

Big Oil

James Corbett

Jul 2017

Index

1	How Big Oil conquered the world	1
	Introduction	1
	Part one: Birth of the Oligarchy	3
	Part two: Competition is a sin	15
	Part three: The World in their image	30
	Conclusion: Monopolizing life	49
2	Why Big Oil conquered the world	51
	Introduction	51
	Part one: The rise of Eugenics.	54
	Part two: Oligarchs for climate change	76
	Part three: Agenda: Technocracy	101
	Conclusion	124
3	Author's epilogue	129

Chapter 1

How Big Oil conquered the world

Introduction Oil. From farm to pharmaceutical, diesel truck to dinner plate, pipeline to plastic product, it is impossible to think of an area of our modern-day lives that is not affected by the petrochemical industry. The story of oil is the story of the modern world.

Parts of that story are well-known: Rockefeller and Standard Oil; the internal combustion engine and the transformation of global transport; the House of Saud and the oil wars in the Middle East.

Other parts are more obscure: the quest for oil and the outbreak of World War I; the petrochemical interests behind modern medicine; the Big Oil money behind the “Green Revolution” and the “Gene Revolution.”

But that story, properly told, begins somewhere unexpected. Not in Pennsylvania with the first commercial drilling operation and the first oil boom, but in the rural backwoods of early 19th century New York State. And it doesn’t start with crude oil or its derivatives, but a different product altogether: snake

oil.

“Dr. Bill Livingston, Celebrated Cancer Specialist” was the very image of the traveling snake oil salesman. He was neither a doctor nor a cancer specialist; his real name was not even Livingston. More to the point, the “Rock Oil” tonic he peddled was a useless mixture of laxative and petroleum and had no effect whatsoever on the cancer of the poor townsfolk he conned into buying it.



He lived the life of a vagabond, always on the run from the last group of people he had fooled, engaged in ever-more-outrageous deceptions to make sure that the past wouldn't catch up with him. He abandoned his first wife and their six children to start a bigamous marriage in Canada at the same time as he fathered two more children by a third woman. He adopted the name “Livingston” after he was indicted for raping a girl in Cayuga in 1849.

When he wasn't running away from them or disappearing for years at a time, he would teach his children the tricks of his treacherous trade. He once bragged of his parenting technique: “I cheat my boys every chance I get. I want to make 'em sharp.”

A towering man of over six feet and with natural good looks that he used to his advantage, he went by “Big Bill.” Others, less generously, called him “Devil Bill.” But his real name was William Avery Rockefeller, and it was his son, John D. Rockefeller, who would go on to found the Standard Oil monopoly


and become the world's first billionaire.

The world we live in today is the world created in "Devil" Bill's image. It's a world founded on treachery, deceit, and the naïveté of a public that has never wised up to the parlor tricks that the Rockefellers and their ilk have been using to shape the world for the past century and a half.

This is the story of the oilgarchy.

Part one: Birth of the Oilgarchy Titusville, 1857. A most unlikely man alights from a railway car into the midst of this sleepy Western Pennsylvania town on the shores of Oil Creek: "Colonel" Edwin Drake. He's from the Pennsylvania Rock Oil Company, and he's here on a mission: to collect oil.

Like "Dr." Bill, Drake isn't really a Colonel. The title is bestowed on him by George Bissell and James Townsend, a lawyer and a banker who started the Pennsylvania Rock Oil Company after they discovered they could distill the region's naturally occurring Seneca oil into lamp oil, or kerosene. Drake is actually an unemployed railroad conductor who talked himself into a job after staying at the same hotel as Bissell the year before. Calling him a Colonel, it is hoped, will help win the respect of the locals.



The locals think he's crazy anyway. Seneca oil is indeed

plentiful¹, bubbling out of seeps and collecting in the creek, but other than as a cure-all medicine or grease for the local sawmill's machinery, it's hardly seen as something valuable. In fact, it can be a downright nuisance, contaminating brine wells that supply Pittsburgh's booming salt industry.

Still, Drake has a task to complete: finding a way to collect enough oil to make the distillation of Seneca oil into lamp oil profitable. He tries everything he can think of. The Native Americans had historically collected the oil by damming the creek near a seep and skimming the oil off the top. But Drake can only collect six to ten gallons of oil a day this way, even when he opens up extra seeps. He tries digging a shaft, but the groundwater floods in too quickly.

By the summer of 1859 he's desperate. Drake's running out of ideas, Bissell and Townsend are running out of patience and, most importantly, the company is running out of funds. He turns to "Uncle" Billy Smith, a Pittsburgh blacksmith who had experience drilling brine wells with steam-powered equipment. They get to work drilling down through the shale bedrock to reach the oil. It's maddeningly slow work, with the crude equipment struggling to get through three feet of bedrock a day. By August 27th they've drilled down sixty-nine and a half feet, Drake has used the last of his funds, and Bissell and his partners have decided to close up the operation. On August 28th, they strike oil.

Narrator: Then on Sunday, August 28th, 1859, oil bubbled up the drive pipe. Uncle Billy and his son Sam bailed out several buckets of oil. On Monday, the very day that Colonel Drake received his final

¹<http://www.enopetroleum.com/earlyoilpennsylvania.html>

payment and an order to close down the operation, they hitched the walking beam to a water pump and the oil began to flow. The first oil was to sell for \$40 a barrel. Years later a local newspaper interviewed Uncle Billy about the day they struck oil:

"I commenced drilling and at 4:00 I struck the oil. I says to Mr. Drake, 'Look there! What do you think of this?' He looked down the pipe and said, 'What's that?' And I said, 'That is your fortune!'"

Drake's well proved that by drilling for it, oil could be found in abundance and produced cheaply. Overnight a whole new industry was born. Before long in millions of homes, farms and factories around the world, lamps would be lit with kerosene refined from West Pennsylvania crude.

Daniel Yergin: When the word came out that Drake had struck oil, the cry went up throughout the narrow valleys of Western Pennsylvania: 'The crazy Yankee has struck oil! The crazy Yankee has struck oil!' And it was the first great boom. It was like a gold rush.

SOURCE: *The Prize* (parte 1)²

Overnight, the quiet farming backwoods of rural Pennsylvania was transformed into a bustling oil region, with prospectors leasing up flats, towns springing up from nowhere, and a forest of percussion rigs covering the land. The first oil boom had arrived.


²http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0278873/?ref=tt_ov_inf

Already poised to make the most of this boom was a young up-and-coming bookkeeper in Cleveland with a head for numbers: John Davison Rockefeller. He had two ambitions in life: to make \$100,000 and to live to 100 years old. John D. set off to make his fortune in the late 1850s, armed with a \$1,000 loan from his father, "Devil" Bill.

David Rockefeller: Grandfather never finished high school and went to Cleveland having borrowed \$1,100 from his father to start a business – paid 9% interest on it, incidentally. And he read about the oil business just beginning and got interested, and came to realize it was a very volatile business at the time.

SOURCE: The Prize (parte 1)³

In 1863, seeing the oil boom and sensing the profits to be made in the fledgling business, Rockefeller formed a partnership with fellow businessman Maurice B. Clark and Samuel Andrews, a chemist who had built an oil refinery but knew little about the business of getting his product to market. In 1865, the shrewd John D. bought out his partners for \$72,500 and, with Andrews as partner, launched Rockefeller & Andrews. By 1870, after five years of strategic partnerships and mergers, Rockefeller had incorporated Standard Oil.



³http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0278873/?ref_=tt_ov_inf

The story of the rise of Standard Oil is an oft-told one.

Narrator: In a move that would transform the American economy, Rockefeller set out to replace a world of independent oilmen with a giant company controlled by him. In 1870, begging bankers for more loans, he formed Standard Oil of Ohio. The next year, he quietly put what he called "our plan" — his campaign to dominate the volatile oil industry — into devastating effect. Rockefeller knew that the refiner with the lowest transportation cost could bring rivals to their knees. He entered into a secret alliance with the railroads called the South Improvement Company. In exchange for large, regular shipments, Rockefeller and his allies secured transport rates far lower than those of their bewildered competitors.

Ida Tarbell, the daughter of an oil man, later remembered how men like her father struggled to make sense of events: "An uneasy rumor began running up and down the Oil Regions," she wrote. "Freight rates were going up. ... Moreover ... all members of the South Improvement Company — a company unheard of until now — were exempt. ... Nobody wanted to find out his neighbor's opinion. On every lip there was but one word and that was 'conspiracy.'"

Ron Chernow, Biographer: By 1879, when Rockefeller is 40, he controls 90 percent of the oil refining in the world. Within a few years, he will control

90 percent of the marketing of oil and a third of all of the oil wells. So this very young man controls what is not only a national but an international monopoly in a commodity that is about to become the most important strategic commodity in the world economy.

SOURCE: The Rockefellers⁴

By the 1880s, the American oil industry was the Standard Oil Company. And Standard Oil was John D. Rockefeller.

But it wasn't long until a handful of similarly ambitious (and well-connected) families began to emulate the Standard Oil success story in other parts of the globe.

One such competitor emerged from the Caucasus in the 1870s, where Imperial Russia had opened up the vast Caspian Sea oil deposits to private development.⁵ Two families quickly combined forces to take advantage of the opportunity: the Nobels, led by Ludwig Nobel and including his dynamite-inventing prize-creating brother Alfred, and the French branch of the infamous Rothschild banking dynasty, led by Alphonse Rothschild.

In 1891, the Rothschilds contracted with M. Samuel & Co., a Far East shipping company headquartered in London and run by Marcus Samuel, to do what had never been done before: ship their Nobel-supplied Caspian oil through the Suez Canal to East Asian markets.⁶ The project was immense; it involved not only

⁴<http://www.pbs.org/video/american-experience-rockefellers/>

⁵<https://mershoncenter.osu.edu/research/2012-2013/the-transnational-origins-of-the-russian-oil-industry-the-rothschilds-bnito-and-baku-naphtha.html>

⁶<https://www.rothschildarchive.org/materials/ar2007oil>.

sophisticated engineering to construct the first oil tankers to be approved by the Suez Canal Company, but the strictest secrecy. If word of the endeavour was to get back to Rockefeller through his international intelligence network, it would risk bringing the wrath of Standard Oil, which could afford to cut rates and squeeze them out of the market. In the end they succeeded, and the first bulk tanker, the Murex, sailed through the Suez Canal in 1892 en route to Thailand.⁷

In 1897, M. Samuel & Co. became The Shell Transport and Trading Company. Realizing that reliance on the Rothschild/Nobel Caspian oil left the company vulnerable to supply shocks, Shell began to look to the Far East for other sources of oil. In Borneo they ran up against Royal Dutch Petroleum, established in The Hague in 1890 with the support of King William III of the Netherlands to develop oil deposits in the Dutch East Indies. The two companies, fearing competition from Standard Oil, merged in 1903 into the Asiatic Petroleum Company,⁸ jointly owned with the French Rothschilds, and in 1907 become Royal Dutch Shell.

Another global competitor to the Standard Oil throne emerged in Iran at the turn of the 20th century. In 1901, millionaire socialite William Knox D'arcy negotiated an incredible concession with the king of Persia: exclusive rights to prospect for oil throughout most of the country for 60 years.⁹ After

pdf

⁷<http://www.shipstamps.co.uk/forum/viewtopic.php?f=2&t=5746>

⁸<http://www.fundinguniverse.com/company-histories/royal-dutch-petroleum-company-the-shell-transport-and-trading-company-p-l-c-history/>

⁹https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/D'Arcy_Concession

seven years of fruitless search, D'Arcy and his Glasgow based partner, Burmah Oil, were ready to abandon the country altogether. In early May of 1908 they sent a telegram to their geologist telling him to dismiss his staff, dismantle his equipment and come back home. He defied the order and weeks later struck oil.

Burmah Oil promptly spun off the Anglo-Persian Oil Company to oversee production of Persian oil. The British government took 51% majority control of the company's shares in 1914 at the behest of Winston Churchill¹⁰, then First Lord of the Admiralty, and survives today as BP.

The Rothschilds and Nobels. The Dutch royal family. The Rockefellers. These early titans of the oil industry and their corporate shells pioneered a new model for amassing and expanding fortunes hitherto unheard of. They were the scions of a new oligarchy, one built around oil and its control, from wellhead to pump.

But it was not just about money. The monopolization of this, the key energy resource of the 20th century, helped secure the oiligarchs not just wealth but power over the lives of billions. Billions who came to depend on black gold for the provision of just about every aspect of their daily lives.

In the late 19th century, however, it was by no means certain that oil would become the key resource of the 20th century. As cheap illumination from the newly-commercialized light bulb began to destroy the market for lamp oil, the oiligarchs were on the verge of losing the value from their monopoly. But a series of "lucky strikes" was about to catapult their fortunes even further.

¹⁰<http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/oil-agreements-in-iran>

The very next year after the commercial introduction of the light bulb, another invention came along to save the oil industry: German engineer Karl Benz patented a reliable, two-stroke internal combustion engine. The engine ran on gasoline, another petroleum byproduct, and became the basis for the Benz Motorwagen that, in 1888, became the first commercially available automobile in history. And with that stroke of luck, the business that Rockefeller and the other oiligarchs had spent decades consolidating was saved.



But more luck was needed to ensure the market for this new engine. In the early days of the automobile era it was by no means certain that gas-powered cars would come to dominate the market. Working models of electric vehicles had been around since the 1830s, and the first electric car was built in 1884¹¹. By 1897 there was a fleet of all-electric taxis shuttling passengers around London¹². The world land speed record was set by an electric car in 1898¹³. By the dawn of the 20th century, electric cars accounted for 28% of the automobiles in the

¹¹<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/newstoppers/howaboutthat/5212278/Worlds-first-electric-car-built-by-Victorian-inventor-in-1884.html>

¹²<http://blog.sciencemuseum.org.uk/the-surprisingly-old-story-of-londons-first-ever-electric-taxi/>

¹³https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Land_speed_record#1898.E2.80.931965_.28wheel-driven.29

United States¹⁴. The electrics had advantages over the internal combustion engine: they required no gear shifting or hand cranking, and had none of the vibration, smell, or noise associated with gasoline-powered cars¹⁵.

Lady Luck intervened again on January 10, 1901, when prospectors struck oil at Spindletop in East Texas. The gusher blew 100,000 barrels a day and set off the next great oil boom, providing cheap, plentiful oil to the American market and driving down gas prices. It wasn't long before the expensive, low-range electric engines were abandoned altogether and big, loud, gas-guzzling engines came to dominate the road, all fueled by the black gold that Standard Oil, Shell, Gulf, Texaco, Anglo-Persian and the other oil majors of the time were drilling, refining and selling.

Perhaps John D.'s greatest stroke of luck, however, was not supposed to be luck at all. Rockefeller had come under increasing scrutiny by a public outraged by the unprecedented wealth he had amassed through Standard Oil. Muckraking reporters like Ida Tarbell began digging up the dirt on his rise to power through railroad conspiracies, secret deals with competitors and other shady practices. The press pictured him as a colossus with bribed politicians literally in the palm of his hand¹⁶; Standard Oil was a menacing octopus with its tentacles strangling the lifeblood of the nation¹⁷. Hearings began, inves-

¹⁴<http://www.pbs.org/now/shows/223/electric-car-timeline.html>

¹⁵<http://inventors.about.com/od/estartinventions/a/History-Of-Electric-Vehicles.htm>

¹⁶<http://faculty.uml.edu/sgallagher/sgallagher/Small22Jan1900.JPG>

¹⁷https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/thumb/a/a0/Standard_oil_octopus_loc_color.jpg/640px-

tigations were launched, lawsuits were brought against him. And then, finally, in 1911 the Supreme Court made a monumental decision.



Narrator: On May 15th, 1911, the Supreme Court of the United States declared that Standard Oil was a monopoly in restraint of trade and should be dissolved. Rockefeller heard of the decision while golfing at Kykuit with a priest from the local Catholic church, Father J.P. Lennon.

Ron Chernow, Biographer: And Rockefeller reacted with amazing aplomb. He turned to the Catholic priest and said, "Father Lennon, have you some money?" And the priest was very startled by the question and said, "No." And then he said, "Why?" And Rockefeller replied, "Buy Standard Oil."

Narrator: As Rockefeller foresaw, the individual Standard Oil companies were worth more than the single corporation. In the next few years, their shares doubled and tripled in value. By the time the rain of cash was over, Rockefeller had the greatest

Standard_oil_octopus_loc_color.jpg

personal fortune in history — nearly two percent of the American economy.

Chernow: And it was really losing the antitrust case that converted John D. Rockefeller into history's first billionaire. So that Standard Oil was punished in the federal antitrust case, but John D. Rockefeller, Sr. most assuredly was not.

SOURCE: The Rockefellers¹⁸

To the amazement of the world, Rockefeller's punishment had in fact been his reward. Rather than being taken down a peg, the splitting up of the Standard Oil monopoly had launched him as the world's only acknowledged billionaire at a time when the average annual income in America was \$520.

Rockefeller's story was perfectly mirrored by the story of Colonel Edwin Drake. Having struck oil in Titusville and given rise to a billion-dollar global industry, Drake had not had the foresight to patent his drilling technique or even to buy up the land around his own well. He ended up in poverty, relying on an annuity from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to scrape together a living and dying in 1880.

For the oilgarchy, the lesson of the rise and rise of Rockefeller was obvious: the more ruthlessly that monopoly was pursued, the tighter that control was grasped, the greater the lust for power and money, the greater the reward would be in the end.

From now on, no invention would derail the oil majors from their quest for total control. No competition would be tolerated. No threat to the oilgarchs would be allowed to rise.

¹⁸<http://www.pbs.org/video/american-experience-rockefellers/>

Part two: Competition is a sin When asked how he could justify the treachery and deceit with which he pursued the creation of the Standard Oil monopoly, John D. Rockefeller is reputed to have said: "Competition is a sin." This is the mentality of the monopolist, and it is this justification, framed as religious conviction, that drove the oilgarchs to so ruthlessly eliminate anyone who would dare rise up as a pretender to their throne.

Ironically, it was the competition between the oilgarchs in the early 20th century that helped give rise to an early external threat to their empire: alcohol fuel.

As historian Lyle Cummins has noted of the period: "The oil trust battles between Rockefeller, the Rothschilds, the Nobels and Marcus Samuel's Shell kept prices in a state of flux, and engines often had to be adaptable to the fuel that was available."¹⁹.

