it, but no Royal edict.”<sup>26</sup>, earlier acts of parliament, inscrutable actually encouraged usury instead of preventing it.

Not until Henry V's reign was the rate of interest legalised by an act passed by Henry, (burdened by a huge appetite for sport, gaming and search for an heir) whereupon it was set at 10%

In 1552 there was a fresh prohibition against it, but legalised again under Elisabeth 1<sup>st</sup>

This shows a power struggle between the Pope, Henry VIII, Mary Queen of Scots and Elisabeth or between the Roman Catholic faith and the Protestant.

The struggle between the banks of Genoa, Venice and Barcelona (Roman Catholic and part of the Holy Roman Empire or 2<sup>nd</sup> Reich) and Amsterdam having repercussions in England.

Professor Andreades notes one of the influence's for allowing Usury, (any interest on loans) was due to the presence of John Calvin<sup>27</sup>, and the Aristotelian school of thought, Amsterdam also being Protestant Elizabeth I reduced the limit to 8% as she was skilled in placating her Roman Catholic subjects and or papal delegates, in finance and in Church services .In 1651 the rate was reduced to 6 %, and by this era...

“ the controversy as to the legality of Interest changed into one as to the legal rate”<sup>28</sup>

as the desire to make higher profits (out of nothing) rose, morals and wisdom vanished.

The reformation under Calvinism returned to a “Judeo – Christian” tradition moving away from a “Hellenistic” tradition (Greek) or from a more Gentile tradition to a Jewish view depending on whether your inclination was spiritual or political in its piety.

Having “reformation’ed” (Hallelujah) the legality of interest on loans it was necessary to decide on the “type” money was to take, and whether the new doctrine would succeed in theory and practice.

From the days of the Crusaders,(from 1000 ad) who became the Kings of Jerusalem, up until the “discovery” of America.(1492)

“it was evident that there were two lines of ratios; one proceeding from Indo-Arabic, the other from Romano – German origin, and that this conflict of ...ratios, which only ceased when America was discovered”<sup>29</sup>

Columbus reaching America in 1492, born in Genoa sailing on behalf of Spain and under the colours of the “Knights of Christ” a Knights Templar order with the red cross on a white background. This was followed by the Portuguese in 1500, later by the French and lastly the British under Walter Raleigh for Queen Elizabeth. The Dutch following to make a New Amsterdam.(New York.)

The outpouring of coins from the Gold, brought from the New Atlantis gave increased power to the Spanish Empire, and also gave it visions of a greater

Imperialism. The whole adventure was upsetting the world's economy and the medieval ages' relative stability of coinage and exchange in trade.

Arabian disquiet was rumbling on the Empire's east and south, and the "sons of Woden" in Germany and the lowlands, into the heart of Europe were also feeling the increased instability.

The resultant disquiet serving as a backdrop to the Religious reformation, agitating the empire of Spain, and therefore the Holy Roman Empire.

The lowlands of Holland were also in a state of angst, they were paying the increased taxes the Spanish Empire's new expansion required. Spanish coins were causing the Dutch currency value to decrease, yet its relative prosperity often bore the brunt of piracy, when its Bullion was lost. The seeds of revolution were already sown in the Dutch province. Once revolution was settled there the 1st modern Capitalist state set its sight on England.

The kings of England were a layer of bureaucracy any new Bank could do without, reformations, counter reformations revolutions Glorious and revolutions failed provided a volatile sea in which to anchor any new ship ....or bank.

As early as 1682, during Charles II's restoration of the Stuarts, after Cromwell's death, proposals for a Bank were mooted usurping the modern view that Adam Smith was the Father of modern monetary policy.

The Tory (so called after a Celtic chieftain) party were against it fearing that the creation of banks led to Republics (as with Genoa and Holland), they saw the new Banking as incompatible with Monarchy.

The Jacobites were with them fearing for the French monarchy (and the Stuarts), and the need to control revolution for themselves.

The Whigs on the other hand (Liberal party) feared that the bank would lend directly to the Monarch without consulting parliament.<sup>30</sup>

Primarily Protestant and parliamentarian the Whigs did not want to return to pre-Cromwell days.(being revolutionary, as was Cromwell paid by Dutch finance.)<sup>31</sup>

The Liberal "Whigs" (today the Labour party) financed by the Dutch "was a powerful party which did not want to solve the difficulties the reformation placed England in, but rather to prevent the institution of Monarchy from working in its historic fashion. Between the king and the Puritan party, which was powerful in Cromwell's parliament, there was the

unbridgeable gulf of religious difference. The Kings conscience would not permit him to allow Puritanism to dominate England , nor would Puritan conscience allow such a domination to the Kings Anglo- Catholicism”<sup>32</sup>

A compromise would need to found and ...Mary Queen of Scots lost her head as did her Grandson Charles 1st in 1649.

Elizabeth 1 who died in 1603 ,was Protestant in name only, and her illegitimate son Francis Bacon<sup>33</sup> author of “The New Atlantis” shared Elizabeth’s fascination with the occult particularly Alchemy and Cabbalism, both enjoying the Royal astrologers advice from the alchemist John Dee.

Bacon was instrmental as was Elisabeth the 1st, in forming the “Honorable” East India Company, in 1600. Setting sail for colonisation, pillage and murder, whether in Ireland or India, there aim was to subdue the natives and impose a strict tax, whilst pillaging the land and valuables. For an example of how far the company would go to achieve those aims, we can look at a bizarre hedge which it planted down the east length of India, from the north Punjab to the middle of India (Chandrapur), turning east to Sonapur.

This artificial hedge of thorny bushes was a custom barrier to improve the companies lot in collecting draconian levels of salt tax.

Ghandi was later to boycott the purchase of salt from factories and instruct Indians to collect it themselves and sell it, thus destroying the artificial economic base the east India company had imprisoned a whole continent with.Indian independence duly followed.

This hedge was 2300 miles long ! and divided a continent for no more reason than

“justifying the salt tax as enlightened Imperialism , as it similarly sought to justify the production of Opium destined for China”<sup>34</sup>

It was not to spread Christianity, and the company which eventually became the “British” Navy, introduced so much Heroin to Hong Kong, the addicts signed it away on a 99 year lease, for a few pounds, all of this was calculated as opening up a market. The company was the City, which was the Government. In later years Napoleon, fought the East India Company, as opposed to the “British”. Recent films like the “Far side of the world” with Russell Crowe, use the media to present a false picture of a private Corporations adventures, who rape Chinese woman, as payment for their husbands addictions , pillage India, whilst watching it starve and enslave Africans, selling them abroad, slaughtering Aborigines in “OZ”, and planting colonists in “Ireland”. There is no honour here.

Bacon was Later to become Lord Privy councillor in 1616 already installed as His Majesty's Attorney General (James 1<sup>st</sup>), he envisaged the New Atlantis Gold as better stored in England than in Spain. (South Americas gold quest by both Spain and England decimated an entire culture, they saw it as the New Atlantis).these crusades on the pretext of converting the natives, had many precedents.

Francis Bacon the "Hamlet" of the English court was determined to make all well in the state of Denmark he was very well travelled and skilled in Propaganda as a Political instrument.

One of Bacons main achievements which continues to this day was to persuade the world that "Macbeth" was a dark and evil King, (historically the exact opposite was the case). saw the Gold fo America as way of injecting cash, the Spanish were already enjoying.

Lord "Protector" Cromwell ruled from 1642 to 1658, (although Charles 1<sup>st</sup> did not lose his head until 1649), during the period known as the "Commonwealth" which followed after the House of Stuart (James the 1<sup>st</sup> 1603 – 1625 & Charles the 1<sup>st</sup> 1625 - 1649), first reign before the restoration of the Stuarts under Charles 2<sup>nd</sup> in 1660.

The commonwealth was to be based on the "Commonwealth of all nations" supposedly inspired by the Bible,(but maybe not a copy) which states a time will rise when Christ will rule as head of a Commonwealth of all nations **...in person.**

Monarchy it seems was not a part of that system, it was a "Saul" not a "David", and like Saul, God would punish the "peoples choice" over Gods choice to rule....even though Christs imminent return was supposed to cap the system.when he would take up the throne Cromwell had built.

Unfortunately the Commonwealth, and its new colony's were procured largely by the East India shipping company, who preferred exporting heroin from India to Hong Kong,or enslaving Africans, selling them to New England colonists than waiting for Christ.

In the Interim Cromwell would rule,...not as King but as Lord protector ...in waiting.....

When Cromwell died his son Richard became Lord protector until 1660.Negotiations began cementing the trade that had existed between the

Dutch Republic since mediaeval days but particularly since Henry V 111, who sought to free himself from Papal Rome and Spanish dominance. Cromwell tried to unite the protectorate of England with the Dutch Republic. Declaring himself Lord protector after the English civil war. The Royalist Cavaliers evolved into the Tory party and the Parliamentary Roundheads into the Whigs.(Liberals...and the original neo – liberals of their day)

The joint envisaged Republic of England and Holland was temporarily thwarted by the restoration of the Stuarts, i.e. Charles 11 in 1660 and his brother James 11 in 1685.

James 11 was later banished for trying to re-introduce the Catholic faith or prevent the Whigs from owning the country's finance and the City .. a Prince from Holland was later "invited" and installed as king of England.(William of Orange)

Oliver Cromwell in his day, used the Scots Presbyterians against Charles 1st in the first civil war,

Viewing the opportunity of discontent of the Scottish nobles, Charles persuaded them to support him in the second civil war, and in return he would make them the state religion. The Scots marched south only to be defeated by Cromwell at Preston who had once sided with him. Thus "sides" can change quickly, revolving around the money question. The battle of Edgehill was significant for the fact that afterwards no one knew who had won, and the soldiers could also not tell who was who !.

To complete the levelling of all opposition to the new republic and new imported Dutch banking system, the King, Charles the 1st was arrested and tried in 1649. He was smeared as a tyrant who had not acted in the interests of the "people". Branded a man of blood, and the very personification of evil, Charles would not recognise the court and Cromwell refused him permission to speak and therefore mount a defence

Indeed Charles was a intemperate man with expensive habits but no more so than his accusers or previous kings. He had hoped that the Presbyterian members of parliament would find for him, but they were not allowed to enter the house barred from doing so by a soldier named Pride. The event has become known as Prides purge .Allegiances which cross denominations and country's, overlapping and doubling back again, has left modern historians with a headache. how to explain it all without mentioning the

“ money problem”. Cromwell is therefore seen as a great man of God, (which God is the question) his theology flitting back and forth, as Dutch Finance permitted.

The Anglican faith was therefore, something of a contrivance, even if many were sincere in their faith, a half way house between the two, i.e. Catholicism and Calvinistic Presbyterianism, one which suited the new revolutionaries.

After the convenient great fire of London in 1666, the City and outer London was largely rebuilt with Dutch finance, the Bank of Amsterdam being the most powerful bank in the world at that time<sup>35</sup> Cromwell after inheriting debts from Elizabeth 1<sup>st</sup>, James 1<sup>st</sup> and Charles 1<sup>st</sup> issued very high taxes and the burden of finance a “kingly” office held ..he was not up to the task

“He dared not disband his army, which had also marched against parliament in 1647, at the time Charles 1<sup>st</sup> made a pact with the Scots, until he had obtained popular support for his rule and the longer that he continued to rule through the army , the more unpopular his rule became. Caught in an unsolvable dilemma, he dragged out his miserable days”.<sup>36</sup>

Eventually a King all but in name, the Parliament turned against him. He did not accept the offered Crown, mainly because the New Model army would have deserted him. Unable to fuse a Parliamentary Democracy, we have inherited his dilemma to this day ...in that we still do not possess one.

Ironically Cromwell started his career in debt after going bankrupt. His location amongst the majority puritans of the South West of England, and the close association with the Dutch merchants inspiring a new career, which also ended in debt... of the country.

Charles 2nd in the restoration, also inherited the ruins of Cromwell's debts. Charles's foreign policy was a wavering balance of alliances with France and the Dutch in turn. In 1670, Charles signed the secret treaty of Dover under which Charles would declare himself a Catholic and England would side with France against the Dutch - in return Charles would receive subsidies from the King of France (thus enabling Charles some limited room for manoeuvre with Parliament, but leaving the possibility of public disclosure of the treaty by Louis.

In 1687 James 11 issued the Declaration of Indulgence aiming at religious toleration; seven bishops who asked James to reconsider were charged with seditious libel, but later acquitted to popular Anglican acclaim. When his second (Roman Catholic) wife, Mary of Modena, gave birth on 10 June 1688 to a son (James Stuart, later known as the 'Old Pretender' and father of Charles Edward Stuart, 'Bonnie Prince Charlie'), it seemed that a Roman Catholic dynasty would be established. William of Orange, Protestant husband of James's elder daughter, Mary (by James's first and Protestant wife, Anne Hyde), was therefore welcomed when he invaded on 5 November 1688. **The welcome was largely engineered by the Dutch financed liberal party, who did not want to see a native of England protestant or Catholic, controlling the countrys finace's. This would make it easier for the sister branch of the Bank of Amsterdam to open ( aka The Private Corperation of the Bank of England)** Chapter 5 contains a detailed and well researched document at the very end of the chapter (scanned document of 11 pages)

The Army and the Navy (disaffected despite James's investment in them) deserted to William, and James fled to France.

Stripped of any legal constitutional powers in person and court William of Orange became the puppet the newly created bank of England needed ...in effect not to do anything except to receive a loan to fund his war with France over what is today Belgium.

Scotland later shared in this National debt "Union" in 1707 only 13 years after the Bank of England was formed.

Free from interference, the new Bank in its infancy, having subdued religious controversies, to an acceptable level, next had to consider how their money could be created and issued

They had considered many proposals from the finest brains as to how it could be achieved to maximum effect for expansion. As many as 120 schemes were considered, **controversy and arguments narrowed the design to one of credibility, and the publics suspension of disbelief was uppermost in their minds. Making the system seem plausible and Godly and respectable was the aim rather than Universal benefit to the realm.**

A solution from a unlikely source came, borne out of a problem which had existed for centuries, if not, for thousands of years....the problem of coin clipping.

Coins of Gold and silver were in circulation for over four thousand years, as was the temptation to clip the coins, keeping the clipped piece and circulating the coin again, despite the heavy penalties if you were caught.

A shilling or pound on its rounds may only have half the value of silver or gold within it, yet despite this people albeit grudgingly still traded with them, and accepted them, as who could be bothered to weigh every coin in every transaction.

Eventually the recoinage which worn coins necessitated meant the treasury had to import more bullion to mint the coins increasing the cost of money and further inducing temptations to clip them.

Smuggling of bullion out of the country meant the circulation of money in gold and silver would not be viable. An idea they proposed was to simply rename (for example) a shilling to a pound, this idea today is the same as saying the a 50 pence piece is now a £1 coin or a £5 note is now a £10 note!! This is less money to mint it buys more but no new money or wealth or produce has been created.

Slowly the idea of having no valuable metal or anything of intrinsic value to support the idea that money was real, dawned on those seeking the quest for a bank.

The idea enlarged and applied to paper money, was burgeoning, but was resisted by many of those consulted for the obvious reason that this was a fraud.

“Would it not be better to keep the same names for the crown, half crown, the shilling, and the sixpence, but to coin an ounce of silver into seven shillings instead of five?”. There are people who even now believe that the government can give an intrinsic value to a coin which it does not possess in Bullion. But many more people believed in this theory in 1695”<sup>37</sup>

This was one view forwarded by William Lowndes, under a committee consisting of men from the City,(see end of chapter 5) prime among them Montague, who was instrumental in forming the very early Orange Order.... Most of these men had been instrumental in “inviting” William of Orange over to take the crown, despite the Genealogists of the day claiming that there were over a hundred more entitled candidates.

John Locke had the following to say, concerning Lowndes debasement plan,

“He (Locke ) began by stating as a principle that there is only one difference between the Government which debases the coins and the criminal who clips them, viz, that the Government can oblige the people to accept the debased coins” of course they could also oblige the people to accept paper money, just as easily.

Locke continues after pointing out that such conduct would cost the state dear

“debasement will defraud the King, the church , the Universities and hospitals,”<sup>38</sup> he adds

“it will weaken the public faith”<sup>39</sup>

Taking debasement to its logical conclusion, if you hold no Gold at all (and no one to inspect your vaults) then if you state a Pound is worth a pound or a hundred pence, people take this as Gospel.