In many areas where oil wasn't available, the alternative was alcohol. Ethyl alcohol had been used as a fuel for lamps and engines since the early 19th century. Although it was generally more expensive, alcohol fuel offered a stability of supply that was alluring, especially in areas like London or Paris that did not have predictable access to oil supplies.

Alcohol has a lower heat value, or BTU, than gasoline, but a series of tests by the US Geological Survey and the US Navy in 1907 and 1908 proved that the higher compression ratio of alcohol engines could perfectly offset the lower heat value, thus making alcohol and gasoline engines fuel economy equivalent²⁰.

¹⁹<https://books.google.co.jp/books?id=SNsgAAAAIAAJ&focus=searchwithinvolume&q=rothschilds>

²⁰<http://pubs.er.usgs.gov/publication/b392>

One early supporter of alcohol fuel was Henry Ford, who designed his Model T to run on either alcohol or gasoline²¹. Sensing an opportunity for new markets to boost the independent American farms that he felt were vital to the nation, Henry Ford told the New York Times²²:

“The fuel of the future is going to come from fruit like that sumach [sic] out by the road, or from apples, weeds, sawdust — almost anything. There is fuel in every bit of vegetable matter that can be fermented.”



Farmers, looking to capitalize on this, lobbied for the repeal of a \$2.08 per gallon alcohol tax that had been imposed to help pay for the Civil War. They were aided by those who saw fuel alcohol as a way to break the oiligarchs’ monopoly. In support of a bill to repeal the alcohol tax, President Teddy Roosevelt told the US Congress in 1906²³:

”The Standard Oil Company has, largely by unfair or unlawful methods, crushed out home competition. It is highly desirable that an element of competition should be introduced by the passage of some such law as that which has already passed the House, putting alcohol used in the arts and manufactures upon the free list.”

²¹<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5qDYoEupI28>

²²<http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=9C00E4DB153FE631A25753C2A96F9C946495D6CF>

²³<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=69667>

The alcohol tax was repealed in 1906 and for a time corn ethanol at 14 cents a gallon was cheaper than gasoline at 22 cents a gallon. The promise of cheap, unpatentable, unmonopolizable fuel production, production open to anyone with raw vegetable matter and a still, swept the nation.

But cheap, plentiful fuel that can be grown and produced locally and independently is not what the oilgarchs had in mind.



A 1909 USGS report comparing gas and alcohol engines had noted that a significant point in alcohol fuel's favour was that there were fewer restrictions on alcohol engines²⁴. For the oilgarchs, the answer was simple: find a way to place greater restrictions on alcohol engines. Thankfully for them, the answer to their problem was already gaining popular support.

In the 19th century, America had a drinking problem. By 1830, the average American over 15 years old drank seven gallons of pure alcohol per year²⁵, three times higher than today's average. This led to the first anti-alcohol movements in the 1830s and 1840s and the formation of the Prohibition Party in 1869 and the Women's Christian Temperance Union in the 1870s. The movement enjoyed widespread and growing support but had few political successes; Maine flirted with prohibition by outlawing the sale and manufacture of liquor in 1851,

²⁴<http://pubs.usgs.gov/bul/0392/report.pdf>

²⁵<http://www.pbs.org/kenburns/prohibition/roots-of-prohibition/>

but the ban only lasted five years²⁶.

This changed with the formation of the Anti-Saloon League in Standard Oil's birth state of Ohio in 1893. The ASL was started by John D. Rockefeller's long-time personal friend²⁷ Howard Hyde Russell and was bankrolled in part by generous annual donations from Rockefeller himself²⁸. The ASL, with Rockefeller's backing, quickly became the driving force behind a national movement to outlaw the production and sale of alcohol.

Rockefeller was a teetotaler himself, not from moral concern but because he was afraid that "good cheer among friends"²⁹ would lead to his downfall in business. Stephen Harkness, one of the silent partner investors in Standard Oil and a director in the company until his death, had caught Rockefeller's eye³⁰ when he made a fortune buying up whiskey in advance of a new excise tax that he had been tipped about and selling it at a huge profit after the tax kicked in.

No, Rockefeller and Standard Oil were not concerned about the moral state of the nation...except as far as it impacted their bottom line. But when prohibition did come in 1920, it had an interesting side effect: Although it didn't ban the use of ethanol as a fuel directly, it did lead to increasingly burdensome re-

²⁶http://www.pbs.org/kenburns/prohibition/media_detail/2085516512/

²⁷[http://quod.lib.umich.edu/b/bhlead/umich-bhl-852272?
rgn=main;view=text](http://quod.lib.umich.edu/b/bhlead/umich-bhl-852272?rgn=main;view=text)

²⁸[https://web.archive.org/web/20121023134801/http:
//www.rockarch.org/publications/resrep/dighe.pdf](https://web.archive.org/web/20121023134801/http://www.rockarch.org/publications/resrep/dighe.pdf)

²⁹[https://books.google.co.jp/books?id=zyKDeUHXyAkC&
printsec=frontcover&dq=God%27s+Gold&hl=en&sa=X&redir_esc=y#
v=snippet&q=prohibition&f=false](https://books.google.co.jp/books?id=zyKDeUHXyAkC&printsec=frontcover&dq=God%27s+Gold&hl=en&sa=X&redir_esc=y#v=snippet&q=prohibition&f=false)

³⁰[https://books.google.co.jp/books?id=zyKDeUHXyAkC&
printsec=frontcover&dq=God%27s+Gold&hl=en&sa=X&redir_esc=y#
v=onepage&q=harkness&f=false](https://books.google.co.jp/books?id=zyKDeUHXyAkC&printsec=frontcover&dq=God%27s+Gold&hl=en&sa=X&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=harkness&f=false)

strictions³¹ requiring producers to add petroleum products to their ethanol to make it poisonous before it could be sold. Alcohol fuel, now completely unable to compete with gasoline, was abandoned altogether by the automobile industry.

Another existential threat to the vast fortunes of the early oiligarchs was to require an even greater effort at social engineering: public transportation. By the end of World War I, private car ownership was still a relative rarity; only one in ten Americans owned a car. Rail was still the transportation of choice for the vast majority of the public, and city-dwellers in most major cities relied on electric trolley networks to transport them around town. In 1936, General Motors formed a front company, "National City Lines," along with Firestone Tire and Standard Oil of California, to implement a process of "bustitution": scrapping streetcars and tearing up railways to replace them with GM's own buses running on Standard Oil-supplied diesel. The plan was remarkably successful.



As historian and researcher F. William Engdahl notes in "Myths, Lies and Oil Wars"³²:

"By the end of the 1940s, GM had bought and scrapped over one hundred municipal electric transit systems in 45 cities and put gas-burning GM buses on the streets in their place. By 1955

³¹http://www.slate.com/articles/health_and_science/medical_examiner/2010/02/the_chemists_war.html

³²<https://www.createspace.com/3923714>

almost 90% of the electric streetcar lines in the United States had been ripped out or otherwise eliminated.”

The cartel had been careful to hide their involvement in National City Lines, but it was revealed to the public in 1946 by an enterprising retired naval lieutenant commander, Edwin J. Quinby. He wrote a manifesto exposing what he called “a careful, deliberately planned campaign to swindle you out of your most important and valuable public utilities – your Electric Railway System.”³³ He uncovered the oilgarchs’ stock ownership of National City Lines and its subsidiaries and detailed how they had, step by step, bought up and destroyed the public transportation lines in Baltimore, Los Angeles, St. Louis and other major urban centres³⁴.

Quinby’s warning caught the attention of federal prosecutors, and in 1947 National City Lines was indicted for conspiring to form a transportation monopoly and conspiring to monopolize sales of buses and supplies³⁵. In 1949, GM, Firestone, Standard Oil of California and their officers and corporate associates were convicted on the second count of conspiracy. The punishment for buying up and dismantling America’s public transportation infrastructure? A \$5,000 fine. H. C. Grossman, who had been the director of Pacific City Lines when it oversaw the scrapping of LA’s \$100 million Pacific Electric system, was fined exactly \$1.

³³<https://www.createpace.com/3923714>

³⁴<http://www.chicagorailfan.com/holdbun.html>

³⁵<http://web.archive.org/web/20080608012144/http://www.altlaw.org/v1/cases/770576>



Unsurprisingly, GM and its associates did not remain in the doghouse for long. In 1953, President Eisenhower appointed Charles Wilson, then the President of General Motors, as Secretary of Defense. Wilson, with Francis DuPont of the Rockefeller-connected DuPont family as Chief Administrator of Federal Highways, oversaw one of the largest public works projects in American history: the creation of the interstate highway system. With a war-era excise tax on train tickets still in place and federally funded highways and airports providing cheaper alternatives, rail travel declined a startling 84% between 1945 and 1964³⁶.

This social engineering paid off well for Standard Oil and its growing list of petrochemical associates. In the two-and-a-half decades after the outbreak of World War II, vehicle production in Detroit almost tripled, from 4.5 million cars a year in 1940 to over 11 million in 1965. As a result, sales of refined gasoline over the same period rose 300



³⁶<http://history.howstuffworks.com/american-history/decline-of-railroads.htm>

But Rockefeller was not the only oiligarch working to crush all opposition to his monopoly. Across the pond, the European oiligarchs were working to protect their own oil investments from upstart competitors.

In 1889, a consortium of German investors led by Siemens' Deutsche Bank obtained a concession from the Turkish government for extension of a railway line connecting Berlin to Basra on the Persian Gulf via Baghdad in what was then part of the Ottoman Empire. The Berlin-Baghdad Railway³⁷ concession was for ninety-nine years and came with mineral rights for twenty kilometers on either side of the line — an especially lucrative deal since the rail cut right through the heart of the still untapped Mesopotamian oil regions south of Mosul along the Tigris River.

For the powers behind the British empire, concerned with the military rise of Germany, this deal was unacceptable.

F. William Engdahl: Well, Germany in the end of the 19th century was looking for outlets for its exports — its industrial exports — as the German economy was growing like China's has grown in the last 30 years. And they decided that Turkey would be an ideal strategic trade partner for Germany. And Georg von Siemens, one of the directors of Deutsche Bank, came up with a strategy to extend a railway from Berlin all the way down to Baghdad — which was then part of the Ottoman Empire, Baghdad and Iraq today, near the Persian Gulf. German military began training the

³⁷<https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/boshtml/bos139.htm>

Turkish military. German industry began investing in Turkey. They saw a huge potential market to begin bringing Turkey into the 20th century economically. Deutsche Bank also negotiated mineral rights — I think it was 20 kilometres either side of the railway — and it was already known in 1914 that Mosul and these other areas contained huge petroleum deposits.

Well, why is that significant? At the end of the 19th century, Jack Fisher—the head of the Admiralty and the head of the Royal Navy—advocated the conversion of the British Navy from coal-fired to oil-fired. That it would have a qualitative strategic improvement in every aspect of warship design. And since Britain didn't know that they had any oil back then they went to Persia and swindled the Shah out of oil rights in Persia. They went to Kuwait and backed a coup d'état of the Al-Sabah family to be a British pawn, and they literally wrote a contract with him that nothing that Kuwait does will be done without approval of the British Governor. And Kuwait was known to have oil lying right on the Persian Gulf.

The British looked at this railway plan of the Germans going right down to Baghdad and said "My God! You can put soldiers on rail cars and bring them down and threaten the oil lifeline of the British Navy." This is a strategic move by the Germans. It also would make Germany independent of the British control of the seas. They would

have a landline much like the Chinese "One Belt, One Road" infrastructure for high-speed rails going throughout Eurasia into Russia, on into Belarus and Western Europe that removes the United States' Navy ability to control China and control Central Asia to a great extent.

The British oiligarchs, including the British crown with its hidden controlling stake³⁸ in Anglo-Persian Oil and the Rothschild's merchant Marcus Samuel³⁹ at Royal Dutch Shell, sought to counter this German threat to their commercial and strategic interests. They used Armenian-born naturalized British citizen Calouste Gulbenkian – the architect of the Royal Dutch/Shell merger – in order, as he later recalled "to see British influence get the upper hand in Turkey" against the Germans⁴⁰. If that was his task, it was a remarkable success.



In 1909, the British set up the Turkish National Bank, which was "Turkish" in name only. Founded by London banker Sir Edward Cassel and with directors like Hugo Baring of the Barings banking family, Cassel himself, and Gulbenkian, the Bank

³⁸<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/business/149259.stm>

³⁹<http://royaldutchshellplc.com/2008/04/23/marcus-samuels-oil-excursion/>

⁴⁰https://books.google.co.jp/books?id=_0sEAAAAMBAJ&q=turkish+petroleum+company#v=snippet&q=turkish%20petroleum%20company&f=false

set up the Turkish Petroleum Company in 1912. Formed explicitly to exploit the petroleum-rich oil fields of Iraq, then part of the Ottoman Empire, Gulbenkian brokered a deal that forced Deutsche Bank, with its 40-kilometre concessions along the oil-rich Baghdad railway line, into a junior partnership in the company. The stock was split so the British government's Anglo-Persian Oil Company owned half the shares, with Royal Dutch Shell and Deutsche Bank splitting the other half.

Their plan to take over Germany's Turkish oil interests had been successful, but in an amazing irony, it didn't even matter. Gulbenkian finished negotiations for the Iraqi oil concession on June 28, 1914⁴¹, the same day Archduke Ferdinand was shot in Sarajevo. An alliance the British had been brokering for years to constrain the rising German threat, an alliance involving France and Russia, kicked into motion, and the world was engulfed in war. By the end of World War I, the British and their allies had taken over Iraq and its oil deposits anyway, Germany had been completely cut out, and Gulbenkian, their scheming servant, received 5% of all oil field proceeds in the newly minted country.

As the century wore on, the oil industry grew beyond the control of the handful of families that had dominated it since its inception. Oil deposits were located around the globe and the resources of entire nation states were marshaled to control them. Now, threats to the oilgarchs and their interests required multi-lateral, multi-national responses and the consequences of those deals were felt worldwide.

The story of the Oil Shock of 1973 as it has been delivered to us by the history books is well known.

⁴¹http://www.engdahl.oilgeopolitics.net/History/Oil_and_the_Origins_of_World_W/oil_and_the_origins_of_world_w.HTM

Narrator: By the late 1960s, the nation relied on imported oil to keep the economy strong. Then, in the early 1970s, oil-dependent America's nightmares came true: 13 oil-producing countries in the Middle East and South America formed OPEC, the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries. In 1973, OPEC placed an oil embargo on the US and other nations that had supported Israel against the Arab states in the Yom Kippur war. The American economy went into a tailspin as gas shortages gripped the nation.

SOURCE: History of Oil⁴²

Few, however, know that the crisis and its ensuing response was in fact prepared months ahead of time at a secret meeting in Sweden in 1973. The meeting was the annual gathering of the Bilderberg Group, a secretive cabal formed by Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands in 1954.

The Dutch royal family not only gave its royal imprimatur to Royal Dutch Petroleum, they are still rumoured to be⁴³ along with the Rothschilds⁴⁴ one of the largest shareholders in Royal Dutch Shell, from the days when Queen Wilhelmina's Anglo-Dutch Petroleum holdings and other investments made her the world's first female billionaire right through to today⁴⁵. Bernhard's guest list at the Bilderberg Group reflected his position in the oilgarchy; alongside him at the Swedish conference were David Rockefeller of the Standard Oil dynasty and his protégé

⁴²https://youtu.be/nJDacQbRL_k?t=534

⁴³<http://royaldutchshellplc.com/2005/08/22/royal-dutch-shells-tarnished-royal-prefix/>

⁴⁴<http://www.tavex.lv/index.php?main=506>

⁴⁵<http://www.tavex.lv/index.php?main=506>

Henry Kissinger; Baron Edmond de Rothschild; E.G. Collado, the Vice President of Exxon; Sir Denis Greenhill, director of British Petroleum; and Gerrit A. Wagner, president of Bernhard's own Royal Dutch Shell.



At the meeting in Sweden, held five months before the oil crisis began, the oiligarchs and their political and business allies were planning their response to a monetary crisis that threatened the world dominance of the US dollar. Under the Bretton Woods system, negotiated in the final days of World War II, the US dollar would be the backbone of the world monetary system, convertible to gold at \$35 per ounce with all other currencies pegged to it. Increasing US expenditures in Vietnam and decreasing exports caused Germany, France, and other nations to start demanding gold for their dollars.

With the Federal Reserve's official gold holdings plunging and unable to stem the tide of demand, Nixon abandoned Bretton Woods in August 1971, threatening the dollar's position as the world reserve currency.

Richard Nixon: Accordingly, I have directed the Secretary of the Treasury to take the action necessary to defend the dollar against the speculators. I have directed Secretary Connally to suspend temporarily the convertibility of the dollar into gold or other reserve assets except in amounts and conditions determined to be in the interest of mone-

tary stability and in the best interest of the United States.⁴⁶

As leaked documents from the 1973 Bilderberg meeting show, the oiligarchs decided to use their control over the flow of oil to save the American hegemon. Acknowledging that OPEC "could completely disorganize and undermine the world monetary system,"⁴⁷ the Bilderberg attendees prepared for "an energy crisis or an increase in energy costs," which, they predicted⁴⁸, could mean an oil price between \$10 and \$12, a staggering 400% increase from the current price of \$3.01 per barrel.

Five months later, Bilderberg attendee and Rockefeller protégé Henry Kissinger, acting as Nixon's Secretary of State, engineered the Yom Kippur War⁴⁹ and provoked OPEC's response: an oil embargo of the US and other nations that had supported Israel. On October 16, 1973, OPEC raised oil prices by 70%. At their December meeting, the Shah of Iran demanded and received a further price raise to \$11.65 a barrel, or 400% of oil's pre-crisis price. When asked by Saudi King Faisal's personal emissary why he had demanded such a bold price increase, he replied: "Tell your King, if he wants the answer to this question, he should go to Washington and ask Henry Kissinger."⁵⁰

⁴⁶"Nixon breaks Bretton Woods": <https://youtu.be/0cVtdViitko?t=53>

⁴⁷<http://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/sociopolitica/bilderbergfile/bilderberg12.html>

⁴⁸<http://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/sociopolitica/bilderbergfile/bilderberg57.html>

⁴⁹<http://shruga-elam.blogspot.jp/2012/10/the-yom-kippur-war-and-kissinger-plot.html>

⁵⁰https://books.google.co.jp/books?id=en3EMwEACAAJ&dq=myths,+lies+and+oil+wars+yamani&hl=en&sa=X&redir_esc=y



In the second move of the operation, Kissinger helped negotiate a deal with Saudi Arabia: In exchange for US arms and military protection, the Saudis would price all their future oil sales in dollars and recycle those dollars through treasury purchases via Wall Street banks. The deal was a bonanza for the oilgarchs; not only did they get to pass the price increases on to the consumers, but they benefited from the huge flows of money into their own banks. The Shah of Iran parked the National Iranian Oil Company's revenues in Rockefeller's own Chase Bank — revenues that reached \$14 billion per year in the wake of the oil crisis.