If I receive a receipt ( a pound note) for a Gold coin, and I deposit it at the bank of a England, I can swap the receipt for other coins, in trade in the market or at another bank and so on.

If the Bank of England lend another receipt, (a further pound note) against my gold coin to another borrower of (paper money) Capital, then it is effectively defrauding both parties, as two receipts exist but only one coin Imagine this multiplied by many Billions and you have a gigantic fraud.This is the basis of Capiatlism.

A sympton of this (just one) can be seen by example;

A man places 1000 pounds in the bank, in the 1940s rather than buy a car, which he could have done.

15 years later he withdraws the money now risen with interest to £1900.00 to find he can only buy half a car, which now costs £3,800.00...this is stealing money through inflation, caused by printing money out of nothing.

“So it is clear that a fault exists in the money-lending function of the banking system.The very mechanics of the lending **produces misrepresentation; it is dishonest.** Yet it has become an accepted practice.It has been legitimised.”<sup>40</sup> ...put simply it is a crime, and the law demands that the crime, be brought to light, Judged and punished.

Ironically a solution to coin clipping had however been found, much to the annoyance of the new Bank of England committee. The invention by Frenchman Pierre Blondeau for coining mill edged coin was a great success

in France, but the Government on one excuse or another failed to implement the machine, and in 1656 Blondeau retired to France in disgust.

Further in 1660 Charles II (restored after Cromwell's death in 1660) sought to solve the clipping problem of the coin, but by this time the **power of the Monarch was regulated by Parliament**. They had decided that the King should have no income of his own, but only what taxes the Government allowed him, thus controlling any future Monarch.

Prevented from altering the clipped coins and their weights he decided on Paper Money.<sup>41</sup>

As he approached this experiment He relied on the income parliament had voted for him, namely £1,200,000. pounds but he had only received £800,000, and had to receive donations from the French King, this formed an alliance with the French against the Dutch.

He therefore issued paper credit notes, as promises to pay to the Goldsmiths, ( they had become the bankers of the day) totalling as many as seven or eight, established Goldsmiths, yet anyone of repute could bank. The main Goldsmiths were either Aldermen or Lord Mayors of the City past and present , and had grown up in Cromwell's day where they and Cromwell had received their financing from the Bank of Amsterdam. They were in effect not masters of their own houses, but owned by The Dutch bank. Thus the question of loyalty and therefore stability was erased over the decades.

Having received Charles promise to pay they issued to their own clients who bought and sold with them. When they or the Goldsmiths tried to cash them the were unable, as Charles had not the resource to honour them, being £400,000 short, nor would Parliament (the Whigs the Dutch party) raise taxes for him to do so, thus fermenting a Revolution watched on by the Dutch who were past Masters of Opportunity<sup>42</sup>

In the middle of the Dutch war in 1672 the country went into crisis and as the Goldsmiths had lent out much more than their holdings in cash or Gold, many of the Goldsmiths only holding £1000 in cash, after lending £100,000 in promise to pay bills. The bank of Amsterdam also lent out more than it held, but managed to disguise the fact to the outside world and therefore the Public blamed Charles II, all of this was planned to perfection. This slight of hand meant the public perceived Charles was to blame, and his "Cavalier" attitude to matters did not help him, or alter this view.

Lord Shaftsbury had long sought to restore above all the interests of the City, as a member of the “Kit Kat club” (along with Montague) a quasi – Masonic Orange society who had initially seven members who with special handshakes and passwords planned the invitation of William of Orange.<sup>43</sup> They met regularly at the cats tavern in Temple bar in the City.<sup>44</sup>

Montague and his fellow kit kat members wore sashes of yellow and blue and spent most of their time in Amsterdam or corresponding with the English/Dutch Whig (Liberal) party whose head quarters were in Amsterdam at that time.(until 1688). and the Glorious Revolution of 1688 provided the answer to the Citys crisis<sup>45</sup>

It was a very easy step to see that paper money given any value, not supported by the equivalent in bullion and not under the scrutiny (very little existed despite efforts in the House of Lords) of parliament, could be passed as legal tender, no longer issued as exchequer bills by the crown but by private speculators incorporated as the Bank of England. They were inspired by the clipping of coins. This fraud similar to coin clipping became the National currency and the national debt in one.

As mentioned the Goldsmiths and Charles 11, whose interests divergent as they were tried to keep a rise in prices down, so as not to discredit the paper money experiment. The Bank of England confident that the King (William of Orange) was impotent against them and that at the same time saw that the king would be blamed by public opinion for a rise in prices, saw no necessity for restraint and they lent freely<sup>46</sup>.(Not that William of Orange was too concerned)Once Charles was gone, the last barrier was getting the public to accept the new coins...then as today.

The square mile became a private Republic, surrounded by a “constitutional monarchy” which had no powers against the Republic, as its head had no constitutional powers(which is also the description of the “UK” to this day)

The City still has its own laws separate from, the UK, with its own separate police force, its own rules and regulations, in short a country within a country.

The Tories were satisfied as they had a monarchy of sorts,... the Whigs had a Republic ...of sorts And the Banks had Soveriegnity. In effect the government was a pretence with the power held in the City, the boundaries of which can be seen on any map of London. and are roughly

Blackfriars bridge to Tower bridge and North from Hackney Rd to St John Street.

If all this history and money theory is proving too much, it is worth considering how an organisation like the Orange Order, a Dutch institution came to rule England, at the same time having its origins in Rome ?

Simply consider the following ....should Britain (England ..UK whatever it is called) replace the pound with the Euro...the feeling amongst the public is it is “patriotic” to keep the pound ...yet the pound is owned and distributed by a private corporation, without heed or influence of the Royal family or the House of Commons, and therefore the people, it’s a facade and is not owned by a British private corporation but a Dutch one in origin. Is the Euro any less remote. The people do not own or control the pound which is not now a pound of anything, it matters not who controls the currency ...if there is no “people control” over it.

Losing the pound stirs the “British” patriot. Why does this patriotism not focus and extend itself to actually save the country from the private republic of the city ?..of course it’s a nonsense.

The City and for example St John Street was so named after the Knights Templar particular veneration for this evangelist whom they saw as a cult figure to be worshipped.

They had begun banking as early as 1099 AD, after the Norman conquests. It was they who built the Temple<sup>47</sup>, or the great White Temple as it is now sometimes called, opposite the Royal Courts of Justice.

As already mentioned the Knights of Christ and Columbus were an offshoot of this order.

The “City” itself was first built by the Romans (although it was known as Lugh after a celtic diety before this) as a fort providing protection against the Celtic Britons of the day<sup>48</sup>.

The Romans as everyone else since knew that it was also a fortress against invasion, being an Island, a fact admired by banks in later centuries.

Once financial problems beset the Roman Empire its detraction, provided an opportunity for the invited Saxons to stay.(House of Wessex 802 – 1016)

They were originally hired as mercenaries against the Christianised Picts.It was they who instigated the system of sheriffs, aldermen and guilds, surrounding the pagan worship of Odin, providing a fort and a city within a foreign society<sup>49</sup>

Next came the invasion of the Danes,(1014 – 1042) who conquered the Saxons, who in turn re- conquered the Danes (1042 – 1066) and eventually large tracts of the Island of Albion.... until they were defeated by the Normans, (1066 – 1141), all including the Dutch in recent centuries have used the “City” as a fort from which to subdue the enemy without . This usually begins with the immediate geographic population who must be pacified and enlisted to aid expansion. Expansion of course can know no earthly limits. The present enemy without (this means you) are suffering under the national debt (see first page of this chapter) and modern slave monetary policies.

Its most modern personae the Bank of England took its non – democratic decision on the issue of finance without care for future generations as capitalism always does.

The people who faced with an explanation of this new agreement and without schooling in affairs of court and the bar were incredulous, confused and pacified. Their national debt was theirs to pay for whilst cheering for it, unable to recognize a Coup De Taut and their loss of freedom. this does not mean of course that if the king had not been killed or put into exile he would have been any better, honesty integrity and leadership are rare in kings or presidents.

Karl Marx says of it

“And with the rise of National debt making, want of faith in the national debt takes the place of Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit”<sup>50</sup>

The church were therefore powerless, the theocracy of the state forbidding anyone to view the iniquity and the sin which so troubled the future Governor of the Bank of England Josiah Stamp.