With the creation of this new system, the "petrodollar,"⁵¹ the oilgarchs had reached unprecedented levels of control over the economy. Not only that, they had backed the world monetary system with their commodity, oil, and brought potential competition from upstart producer nations under their control all in one step.

⁵¹<http://ftmdaily.com/preparing-for-the-collapse-of-the-petrodollar-part-2/>

But for the insatiable appetites of these monopolist titans, mere control over the world's monetary system was not enough.

Part three: The World in their image In the nineteenth century, railroad conspiracies and predatory pricing had been enough to assure the oilgarchs' monopoly. But by the time that the British crown, the Dutch royal family, the Rothschilds and the other European oilgarchs began opening up the Middle East and the Far East to oil exploration in the early twentieth century, the goal was no longer to maximize profits or control the oil industry. It was not even to control international diplomacy. It was to control and shape the world itself. Its resources. Its environment. And its people.

In order to achieve this goal, the oilgarchy would need a facelift.



In the current age, with the Rockefeller name now more likely to be associated with Rockefeller Plaza or Rockefeller University than Standard Oil, it is difficult to understand just how hated John D. was in his own day. He was the head of the Standard Oil Hydra⁵², an octopus strangling the world in his

⁵²<https://cut2thetruth.files.wordpress.com/2014/10/standard-oil-rockefeller-cartoon-monopoly-scandal-cut2thetruth.jpg?w=566&h=684>

tentacles⁵³ a cutthroat gardener pruning the competitors from the flower of his oil monopoly⁵⁴. As one of the richest men the world had ever known, he was an easy target for the average working man's frustrations and a magnet for the poor seeking help.

Judith Sealander, Historian: He received on average 50,000 to 60,000 letters a month, asking for help. Dozens of people followed him in the street. Literally, crowds stood around the Standard Oil offices waiting for him to come out. Little children, painfully thin, crying in the street and so on. Rockefeller felt overwhelmed.

SOURCE: The Rockefellers⁵⁵

Besieged by the downtrodden, despised by the working man, hounded by Ida Tarbell and the muckraking press, John D. had the mother of all PR problems. The answer was simple: invent the PR industry. He hired Ivy Ledbetter Lee, a journalist-turned-communications expert who invented the modern public relations industry, to burnish the Rockefellers' tarnished image. It was Lee that suggested giving the family name to Rockefeller Center and filming John D. handing out dimes in public.

Narrator: An early master of public relations, Lee used the media which the muckrakers had used to

⁵³http://www.sott.net/image/s11/235178/full/Rockefeller_octopus.jpg

⁵⁴http://college.cengage.com/history/research_companion/primary_sources/us/shared/images/w339.jpg

⁵⁵<http://www.pbs.org/video/american-experience-rockefellers/>

disgrace Rockefeller to turn him into a sympathetic figure. Ivy Lee recognized early the power of the new moving picture and used newsreels to show a remarkably benevolent Rockefeller.

John D. Rockefeller: I am very grateful to you and to a host of people who are so kind and good to me all the time.

Second Man: Why, because you're so good to everybody. **Rockefeller:** Yes, you are.

Peter Collier: As Ivy Lee began to control his public image he became oddly a kind of American character, and people kind of warmed to him in a bizarre sort of way. It was like having Frankenstein on the loose walking around New York City or something like that, with a cane and a long hat.



Narrator: Although this plane never takes off, this photo opportunity was presented as Senior's first flight. Perhaps Ivy Lee's most brilliant public relations move was the casting of Rockefeller as "The Man Who Gave out Dimes."

Man off camera: Don't you give dimes, Mr. Rockefeller? Please, go ahead.
Woman: Thank you, sir. **Man:** Thank you very much. **Rockefeller:** Thank you for the ride! **Man:** I consider myself more than amply paid. **Rockefeller:** Bless you! Bless you! Bless you!

SOURCE: "John D. Rockefeller - Standard Oil"⁵⁶

These PR stunts seem obvious and ham-handed by today's standards, but they were effective enough: To this day people leave dimes on the stone marker at the base of the 70-foot Egyptian obelisk that towers over John D.'s final resting place in Cleveland's Lake View Cemetery. But it was not stage-managed photo opportunities like these that transformed Rockefeller into a public hero.



In order to win the public over, he was going to have to give them what they wanted. And what they wanted wasn't difficult to understand: money. But just as his father, Devil Bill, had taught him to do in all his business dealings, Rockefeller made sure to get the better end of the bargain. He would "donate" his great wealth to the creation of public institutions, but those institutions would be used to bend society to his will.

⁵⁶<https://youtu.be/sfWZeeGeLTc?t=918>

As every would-be ruler throughout history has realized, society has to be transformed from the ground up. Americans in the 19th century still prized education and intellectual pursuits, with the 1840 census finding unsurprisingly that the United States — a nation that had been mobilized by tracts like Thomas Paine’s remarkably popular *Common Sense* — was a nation of readers, with a remarkable 93% to 100% literacy rate. Before the first compulsory schooling laws in Massachusetts in 1852, education was private and decentralized, and as a result classical education, including study of Greek and Latin and a solid grounding in history and science, was widespread.

But a nation of individuals who could think for themselves was anathema to the monopolists. The oilgarchs needed a mass of obedient workers, an entire class of people whose intellect was developed just enough to prepare them for lives of drudgery in a factory. Into the midst stepped John D. Rockefeller with his first great act of public charity: the establishment of the University of Chicago.

He was aided in this task by Frederick Taylor Gates, a Baptist minister that Rockefeller befriended in 1889 and who would go on to be John D.’s most trusted philanthropic adviser. Gates would go on to write a short tract, “The Country School of Tomorrow,”⁵⁷ that laid out the Rockefeller plan for education:

”In our dream, we have limitless resources, and the people yield themselves with perfect docility to our molding hand. The present educational conventions fade from our minds; and, unhampered by tradition, we work our own good will upon a

⁵⁷<https://books.google.co.jp/books?id=aaygAAAAAAAJ&focus=searchwithinvolume&q=limitless>

grateful and responsive folk. We shall not try to make these people or any of their children into philosophers or men of learning or science. We are not to raise up from among them authors, orators, poets, or men of letters. We shall not search for embryo great artists, painters, musicians. Nor will we cherish even the humbler ambition to raise up from among them lawyers, doctors, preachers, politicians, statesmen, of whom we now have ample supply.”

Although Rockefeller’s resources weren’t exactly limitless, they might as well have been. In 1902 he established the General Education Board to help implement Gates’ vision for the country school of tomorrow with a staggering \$180 million endowment.

The Rockefeller influence on education was felt almost immediately, and it was amplified by help from fellow monopolists of the era, who were approaching the topic of philanthropy from the same angle.

Although best known as a steel magnate, Andrew Carnegie’s fortune started on the railroads transporting Rockefeller’s Standard Oil around the country and was greatly magnified by a lucrative investment in property near Oil Creek that provided steady, profitable oil sales. In 1905, he established the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, a tax-free foundation through which Carnegie and his appointees could direct the development of the education system in the United States, and, eventually, worldwide. In 1910, Rockefeller followed suit by establishing the Rockefeller Foundation, which became the tax-free umbrella organization for his philanthropic ambitions.



As the Reece Committee — a Congressional investigation into the activities of these tax-free foundations in the 1950s — discovered, it wasn't long before Carnegie's Endowment approached Rockefeller's Foundation with a proposal: to cooperate on their shared desire to transform the American education system in their own image. Norman Dodd, the director of research for the congressional committee who was granted access to the Carnegie Endowment's board minutes, explains:

So they approach the Rockefeller Foundation with a suggestion: that portion of education which could be considered domestic should be handled by the Rockefeller Foundation, and that portion which is international should be handled by the Endowment.

They then decide that the key to the success of these two operations lay in the alteration of the teaching of American History. So, they approach four of the then most prominent teachers of American History in the country — people like Charles and Mary Byrd. Their suggestion to them is this, "Will they alter the manner in which they present their subject?" And, they get turned down, flatly.

So, they then decide that it is necessary for them to do as they say, i.e. "build our own stable of histori-

ans.” Then, they approach the Guggenheim Foundation, which specializes in fellowships, and say, “When we find young men in the process of studying for doctorates in the field of American History, and we feel that they are the right caliber, will you grant them fellowships on our say so? And the answer is, “Yes.”

So, under that condition, eventually they assemble twenty (20), and they take these twenty potential teachers of American History to London. There, they are briefed in what is expected of them — when, as, and if they secure appointments in keeping with the doctorates they will have earned.

That group of twenty historians ultimately becomes the nucleus of the American Historical Association. And then, toward the end of the 1920s, the Endowment grants to the American Historical Association \$400,000 for a study of our history in a manner which points to what this country look forward to, in the future.

That culminates in a seven-volume study, the last volume of which is, of course, in essence, a summary of the contents of the other six. The essence of the last volume is this: the future of this country belongs to collectivism, administered with characteristic American efficiency.

SOURCE: Norman Dodd interview⁵⁸

⁵⁸<https://youtu.be/c5eHdTk5hjw?t=1738>

With this base for transformation firmly established, the Rockefeller Foundation and like-minded organization embarked on a program so ambitious that it almost defies comprehension.

They transformed the practice of medicine.



As usual, the oiligarchs that funded this change were also there to profit from it, and once again John D. took his cue from "Devil" Bill's example. William Rockefeller had called his brand of snake oil "Nujol," for "new oil," and Standard Oil spun off "Nujol" as a laxative under their Stanco subsidiary⁵⁹. Manufactured on the same premises as "Flit," an insecticide also derived from Standard Oil's byproducts, "Nujol" sold at the druggist for 28 cents per six ounce bottle; it cost Standard Oil less than one-fifth of a cent to manufacture. Pharmaceuticals provided a lucrative new opportunity for the oiligarchs, but in a turn-of-the-century America that was still largely based on naturopathic, herbal remedies, it was a tough sell. The oiligarchy went to work changing that.

In 1901, John D. established the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research. The Institute recruited Simon Flexner, a pathology professor at the University of Pennsylvania, to serve as its director. His brother, Abraham, was an educator who was contracted by the Carnegie Foundation to write a report on the state of the American medical education system. His study,

⁵⁹<http://www.wellwithin1.com/TheDrugStoryBeale.htm>

The Flexner Report⁶⁰, along with the hundreds of millions of dollars that the Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations were to shower on medical research in the coming years⁶¹, resulted in a sweeping overhaul of the American medical system. Naturopathic and homeopathic medicine, medical care focused on unpatentable, uncontrollable natural remedies and cures was now dismissed as quackery; only drug-based allopathic medicine requiring expensive medical procedures and lengthy hospital stays was to be taken seriously.

Narrator: The fortunes of Carnegie, Morgan and Rockefeller financed surgery, radiation and synthetic drugs. They were to become the economic foundations of the new medical economy.

G. Edward Griffin: The takeover of the medical industry was accomplished by the takeover of the medical schools. Well, the people that we're talking about, Rockefeller and Carnegie, in particular, came to the picture and said, "We will put up money." They offered tremendous amounts of money to the schools that would agree to cooperate with them. The donors said to the schools: 'We're giving you all this money, now would it be too much to ask if we could put some of our people on your Board of Directors to see that our money is being spent wisely?' Almost overnight all of the major universities received large grants from these

⁶⁰http://archive.carnegiefoundation.org/pdfs/elibrary/Carnegie_Flexner_Report.pdf

⁶¹<https://web.archive.org/web/20120801192443/http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/who-we-are/our-history/1920-1929>

sources and also accepted one, two or three of these people that I mentioned on their Board of Directors and the schools literally were taken over by the financial interests that put up the money.

Now what happened as a result of that is the schools did receive an infusion of money, they were able to build new buildings, they were able to add expensive equipment to their laboratories, they were able to hire top-notch teachers, but at the same time as doing that they schewed the whole thing in the direction of pharmaceutical drugs. That was the efficiency in philanthropy.

The doctors from that point forward in history would be taught pharmaceutical drugs. All of the great teaching institutions in America were captured by the pharmaceutical interests in this fashion, and it's amazing how little money it really took to do it.

SOURCE: "The money takeover of medicine"⁶²

The oilgarchy birthed entire medical industries⁶³ from their own research centers and then sold their own products from their own petrochemical companies as the "cure." It was Frank Howard, a Standard Oil of New Jersey executive, who would go on to persuade Alfred Sloan and Charles Kettering to donate their fortunes to the cancer center that would then bear their name. As director of research at Sloan-Kettering⁶⁴ Howard ap-

⁶²<https://youtu.be/mWB2lotgByI?t=139>

⁶³<http://www.whale.to/b/mullins7.html>

⁶⁴<https://www.mskcc.org/about/leadership/office-president/presidents-through-history>

pointed Cornelius Rhoads⁶⁵, a Rockefeller Institute pathologist, to develop his wartime research on mustard gas for the US Army into a new cancer therapy. Under Rhoads' leadership, nearly the entire program and staff of the Chemical Warfare Service were reformed into the SKI drug development program, where they worked on converting mustard gas into chemotherapy⁶⁶. And once again, the Rockefeller's own snake oil was being sold as a cancer cure-all.



The oiligarchs' interest in the burgeoning pharmaceutical industry converged in companies like I.G. Farben, a drug and chemical cartel formed in Germany in the early 20th century. Royal Dutch's Prince Bernhard served on an I.G. Farben subsidiary's board in the 1930s⁶⁷ and the cartel's American operation, set up in cooperation with Standard Oil, included on its board⁶⁸ Standard Oil president Walter Teagle as well as Paul Warburg of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., itself headed by Jacob Schiff of the Rothschild broker family. At its height, I.G. Farben was the largest chemical company in the world and the fourth largest

⁶⁵https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cornelius_P._Rhoads

⁶⁶<http://cancerres.aacrjournals.org/content/68/21/8643.full>

⁶⁷<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/netherlands/7377402/Dutch-Prince-Bernhard-was-member-of-Nazi-party.html>

⁶⁸<http://www.fundinguniverse.com/company-histories/gaf-corporation-history/>

industrial concern in the world, right behind Standard Oil of New Jersey.

The company was broken up after World War II, but like Standard Oil, its various pieces remained intact and today BASF, one of its chemical offshoots, remains the largest chemical company in the world⁶⁹, while Bayer and Sanofi, two of its pharmaceutical offshoots are among the largest pharmaceutical companies in the world⁷⁰.



Not content merely to monopolize the fields of education and medicine, the same oilgarchical interests banded together to take control of America's finances. In 1910 John D. Rockefeller Jr.'s own father-in-law, Senator Nelson Aldrich, Frank Vanderlip of the National City Bank, and Paul Warburg, as well as various agents of J.P. Morgan, met in complete secrecy on Jekyll Island to hammer out the details of what would go on to become the Federal Reserve, America's central bank. The Fed, established in 1913, would be run by hand-picked appointees of the oilgarchy and their banking associates, including, perhaps inevitably, Standard Oil president and American IG director Walter Teagle.

The Rockefeller family would go on to formally enter the banking field in the 1950s, when James Stillman Rockefeller,

⁶⁹<http://cen.acs.org/articles/92/i30/CENs-Global-Top-50-Chemical.html>

⁷⁰http://www.pmlive.com/top_pharma_list/global_revenues

the grandson of John D.'s brother, was appointed director of National City Bank. Meanwhile John D.'s own grandson, David Rockefeller, would go on to take over Chase Manhattan Bank, the long-time banking partner of the Standard Oil empire.

In this move the Rockefellers' story perfectly mirrored that of their fellow oiligarchs, the Rothschilds. Whereas the Rothschilds had supplemented their banking fortune with their oil interests, the Rockefellers supplemented their oil fortune with banking interests.

Springboarding from success to success as they consolidated monopolies across every field of human activity, the oiligarchs' ambitions became even larger. This time, their goal was to consolidate control over the very food supply of the world itself, and once again they would use philanthropy as the cover for their business takeover.



Narrator: The Green Revolution began in 1943, when plant geneticist Norman Borlaug and a team of researchers arrived on Mexican soil. His goal was to improve agricultural techniques and biotechnological methodologies which in turn would help alleviate starvation and improve the living quality of developing nations. Creating new genetically modified strains of wheat, rich, maize and other crops, Borlaug planned to win the battle against world hunger. The hope was that these

new crops and farming techniques would rescue third world countries from the brink of starvation.

That's exactly what happened. The agricultural innovations brought to the poverty-stricken countries gave the farmers the skills and resources necessary to sustain themselves. This triggered a chain of events that would allow these once-struggling nations to survive. Agricultural exports soared in quantity and diversity and allowed the countries to become self-sufficient.

As the genetically modified crops thrived, farmers were able to use their increased income to purchase newer and superior farming machinery. This increase in revenue made farming easier, more reliable and more efficient. The Green Revolution led to the modernization of agriculture and has had a profound social, economic and political impact on the world.

The Mexican government turned to the Rockefeller Foundation in their endeavour to nourish Mexico through agriculture.

SOURCE: Green Revolution Waging War Against Hunger⁷¹

Norman Borlaug, needless to say, was a researcher for the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Green Revolution, for whatever increase in yields it brought about, also created markets for the oilgarchs' own interest in the petrochemical fertilizer industry and gave rise to the "ABCD" seed cartel of Archer

⁷¹<https://youtu.be/HucSCNQ01X4?t=71>

Daniels Midand, Bunge, Cargill and Louis Dreyfus⁷². These companies, along with their associated interests in the food packaging and processing industry, formed the core of American “agribusiness”, a concept developed at Harvard Business School⁷³ in the 1950s with the help of research conducted by Wassily Leontief for the Rockefeller Foundation⁷⁴.

The American agribusiness giants shared a common goal: the transformation of Third World agriculture into a captive market for their goods. From this perspective, the project was a runaway success. By the 1970s, the Rockefeller Standard Oil network and its cronies in the nitrogen fertilizer industry (including DuPont, Dow Chemical, and Hercules Powder) had broken into markets around the world, markets conveniently forced open for them by the US government itself under President Johnson’s “Food for Peace”⁷⁵ program, which mandated the use of petrochemical-dependent agricultural technologies (fertilizers, tractors, irrigation, etc.) by aid recipients.

Unable to afford these new technologies themselves, the impoverished Third World “beneficiaries” of this “revolution” relied on loans from the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank handled by Rockefeller’s own Chase Manhattan Bank and guaranteed by the US government.

⁷²<https://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/rr-cereal-secrets-grain-traders-agriculture-30082012-en.pdf>

⁷³<http://www.exed.hbs.edu/programs/agb/Pages/seminar.aspx>

⁷⁴<https://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/app/uploads/Annual-Report-1955.pdf>

⁷⁵<https://history.state.gov/milestones/1961-1968/pl-480>



The real costs of the Green Revolution — economic, agricultural and environmental — are seldom tallied. Access to these debt-financed petrochemical-dependent technologies exacerbated the difference between the rich landowning class and the landless peasants in countries like India⁷⁶, where land reform and abolition of usury were dropped from the political agenda after the Green Revolution took over.

Even then, the revolution's main success, its increase in agricultural yields, has been oversold. Yield growth across India actually slowed after the introduction of agribusiness⁷⁷. The environmental destruction is even more devastating. An overview in the December 2000 edition of *Current Science* notes: "The green revolution has not only increased productivity, but it has also [produced] several negative ecological consequences, such as depletion of lands, decline in soil fertility, soil salinization, soil erosion, deterioration of environment, health hazards, poor sustainability of agricultural lands and degradation of biodiversity. Indiscriminate use of pesticides, irrigation and imbalanced fertilization has threatened sustainability."⁷⁸

The Rockefeller Foundation even acknowledges the critiques of the Green Revolution it funded into existence, insisting that

⁷⁶<http://rupe-india.org/35/app1.html>

⁷⁷<http://rupe-india.org/35/app1.html>

⁷⁸http://www.academia.edu/4021874/Precision_farming_-_The_emerging_concept_of_agriculture_for_today_and_tomorrow

”current initiatives take into account lessons learned.”⁷⁹ Even so, the Foundation continues to fund research and write reports on how to improve prospects for agribusiness investment in its target markets⁸⁰.

As egregious as the Green Revolution was and continues to be, however, in many ways it was just the prelude to an even more ambitious project: the **Gene Revolution**. Now the project is not merely to monopolize the technologies, supplies and chemical inputs for agriculture worldwide, but to monopolize the food supply itself through the replacement of the world’s natural seeds with patentable genetically modified crops.

The players involved in this Gene Revolution are almost identical to the players in the Green Revolution, with IG Farben offshoots Bayer CropScience and BASF PlantScience mingling with traditional oilgarch associate companies like Dow AgroScience, DuPont Biotechnology, and, of course, Monsanto, all funded by the Rockefeller Foundation and fellow ”philanthropists” at the Ford Foundation, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and like-minded organizations.



The convergence of corporate, “philanthropic,” governmental, and inter-governmental interests in promoting GM

⁷⁹<http://rockefeller100.org/exhibits/show/agriculture>

⁸⁰<https://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/report/an-assessment-of-agricultural-policy-and-regulatory-constraints-to-agribusiness-investment/>

crops around the world can be seen in the bewildering array of research institutes, industry associations, and “consultative groups” devoted to the case. The Rockefeller-funded⁸¹, International Rice Research Institute (IRRI), the Rockefeller/Monsanto/USAID brainchild⁸², International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-biotech Applications (ISAAA), the Rockefeller/Ford/World Bank-created⁸³ Consultative Group of International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), and dozens of other bland, benign-sounding organizations research and promote GM crops in target markets around the globe, with the profits ending up in the oilgarchs’ coffers.

A representative example of this story is the agribusiness neocolonization of Argentina, where Monsanto ran an elaborate “bait-and-switch” to get the country hooked on its genetically modified Roundup Ready soybeans before demanding royalties on the crops that were by then already growing⁸⁴ DuPont then took over, magnanimously beginning a “Protein for Life” programme to foist their own GM soybeans on the country’s poor⁸⁵.

The same scene has played itself out in country after country, where cartel-developed GM crops are foisted on emerging economies through “food aid,” usually during times of famine

⁸¹<http://rockefeller100.org/exhibits/show/agriculture/research-institutes>

⁸²http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php/International_Service_for_the_Acquisition_of_Agri-biotech_Applications#Founding

⁸³https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/CGIAR#The_early_years

⁸⁴<https://www.grain.org/es/article/entries/148-monsanto-s-royalty-grab-in-argentina>

⁸⁵<https://www.grain.org/article/entries/435-argentina-s-torrid-love-affair-with-the-soybean>

when those countries are especially vulnerable. Only a handful of countries, like Zambia⁸⁶ or Angola⁸⁷, have outright rejected this GMO takeover of their food supply, generously subsidized by the US government to the benefit of the agribusiness cartel.

Conclusion: Monopolizing life From cutthroat pioneers of the early oil industry to Machiavellian social engineers and geopolitics schemers, the oilgarchs have come a long way since the days of Devil Bill's snake oil cure-alls. But his use of every form of deception and trickery to swindle the public informed how John D. and the rest of the oilgarchs built up their business interests.

As the 20th century drew to a close, it was obvious that for the powerful cartel that built the oil industry — the Rockefellers, the Rothschilds, the British and Dutch royal families — it was no longer about oil, if it ever really was. The takeover of education, of medicine, of the monetary system, of the food supply itself, showed that the aim was much greater than a mere oil monopoly: it was the quest to monopolize all aspects of life. To erect the perfect system of control over every aspect of society, every sector from which any threat of competition to their power could emerge.

They had been remarkably, almost unbelievably, successful. From oil well to gas pump, farm to fork, hospital to pharmaceutical, drill rig to dollar bill, there was almost no aspect of society that was not under control.

But the oilgarchs are not done yet. Their next project, launched in the late 20th century, is almost too ambitious to be

⁸⁶http://www.newsfromafrica.org/newsfromafrica/articles/art_851.html

⁸⁷<http://www.scidev.net/global/gm/news/angola-rejects-gm-food-aid.html>

comprehended. It is not about oil. It is not about money. It is about the monopolization of life itself. They have spent decades preparing the path for this takeover and marshaled their mind-boggling resources in service of the task.

And the vast majority of the world's population, still playing the shell game that the oiligarchs perfected and abandoned long ago, are about to fall right into their hands yet again.



Chapter 2

Why Big Oil conquered the world

Introduction At the dawn of the 20th century, a new international order was emerging. One founded on oil. And by the end of the 20th century, that order was firmly established. Heating. Transportation. Industrial power. Plastic manufacturing. Pharmaceuticals. There is no facet of modern life that is not, one way or another, dependent on oil.

But the rulers of this oilgarchy – the Rockefellers at Standard Oil, the British royals at BP, the Dutch royals and the Rothschilds at Royal Dutch Shell – were not content with mere financial domination. The power that came with their near-total monopoly on the world’s most important commodity was enormous, and they had no qualms about using that power to re-make the world in their image.

Como vimos en *Cómo el Petróleo Conquistó al Mundo*, el impacto de

As we saw in *How Big Oil Conquered the World*, the impact of the oilgarchs has been breathtaking. From the education system to the medical profession, from the “Green Revolution”

to the "Gene Revolution," from World War to the Gulf War, oil money has been used to shape every aspect of the world we live in. With the rise of the petrodollar in the 1970s, even the international monetary system itself rests on oil.

But now, in the 21st century, it seems that the old order, the oil order, is finally coming to an end.

Amy Goodman: We begin looking at a new milestone in the growing campaign for divestment from the gas, oil and coal companies that are fueling climate change. May Boeve, Executive Director of 350.org, made the announcement just before our broadcast today.

Today we're announcing that as of today total divestment commitments have passed the \$3.4 trillion mark. That's \$3.4 trillion of assets under management now fossil free.

SOURCE: Is Oil & Gas the New Tobacco? Fossil Fuel Divestment Movement Reaches New Milestone – Democracy Now!¹

Robert Dudley: In the oil and gas sector, we recognize the contribution of our activities and products to greenhouse gas emissions. Which is why the OCGI [Oil and Gas Climate Initiative] was setup.

SOURCE: OCGI invests in innovative low emissions technologies²

¹https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1xmoldqBy_I

²<http://www.oilandgasclimateinitiative.com/about>


Narrator 1: What began as a movement on US college campuses has reached the skyscrapers of high-finance.

Narrator 2: Globally nearly 200 institutions and thousands of individuals have moved a total of \$50 billion in assets away from fossil fuels.

Divestment Activist: If we take our money, put it into renewable like solar panels, the world could be such a better place.

SOURCE: Global Divestment Day 2015³

The masses, having identified the oilgarchs and their destructive grip on the planet, see Big Oil waning and have begun to celebrate. To them, the promise of a post-carbon future represents the end of the oilgarchy.



What many do not realize, however, is that the oil order was never about oil. The oilgarchs did not care about oil but control. And, having long outgrown their financial dependence on the commodity that brought them their power and riches, they are at the forefront of this push for the post-carbon era.

Now, the oilgarchs are seeking to bring in a new international order. One in which their control is consolidated, their plan complete, their power unquestionable. One in which every aspect of human life, from energy to money to the very

³<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ckJ9M56Ftbg&>

genome itself, is precisely ordered and technologically controlled.

This is the story of what the oiligarchs really desire, and how they plan to achieve it.

Part one: The rise of Eugenics. Dhaka, 1963. It's a day much like any other in Dhaka. The streets are crowded, dirty, squalid, smelly, and absolutely swarming with people. Lying in the streets. Coiled in the gutters. Into that swarm of people steps a most unlikely figure. Wearing his drip-dry suit and hugging his briefcase, he sticks out from the crowd. Surveying the scene, he shakes his head ever so slightly before remarking, half to himself and half to his traveling companion, "Well, that's the problem, isn't it?"



It's a scene that has played itself out many times: a Western tourist overwhelmed by the bustling crowds of the Indian subcontinent. But this was no mere tourist passing time on his holiday. This was John D. Rockefeller III, grandson of oil baron John D. Rockefeller⁴. And, armed with the unimaginable wealth, power and influence that his family name bestowed on him, he was on a mission to do something about the "problem" of overpopulation.

Rockefeller approached that mission as a representative of the

⁴<http://mikaelynyberg.nu/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/The-Green-Capitalists.pdf>

Population Council, a group that he himself had founded to address the "problem" in Dhaka and elsewhere. On its surface, the Population Council was a straightforward organization with a straightforward task: to support medical and scientific research into the question of the growing human population. But the dark history of the Council and its guiding philosophy reveal Rockefeller's true interest in this "problem" and its ultimate "solution."



John D. Rockefeller III — or JDR3, as he was known to the constellation of researchers, businessmen, politicians, diplomats and royals in the orbit of the Rockefeller family — had decided early on how to make proper use of the formidable money and power at his disposal: by controlling the population of the planet. In 1934, the then-28-year-old JDR3 had written a letter to his father, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., about the Rockefeller Foundation's research into "birth control and related questions," declaring, "I have come pretty definitely to the conclusion that it is the field in which I will be interested, for the present at least, to concentrate my own giving."

JDR3 was nothing if not a man of his word. After commissioning a Rockefeller Foundation fact-finding mission to Asia to report on the threat of the growing Third World population⁵, he organized a conference of the top medical and demographic

⁵<https://web.archive.org/web/20190828160018/https://rockarch.org/publications/resrep/huang2.pdf>

researchers of the era to discuss — as the very title of the meeting termed it — “population problems”.⁶ From that meeting emerged the idea for an organization, the Population Council, to guide the development of the burgeoning field of population and fertility research. JDR3 personally donated \$1.35 million of his own money to found the Council and provide its initial operating expenses.

Like his father and grandfather before him, Rockefeller had learned to use philanthropy and largesse as a mask for his true intention: control. But that mask slipped when he penned a draft of the Council’s charter revealing the organization’s true purpose. The Council, according to JDR3, would “promote research and apply existing knowledge to help develop such changes in the attitudes, habits and environmental pressures affecting the life of human beings so that within every social and economic grouping parents who are above the average in intelligence, quality of personality and affection will tend to have larger than average families”.⁷

Thomas Parran, the former Surgeon General of the United States and Council co-founder, warned against including such a blunt admission in the Council’s mission statement. “Such questions arise as the following,” he warned.⁸ “Who is to determine the ‘parents who are above average in...affection?’ [...] Also, who would decide the persons having better than average personality? Frankly, the implications of this, while I know they were intended to have a eugenic implication, could read-


⁶<https://web.archive.org/web/20190828155907/https://rockarch.org/publications/resrep/williams.pdf>

⁷<https://web.archive.org/web/20190828160027/https://rockarch.org/publications/resrep/ramsdem.pdf>

⁸<https://web.archive.org/web/20190828160027/https://rockarch.org/publications/resrep/ramsdem.pdf>


ily be misunderstood as a Nazi master race philosophy. I have, therefore, recast this paragraph.”

The line was dropped from the final version of the charter.



In truth, however, that sentence had not been written by JDR3 himself. Instead, it had been copied word for word from the back cover of *Eugenical News*, the central publication of the American eugenics movement. This was no mere accident. Frederick Osborne, one of the co-founders of the Council and its first president after Rockefeller stepped down in 1957, was also the president of the American Eugenics Society. When the Population Council was founded, both Osborne and the American Eugenics Society he directed formally moved its operations into the Council’s New York office⁹, with the eugenics society now taking its funding directly from Rockefeller’s Population Council grant. The Population Council was the Eugenics Society under another name.

⁹<http://amphilsoc.org/collections/view?docId=ead/Mss.575.06.Am3-ead.xml>



Eugenics. This was the guiding vision of JDR3 and the Rockefeller family’s ”philanthropy.” A vision that cast the Rockefellers and their fellow oilgarchs as superior families, fit, by very virtue of their wealth and success, to guide the course of world events. The power to determine who was fit to breed and who was too poor to pass on their genes.

Joe Plummer¹⁰: Eugenics is basically a movement among the elite to eradicate what they deem the inferior classes, and that’s the inferior social classes, racial classes, ethnic classes. More or less everyone who isn’t up to their standards. And after eradicating those classes, what they aim to do is genetically engineer themselves to such a high level that the remaining population that they permit to exist beneath them will never have the power to overthrow them, essentially. The end of history.

So, the term itself was coined by Galton and it

¹⁰<http://www.joeplummer.com/>

essentially means "well-born." The idea is kind of a mix of a bunch of ideas that were circulating around the 1850s. So if you go back to, say, Mendel, Mendel was studying hereditary characteristics in pea plants. And he was able to determine that certain characteristics were being passed on and that these things could be determined and essentially predicted.

And almost at the same time, now you have Spencer, who was talking about the "survival of the fittest," with the same kind of idea, the same thread running through there. That there are genetic characteristics that exist that would make one species, one plant or animal more fit than another, and more capable of surviving.

Also, of course, you had Darwin. Darwin's work at the time, *Origin of Species*, kind of maps this process by which genetic material is passed along and, you know, evolution results through this process.

So Galton is essentially taking all of these ideas, and he was kind of known for observing and identifying patterns. And what he essentially did was [he] started to come up with this idea that through studying human characteristics they could, if they chose to, breed superior human beings.

Obsessed with breeding and family heredity, the eugenicists believed that it was not merely physical characteristics like weight or height that were determined by one's family line, but social characteristics, like intelligence or conscientiousness or even criminality. If you are poor, it's because you come from

poor stock. If you're criminal, it's because your family line is criminal. And if you're a Rockefeller or a Rothschild or a royal, you are rich and successful because your family was destined for fortune and success.

The pseudoscientific trappings of the 19th century eugenic philosophy may have been new, but in fact the idea is as old as human civilization itself. People have always been taught to believe that their rulers are special, a class apart, members of a family specially chosen to rule over the masses. Whether literal descendants of the gods, like the Pharaohs of Egypt or the Emperors of Japan, or members of families specially chosen by god to reign over their kingdoms, like the monarchs of Europe, the right to rule over others was something passed down through family trees. The commoners, meanwhile, knew their place; not being born of royal blood, they entered the world as serfs, worked the land for the benefit of the noble class, and, if they were lucky, had children of their own to repeat the cycle for another generation.



But the breakdown of medieval feudalism gave rise to a newly-wealthy merchant class. The development of the scientific method challenged centuries of religious dogma. The spread of Enlightenment philosophy to the toppling of monarchs and the rise of democracy. And the industrial revolution paved the way for the rise of the robber barons and the creation of vast new family fortunes.

By the late 19th century, as the oiligarchs in America and Europe began to consolidate their wealth, a new justification for elite rule of society was needed. One that discarded outdated appeals to supernatural order and seemed to rest on a bedrock of science. An idea that could explain how nouveau riche upstarts like the Rockefellers and Rothschilds had risen to positions of prominence in society alongside the old royal dynasties of Europe.

Eugenics fit the bill perfectly. The answer was in their genes.

Richard Grove: Well, I think this eugenic idea that comes about from "survival of the fittest" almost gives a scientific excuse for some of the most inhumane and horrific actions that have ever been journeyed by humanity and then manifested. So the idea of controlling people through controlling reproduction, reproductive capability and access to mates and stuff like this is an idea that's thousands of years old.

So eugenics [...] came around in a strong form in the late 1800s, where you've got people like the Darwins, the Wedgwoods and the Huxleys — specifically Thomas H. Huxley, known as "Darwin's bulldog." So these ideas of eugenics really take on a new life of their own at the end of the 1800s, and coming into the 1900s, these ideas were embraced by the same families that were these robber barons that were being funded by [the] Rothschild banking network, also the Fabian socialist society, which again had a lot of the same movers and shakers as these people who were higher-ups

in the British empire.

So [...] it reared its head in the 1920s and 1930s in these forced sterilization campaigns, where if they thought you had a low IQ or if you had some congenital disease that would be passed on, then you didn't have the right to marry and have children.