The science of money became a intellectual one between Sir Isaac Newton , John Locke and William Lowndes, their proposals and objections were refined to the point of purity, although all involved knew that the iniquity spoiled the 24 carat purity, it was hoped the public (at least ) would not suspect the sin.

Viewing the first bank of England accounts

“This account shows the very clearly that the bank had been operating as a machine for financing the Government by inflating the currency”<sup>51</sup>

When coins could not keep pace with demand the bank asked to make more paper money available, the Government at first refused and credit was paralysed leading to deflation, John Locke protested that the population were defrauded out of 20% of the value of their wealth.

As a temporary measure the Government issued its own exchequer paper bills in 1696, yet by 1698 the bank had once again established the monopoly to issue notes<sup>52</sup>This was in essence the point of the English revolution and the civil war and the fulcrum of most of modern history and politics.

Although Charles II earlier experiments with paper money had failed, through no fault of his own, a decision to use paper money was eventually taken

Amidst the endless theorising a Scottish Economist William Patterson devised a plan which the Lord Treasurer Montague pushed through Parliament as “The ways and Means act” a device to supposedly supply money for the upkeep of the fleet then on the Thames. This gave a excuse to print money quickly.

Patterson had spent the years previous to the revolution in Amsterdam with the English Whigs at their headquarters<sup>53</sup>, he joined the kit kat club<sup>54</sup>, and involved with the pretence of the new Monarchs rule.

Instead of raising the money through the Goldsmiths, the private Corporation “The Bank of England” formed in the city would raise the money it self through its own supporters, first they raised £1,200,000 .

This was not a democratic decision, yet they promised to collect this money from the public via taxes and issue the equivalent in loans up to £1,200,000 as legal tender to whoever they pleased.

Thus they loaned to the “Crown”, an institution which now in effect did not exist, (being as it was William of Orange, without constitutional powers) at a low rate of 8% and £4000.00 expenses...in effect lending it to themselves.<sup>55</sup>

### **The trick was;**

“they issued a £1, the holder of the £1 note had the right to demand that the bank give him cash for his note, but , if he made that demand, the Bank had the right to demand the Government raise the £1 by taxation and repay the £1 worth of debt to the bank so that the bank might repay its £1 to the note holder”<sup>56</sup>

Therefore the bank loaned money to the government with interest in order that the government could repay the bank, when you demanded payment of intrinsic value for your paper money. As you had already lost this money by way of taxation to the government you were / are paying for the same money twice. The initial loan with interest becomes the national debt, and all of this is produced out of nothing, on the one hand issuing currency to the Public, and with the other raising loans which were never repaid, accumulating on paper as our National Debt.

This is Alchemy.

The basis for this accumulation is for example one pound is loaned 400 years ago at 10% interest, it will by now have become a Billion etc etc. Since it was £1,200.000, every year for a period increasing over the centuries, we can see that the initial “privilege” has become enormously expensive

The amount of “our” national debt is converted into pieces of paper as Stocks Bonds and Treasury bills, collectively known as “gilt edge securities” or gilts. They are an I.O.U. to the Government from the Government. They are sold on the stock markets with the promise (a unfailing certainty) that they will return a better price at some future date, as the National debt increases.

These stocks and bonds and bills were sold in the first place because the Government did not collect enough in Taxes (or allocate them wisely) to pay for public services. By selling the Gilt edge securities, it raises the necessary money to fund our public services.

Eventually the buyers of the stocks, bonds and bills come to collect the matured gilts, and the Government must re-imburse the holder....except it cannot....so how does the Government raise the funds outside of already death grip like taxes,.....it borrows again form the Bank of England !

Michael Rowbotham adds..

**“What happens next is pure comedy** (i.e. after the government cannot reimburse the holder, in effect being bankrupt) ... **wait for it ....by selling more Government stock to the stockmarkets** ,( insurance companies, pension funds, banks, trust funds or any accumulators “Gordon Gecko” like in outlook.) **promising even more money in the future”**<sup>57</sup>

It is in this cloaked merry go round that our taxes are siphoned off to create war, and imperialistic slaughter in our name. It cannot stop or the game will become clear. Enemies must be found, like a ravenous beast, the minus margins of our economy's accounts, like swirling black holes need more negativity to feed on and consume. If it does not exist it invents it, humanity suffering as it expands.

A Christian nation surely cannot serve two masters, and whether it is Mr Blair or a Conservative leader in power war will be just as likely (if not more so), to occur.

This continues every year with the original debt never repaid and interest accumulating interest, year in and year out for hundreds of years. and the National debt continues to rise and rise. However we can rest easy as President Bush has announced a crackdown on Corporate fraud and terror. Just imagine all the money each person earns each day, week in and out, and how this is being wasted, not buying new schools or hospitals, or roads or services, or clothes or food or a decent well run society.

Finally having found the means to print money out of nothing, without democratic agreement, and without supporting manufacturing, or indeed any collateral, of intrinsic value behind it, the next step was to make sure that there was never enough paper money to go around, or that price levels always exceeded earnings. This way family's, as homeowners, capped wages with low increases, people with small businesses, local authorities with need to spend on public services, in fact anybody at all, would always find they were short of Capital, and therefore always need to approach a bank, as a branch of the Central Bank of England for a loan and credit. A trap is therefore created.

This continued all the way up the food chain, back to the Government itself, who would then apply to the City for more money. The Bank of England would happily oblige, writing the amount out of nothing, but charging interest on what was loaned.

This is nothing new, supposing in an early primitive society, rare seashells were used as currency. Any moneylender could lend 10 shells to a farmer or even a local herdsman or chieftain in a village, he could draw a written IOU or pronounce a verbal contract that the lender repay 11 shells as interest.

Previously the moneylender would have first, procured all the shells in known existence for himself, ... for augments sake, let's say there were 10 in known existence. The borrower would then trade and work to pay the shells

back one by one to the lender, and finally having repaid all 10 shells, he is faced the problem of having to produce shell number 11. As it does not exist he is then in breach of contract if the lender so deems it.

If he does so deem! then all that the farmer, herdsman, or chieftain owns becomes the moneylenders.

Owning the sole means of providing currency, and also being the only lender of that currency means you own everything. The question is do our democracies have any control over this situation, by normal democratic means, the answer is none whatsoever.

### A brief history of time motion, and money.

The Victoria one of the five ships under Ferdinand Magellan's command had made it round the World circumnavigating it for the first( recorded) time in 1522, much to the amazement of the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, and the church in general.

Many since the Spanish Emperor realised that apart from the world not being flat, it was also not infinite i.e. it did not stretch onwards flatly forever. It could therefore be owned, parcelled into lots or territories (colonies or conquered nations) and sold , mortgaged and controlled.

When the earth was flat the concept was harder to contemplate, as anyone attempting to flog a parcel of land to a disgruntled native (of their own land) meant that they might simply move on into the outer reaches of the flat earth and build their own house and farm their own land.

Therefore the new Round earth, could be completely mapped and controlled and more to the point could be conquered and armies of land and estate agents could plague the inhabitants much like well ....today.

The race was on but who would gain control.

Credit lending, as opposed to banking merely receiving deposits can be traced to early dates even in the mediaeval period and even before to the eleventh century.

A bank in question is Bruges in modern Belgium. Its history began with the

1. Italian merchant bankers, who supported its new creation.
2. The Italian pawnbrokers (the Lombard's)
3. The money changers,

as three distinct forms of banking.<sup>58</sup> And whilst separately, they did not form hermetically sealed groups

“it was sometimes possible to pass from one to the other”<sup>59</sup>

This was primitive speculation from the middle 1300s, and essentially involved no class in particular the Merchants creating a class of their own which could be enlarged internationally if cooperation could be forced or created with ease...whichever.

Holland at the period before the reformation was a successfully rural society, which had developed a high level of manufacture mainly in textiles in the lowlands of the south, and also providing good reclaimed and existing soil. By 1650 the Republic had 19 cities with populations over 10,000 ,as compared with 9 in England. The manufacturing was mainly in the south of the country, but by the end of the revolt the manufacturing base had moved to the north and surrounded Amsterdam.<sup>60</sup> this is an amazing turnaround, in such a short period of time.