Eugenics, of course, was pseudoscience. When Galton and his fellow travelers began developing the theory, the identification of the actual mechanism of heredity, including genes and DNA, was nearly 100 years away. Instead, they used catch-all terms with no definition — like “feeble-mindedness” to diagnose poverty or criminality, claiming it was caused by “defective germ plasm.” They used phrenology to try to determine the physical expression of alcoholism or low intelligence. Even the most famous works of the eugenics era, like Henry Goddard’s study of the Kallikak family, were roundly discredited and even repudiated by their authors.

Joe Plummer: So it’s 100% pseudo-scientific. It’s absolutely arbitrary, the characteristics that they’re looking for. Something like feeble-mindedness is something that is not only not scientific, it can essentially be described in any way by

the person observing wants it to be described. So feeble-minded could mean that maybe you stutter so then you're feeble-minded maybe, or you're shy so you're feeble-minded. Maybe they just don't like the way you act so you're feeble-minded.

But the idea was an infectious one. Like all the most enticing pseudoscience, it explained so much with so little effort. It appealed to the vanity of the researchers, usually hailing from successful and wealthy families themselves. And it gave an excuse for social engineering on a scale never before dreamed of.

When eugenics crossed the Atlantic, spreading from the rarefied British countryside of Galton and his cohorts to the rocky shores of America, it hit ambitious young researchers like Charles Davenport with hurricane force. A Harvard-trained zoologist who had grown up in a strict, puritanical family of New England Congregationalists, Davenport's authoritarian father was obsessed with genealogy, tracing the family tree all the way back to his Anglo-Saxon forebears in 1086. When the younger Davenport discovered Galton's writing while working at a biological laboratory on Long Island, he found his purpose in life. As he later told the American Breeders Association, which became an important ally in his eugenicist cause: "Society must protect itself; as it claims the right to deprive the murderer of his life, so also it may annihilate the hideous serpent of hopelessly vicious protoplasm."

With the proselytizing fervour of a religious convert¹¹, Davenport concocted an ambitious idea for furthering the eugenic cause: the creation of a Eugenics Record Office to register

¹¹http://www.eugenicsarchive.org/eugenics/topics_fs.pl?theme=32&search=&matches=

the genetic background of every single man, woman and child in America (and, eventually, the world), so that every person could be categorized by their family line and assigned a genetic rating. Once completed, those with the lowest eugenic value could be eliminated from the gene pool.

Joe Plummer: So the idea of eugenics makes it way to America, lands in the lap of Charles Davenport, who approaches the Carnegie Institute for funding and on the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory they set up essentially an institute to study eugenics, and this eventually evolves with some Harri-man money into the Eugenics Records Office. So between this initial institute that's set up at Cold Spring Harbor and then the Eugenics Record Office, which is also added to that, you're talking about millions and millions and millions of dollars of funding that's put forward to go out and investigate and find the inferior "germ-plasm" — that's how it's often described.


The Rockefeller Foundation's initial contribution to the Eugenics Record Office, a mere \$21,650, was a small sum, but it came with clear benefits: not only the institutional infrastructure and the personnel of the Foundation and the prestige of the Rockefeller name itself, but the promise of increased support as the work advanced. And as always, the Rockefellers were true to their word.

Rockefeller Foundation researchers like William Welch, the founding director of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, sat on the ERO's board and helped direct its activities¹².

¹²<http://eugenicsarchive.org/html/eugenics/static/images/>

The Rockefellers also provided funds for specific research, like a \$10,000 grant to survey New York's Nassau County for the eugenically unfit. And it created sister organizations like the Bureau of Social Hygiene, which cross-pollinated research and researchers with Davenport's own laboratory.

John D. Rockefeller, Jr. especially showed an interest in Davenport's work right from the start. They kept up a regular correspondence on a number of eugenics issues. In January 1912, when a plan to institutionalize "mentally deficient" female convicts to stop them from having children was floated, the young Rockefeller heir wrote to Davenport for his thoughts on the scheme. For his part, Junior declared that "this plan seems to me an immensely important one. It points out a scientific way of escape from the evils which our courts are intended to correct but in reality only increase."¹³ After Davenport responded that the plan would only work if it included a eugenical screening of the convicts, Junior contributed \$200,000 to found just such an institute. The Institute of Criminology in New York was administered by Rockefeller's own Bureau of Social Hygiene and staffed by workers trained at the Eugenics Record Office.



Fueled by the support of America's rich and powerful, the field of eugenics transformed from the quaint hobbyhorse of

971.html

¹³<http://ferris-pages.org/ISAR/archives2/sources/bsh.htm>

a few mad scientists into the social cause of an entire generation. Economists, politicians, authors, activists — by the 1920s, everyone who was anyone was extolling the need to eradicate the germ-plasm of the lower stock.

Marie Stopes, the celebrated family planning pioneer who founded Britain's first birth control clinic in North London in 1921, railed against "hordes of defectives," calling for the compulsory sterilization of those she deemed "unfit for parenthood."

Tommy Douglas, now venerated as a hero in Canada for his role in founding the nation's health care system, submitted a Master's thesis to McMaster University advocating that "subnormals," "defectives" and "morons," like those with low IQ or physical abnormalities, be isolated "on a state farm, or in a colony where decisions could be made for them by a competent supervisor," and called on the government to certify "mental and physical fitness" to stop the "unfit" from breeding.

John Maynard Keynes, the economist who gave us the Keynesian economic school that is still popular among central planners today, was himself president of the British Eugenics Society from 1937 to 1944.

Alexander Graham Bell is still revered as the inventor of the telephone but was in fact an early supporter of Charles Davenport and a founding member of the Eugenic Records Office Board of Scientific Directors. He openly campaigned for the "eradication of the deaf race" by governments intervening to stop deaf people from marrying.

Nobel Prize-winning playwright and author George Bernard Shaw advocated for the creation of a government panel that would require everyone to justify their existence before it. If they failed to do so, Shaw thought those people should be killed

by the state.

George Bernard Shaw: ...But there are an extraordinary number of people whom I want to kill. Not in any unkind or personal spirit, but it must be evident to all of you — you must all know half a dozen people, at least — who are no use in this world. Who are more trouble than they are worth. And I think it would be a good thing to make everybody come before a properly-appointed board, just as he might come before the income tax commissioner, and, say, every five years, or every seven years, just put him there, and say: "Sir, or madam, now will you be kind enough to justify your existence?" If you can't justify your existence, if you're not pulling your weight because you won't, if you're not producing as much as you consume, or perhaps a little more, then, clearly, we cannot use the big organization of our society for the purpose of keeping you alive. Because your life does not benefit us and it can't be of any much use.

SOURCE: *George Bernard Shaw talking about capital punishment*¹⁴



¹⁴https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=B-Ljkoh_vmE

Eventually, with foundation funding and promotion, this eugenicist mindset filtered down into the popular culture. The American Eugenics Society sponsored "fitter family contests" at state fairs, awarding prizes to families scoring the highest on "eugenic health" tests¹⁵. The Society also sponsored contests to award prizes to clergy who fit the message of eugenics into their sermons. Eugenics even found its way to the silver screen:

"We thought it necessary to present your family's case to the state medical commission and after an examination they decided that there was one important action to take, to have your entire family sterilized."

"Why, what's that? I don't know what you're talking about."

"Well, we investigated your family's history, Alice, and most of the past 3 generations have been feeble-minded, congenital cripples or habitual drunkards. Instead of improving, each generation is more of a problem. Now in this state we have a law which provides for such people to have an operation so there won't be any more children."

"I see."

SOURCE: Tomorrow's Children¹⁶

But merely popularizing their ideas was not the goal of the eugenicists. They wanted action. And in this case, that meant

¹⁵http://www.eugenicsarchive.org/eugenics/topics_fs.pl?theme=8

¹⁶<https://archive.org/details/TomorrowsChildren1934-AmericanForcedSterilization-PublicDomain>

concrete steps toward eliminating the defective germ-plasm from the human population.

Government-sanctioned murder of those deemed unfit was always one option on the table. And it wasn't just playwrights like Bernard Shaw advocating for government death panels; eugenicists of all stripes discussed and debated the idea of "murdering degenerates" as the quickest way of achieving their goals.

"Mistaken regard for what are believed to be divine laws and a sentimental belief in the sanctity of human life tend to prevent both the elimination of defective infants and the sterilization of such adults as are themselves of no value to the community. The laws of nature require the obliteration of the unfit and human life is valuable only when it is of use to the community or race." — Madison Grant, director of the American Eugenics Society, 1915

But mainstream eugenicists realized that this approach was not possible in the political and judicial climate of the day. As Henry Goddard noted in his infamous study on *The Kallikak Family*: "For the low-grade idiot, the loathsome unfortunate that may be seen in our institutions, some have proposed the lethal chamber. But humanity is steadily tending away from the possibility of that method, and there is no probability that it will ever be practiced."

Instead, they would have to turn to the other option, the more politically acceptable solution for stopping the undesirables from breeding: forced sterilization.

Indiana passed America's first eugenic sterilization law in 1907, and within only a few years there were a dozen states where those deemed "unfit" were being legally sterilized against their will. But still, this was not enough for the eugenicists. The approach was too scattershot: only a few thousand sterilizations had taken place under these laws, and Indiana's own forced sterilization act was overturned by the state's Supreme Court in 1921.

Once again, Harry Laughlin, Davenport's right-hand man at the Rockefeller-funded Eugenics Records Office, stepped in to solve the problem. He drafted a "Model Eugenic Sterilization"¹⁷ law in 1922 that became the basis for Virginia's 1924 sterilization act. To confront the issues head on, the eugenicists decided to challenge the law's constitutionality themselves and take the lawsuit all the way to the Supreme Court. All they needed was the right test case to bring to trial. And they found that case in Carrie Buck, an 18-year-old ward of the Virginia State Colony for Epileptics and Feeble-minded, who was neither epileptic nor feeble-minded.



Amy Goodman: But start back in the 1920s with Carrie Buck.

Adam Cohen: So she's a young woman who is growing up in Charlottesville, Virginia, being

¹⁷<http://alexwellerstein.com/laughlin/>

raised by a single mother. Back then, there was a belief that it was better often to take poor children away from their parents and put them in middle-class homes. So she was put in a foster family that treated her very badly. She wasn't allowed to call the parents "mother" and "father." She did a lot of housekeeping for them and was rented out to the neighbors. And then, one summer, she was raped by the nephew of her foster mother. She becomes pregnant out of wedlock. And rather than help her with this pregnancy, they decide to get her declared epileptic and feeble-minded, though she was neither, and she's shipped off to the Colony for Epileptics and Feeble-minded outside of Lynchburg, Virginia.

Goodman: And what happened to her there?

Cohen: So she gets there at just the wrong time. Virginia has just passed an eugenics sterilization law, and they want to test it in the courts. So they seize on Carrie Buck as the perfect plaintiff in this lawsuit. So they decide to make her the first person in Virginia who will be eugenically sterilized, and suddenly she's in the middle of a case that's headed to the U.S. Supreme Court.

SOURCE: Buck v. Bell: Inside the SCOTUS Case That Led to Forced Sterilization of 70,000 & Inspired the Nazis¹⁸

¹⁸https://www.democracynow.org/2016/3/17/buck_v_bell_inside_the_scotus

The case was a sham, concocted merely to get the Supreme Court's stamp of approval on the issue of forced sterilization. Buck's "independent counsel" was, in fact, Irving Whitehead, one of the founding directors of the colony that was pushing to sterilize her and the man who appointed the director that was pushing for her sterilization. Buck herself was not feeble-minded, nor was her mother, nor was her daughter, Vivian Buck, who Carrie bore as a result of being raped and who was declared "feeble-minded" as a baby, because, as a social worker testified during the trial, "There is a look about it that is not quite normal, but just what it is, I can't tell."

None of these facts mattered to the Supreme Court. Presided over by former President and Chief Justice William Howard Taft, the Court voted 8-to-1 in favor of upholding Buck's forced sterilization and the constitutionality of the Virginia eugenics sterilization law itself. Writing the decision was one of the most famous and venerated Justices in the history of the court, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., himself a eugenicist from the so-called "Boston Brahmin" sect of the hereditary East Coast establishment.

In his decision, Holmes justified the forced sterilization of those like Buck by calling on the government's right to vaccinate its citizens against their will¹⁹:

"It is better for all the world if, instead of waiting to execute degenerate offspring for crime or to let them starve for their imbecility, society can prevent those who are manifestly unfit from continuing their kind. The principle that sustains compul-

¹⁹<https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/274/200/case.html>

sory vaccination is broad enough to cover cutting the Fallopian tubes,” he declared before infamously concluding: ” Three generations of imbeciles are enough.”

And with that, the floodgates were opened. New laws were enacted and old laws revised to comport with the Supreme Court’s decision. Forcible sterilizations, taking place in a covert and low-key manner before, were now reported with pride. A few thousand individuals sterilized against their will became tens of thousands. The eugenics era, brought into being by the immense fortunes of the Rockefellers and their ilk, had arrived. And, with the aid of a very dramatic push by the Rockefellers, it was about to go international.


Beginning in November 1922 and increasingly throughout the 1920s, the Rockefeller Foundation began a series of grants and fellowships to German scientists. Equivalent to millions of dollars in today’s money, these fellowships transformed the German scientific establishment, devastated in the wake of World War I. The Foundation’s money found its way into the coffers of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institutes, a series of scientific organizations that included an Institute for Psychiatry and an Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity and Eugenics.

One of the main beneficiaries of this Rockefeller largesse was Ernst Rüdin, a head researcher at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Psychiatry and a key architect of Germany’s eugenics program under the Third Reich. Rüdin co-edited the official rules and commentary on the Law for the Prevention of Defective Progeny²⁰, which was passed on July 14, 1933, less than six

²⁰https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/b/b9/Reichsgesetzblatt_25_Juli_1933.jpg

months after Hitler was appointed interim chancellor by President Paul von Hindenburg. The law, like the Virginia law that the Supreme Court upheld and that led to the sterilization of Carrie Buck and tens of thousands of other Americans, was modeled on Harry Laughlin's Model Eugenic Sterilization legislation²¹. It formed "Genetic Health Courts" which could mandate sterilization of "defectives" in eight different categories: the feeble-minded, schizophrenics, manic depressives, sufferers of Huntington's chorea, epileptics, those with hereditary deformities, the blind and the deaf. Alcoholics, a ninth category, were to be optionally added to the list, with a caution against inclusion of ordinary drunkards. By the end of the year, 62,400 Germans were found unfit to breed and sterilized against the will. By 1945, that number had reached 400,000.

In the 1940s, that eugenics program was to expand into euthanasia under the Aktion T4 program, resulting in over 70,000 children, senior citizens, and psychiatric patients being murdered by the Nazi regime²².



As the dust settled on World War II, the name of "eugenics" became synonymous with the Nazis in the minds of the general public. The eugenicists, outraged, knew that their work could not continue any longer under the name of eugenics. But that

²¹http://www.eugenicsarchive.org/eugenics/view_image.pl?id=1901

²²<https://www.t4-denkmal.de/Aktion-T4>

didn't mean that it couldn't continue.

Richard Grove: So after World War II you don't hear about it anymore as eugenics. What you hear is molecular biology, and these sorts of colloquial terms that were developed by the Rockefeller Foundation, which was one of the families primarily in America that was helping to fund it in America, in Britain, in Germany, who also funded Hitler during that time. So there's a lot of overlaps between the people who were actually out there funding genocide and the people who had ideas about culling the population, population control and sterilizing people, and these ideas go on and permeate society to this day.

As American Eugenics Society co-founder Frederick Osborne wrote: "Eugenic goals are most likely to be attained under a name other than eugenics".²³ Thus, he moved the American Eugenics Society into the offices of John D. Rockefeller III's Population Council, becoming president in 1957.

The Rockefellers and their fellow oilgarchs had for generations felt themselves to be stewards of the planet, protecting it from the rising tide of the genetically inferior. They were not about to give up that quest. They would simply have to package it under a different name.

²³<http://www.uvm.edu/~eugenics/primarydocs/orfofhh000068.xml>



Part two: Oiligarchs for climate change

Maurice Strong: With all the evidence that we've amassed in our preparations for the Stockholm Conference, including the views of many of world's leading scientists, I am convinced that the prophets of doom have got to be taken seriously. In other words, doomsday is a possibility. I am equally convinced that doomsday is not inevitable.

SOURCE: Maurice Strong Interview (BBC 1972)²⁴

On paper, it would be almost impossible to find a less likely candidate for "Godfather" of the modern environmental movement than Maurice Strong. A junior high school dropout from a poor family in rural Manitoba struck hard by the great depression, Strong's meteoric rise to the heights of wealth and political influence is itself remarkable. The sheer number of environmental organizations that he founded, conferences he

²⁴<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1YCatox0Lxo>

chaired, campaigns he directed and accolades he received over the course of his career is even more remarkable: Organizer of the Stockholm Environmental Conference, founding director of the United Nations Environment Program, Secretary General of the Rio Earth Summit, founder of the Earth Council and the Earth Charter movement, chair of the World Resources Institute, commissioner of the World Commission on Environment and Development, and board member of a bewildering array of organizations, from the International Institute for Sustainable Development to the Stockholm Environment Institute to the African-American Institute²⁵.

But perhaps the most remarkable thing about Strong, this ubiquitous figure of the 20th century environmental movement, was his background: a Rockefeller-connected millionaire from the Alberta oil patch who divided his time between environmental campaigning and running major oil companies.



To understand how this came about, we have to examine the history of the emergence of the environmental movement. In the post-war period, the desire to control the population put on a new mask: protecting the world from resource depletion, pollution and ecological catastrophe. And, as always, the Rockefeller family was there to provide the funding and organizational support to steer this burgeoning movement toward their

²⁵<http://mauricestrong.net/index.php/short-biography-mainmenu-6>

own ends.

Raymond Burr: President Nixon and the United States Congress established the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. The chairman of this unique commission is John D. Rockefeller III.

John D. Rockefeller III: There's a very broad-ranging mandate. Nobody's had one of this character before and just from that this question of quality of life just emerged as the seemingly key issue.

Burr: But the main finding was that stabilization of some kind is clearly desirable for the country.