Trotsky once said that the whole of modern history is the subjection of the countryside to the town<sup>61</sup> and Holland had perfected this, they moved much more quickly from feudalism to capitalism, the war with Spain providing that transition.

“During the revolt the rural society in the west became increasingly immobile, commercialised and into the urban and overseas markets”<sup>62</sup>

and the markets in Holland took over everything. the nobility were eclipsed by the Merchants who no longer wanted to be Nobles but speculators, and they saw Calvinists as individualistic (wanting to break free of Rome) Their new doctrine was a revolutionary idea, and they aligned themselves with the cities and towns not the rural areas.

Roman Catholics in the South did not defend their churches when the images were attacked<sup>63</sup> as all were tired of the heavy taxes that the Spanish Emperor placed on the increasingly prosperous Netherlands, taxes to aid expansion, and to keep the peasants subdued.

Hollands prosperity however was no longer based on sensible rural production, complementing the urban production, which its rise since the 1300s had earned its population.

It had shifted to the riskier speculative Capitalism, which was not working for the benefit of everyone, but for the few, whilst bleeding the rest of the country dry to sustain its upkeep.

Wars and expeditions were expensive and they did not please the nobility or their replacements the merchants. The Catholic church was increasing charges for the forgiveness of sins<sup>64</sup>, (indulgences !) which were becoming more numerous and expensive as trading and the rates of exchange for venial or mortal sins increased in intensity.  
Heresy and protesting being big wage earners.

The cost of purity or sin forming the denominational preference, whilst the undecided could not stand the pressure of decision financially or morally....Therefore as with the population under Elisabeth the 1<sup>st</sup> and with Elizabeth herself an outward “Protestant” appearance would be cheaper whilst retaining essential Roman Catholic practice, or you could hedge your bets and jump from one to the other.  
If you were poor in the South or in the North ,whether Catholic or Puritan the original vision of Equality or freedom was in the end a brief bubble the markets did not sustain.

Many years before the Dutch revolution the Italians of Venice under Senator Tomasso Contari ,suggested a clearing bank be established as a municipal institution, initially Bruges was considered but the town refused ?  
Antwerp and Lyon were then mooted and initially, Antwerp was chosen<sup>65</sup>....but the year was 1585 and Antwerp was about to be replaced by Amsterdam.

The south or rather the Nobles in the southern provinces sided with the Spanish Catholic Empire,as their wealth over the centuries, had supported the old order.

The North declared itself independent, and the states general declared themselves Sovereign. The Italians obviously saw the new Republic as the more attractive chose for the first clearing bank outside of Italy. How did this come to be ? , what made them choose the North over the South, especially as the entire countries economy and infrastructure would need to move north and change beyond recognition

As already discussed on the Italian bankers under Senator Tomasso wished to expand Italian banking across the continent  
The bank in Bruges was offered this ability but refused<sup>66</sup> , and the merchant bankers moved to Antwerp

They shrewdly moved to Amsterdam due to the revolt, but which came first the threat of revolution as a basis for their decision to move, or did the banks cause the revolution in order to move.?

The revolt in Amsterdam had a long history, and the Duke of Burgundy's (Frankish Norman in origin), also called Phillip the Good, ironically misnamed, was hated by the Dutch, as was his imperialist vision, as not only were the cost of sins increasing he was also increasing taxes beyond the means of the Dutch<sup>67</sup>.

He had recently acquired the Netherlands and ruled as Lord of Holland, Zealand and Hainault, other principalities included Antwerp. And in 1437 he founded the order of the Golden Fleece at Bruges<sup>68</sup>.

This knightly order was formed out of the remains of the scattered Knights Templar, and just as Columbus had joined with the Knights of Christ, setting sail for new Gold in 1492, other orders of the Knights Templar had also re-appeared since their glory days as the bankers of 11th century Europe, and the crusades to Jerusalem.

It was this new influx of gold, into Spain, which became an increasing burden on other countries, the increased coinage, devaluing other nations coins and so decreasing the amount you could buy with goods that remained relatively the same price. Once the price of goods fell so eventually the nations standard of living fell, this increased the fires of revolt around the empire. Especially of pirates stole quantities of Gold making a tax increase likely to match expected growth keeping it alive.

Other offshoots of the Knights Templar include the Knights of St John, Knights of Malta, Knights Hospitalers, The Priory of Sion and the Teutonic Knights of Germany, who would later support Martin Luther, in opposition to the Pope.

Also included were the Rosicrucian's, of which Francis Bacon was a member, out of which grew the modern order of Knights Templars.

The reason so many splinter organisations appear is due to the crushing of the original Knights Templar by Papal decree in 1307.

Philippe le bel (Philippe IV of France) had been humiliated by the Templars, as they had refused to let him join the order, and had sworn revenge. Philippe had already kidnapped and poisoned Pope Boniface VIII and possibly Benedict XI.

In 1305 he secured the Papacy for his friend the Archbishop of Bordeaux, later Clement V, and as the Pope was the Knights Templars "chief in

command” he used Clement to move against the Templars by accusation and slander.<sup>69</sup>

Many were rounded up and tortured, whilst many fled into areas such as Germany, Malta and even Ireland and Scotland where the papal order was not put into effect.

It is reputed that the military expertise of the Templars was an enormous help to Robert the Bruce and his victory over Edward the longshanks, made famous by the film Braveheart. The leader of the Templars Jacques DeMolay swore revenge in turn on the papacy in the form of a curse with his dying breath.

The implications for Europe and the new world was a complete disruption of power, and a new order as the Knights Templars were the first to combine bills of credit, with outposts of stored Bullion for travellers with a military expertise, especially travellers on their way to Jerusalem. In effect the soldier monk was crossed with the merchant banker.

From 1307 to 1437, the knights Templar laid low, dates vary according to which order was reformed, and the Golden Fleece, as mentioned appeared in 1437 at Bruges. even though Bruges was their town of formation their headquarters were still regarded as Rome. They prospered under Phillip the Good until his death in 1467<sup>70</sup>

The order however lived on and in 1562 , we discover that the Golden Fleece have been summoned to Bruges<sup>71</sup> to discuss with the Government and the Prince of Orange, the increasing reports and cries of independence from the estates general, giving the Spanish empire and the Pope a cause for concern

This official meeting did not achieve much, and so the prince of Orange agreed to meet with the knights privately at his home with only certain members of the government and not with the Cardinal Granville of Arras the Flemish man of many talents for acquiring wealth<sup>72</sup>, who had a greater following in the south, amongst the government.

The fact that the Fleece, did meet privately with William the Silent (of Orange), shows his power of persuasion, along with their previous grandmasters pledge for revenge on the papacy. It was an obvious opportunity for William

These were no ordinary Knights but the trained elites of their day, the super soldier, highly trained and experienced in combat, and military strategy.

Many of the government men supported Cardinal Granville, who had a seat

( Palace ) at Bruges, although the Prince of Orange tried to persuade them to abandon their support for him

Nothing was achieved at this private meeting, except they did resolve to at least discuss....

“on how it could be rendered practicable to discuss political matters in the future”<sup>73</sup>

The empire of Spain and the backdrop of the reformation provided the successors of the Knights Templar with a reason for choosing to side with the Prince of Orange (William the silent), and it is they that the Duke of Alba as champion of Spain feared the most. The eventual establishment of the Prince of Oranges territory in the north of the Netherlands and Amsterdam, providing the Italian bankers with the perfect independent estate in which a central bank of exchange could flourish. It must have also been a factor that good relations existed between Holland and England at least between the Merchants, and intellectuals of the day.

Since Henry V111 quest for an heir, and his many divorces, the Pope needed an ally against England. Although England and Holland were seen as allies, (even though they had warred against each other), what better way of removing, the threat of another Universal head of the Church (as Henry had conferred on himself), than to seize control of the Crown and England’s finances. The Golden Fleece, the new bank in Amsterdam, and a figurehead puppet king all played its part. The only difficulty was the Golden Fleece, they were the military industrial complex of their day, and were able to do as they wished.

In the end Rome’s objective was achieved, and the many stagemanaged denominations, and pretences of Government, providing a Surreal society ever since. The most obvious is the outward appearance of Protestantism, and Christianity enshrined in its institutions.

The Bank of England as the branch of the Bank of Amsterdam (Holland being the first Capitalist country not England) owned the Government and the people and planted a Dutch Prince to do nothing well.