JDR3: Yes, we said that it is recognized that population cannot continue to grow indefinitely. Nobody question that and we said from our findings (that) we felt that now the nation should welcome and plan for a stabilized population. The whole question of pollution, environment and population came very much to the fore in amazingly rapid time and President Nixon in July of 1969 made a statement to the Congress exclusively on this question, and I'd like to read just two sentences from that statement, as I think it's indicative of his concern in regard to the subject and his recognition of its importance here and around the world. He said, *"One of the most serious challenges to human destiny in the last third of this century will be the growth of the population. Whether man's response*

to this challenge will be a cause for pride or for despair in the year 2000 will depend very much on what we do today.”

SOURCE: Survival Of Spaceship Earth (1972)²⁶

Joining the Rockefellers in shaping the international environmental movement were their fellow oilgarchs across the Atlantic, including the British royals behind BP and the Dutch Royals behind Royal Dutch Shell. And facilitating the transition from eugenics to population control to environmentalism was Julian Huxley, brother of Brave New World author Aldous Huxley and grandson of “Darwin’s bulldog” T.H. Huxley.



Julian Huxley was a committed eugenicist, chairing the British Eugenics Society from 1959 to 1962. But, like the other eugenicists of the post-war era, he understood the need to pursue the now-discredited work of eugenics under a different guise. The founding director of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), Huxley wrote in the agency’s founding document about the need to find ways to make the cause of eugenics politically viable once again:²⁷

”At the moment, it is probable that the indirect effect of civilisation is dysgenic instead of eugenic;

²⁶https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W-Em9A_Alck#t=09m28s

²⁷<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0006/000681/068197eo.pdf>

and in any case it seems likely that the dead weight of genetic stupidity, physical weakness, mental instability, and disease-proneness, which already exist in the human species, will prove too great a burden for real progress to be achieved. Thus even though it is quite true that any radical eugenic policy will be for many years politically and psychologically impossible, it will be important for UNESCO to see that the eugenic problem is examined with the greatest care, and that the public mind is informed of the issues at stake so that much that now is unthinkable may at least become thinkable.”

Huxley found the perfect front for the re-introduction of those “unthinkable” eugenical ideas in 1948, when he used UNESCO as a springboard for founding the International Union for the Conservation of Nature, and then again in 1961, when he used that agency as a springboard to create the World Wildlife Fund. Joining Huxley as co-founders of the fund were not only Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, founder of the Bilderberg Group and former employee of the IG Farben conglomerate, and Prince Philip of England, but Godfrey A. Rockefeller of the Rockefeller dynasty. Together, they pledged to “harness public opinion and educate the world about the necessity for conservation.”

Years of “education” about the strain that the growing human population put on the resources of the earth, paid for by the very oiligarchs who had just spent the past century monopolizing one of the world’s key resources, led, inevitably to a predictable conclusion:

Hugh Downs: Now for the first time in the his-

tory of man, an international movement is underway. The people of the nations and the nations of the world have joined together to find the answers. This building and the worlds representatives hold the solution. We've seen what we've done to bring about the destruction of our Earth. Is it not the time now to cure the disease that we ourselves have created?

SOURCE: Survival Of Spaceship Earth (1972)²⁸

Yes, the "cure" for the "disease" of mankind, according to Rockefeller-funded propaganda featuring John D. Rockefeller III as an expert commentator, was to be found at the United Nations, whose headquarters had been so graciously donated by the Rockefeller family itself. And the first step toward discovering that cure was to organize the UN Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm in 1972, the world's first international environmental conference.

Narrator: For 11 days in June 1972, Stockholm was a magnet for everyone concerned with the environment: 1,200 official delegates from 113 nations were in Stockholm for the 1st International Conference on the Human Environment. The meeting, first proposed to the United Nations by Sweden and approved by the General Assembly in 1968, attracted worldwide attention.

²⁸https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W-Em9A_A1ck#t=09m28s

In four short years, the topic of the human environment had gone from the back pages of newspapers to make headlines on page 1.

SOURCE: 1972 United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (Part 1)²⁹

And who better to oversee the conference and lay the institutional groundwork for this burgeoning, oilgarch-supported movement, than a consummate oil man?

Maurice Strong: The very fact that the conference began with 113 participating countries, with very high-level delegations from those countries, this in itself represented a very significant step forward. Because this demonstrated more than anything else the real concern of the majority of countries in the world.

SOURCE: 1972 United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (Part 1)³⁰

All his life, Maurice Strong had the uncanny ability to be in the right place at the right time to meet the right person to advance up the ranks. Having been born in Oak Lake, Manitoba, in 1929, and suffering through the Great Depression, the ambitious young Strong dropped out of school at age 14 and headed north to look for work. Finding his way to Chesterfield Inlet, Strong got a job as a fur buyer for the Hudson's Bay Company and there met "Wild" Bill Richardson, a prospector whose wife, Mary McColl, hailed from the family behind McColl-Frontenac, one of Canada's largest oil companies.

²⁹<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mJUk70tfELA#t=02m39s>

³⁰<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mJUk70tfELA#t=02m39s>

Elaine Dewar³¹: So, Mr. Strong enters the big world through a guy by the name of 'Wild' Bill Richardson, who was a sort of prospector married into an oil family called McColl whose company was called McColl-Frontenac. It was a major importer of oil from the Middle East that had been taken over long since by the Texaco Company through a brokerage house called Nesbitt Thomson. In a way, Mr. Strong was introduced to the world of Big Oil and the world of resources at a very young age. He was picked up as a very smart kid, taken under the wing of a man named Paul Martin Sr., who was a cabinet minister and whose son would go on to become the Prime Minister of Canada and introduced to the oil patch through people at the very top — and that would include David Rockefeller.

Through the Richardsons, Strong made a series of increasingly unlikely connections. First he was introduced to the Treasurer of the then-brand new United Nations, Noah Monod. Unbelievably, Monod didn't just secure Strong a job as a junior security officer at UN headquarters, he allowed the young Manitoba farm boy to live with him in New York. And while there, Monod introduced Strong to the most important contact of his life, David Rockefeller.

³¹<http://elainedewar.blogspot.com.au/>



From that moment on, Strong was a made man. And from that moment on, wherever Strong went, Rockefeller and his associates were there somewhere in the background.

It was a Standard Oil veteran, Jack Gallagher, who gave Strong his big break in the Alberta oil patch when he quit his UN security job to return to Canada. And when Maurice Strong suddenly decided to quit that oil patch job, sell his house, and travel to Africa, he supported himself working for Rockefeller's CalTex in Nairobi.

When he quit that job in 1954 and started his own company back in Canada, he hired Henrie Brunie (a close friend of Rockefeller associate John J. McCloy) to manage it, and appointed two Standard Oil of New Jersey reps to its board. By his late 20s he was running his own company and was already a millionaire.

As he would throughout his life, Maurice Strong capitalized on these connections and opportunities to full effect. After being chosen to organize the UN environmental conference in Stockholm, he was appointed a Trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation, which then funded his office for the Stockholm summit and supplied Carnegie Fellow Barbara Ward and Rockefeller ecologist Rene Dubos for his team. Strong commissioned them to write "Only One Earth," a foundational text in the sustainable development arena that is heavily touted by globalists as a key document for promoting the global management of re-

sources³².

The 1972 Stockholm summit is still hailed as a landmark moment in the history of the modern environmental movement, leading not only to the first governmentally-administered environmental action plans in Europe but the creation of an entirely new UN bureaucracy: the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Naturally, the UN appointed Maurice Strong as UNEP's first director.

Shortly thereafter, Strong continued his double life by jumping straight back into the oil patch.



Eastern Canada was hit particularly hard by the OPEC oil embargo, and as a result then-Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau created PetroCanada, Canada's national oil company. And who did he tap as the company's first president? None other than that crusading Rockefeller-backed "environmentalist," Maurice Strong.

Leaving that post in 1978, Strong continued with a scarcely believable series of governmental, private sector and international appointments, from Chairman of the Canada Development Investment Corporation to Chairman of AZL Resources Incorporated to leading the UN's famine relief program in Africa.

³²<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0007/000748/074879eo.pdf>



In 1987, Strong helped to organize another environmental conference, much less known but no less remarkable than the Stockholm summit. Dubbed the 4th World Wilderness Congress,³³ the meeting took place in Denver, Colorado, and brought together Strong, David Rockefeller, Edmond de Rothschild,³⁴ then-Treasury Secretary James Baker, and a gaggle of other oilgarchs, bankers, Washington power players and globalists, ostensibly to talk about the environment. What they actually discussed was altogether more incredible:

David Lang: I suggest therefore that this be sold not through a democratic process. That would take too long and devour far too much of the funds to educate the cannon fodder, unfortunately, that populates the earth. We have to take almost an elitist program, [so] that we can see beyond our swollen bellies, and look to the future in time

³³<http://www.wild.org/wild-congress/4wwc/>

³⁴https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edmond_Adolphe_de_Rothschild

frames and in results which are not easily understood, or which can be, with intellectual honesty, be reduced down to some kind of simplistic definition.

SOURCE: UN UNCED Earth Summit 1992 by George Hunt³⁵

Those were the words of David Lang, a banker from Montreal who spoke during the conference. And to Lang, the Rockefellers, the Rothschilds and the other bankers and oiligarchs assembled at the meeting, the general population are "cannon fodder" that "unfortunately [...] populates the earth." This candid admission, a perfect encapsulation of the eugenical ideas at the heart of the global conservation movement funded into existence by the oiligarchs themselves, was caught on tape by George Hunt, a businessman in Boulder, Colorado, who had volunteered to help the conference as a concerned citizen and came away horrified by what he had witnessed there. He released his own recordings of the proceedings in the early 1990s to warn the public about this group and its ultimate aims.

Hunt's recording captured the moment when Maurice Strong introduced Baron Edmond de Rothschild — whose father's cousin had sold the Rothschild's Azerbaijani oil fields to Royal Dutch Shell in 1911³⁶ — as a pioneer of the environmental movement and a founder of the concept of "conservation banking."

Maurice Strong: One of the most important initiatives that is open here for your consideration is that

³⁵<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r8c-NKj00AO>

³⁶https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edouard_Alphonse_de_Rothschild

of the conservation banking program. As we mentioned this morning, we have, as our chairman, fortunately, the person who really is the source of this very significant concept. He was/is one of the trustees of the International Wilderness Foundation, which sponsored this meeting. He was at the first of these conferences. So his conversion to the relationship between conservation and economic development has been a pioneering one. So there is no better person. He epitomizes in his own life that positive synthesis between environment, conservation on the one hand and economics on the other, and I'm just delighted to have this opportunity of introducing to you Edmond de Rothschild.

Edmond de Rothschild: Maurice, thank you very much indeed for all that you've said, and I would ask the audience to take with a slight grain of salt all that he has said about me.

SOURCE: UN UNCED Earth Summit 1992 by George Hunt³⁷

The meeting accomplished some important goals for the oil-garchs. It led to the creation of "Wilderness Areas",³⁸ vast expanses of natural terrain from which the public could be largely excluded. These areas were to be designated and overseen by the IUCN, the same body that British Eugenics Society president Julian Huxley used as a springboard to creating the World Wildlife Fund.

³⁷<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r8c-NKj00AO>

³⁸<https://www.iucn.org/theme/protected-areas/about/protected-areas-categories/category-ib-wilderness-area>

Another important goal of the conference was Rothschild's proposal for the creation of a so-called "World Conservation Bank" that would operate at a supra-national level and coordinate finance for development projects around the world.

Edmond de Rothschild: The meetings now over the concept of an international conservation banking program involve all sectors of the human community: Governmental and inter-governmental agencies, the public and private agencies, large charitable foundations, as well as ordinary individuals worldwide. By thinking forward as to how to reach out to the public at large, to every corporate entity throughout the world to put aside, hopefully tax-free, a part of their profits to fund our ecological and environmental protection.

Ladies and gentlemen, every country has its own problems, its indigenous peoples and its wildlife. This international conservation bank must know no frontiers, no boundaries."

SOURCE: UN UNCED Earth Summit 1992 by George Hunt³⁹

This world conservation bank was forwarded and eventually realized at Maurice Strong's next major conference, the one which was to serve as the crowning achievement of his unlikely career as environmental crusader, and which still remains one of the touchstones of the environmental movement: the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro.

Narrator: In June 1992, the world met in Rio to discuss the fate of planet Earth. In this largest sum-

³⁹<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r8c-NKj00A0>

mit and very first Earth Summit ever held, representatives from 166 countries, 130 heads of state and 15,000 non-governmental organizations came together with the hopes of deciding specific agreements that would balance environmental preservation with economic needs.

SOURCE: 1992 – UN Earth Summit – Rio de Janeiro – In Our Hands (Part 1)⁴⁰

George H.W. Bush: And my gratitude to Secretary General Maurice Strong for his tireless work in bringing this Earth Summit together. This is truly an historic gathering. There are those who say that economic growth and environmental protection cannot be compatible.

John Major: "The world is our garden and together we must cultivate it. This week at Rio we have made a start. Beyond Rio we must continue to carry it through."

Maurice Strong: "We cannot be complacent. Unless the agreements reached here are accompanied by commitments to significant change – change, of course, indeed for the human species in my view, your excellencies—we simply are headed for a moment in the 21st century where the condition of our species may become terminal."

SOURCE: Brazil – Rio Earth Summit (B)⁴¹

⁴⁰<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Esz8wj2xe7c>

⁴¹<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Bn4V23Boeqc>

As useful as the 4th World Wilderness Congress had been in advancing the agenda of Maurice Strong and the oilgarchs, that was only setting the stage for the Earth Summit in Rio.

At the Earth Summit, Edmond de Rothschild got his "World Conservation Bank." Dubbed the "Global Environment Facility" and launched at the summit itself, it serves as the funding mechanism for five different UN conventions and provides billions of dollars worth of financing to environmental and development projects around the world. Its 18 "implementing partners" include the Rockefeller-funded Food and Agricultural Organization, the Huxley-founded International Union for the Conservation of Nature, the Maurice Strong-created United Nations Environment Programme, and the Prince Bernhard/Prince Philip/Godfrey Rockefeller-founded World Wildlife Fund.

One of the Global Environment Facility's specialties is "debt-for-nature swaps",⁴² where Third World countries are given debt relief in return for opening their land up for environmental development projects. The projects come with transaction costs of up to 5%, paid to the contractors who manage and direct the investments, not to the locals who, like the aborigines of Palawan island, are kicked off their land and effectively wiped off the face of the map⁴³.

⁴²<http://www.eco-action.org/dod/no7/76-78.html>

⁴³https://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/publication/The.Challenge.of_.Sustainability.pdf



The Earth Summit also gave rise to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the body to which the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change delivers its reports. Generally thought to be neutral, non-governmental bodies relying only on science and evidence, the UNFCCC and the IPCC are handcuffed by the terms⁴⁴ that Strong set out for them to deliver only one conclusion: that humanity is to blame for **climate change**.

Dr. Tim Ball⁴⁵: When they set up the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Maurice Strong, who we should talk a lot about, he wrote the terms of reference and the first term of reference was the definition of climate change and he limited it, deliberately, to only human causes of climate change. Of course that effectively eliminated all of the natural causes and natural variability which is why you see them not looking at things like the sun and a whole bunch of other issues. He then limited it even further in another term of reference, he set it up into three working groups. There was the technical group, Working Group 1, which wrote the science report, and that was 600 of the 2,500

⁴⁴<http://earthcharter.org/discover/the-earth-charter/>

⁴⁵<http://drtimball.com/>

people. The other 1,900 people were in Working Groups 2 & 3. Now they were inconsequential because they had to accept the findings of Working Group 1, which were already limited by their terms of reference. So whatever their finding was, Working Groups 2 & 3 then said, "OK, you're telling us it's going to warm, we accept that as fact. We now look at the implications of that," and that's where you hear all these stories of the ice is going to melt, the sea-levels are going to rise, etc.

So really, the majority of the report by 1,900 scientists is accepting without question the finding of the first group. Now Strong really restricted it even more because they then came and said, "Now look, this report is not to be used for policy," but then they set up the Summary for Policymakers, the absolute contradiction of that. The Summary for Policymakers is written by a completely separate group, and then they write independent of the science report. The science report is finished and set aside. The Summary for Policymakers is written and given out to the media, but the rules — the terms of reference that Strong set out — said that the Summary for Policymakers goes back to the science report people and says make sure your science report agrees with what we've put in the summary.

SOURCE: The IPCC Exposed⁴⁶

⁴⁶<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L0yBfiHjQvI&#t=36m14s>

Another product of the Earth Summit in Rio was the Earth Charter,⁴⁷ a quasi-religious document that Mikhail Gorbachev, who helped draft the text along with Maurice Strong, referred to as a replacement for the Ten Commandments,⁴⁸ and which sought to usher in an era of Gaia worship and global responsibility. Declaring that "[f]undamental changes are needed in our values, institutions, and ways of living," the document then counsels that we must create a world of "shared responsibility" to the "Earth community," before concluding:

"In order to build a sustainable global community, the nations of the world must renew their commitment to the United Nations, fulfill their obligations under existing international agreements, and support the implementation of Earth Charter principles with an international legally binding instrument on environment and development."

Patrick Wood⁴⁹: Well, the Earth Charter was one of the bi-products ultimately of the first Earth Summit. I published the Earth Charter in the appendix of my book *Technocracy Rising: The Trojan Horse of Global Transformation*⁵⁰, just so people could see this with their own eyes what it says. It was a document that was like a compact with the world. It was a very religious, humanistic document that tried to unify the world into a single concept of globalization. It was a very defined document that

⁴⁷<http://canadafreepress.com/2002/un120902.htm>


⁴⁸<http://earthcharter.org/discover/the-earth-charter/>

⁴⁹<https://www.technocracy.news/>

⁵⁰<https://www.technocracy.news/index.php/product/technocracy-rising-the-trojan-horse-of-global-transformation/>

was signed off – the history goes back before that, but it was finally signed-off by almost all of the nations at the United Nations, and the primary author of the Earth Charter was Steven Rockefeller. And so the Rockefellers understood early on that no, it's not just the economic system and it's not just necessarily the political control system, we also have to factor in a **religious belief** that we can use to get people to believe that what we're doing is for their good.

What the oiligarchs had been working toward for decades, and what they achieved in Rio in 1992, was the completion of the transformation of the eugenics philosophy, from talk of "sterilization" of the "feeble-minded" to a popular understanding of humanity as a cancer that must be removed for the Earth to live. Now the duty was to "reduce carbon footprints" and reduce the population in the name of "saving the planet." But, wrapped in this new vocabulary and coming with a trendy, pervasive, and well-funded advertising campaign, the end result sounded remarkably similar to the eugenics of old.



Tucker Carlson: A new study from Lund University in Sweden says that the single best way to cut your carbon footprint, assuming you want to, is

simply to refuse to reproduce. Deleting some humans from existence, they say, saves far more carbon than, I don't know, being vegetarian, riding a bike to work, not boarding an airplane.

SOURCE: 'Stop Having Kids' – Tucker Carlson Tonight⁵¹

Jennifer Ludden: There is a new study that says, well, actually if we reduce global fertility by half a child per woman, that you could maybe do that. It would go a long way. It would reduce a fifth to a quarter of all carbon emissions needed to avoid that tipping point.

SOURCE: NPR Asks: Should We Have Less Kids Due To Global Warming?⁵²

Bill Nye: So should we have policies that penalize people for having extra kids in the developed world?

Invitado: So, I do think that we should at least consider it.

Nye: Well, at least consider it is like do it.

SOURCE: Bill Nye: Should parents having "extra kids" in developed countries be penalized?⁵³

⁵¹<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UJNH0Z9QMFA&t=18s>

⁵²<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W070E3UWIK8&t=54s>

⁵³https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ip_MCNEHSIM#t=29s

Fox News Reporter: In the push to reduce global warming, children, according to some, are the new culprits. A think tank in the UK says that too many kids are what is making the planet worse. Saying large families, anything over two children really, should be frowned upon as an environmental no-no.

SOURCE: Endgame (2007)⁵⁴

And, without the public even noticing it, the oiligarchs were able to wrap themselves in this new flag to appear not as the billionaire scions of the oil industry who made their vast fortunes by plundering the earth and monopolizing its wealth, but as crusading environmentalists who are going to save the planet from the "cannon fodder" that "unfortunately populates the earth."

David Rockefeller: The negative impact of population growth, on all of our planetary ecosystems, is becoming appallingly evident.

SOURCE: David Rockefeller speaks about population control⁵⁵

Rex Tillerson: So we have been members of the IPCC, we have authored many of their papers, we have peer-reviewed all their papers. So we have been engaged in the understanding and the evolution of our understanding of climate change for decades.

⁵⁴<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x-CrN1l1Zho&t=01h56m14s>

⁵⁵<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ClqUcScwnn8&t=01m21s>

SOURCE: Rex Tillerson explains his position on climate change⁵⁶

Narrator: At Saudi Aramco, we strive to continually reduce the environmental impact of our operations, from oil well to consumer, and our support for the Oil and Gas Climate Initiative that strives to be a catalyst for practical action on climate change through collaboration on technology and best practices.

SOURCE: Saudi Aramco – Sustainable Production⁵⁷

Claudio Descalzi: We have a common reason. We care about environment. We think that together we can do better. We have the competencies, we have the strength, we have the tools to do good things in this field.

Amin H. Nasser: Technology that will be developed through this investment fund of \$1 billion will help us in the long-term to reduce emissions.

Josu Jon Imaz. We want to build an ecosystem of innovation on this issue, working together.

Patrick Pouyanne: We bring our force together, we can bring pragmatic and concrete solutions.

⁵⁶https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_s173XPqw8M#t=59s

⁵⁷<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nVOHzwH0tko>

SOURCE: OGC Invests in Innovative Low-Emissions Technologies⁵⁸

And even today, the masses, outraged over the carnage that Big Oil has wrought, are content to have that outrage directed by the very oilgarchs they seek to oppose, the same oilgarchs who are quietly funding and supporting their environmental movement from behind the scenes — and even leading it from the front.



The Rockefeller family made headlines by divesting from oil completely in 2016.

Narrator: The Rockefellers, heir to an oil fortune that made the family name a symbol of American wealth, believe they're doing their namesake proud by getting out of oil. Fund director Stephen Heintz spoke reverently of oil tycoon John D. Rockefeller in a statement: "We are quite convinced that if he were alive today, as an astute businessman looking out to the future, he would be moving out of fossil fuels and investing in clean, renewable energy."

SOURCE: Rockefeller heirs get out of oil | Fortune⁵⁹

⁵⁸<http://www.oilandgasclimateinitiative.com/news/highlights-from-ceos-meeting-in-london.html>

⁵⁹<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jDwTwbWisOM>

David de Rothschild is one of the photogenic leading lights of the environmental movement. Dubbed "Plastic Jesus" for his publicity stunts and photo opportunities masquerading as a concerned environmentalist, David de Rothschild — a scion of the billionaire banking family that added to its fortune with its Azerbaijani oil field holdings and still invests in oil through ventures like Genie Energy — now spends his time lecturing the public about how their lifestyles are killing the polar bears.



David de Rothschild: We have to start spending money fast on the solutions that we have in hand to try and help these countries which are already seeing the effects of climate change today and seeing the effects of our consumption, basically.

SOURCE: Rothschild Says Climate Change 'Past Point of Talking'⁶⁰

Prince Charles is outspoken on the subject of global warming, warning his loyal subjects that unless they tighten their belts and live more humble lives, they will bring about the end of the world.

Príncipe Carlos: Ladies and gentlemen, the battle against climate change is surely the most defining and pivotal challenge of our time.

⁶⁰https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5vS112X_G9Q#t=03m10s

We cannot ignore the symptoms and should act now to restore the health of the planet before it is too late. This of course will require an unprecedented transformation of our communities, science, societies and lifestyles. All predicated on the move to a low-carbon and circular economy.

SOURCE: Prince Charles urges action against climate change 'before it is too late'⁶¹



The groundwork has been laid for what these oiligarchs call the post-carbon era. It is no longer about oil. It never was. It is about control.

Part three: Agenda:

Technocracy

M. King Hubbert: Now, so this complete cycle for the world, to give you a timescale on that — bear in mind that's starting in 1857, and so here's where we were about three or four years ago. This was proved reserves in the era, which would add up to about here, and the estimated peak would occur about 1995, and we go into the decline. That middle 80%, again, is spread from the late '60s until a little beyond 2020. I computed it out here about 56 years. That assumes an orderly evolution. That

⁶¹https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5vS112X_G9Q#t=03m10s

says that a child born, say, within the last 10 years will probably see the world consume most of its oil if he lives a normal life.

SOURCE: Marion King Hubbert on global oil depletion (1976)⁶²



Today, Marion King Hubbert is best known as the Shell Oil researcher who gained notoriety in the 1950s for predicting that the US would achieve its peak production of petroleum by 1970, and that almost all of the planet's oil supplies would be exhausted by 2020.

This "Peak Oil" theory, still sometimes referred to as "Hubbert's Peak",⁶³ was, like everything else generated by Big Oil, a conveniently crafted lie, designed to habituate the market to artificial scarcity and thus keep oil prices high. Hubbert's "prediction" was not based on any empirical data from any oil field, but instead relied on Hubbert's incorrect guesses⁶⁴ about remaining oil reserves and employed a heuristic tool to model production.

As Hubbert's protégé and colleague at Shell Oil, Kenneth Defeyes, conceded years later: "The numerical methods that Hubbert used to make his prediction are not crystal clear. Today,

⁶²<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ImV1voi41YY>

⁶³<http://www.hubbertpeak.com/hubbert/1956/1956.pdf>

⁶⁴<https://www.forbes.com/sites/rpapier/2016/09/08/what-hubbert-got-really-wrong-about-oil/2/#1e49724f15d5>

44 years later, my guess is that Hubbert, like everyone else, reached his conclusion first and then searched for raw data and methods to support his conclusion.”⁶⁵

Shortly before his death in 1989, Hubbert himself admitted⁶⁶ that when he showed his Peak Oil paper to Shell’s managing director before presenting it to his colleagues, the director had told him not to ”go overboard” with his estimates of oil reserves, pointing specifically to L.G. Weeks, a rival geophysicist who had estimated reserves to be much higher, and thus the impending threat of undersupply and the need for high oil prices to be much weaker.

But although today Hubbert is remembered almost exclusively for his Peak Oil thesis, he was in fact involved in a much larger, lifelong project, helping to codify and incorporate a movement that, much like eugenics, was wildly popular nearly a century ago, fell out of favor in polite society, and yet continues today under other names. That movement was called **Technocracy**.



Arvid Peterson: Hello, I’m Arvid Peterson, and this is the first of a two-part presentation on Tech-

⁶⁵<https://books.google.co.jp/books?id=xbDtAQAQBAJ&dq=hubbert%27s+peak%3A+the+impending&q=courage#v=onepage&q=guts&f=false>

⁶⁶<https://www.aip.org/history-programs/niels-bohr-library/oral-histories/5031-7>

nocracy, an alternative social system. These programs are not intended to entertain or amuse you, nor are they meant to scare you. We are making a new approach. It is not political, financial, philosophical, legal, religious or moral. It is a technological approach. Technocracy is the scientific answer to America's social problems and technocracy is a new design for social operation that based on upon science. It is the vehicle by which we can move into a new era for better living."

SOURCE: Technocracy Full Presentation⁶⁷

Technocracy billed itself as a social movement, a philosophy, a scientific solution to political and economic problems, and a new way of ordering the world. But, at base, it is an idea for a new international economic order, one to be designed and managed down to the most minute detail by a select few: the "technocrats."

Patrick Wood: Technocracy was defined very succinctly in 1938 by their own publication *The Technocrat's Magazine*⁶⁸. They call it a system of scientifically engineering society. They saw themselves as a merger between hard science and social science, which really is an oxymoron. Social science is not really a science in my opinion but they believed that. So they believed they could take their scientific method they use in the hard sciences and apply it to society. They also believe that they

⁶⁷<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5bqPXqYWH1E&t=2s>

⁶⁸<http://www.historyonthenet.com/authenticichistory/1930-1939/2-fdr/2-reception/technocrats/>

alone were the only ones that could run society correctly. As a result of technology having come in and change the fabric of society, they hated politicians, they hated the establishment, the organization of society the way it is because it was not efficient, it was not conservation based if you will to conserve resources. So they took it upon themselves to define the economic model that would replace capitalism and free-enterprise and that's exactly what it was, a replacement of the economic system.

Drawing on Henri Saint-Simon's call for a scientifically-organized socialist system, the positivism and secular humanism of Auguste Comte, and the "Principles of Scientific Management"⁶⁹ propounded by Frederick Taylor, the technocratic movement emerged from the same environment of progressivism, positivism and social Darwinism that birthed eugenics. Just as the eugenicists believed the human race could be improved through selective breeding controlled and administered by a small group of scientists and their billionaire backers, so, too, did the technocrats believe that they could improve the social and economic conditions of humanity by controlling and administering society. And, happily enough for the oiligarchs, the technocrats would improve the world by replacing money with energy certificates.

Led by the eccentric "revolutionary" economist and sociologist Thorstein Veblen, the technocratic movement that formed around Veblen's "New School for Social Research" and "Techni-

⁶⁹<https://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/economics/taylor/principles/>

cal Alliance” attracted both engineers and serious researchers like King Hubbert and Buckminster Fuller and fellow eccentrics like Howard Scott.



Scott, a “mysterious man” of uncertain background, established himself in New York City at the end of World War I and came to be seen as a “bohemian engineer.” In 1920 he went to work for the Wobblies as a research director, and the following year he founded the Technical Alliance, a group of engineers and scientists centered around Columbia University, and which, as a forerunner to the technocracy movement, advocated for a society run by scientists and engineers.

In 1932, the charismatic and well-spoken Scott managed to attach himself to Walter Rautenstrauch, a professor at Columbia and the founder of the university’s Department of Industrial Engineering. With a common interest in technocracy, the two became friends and allies. It was through Rautenstrauch that Scott was able to approach the president of Columbia, Nicholas Murray Butler, for permission to use the university’s facilities. Butler, always on the lookout for the cutting edge of progressivism, was swayed by the technocratic ideas, and soon Scott’s Committee on Technocracy was operating out of the basement of Hamilton Hall.

When Butler let word slip about the next big idea being cooked up in the basement of his university, technocracy became a sensation. It was lauded in the press, Scott became a

sought-after speaker, and there was even a dance named after the movement.

It was at Columbia that Scott met King Hubbert, and the two, an unlikely pair of serious-minded researcher and eccentric revolutionary, immediately hit it off. Their stint together at Columbia was about to come to an abrupt end, but their association would last for decades, and help give birth to ideas that would eventually transform the world.

Patrick Wood: Technocracy really got recognized when it was at Columbia. We'll talk in a minute, they didn't last there very long because as it turned out one of the promoters of technocracy, Howard Scott, turned out to be a fraud. He was kind of the main spokesman for the movement and he pumped up his résumé, like so many people do today, unfortunately, he pumped it up and basically he just lied about his past and his educational past and they all assumed he had a degree in some advanced engineering or whatever and he knew all of the buzz words, but some sharp reporter did some investigative research on him and said, "I can't find where this guy graduated anywhere," and when Columbia found out that the guy was a fraud they realized that, well, Butler's ego got involved and he said, "Man, these people have played me," and so he kicked them all out. Just ka-boom! Just drop-kicked them right out. He said, "Get out of my building!" and they all left and scattered. The technocrats that were left at Columbia, which there were several of them that were professors at Columbia at the time, they just zipped their lips,

shut up, went back to work, figured out I want to keep my job. I'm just going to not ever mention technocracy again. It didn't mean they stopped believing, but they didn't talk about it for a very, very long time at Columbia.

Disgraced, evicted from Columbia, and with the Committee on Technocracy disbanded almost as quickly as it had come together, Scott found himself at a personal low. Penniless and with an old debt having caught up to him, he had only one person he could rely on: M. King Hubbert.

Hubbert let Scott live in his Greenwich Village apartment and paid out of his own pocket to file the articles of incorporation for Technocracy, Inc., a new membership organization that would carry on the principles of technocracy. The first step, of course, was to define precisely what those principles were.



Hubbert got to work penning the Technocracy Study Course,⁷⁰ the Bible of the Technocracy movement. In it, Hubbert laid out the vision of "an abundance of physical wealth on a Continental scale for the use of all Continental citizens," which, he warned, "can only be accomplished by a Continental technological control, a governance of function, a Technate."

The technocratic system was to be structured around a new

⁷⁰<http://www.technocracyinc.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Study-Course.pdf>

monetary paradigm, one based not on dollars and cents but "Energy Certificates" representing the nation's net energy expenditure. These certificates would be denominated in Joules and issued based on a net energy budget deemed appropriate by the technocratic state's governing scientists. Citizens would be issued an equal share of the nation's certificates and make their purchases with them, and the information about these purchases would be relayed back to the central planning body for analysis. By this method, the technocrats could, in the words of one proponent, "create a thermodynamically balanced load of production and consumption, thereby doing away with unemployment, debt and social injustice."⁷¹

In the Technocracy Study Course, Hubbert, like a good technocrat, laid out the exact conditions that would need to be met for this vision to come to pass. According to him, technocracy would require:

- All energy usage and all consumer spending throughout the nation to be calculated and registered on a continuous and instantaneous basis
- A 24/7 inventory of all production and consumption
- A complete registry of all products available for sale, where they were produced, how much energy was expended in their production, and where and when they were sold.
- And, finally, a "specific registration of the consumption of each individual, plus a record and description of the individual.

⁷¹<http://dspace.mit.edu/bitstream/handle/1721.1/2023/SWP-1353-09057784.pdf>

Hubbert's vision was not just that of a totalitarian society in which every detail of every interaction was recorded and reported to a central authority, but, for the 1930s, the concept of continuously and instantaneously updated registries of every good in the economy was not just audacious, but borderline insane.

Nevertheless, suffering through the Great Depression, the American people were willing to listen to any ideas to replace the current system that had so obviously failed them, no matter how outlandish. Technocracy, Inc. did attract a following, swelling into the tens of thousands later in the decade. But Scott's eccentric ways, compelling members to salute him in public and delivering rambling radio addresses, ultimately led to the movement's long, slow decline in relevance.

Hubbert never repudiated the concept of technocracy, but when he joined Shell as a researcher he resigned his position on the board of Technocracy, Inc. and avoided direct mention of the organization.

The technocrats had sketched the outlines of a completely ordered and controlled society, one in which energy is the fundamental measure of value and all consumption and production is meticulously analyzed by a central authority. Technocracy, Inc. still exists to this day, but the language and thinking of the technocrats has, like eugenics, undergone a metamorphosis. And, also like eugenics, the name may have faded into obscurity, but the idea lives on in the hands of the oilgarchs.

Bill Tunbull: Would you live in a greener lifestyle if you could make money from it?

Kate Silverton: That may be possible if a government proposal for personal carbon emissions allowances is implemented. Under the scheme, everyone in the UK would be allocated an annual carbon allowance.

Turnbull: Stored electronically, like a supermarket loyalty card, points would be deducted every time we buy or use non-renewable energy. For example: Using electricity to power appliances in the home.

Silverton: Or traveling somewhere by plane.

Turnbull: Or even buying petrol for your car on the [unintelligible].

Silverton: So then any points left over could then be sold back to a central bank, are you still with us, and people who need more, like motorists, who would use their allocations could then pay for a top-up.

SOURCE: BBC Breakfast: Carbon Ration Card proposal, 20/07/2006⁷²

Carbon rationing. Carbon trading. Carbon taxes. Cap and trade. Just as the technocrats of old envisioned a new economic order based on energy and governed by the dictates of scientists and engineers, so, too, does this modern form of technocracy envision an economic order in which energy is budgeted, priced and traded by intergovernmental panels of scientists and the political caste that grows up around these institutions.

⁷²<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U7HF-ANJLXk>

Senador Jay Rockefeller: The Environmental Protection Agency is not a frivolous agency. It is created to regulate carbon dioxide emissions, and I have been saying to the West Virginia Coal Association, which, for the most part, doesn't believe in climate science — they don't believe there's a climate problem — and I have been saying to them for a number of years that that's wrong. In my judgment the science is true, the science is unequivocally true and that that there is a price to carbon in their future. I said this a couple of months ago — there's a price to carbon in their future.

SOURCE:Sen. Rockefeller Defends EPA, Climate Science⁷³

Al Gore: But I believe that the cap-and-trade approach is the essential first step, partly because it is the only basis upon which we can envision a truly global agreement, because it's very difficult to imagine a harmonized global tax.