William did not even bother to learn English ,rarely spent time in England and used the Bank of England loans to pay for his war with France over Belgium

The English were defeated and paying for another country’s war. The first Governor of the Bank of England was a Dutchmen and in effect true king! without a Coronation aka Sir John Doublon.

Thus the bank at Bruges may well have announced its refusal as expedient to its survival from the Knights of the Golden Fleece and William the Silent, Antwerp put up a greater resistance,(called the civil war) but all in the end in vain.

The bank of Amsterdam was founded by force in 1603.

Both independent from Empire and the Church the Dutch Republic was perfect for the new bank, not that either church or republic looked to God for inspiration. This was the beginning of a new Knightly order which realized that a bank in their control was necessary to expand and colonise other countries. The reformation owing much to older feuds amongst the banks , than to new doctrines on which they built.

William the silent was third behind William of Orange in the historical king lists, but the influence of the Knights Templars through the Golden Fleece pervaded every aspect of the new Republic

The influence of the Fleece, eventually like an Argonaut settling in London, was in doubt fully inspirational on William 111s decision to seek initiation into the Rosicrucian freemason guild at Hampton court in 1694.<sup>74</sup>

The subsequent new order of the Orange itself growing out of the “kit kat”(see previous in this chapter ) club and Golden Fleece degrees and rituals of the previous centuries.

The Orange Order becoming the Calvinist Hanoverian revolutionaries of the Whig/liberal party.

Ironically the Organists in the Whigs had tried to support the Stuarts, but this was a short-lived aspiration. Its brevity was not due to Charles 11, or James 11 Catholicism but due to their insistence that the Monarchy (i.e. themselves) retain control over the paper money experiment.

The agents of Rome, the Knights, and the new Hanoverian puppets could not permit this. This is bewildering for many to grasp, and shows the Orange Order has its roots in Rome itself.

This was not a question of denomination or allegiance, or Protesting to the Pope, but simply a question of allegiance to the power of credit creation, wherever you decided to pray or blaspheme.

Holland had earlier reformations a notable one in the beginnings of the twelfth century initiated by Tanchelyn who seemingly used Antwerp as a Brothel and levied huge sums out of his followers pompously dressing as an Emperor and hiring three thousand armed guards to keep him safe<sup>75</sup> Protesting as he did against the Pope he was assassinated by a Priest in 1115.

The Pope at the time Paschal so hated Henry 1V that he had his body dug up thrown out of the church and Ex-communicated.

The previous Pope Urban 11 introduced a sex tax for the clergy. Although banning marriage, a priest could keep a concubine or a wife as long as he paid the sex tax , infamously known as the “Cullagium”. Urban devised many such ploys to pay for the Crusade of the French King William to the Holy Land

After Paschal Pope Callistus 11, seemed to reissue the previous Bull with the decision that a priest must not marry but learn to keep a “punk” ? instead, or learn to lie alone !<sup>76</sup>.

There was much to protest about but the protestors are not always acting out of a divine purpose but to seize power, become fabulously wealthy and indulge in as much sexual intercourse as possible.

On much firmer ground but quite literally going to war with the church were Waldo (Woldonese), Albigenes, Perfectists, Poplicans, Arnaldists and the Bohemian brothers.

Later still Erasmus developed “heresies” which Martin Luther later built upon. The invention of the printing press vastly improving the followers of whoever to judge for themselves, if they were sinning or not and if they needed to pay for a clear conscience.

They could also wonder if any group or any man had the right to define who or who could not find salvation.there was trouble brewing in Holland centuries before the Revolution

In the Dutch Republic Merchants, Jewish Protestant and decreasingly Catholic traders pitched tents, alongside Astrologers selling Zodiacs, Prostitutes and crystal gazers and Liveries of all kinds competed for trade.<sup>77</sup> “Holland was embarked on a money madness frenzy for getting rich without work”<sup>78</sup>

Even Calvinist Pastors as were all classes seduced by the “TULIPMANIA”,

The ability to speculate on the future price of a commodity to any great effect was invented by the Dutch, who became consumed with the trading in **TULIPS**.

T.U.L.I.P. also has a theological philosophy, made into a church doctrine, as well as a financial commodity it had even become the commodity in which souls were traded between God and the Devil.<sup>79</sup>

**T**otal depravity (we are, or have)

**U**nconditional election (by God)

**L**imited atonement (limited to whom?)

**I**rrresistible grace (who then resisted .i.e. limited atonement suggests some resisted grace)

**P**erseverance of the saints, (once saved, always saved)

This was the doctrine of Protestant Calvinism enshrined at the Synod of Dort in 1618 (only a few years after the powerful new bank was formulated in 1603), in the Dutch Republic, firstly formulated by John Calvin and completed by Beza his student.

Most controversial is the Limited Atonement or the “L” petal in the Tulip, which essentially said many are damned few are chosen, making it however a manmade decision not a divine revelation.

No other view, Protestant, Roman Catholic or “other” was allowed to enter the synod.<sup>80</sup> TULIP of the scented variety or of the anima, animus soon became the trade with which to evangelise the world.

Intoxicated with Gambling of dice and cards, traders in 1634 in Old Amsterdam were buying more than was required in brown bulbs and scraggy roots, in the hope of rising prices for tulips.

Darting in and out of ale – houses and cobbled Amsterdam streets to the newly formed “colleges” a forerunner of the commodity exchanges of London (also founded in Taverns) they perceived for the first time a wedding of gambling and speculation on a national scale amidst the backdrop of the war with Spain<sup>81</sup>

This was the time of Spinoza, and his Deists teachings had already caused him to be thrown out of the Synagogue and the Christian churches of Amsterdam, yet he laid the foundation for Albert Einstein’s theories, who regarded the Philosophy of Spinoza as that of his own.

Other influences included the “dictionary of bayle” and influential on the minds of the French revolution, the writings of Boulanvilliers<sup>82</sup>.

Amsterdam was the centre of the Anti-Christian movement,(a curious backdrop for a future Christian revolution).

The Dutch had literature, books and teachings and philosophies from all over the world , its libraries and universities were stocked with the worlds accumulative knowledge gained from its vast sea-faring and trade expeditions in which it excelled.

Deism, once thought to be English in origin had in fact sprung from Amsterdam, Leyden, Haarlam and the Hauge and later imported to England. Holland was in fact the centre of teaching on the “profane” sciences..<sup>83</sup>

New Amsterdam (New York) had been founded in 1625, and Wall street first began to trade in the 1640s. Wall street was designed by the Dutch settlers from humble beginnings in 1644. The first fort ramparts designed to keep out the Indians and prevent cattle stealing.

Governor William Kieft also representative of the Dutch West India Company (founded in 1644 , the Dutch East India company having its origin in 1602, one year before the Bank of Amsterdam) did not pursue the cattle raiding as he was in effect hiding out, escaping his debtors and the gallows in the Dutch Republic.

He had a charge of embezzling trust funds hanging over his head and gladly accepted a ship from the company whose slave trading, smuggling and piracy did not vet its employees on their Puritan worthiness.

He was eventually replaced by Peter Stuyvestant, whose trading abilities briskly improved the ports business. He even fought the English, when hostilities between the United provinces and England broke out. Although the English eventually captured the port in 1664 renaming it New York ! , it did not matter in the end as the Dutch through William 111, eventually captured London in 1688, and the Glorious Revolution. The trading continued in any case.<sup>84</sup>

The Dutch Republic became the first neo –liberal capitalist state, where gambling and speculation could be perfected to create an elite, who could also create a class system within Christianity, ensuring that the Elect were most likely to be the wealthy, and Atonement Limited to them.

With skill and discreet confidence salvation politically applied, could be kept from the brown slave types, and the Oriental types who were beyond the pale of Limited Atonement.

Whites were not immune to catch damnation but their immediate geography meant they were not quite as pointless as those who were “afar off” An

almost but not quite state of purity existed with the poorer element who by rigorous morals and increased output could aspire to election with a undecreed and silent doctrine of good works.

In fact anyone who was not politically advantageous in his worthiness could be deemed “Reprobate” (predestined to hell) if comparative advantage could be gained.

Of course the laws of supply and demand in a Capitalist class society, meant that elasticity could be the salvation of those surplus widgets, if they proved to be useful in the marketplace.

In the fiat of men’s minds status and position could mean damnation or they could mean salvation.

In the Calvinist puritan society making up Gods mind for him, in the Fiat of their own minds also became speculative and many believed that the market was rigged. (it was difficult for the Supreme being to decide between damnation and eternal life, often choosing unsuitable candidates)

Of course persuading parents that without “infant baptism” the child would not go to heaven could also be seen as a way to raise revenues and inflate Church membership, and the Roman Catholic church and its Lombard bankers were not unaware of the need to also shape doctrine.

Parliament had already voted not to grant the king funds, and William knew that any loans he acquired could be written off as national debt, whilst simultaneously avoiding losing the monarchy since it no longer existed in as a institution of substance.

This is claimed as a Glorious and Christian revolution.

The merchants in both England and the Dutch Republic abandoned the feudal aspiration of becoming noble to become speculators instead. Cross channel assistance was given both by the bank of Amsterdam to English revolutionaries Anabaptist or Calvinist dissenters <sup>85</sup> Assistance came in all forms, as even when the Dutch fishermen who supported William the silent against Alva and Spain, they were allowed to moor on the Thames after a defeat in 1566. these fishermen were known as the sea beggars. Heavily inspired by William and the Fleece there cross channel revolutionary contacts became all important for William 111 in the Glorious Revolution.

Disagreements between Amsterdam and England dressed up as a need to go to war,.. as we also experience today, a pathetic disagreement caused the English merchants to seek address...

They made it a law that all bills of debts be made payable to the bearer of that bill, as the collection of debts became a wearying journey to maybe six or seven debtors who presumably claimed the debt was now with someone else.

As they were alarmed at the lack of secure banking in Holland, this perfecting of the law also helped the bank of Amsterdam to operate with increased confidence and by 1604 a moneyer in Amsterdam was classed as a “kaissier” and banking as “kassiersbedrijf”, (ie cashier) and also following the money changing habits of the mediaeval Venetians and Italians<sup>86</sup> except now they were also merchants bankers with credit skills modelled upon mediaeval pawnbroking

Merchant and public bankers today are known as cashiers combining manual exchanges with deposit banking. the city and bank of England perfected this even further.

And in England

they naturally made it a felony to (without benefit of clergy !) forge and tamper with them, even though their notes were a forgery of a different kind All banks eventually seek Monopoly status first domestically through war if needs be, and next internationally... through war again.

A important distinction between The Bank of England and previous banks (with the exception of the Bank of Stockholm/Sweden began in 1656)

“it never pretended to take the deposit for any other purpose than for trading with them”<sup>87</sup>

“The merchant bankers made a major contribution by developing the bill of exchange. Its use in international trade considerably reduced the demand for specie, since shipments of gold and silver from one country to another were largely eliminated and replaced by a system of payments by compensation and transfer.

In the middle ages, as has been pointed out, the bill of exchange, as well as credit, transaction. Bills were not used for the purpose of discounting bills and still less of rediscounting”<sup>88</sup>

“It is the Guardian of the cash reserves of England and therefore the whole world”<sup>89</sup> writes professor Andreades in 1909.

Sir Isaac Newton went on to be master of the mint for weights and measures, and falling apples as currency may well have been a easier and less complicated solution and just as sound Apples at least could feed the population if they could not eat paper money. Newtons vision today defines our society, his pursuits with alchemy, and heresy concerning the Trinity of God, still as then wholly unchristian.<sup>90</sup>

“A government can decide to make anything legal tender”<sup>91</sup> It simply takes faith to see it as legal tender having intrinsic value.

Khubla Khan who in Xanadu a stately pleasure dome did decree, persuaded his subjects that strips of tree bark were money. In ninth century Russia the skins of Martens were used as currency until they began to rot.

In 1122 the Doge Michieli of Venice at the siege of Tyre managed to persuade the Authorities of Venice to accept Leather money stamped with his coat of arms. they were in effect promises to pay.

The Emperor Frederick laying siege to Milan payed his troops also in Leather money.

Edward “the longshanks” of Braveheart fame employed leather money as did Edward the 1<sup>st</sup>

Arabia used glass as money from 909-1171, China tried paper money from 1260-63, as did Persia in 1294 and copper tokens were used in Delhi from 1330-31.<sup>92</sup>

Indeed any would be Genghis Khan, Nero, or hopeful dictator with a few gestures of his battle axe and a grunt could persuade their subjects anything was money.

“The creation of money” writes Martin Mayer “is a political act, and the Roman Emperors , portraits are on the Roman coins for reasons beyond the vanity of the gentlemen involved. the enforcement of official money as a medium of exchange is one of the key attributes of sovereignty” he continues..

“Everyone can create money (quoting the economist Hyman Minsky speaking in 1986), the problem is getting it accepted.”<sup>93</sup>

Reproducing the correspondence between John Maynard Keynes and French financial journalist Marcel Labordere in the 1920,s Labordere states

“that man will never be able to know what money is no more than he will be able to know what God is, or the spiritual world .Money is not the infinite

but it is the indefinite, an astounding complex of all sorts of psychological as well as material reactions”<sup>94</sup>!

Should we therefore worry about the production of money at its source, or concern ourselves with National debts and the science of money at all !

Michael Rowbotham points to economists who say that our National Debts are simply sums of money owed to ourselves, he comments

“To claim that the national debt is a debt we simply owe ourselves is in any case demonstrably false.(it simply screams out with contradictions)  
Such an argument avoids all the economic details of the arrangement.  
The national debt is a government debt :it is undertaken by the government , underwritten by the government, and owed by the government to our pension funds and insurance funds  
However , the government obliges the people of the nation to pay for this debt.

This is clear when we consider the settlement of the national debt stocks as they become due for repayment. As we have seen , the government generally repays the money due on maturing national debt stocks by borrowing even more from pension funds .

But in very rare years when there is a budget surplus, and a net repayment of the national debt, the population are actually paying this debt off through their taxes.

People are thus paying for what is already theirs, paying a second time from what they have already saved, replacing their own pension fund monies via taxation”<sup>95</sup>

And so the money goes around and around until it busts and we start again. We can however see the difference in the debate, those who favour the debt system merely saying we could simply write off the debt we owe ourselves ..... well why is it not enacted and decreed immediately.(As in a Golden Jubilee given the Judeo – Christian law laid down by a promise from God ?)

A modern economist whose thoughts grace our Universities tries to explain it away as follows

“The UK government ran large actual deficits in the 1970s.hence the nominal value of its debt increased sharply during the 1970s, from £33 billion in 1971 to £113 billion in 1981.

Yet in many of these years the nominal deficit was actually a real surplus once the appropriate inflation-accounting is employed. This suggests that the real debt must have been falling, not rising. And this in fact is the case. Even if it were not, we should remember that, when the economy is growing in real terms, real tax revenue will be rising, and the public sector can service a growing real debt without having to increase tax rates”<sup>96</sup>

He continues.?

“There are two theoretical reasons why concerns about the national debt may be overstated. First, the vast majority of UK debt is owed to UK citizens who hold government bonds. It is a debt we owe ourselves as a nation. Second, some of the money, WHICH THE PUBLIC SECTOR has borrowed in the past has been used as to finance physical investment or investment in human capital, which will raise future tax revenue and help pay off the debt. Prudent business sometimes borrow to finance profitable investment, and there is no reason why a prudent public sector should not do likewise”

Does this make any sense, it is fact first rate spin. He continues...

“Why, then, should a sensible economist worry about the scale of the public debt at all ?. Two reasons....

**First**, if the debt becomes large relative to GNP, high tax rates MAY BE REQUIRED TO MEET THE DEBT INTEREST BURDEN. High tax rates may have disincentive or distortionary effects”

“**Second**, if the government is unwilling to raise tax rates beyond a certain point (perhaps because of the adverse effects mentioned above) or is unable to raise tax rates beyond a certain point (perhaps because business and rich individuals would then emigrate ), a sufficiently large debt may lead to large deficits which the government can finance only by borrowing or printing money, eventually the temptation to print money on a massive scale may become irresistible. That is how hyperinflations start.”<sup>97</sup> ?

Ironically the explanation points to “irresistible”, problems which have already occurred for hundreds of years ???.

Economists and professors of over 70 years ago (who are now making a comeback in economic thinking at least) pointed out the problems quite simply and yet were ignored ?. The professor below has described a system and gives a direct explanation even his students could grasp

“ To initiate the system some £2,000,000.00 of national interest bearing debt should be cancelled and the same sum of national money (non- interest – bearing National debt) issued to replace the credit replaced by the banks. The taxpayer would thereby be relieved of the payment of £1,000,000.00 a year on purely fictitious loans. This annual interest is a payment by the taxpayer to bondholders for money lent to the state, and it is transferred under the existing system to the banks for their services in creating new money as bank credit and conferring it on bond holders against their bonds as collateral security. The taxes are thus paid to the bank for doing what the taxes were imposed to prevent being done, namely the increase of the currency. Otherwise there would have no reason for the state to borrow at interest if it had not wished to prevent the increase of the currency ” <sup>98</sup>

Of course the only debts wiped out are those debts belonging to people who control the money .. the ordinary consumer can lose their homes and their jobs, whilst the third world starve in their millions whilst managing their national debts.

To live in debt or out of debt, which is better and for whom.

Can we therefore understand what money is, ?? is it an astounding complex of all sorts of psychological as well as material reactions that like God or the spiritual cannot be understood.?

“wealth is a positive physical quantity , but debt is a negative quantity. It has no concrete existence , and is to the physicist an imaginary quality.”<sup>99</sup>

Try telling this to a starving man or woman.

“Aristotle tried to cut the Gordian knot by defining wealth as all things whose value can be measured in money”<sup>100</sup> so defining the Roman empires philosophy, and ironically the Calvinists revolutionry’s ?...in asking the riddle “what has Rome to do with Jerusalem ?”, well they are both in each others debt.

Any expanding empire needs an increase in currency yet Love for example or things spiritual cannot be defined in money nor can they be defined as things bought and sold..

Professor Soddy commenting on J.S. Mill “Principles of political economy” cites Mill

“A merchants credit is purchasing power exactly like money”

The Professor states

“Therefore according to Mill and Aristotle, **Credit is wealth**” and by definition **debt is wealth**

Citing H. D. MacLeods “Theory of credit”

“ How is debt created ? By the mere consent of two minds By the mere fiat of the Human will”.

The human will (and not Gods although of course he could) therefore has the inclination to create debt out of nothing and to extinguish it decreasing it into nothing.

More to the point it can be created without recourse to the spiritual and without the express wish or permission of God, and voyeur further into the iniquity and the sin, let us see the orgy of depraved libertines in action. How is it possible to hold the stones and not throw them at themselves and each other.

In 1994 Viacom minted coins in nickel, silver and gold in the British mint and had it accepted as coin in Liberia.

The newly minted coins had the Liberian coat of arms and pictures of James T Kirk and/or Jean-Luc Picard, captains of the Starship Enterprise and now industry.

Bravely going where no man had gone before they managed to briefly trade in these Viacon Liberian monies so expanding starfleets understanding of the Alien mind.<sup>101</sup>

“There aren’t too many other products you could do this with....its highly unlikely that you could create a Mickey Mouse coin and have it be legal tender. But he cant be sure nobody has tried”<sup>102</sup> !

“Even a child can see the reason why money is made of a valuable metal”<sup>103</sup>

Seeking out new frontiers the worlds Money markets took a giant leap for mankind with the Gold crisis in the 1930s.

The Bank of England Governor Montague Norman simultaneously managed to convince the country that the Gold standard was not working and inadequate( although previously supporting it) for national economics and fiscal policy but... was perfectly acceptable for international economic stability.?

John Hargreave, Normans biographer puts it all to shame...he likens the Gold crisis as a credit confidence trick ..the great confidence trick of the Banking Combine.

Combining the absurd with the spiritual....

“Most people are just as easily imposed upon in matters of finance as were the followers of Joseph Smith, the founder of the Latter-Day saints, Smith was unsurpassed as a master of witchery of the non-existent.

He told his disciples that he was guided by an angel to the discovery of a new bible. This was the Book of Mormon, originally inscribed by the Patriarch Mormon UPON golden plates in the “reformed” Egyptian language, and buried on a hill at Palmyra in New York state.

“Having dug up the box containing this revelation of the divine truth ,Joseph Smith found a few people ready to finance the publication of the Holy book as soon as he had translated it .

None of them had set eyes on the golden plates .It had to be kept hidden from the profane....!

Smith sat behind a green curtain deciphering the hieroglyphs.

Day after day he dictated an English version from the “reformed Egyptian” to certain of his followers sitting on the other side of the curtain

After a time, however, curiosity of three of these disciples overcame them. they implored their master to show them the golden plates. At last Smith led them behind the curtain, and opened the box, ....to their utter astonishment, there was nothing in it !!.

Brother Joseph , where are the golden plates ? they asked timidly ...we cannot see them !

To which Brother Joseph replied O ye of little faith ! Kneel down and pray. Then you will see them.

They did what they were told, and prayed long and fervently that God might strengthen their weak faith.

Some hours later. they begged to be allowed to peep again in to the box, and behold, ! they could actually see the inscribed plates of Gold (that weren't there) !” <sup>104</sup>

Hargreave says it is the same with the “Book of Norman” ...(Montague), later the gold standard was abandoned at the Bretton Woods conference in America and replaced with the Dollar as the standard other currencies were set against.

Therefore whether the standard is Gold or Silver or an absence of them a great deal of faith is required, is this beyond the ability of James T Kirk, Jean-Luc Picard or even Mickey Mouse.

This veiled reference for keeping the mysteries of banking hidden from Public view, was instigated from the inception of the Bank of England. It managed to keep its fraud hidden without a green curtain, opening it to display, answering any bewilderment or puzzlement as the lack of faith of the public, after all in the days of the reformation. “sides” allowed the odd iniquity Grace, and who would protest if treason, or heresy was brought as an accusation.

In those days of execution, witch burnings and careful vocabulary as to your most private doctrinal opinions of faith, who would say the Emperor was naked or the banks cupboard was bare..

The closer one looks it is clear that the profane can look upon the mysteries of banking it’s credibility screams like a warning from the engine room of the starship Enterprise with Scotty shouting

“ I canna hold her captain ...she’s breaking up”

and even though Spock has beamed down to the planet’s surface, the blob like creature is advancing ever closer , can a Vulcan mind transfer with the beast save the situation.

Spock bravely attempts the mind link, whilst the Enterprise and its crew are thrown from side to side.

After a sharp twinge of pain the blob speaks through Spock and it message is linked to the bridge

The blob relates how it is the sole survivor from a world not unlike your earth (but much older).It was a beautiful civilization once until a revolution and blindness of heart changed its fiscal policy , burdening the once proud and bountiful planet with increasing debt, misery and war, cumulating in total destruction.”

Spock breaks free from the Blob which has started to glow and smoke, the Enterprise goes to Red alert just managing to beam up the cabbaged Spock.The captains log relates how they returned to Starfleet at warp factor ten, with Bones saying Damn your Vulcan ears.

Today

“Fully one third of all world trade now consists of exchanges **within the same firm**; that is , shell trading with shell, IBM trading with IBM, Unilever

with Unilever. A further third of world trade is not intra-firm but inter-firm, or Trans national corporations trading with each other – General Electric with General Motors. Only the remaining third of exchanges on world markets can in any normal sense be called “national” trade and this share is steadily shrinking. What Original sin and the Holy Trinity are to Catholics, the benefits of free trade are to neo-liberals.”<sup>105</sup>

The benefits of fraudulent accounting , inflated profits and billions lost or written off, do not enrich the Billions around the world who live below the poverty line or who are about to starve or have starved to death or die in wars they have no control over. The huge bubble bursts of 2001 and 2002, indicators of the economics of lunacy. Our national debts have increased to fund the wars with Iraq (or rather the occupation of Iraq, wars have two sides).

Democracy is credit. “The democratisation of credit” especially since the turn of this century means democracies are not defined as such, until they can issue credit, here or abroad.<sup>106</sup> Is this a good or bad system to have ? Democracy is not as we might naively think a matter of having a one man, and one woman one vote tri-partite parliamentary system, but a merry go round, stage managed, and fronted by a convincing façade.

Credit and debt hand in hand need to constantly expand, once they have completely infected the wheels of government, then one way or another fair or foul the war machine will roll. New markets willing or resistant find that the new theocracy placed upon them have not come to preach the Sermon on the Mount.