SOURCE:Cap and Trade is a tax Dingell, Gore⁷⁴

Christiana Figueres: A carbon tax or any other way of putting a carbon price is actually, from an economic point of view, the most effective and efficient way to do this, OK? You can regulate and you can do all kinds of things but nothing is as strong a market signal to the private sector as a carbon

⁷³<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n0Mfcpv-4JU&feature=youtu.be>

⁷⁴<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gug9cGtFd-4>

price, whether that be a carbon tax or whether it be a cap-and-trade – which is what California’s doing – or any of the other measures that ultimately give you a carbon price. That is the simplest, cleanest, most powerful signal. So if that’s possible, I’m with you.

SOURCE:Christiana Figueres: Meeting Our Climate Challenge – A United Nations Perspective⁷⁵

These measures are sold to the public as a way of penalizing the big oil interests that have spent the last century monopolizing the world’s key resources and plundering the earth in the pursuit of profit. What they do not understand, because it has been deliberately obscured, is that it is these very interests that have been instrumental in creating these schemes in the first place.

Rep. Steve Scalise: ”Its my understanding that back in 1997, when you were Vice President, Enron’s CEO Ken Lay was involved in discussions with you at the White House about helping develop this type of policy, this trading scheme. Is that accurate? Is it inaccurate? It’s been reported.

Al Gore: I don’t know, but I met with Ken Lay, as lots of people did, before anybody knew that he was a crook.

Scalise: Right. And clearly you can see why so many of us are concerned about this type of cap-and-trade energy tax that would be literally turning over this country’s energy economy.

⁷⁵<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WX8h5VIisKc>

Gore: I didn't know him well enough to call him "Kenny-boy."

Scalise: But you knew him well enough to devise this trading scheme.

SOURCE: Al Gore's Lies Exposed By Congress⁷⁶

In the early 1990s, Enron — the disgraced Texas-based energy trading company that turned out to be a complete fraud — spearheaded the EPA's \$20 billion cap-and-trade program for sulfur dioxide, promptly becoming the largest trader in the market⁷⁷. As a follow-up, the company, led by Ken Lay, began lobbying the Clinton administration, and particularly Vice President Al Gore, to create a similar market for carbon dioxide⁷⁸. Making lavish contributions to environmental groups like the Nature Conservancy, whose Climate Change Project argued for restrictions on carbon emissions, Enron then hired Christopher Horner, a former staffer on Senator Joe Lieberman's Environment Committee, to lobby for an international treaty that would restrict emissions and allow for trading in emission rights.

They were joined in this quest by Goldman Sachs, the infamous Wall Street investment bank known today for the revolving door between the firm and the US Treasury, who helped establish the Chicago Climate Exchange as the first North American emissions trading platform⁷⁹. In 2004, Al Gore, who has

⁷⁶<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vFK-UTGH1Zw>

⁷⁷<https://ep.probeinternational.org/2009/05/30/enrons-other-secret/>

⁷⁸<http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/news/1813229/posts>

⁷⁹<https://quidsapio.wordpress.com/2012/06/06/how-goldman-sachs-invented-cap-and-trade/>

spent the last two decades lobbying for the creation of a carbon trading market, founded Generation Investment Management, an investment management partnership that sells carbon off-sets, with David Blood, the CEO of Goldman Sachs Asset Management, who stepped down from his position with Goldman to go into business with Gore. By the end of the decade, Gore was already being hailed as a candidate to become the world's first carbon billionaire⁸⁰.

Gore himself is an oilgarch⁸¹. His father, Al Gore, Sr., was a close friend of Armand Hammer, the oil tycoon behind Occidental Petroleum. After losing a Senate race in 1970, Gore's father went to work for Hammer at Occidental for \$500,000 a year. Over the course of his career, Gore, Sr. accumulated hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of Occidental stock, which fell into the hands of the executor of his estate at the time of his death: none other than his son, Al Gore. The Occidental connection does not end there. Discovering zinc ore on their Tennessee estate, Hammer bought the Gores' land and sold it back to them with a claim on the mining rights, complete with a \$20,000 annual payment, which also went to Gore after his father's death. In 2013, Gore earned \$100 million from the Qatari government on the sale of his "Current TV" venture, and then was surprised⁸² when reporters were more interested in discussing his oil money than his new book on the global warming cause.

⁸⁰<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/earth/energy/6491195/Al-Gore-could-become-worlds-first-carbon-billionaire.html>

⁸¹<http://content.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,55826,00.html>

⁸²<https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2013/01/100-million-worth-oil-money-richer-al-gore-doesnt-get-why-critics-are-being-so-critical/318926/>



But Gore's story is only an example of a larger phenomenon. In 2006, the United States Climate Action Partnership⁸³ was formed to create "A Call for Action"⁸⁴ to cut down on carbon emissions. It drafted the Blueprint for Legislative Action⁸⁵, which became the basis for the American Clean Energy and Security Act, seeking to create an emissions trading regime modeled on the European Union Emission Trading Scheme. And the members of the US Climate Action Partnership? A who's who of the oiligarchy, including BP, ConocoPhillips, and General Motors.

Carbon taxes and carbon trading have proven to be a hard sell for an increasingly wary public, but with the Paris Agreement of 2015 the world saw the biggest step yet toward this technocratic future of energy control and carbon rationing. No surprise, then, that the summit itself was sponsored by and prominently supported⁸⁶ by big oil.

⁸³http://www.merid.org/en/Content/Projects/United_States_Climate_Action_Partnership.aspx

⁸⁴<http://www.merid.org/~media/Files/Projects/USCAP/USCAP-A-Call-for-Action>

⁸⁵<http://www.merid.org/~media/Files/Projects/USCAP/USCAP-A-Blueprint-for-Legislative-Action>

⁸⁶<https://www.thelocal.fr/20150527/are-top-polluters-funding-paris-climate-summit>

Erik Schatzker: What's your position and what message would you send to the President?

Bob Dudley: Well, we have been clear in our support of the climate agreement in Paris. We're part of the Oil and Gas Climate Initiative, which is 10 of the big companies in the world, who are working towards projects and technologies that are needed. I think we all want to know how the formula will work, but I think the concept of Paris needs to stay in everybody's mind on the issues of — we've got to transition the world to lower-carbon forms of energy, I have no doubt it will happen.

SOURCE: BP CEO Dudley on Oil Market and Paris Climate Accord⁸⁷

Gerard Mestrallet: Yes, I think that what happened in Paris is very, very important and Mr. Ban Ki-moon on the (spoke) on the line that yesterday, it is important not only for the planet, not only for us citizens, not only for our children, it is important for the business.

SOURCE: ECO:nomics: Businesses' Role in Paris Agreement⁸⁸


But using energy as the new "metric of value" for the post-carbon economy is just one element of the neo-technocratic vision.

When Hubbert wrote his Technocracy Study Course, he made it clear that technocracy could not come to fruition without

⁸⁷<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c27JciFJeuU>

⁸⁸https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C_CsnJt5y_I

24/7 surveillance of all energy usage and a continuous stream of data about all goods being produced by and consumed by society. But whereas in the 1930s such a system must have seemed like a delusional flight of fancy, today it is already being implemented.



Narrator: By now you may have heard the term "Internet of Things." Sounds interesting but what does the Internet of Things actually mean? I.O.T. is an evolution of mobile, home and embedded applications that are being connected to the internet, integrating greater compute capabilities and using data-analytics to extract meaningful information. Billions of devices will be connected to the internet and, soon, hundreds of billions of devices. As related devices connect with each other, they can become an intelligent system of systems, and when these intelligent devices and systems of systems share data over the cloud and analyze it, they can transform our businesses, our lives and our world in countless ways.

SOURCE: Internet of Things explained simply⁸⁹

Reporter: This department store in Bundang has introduced a new way to shop. With its "Smart

⁸⁹<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uEsKZG0xNKw>

Shopper” system, customers pick up a small scanner and tag the item they want to buy. It eliminates the hassle of having to carry heavy items in a shopping basket, not to mention the hassle of having to get them home. After you pay for the items at an automated kiosk the goods are delivered right to your home.

Shopper (Translated): Before I had to wait in long lines at the checkout but now I can use the Smart Shopper system to pay. It’s really quite convenient.

Reporter: Aside from their convenience to shoppers the system also helps stores gather data about their customers’ shopping habits.

SOURCE: New smart technologies changing our everyday activities⁹⁰

Alice Bravo: Why create a smart city? Well, smart cities are more responsive to citizens and they help reduce environmental impact.

Michael Liu: They are more cost-effective and they’re safer.

Carlos Gimenez: Smart cities make people happier and more connected to their community.

SOURCE: AT&T Smart Cities⁹¹

⁹⁰<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fz-1Ph1X5EO>

⁹¹<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZkkM8iYAagQ>

Narrator: Today, more people live in cities than ever before, and for good reason. They are centers of trade, innovation, culture and opportunity. As such, they are complex entities comprising many different inter-connected systems. As more people flock to cities and put pressure on these systems, an important shift is helping cities deal with this challenge: a rise in data. Cities are becoming increasingly instrumented. Sensors that enable the capture of all sorts of data are being integrated across city systems, providing critical information on city activity and operations. Sensors on a bridge transmit data on its physical condition. A camera on a freeway relays traffic flow and digital meters record water and energy usage in real time. Mobile and social channels enable local governments and citizens to communicate with other, creating yet another source of useful data. Advanced analytics can now readily identify trends and patterns within these massive amounts of data. Information can be integrated, gathered and shared via dashboards, visualizations and alerts to facilitate understanding and collaboration across systems, agencies and groups.

SOURCE: How It Works: Smarter Cities⁹²

Narrator: The smart home communicates with the grid and enables consumers to manage their electricity usage. By measuring homes' electricity consumption more frequently through a smart meter,

⁹²<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yJVK25wWvbE>

utilities can provide their customer with much better information to manage their electricity bills. Inside the smart home, a Home Area Network or HAN, connects smart appliances, thermostats and other electric devices to an energy management system.

SOURCE:What Is the Smart Grid?⁹³

Josh Del Sol: With the smart meters, they'll be able to tell exactly what's going on in your home down to the micro-second based upon 24/7 communication with all of your appliances. Which will also in the future, if this goes through fully and if there's not a public backlash, all of your appliances will need to have a wireless transmitter on them and they'll need to certified under some "smart program."

So this means not only – just stepping aside for one moment from the health issue – this means that not only is your smart meter emitting on average 13,000 microwave pulses per day but every one of your appliances is going to be doing the same thing because it will be needed to be communicating with the smart meter itself. So that is a serious concern and we'll get into that a little bit later. But as far as the privacy issue, just diving right in, the current CIA Director, David Petraeus, was quoted as saying⁹⁴, "We're gonna use smart-appliances to spy on you," and it's very much just

⁹³<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JwRTpWZReJk>

⁹⁴<https://www.wired.com/2012/03/petraeus-tv-remote/>

putting it out there. It's kind of like, it's getting to a point now, James — and I'm sure you're seeing this — it's, like, they're just getting more and more in your face. And it's kind of like this collective force of the controllers and they're kind of saying, "This is what we're gonna do and what are you gonna do about it?" So they're almost challenging us in a schoolhouse bully sort of way: "What are you going to do about it?"

SOURCE: Corbett Report Radio 230 – Take Back Your Power with Josh Del Sol⁹⁵

Once again, we are being asked to believe that the vested corporate interests that are rolling these technologies out in a coordinated fashion are doing so for the benefit of the public. That this technology is to help save the earth. And once again, we are being duped.

The technocratic agenda is not about saving the earth. It is not about helping the public. It is not even about making money. It is about complete control over every aspect of our daily life.

Patrick Wood: There's two levels.... The way I look at technocracy, there's two levels operating at the same time. There's the operational side of it that has to do with things like smart grid. That have to do with things like various technocratic innovations, surveillance and other big hot-button [issues] for technocracy. These are operational issues. From a strategic point of view, which is

⁹⁵<https://www.corbettreport.com/corbett-report-radio-230-take-back-your-power-with-josh-del-sol/>

where the Rockefeller-type people operate, it's a different view of where it's headed. On an operational level it's headed towards a scientific dictatorship and you don't have to be a visionary to figure that one out really anymore. You don't. It's there.

But on a strategic basis, what's happening is that there's a massive resource grab going on all over the planet. And when I say resource grab, you have to put yourself in Rockefellers' shoes — the bankers' shoes and the Rothschilds' shoes or whatever — and say, "What do you do when money runs out? What do you do? When you suck all of the value that you can out of the monetary systems you've created, what's left?"

Well, you and I don't think about those sort of things because we don't have that much money, but these people at the top, especially the bankers, I'm sure they stay up at night thinking, "What's after money? What comes after money?" The Rockefeller family especially has always been a resource intensive family. That's what oil was all about in the first place. It was a resource and they understood that energy would be the most important factor in the world over any other type of resource. They understood that, that's why they wanted to create a monopoly over energy.

Well, today as money has been sucked dry, the only thing left to do is to make a grab for the resources themselves and that's what sustainable develop-

ment is all about. It's taking the resources of the world away from you and me, away from private companies that aren't part of the clique, if you will, and putting them into a global common trust that will be managed by them for their benefit. This is really nothing more than neo-feudalism again where the resources are owned by a few and everybody else gets to operate with those resources at their pleasure and discretion.

The technocrats and functionaries of this agenda, like Hubert and his colleagues in Technocracy, Inc., pioneered this idea because they believed that they, the technocrats and engineers, would be able to solve the world's problems. But the oilgarchs and bankers who funded their ideas into existence did so because it would help them to become the rulers of a system so perfectly crafted that no resource, no commodity, no person would be beyond their control.

And now, in the 21st century, that technocratic vision is coming into view. And it is being helped along by a public that believes the post-carbon future represents the end of the oilgarchy. They couldn't be more wrong.

Conclusion Oil. It was never about oil. It was about control. Control over energy and production and consumption. Control over the world's resources. Control over the population. Control over humanity itself.

Joe Plummer: Every other thing that the elite put forward is nothing more than a pretext for what they've been after since the beginning. So, as I

cover in *Tragedy and Hope* 101 ⁹⁶, I discuss this concept of the elite seeking to rule all habitable portions of the world and they don't want to secure that so that they can then have it taken away from them. So they come up with pretexts that they can sell both to the public but also the administrative class that justifies what it is that they are trying to do — they need to do. So whether it's global warming hysteria or whether it's technocracy whether it's Agenda 2030 or whether it's eugenics, there's a common thread that runs through all of this and that common thread is the desire to consolidate and exercise coercive power. In the case of eugenics, it's the desire to consolidate and exercise the ultimate power, which is the power over who is ultimately going to live or die, who will be permitted to exist in the gene pool from here forward.

The picture is bleak, and made all that much bleaker by the fact that so many have been duped into believing that the oilgarchs' ultimate agenda, an agenda of technocratic control, micromanagement of our daily lives, and, ultimately, the elimination of the "cannon fodder" from the gene pool, is in fact in their own best interest.

The oilgarchs, shielded behind their smokescreen of "sustainable development" and "post-carbon" economy, are closer than ever before to achieving their true goal of total control.

But if the people perish from lack of knowledge of this agenda, then understanding is the first step toward the solution.

⁹⁶<http://www.joeplummer.com/>




Patrick Wood: It's hard to fight an enemy that you don't recognize or can't see. That's the biggest problem in the world today, in my opinion, is that people have no visibility whatsoever of this issue. They've covered their tracks so well that nobody can see them. How can you fight an enemy that you don't know? I think famous Chinese general Sun Xiu brought that up hundreds of years ago. You can't fight an enemy that you don't know. First we have to recognize who the enemy is.

Richard A. Grove: Well, Big Oil conquered the world because the monopolization of all resources on the planet is the goal, and to get to that goal you have to monopolize the energy aspects of people around the planet. But you also have to control the food — the actual energy for the human beings whose energy you want to control. If you control those two aspects, the Green Revolution and the Gene Revolution, then you're able to control the entire planet, every resource on it, and basically extinguish freedom for the rest of history.

So, *How Big Oil Conquered The World*⁹⁷ was already done in a movie. *Why Big Oil conquered the world*

⁹⁷<https://corbettreport.com/bigoil>

has to do with the complexities of controlling populations — not for money, because these are the people that print money out of nothing and charge us for it. So really, it's a study of power. So, why did they want to do this to the rest of us? Because they could and because we were tolerant so far and haven't resisted enough to make it stop. So that's where we find ourselves today. Becoming informed on the history so that we can actually plot our course in the future to map or chart out a course and actually get to some place that resembles cognitive liberty and physical freedom and justice for all.



Big oil. Big pharma. The Green Revolution. Genetic engineering. Eugenics. The environmental movement. Technocracy. Not one person in a thousand can detail the historical development of these ideas, or the people and the agenda that connects them. But if you have watched this documentary, you are now that one person in a thousand. The question is, "What are you going to do with this information?"

As the oilgarchs' quest for total control comes into view, it's difficult to remember that it all started a century and a half ago with "Devil Bill" Rockefeller, a two-bit snake oil salesman always on the run from the last group of marks he managed to con. In a way, nothing has changed but the scope of the con

and the number of marks who have fallen for the routine. But now that you know the snake oil that is being fed to the public, the only question that matters is: Are you going to drink it?

Chapter 3

Author's epilogue

*(Transcribed from the ending of the documentary
Why Big Oil Conquered the World¹)*

Hello, this is James Corbett of CorbettReport.com, the writer, director, narrator and creator of the documentary you've just been watching, *Why Big Oil conquered the world*. And if you have just watched this documentary all the way through, as well as the previous documentary on *CHow Big Oil conquered the world*, then as I say towards the end, you really are now better informed than the vast majority of the public on these issues and on the history of this picture that I'm trying to paint here. And the real question is: **what are you - what are we going to do with this information?**

Well, the first thing I'd like to encourage you to do is to go to CorbettReport.com/bigoil , that is the destination where you'll be able to find audio and video copies of the entire documentary: *How Big Oil* and *Why Big Oil conquered the world* - all

¹<https://corbettreport.com/bigoil>

there for free download and perusal, and as a handy link that you can share with others if and when you're ready to start sharing this information.

But perhaps the most important part of CorbettReport.com/bigoil is the hyperlinked transcript: everything that is said in this documentary, including [links] to all the source documents from which this information came is in that transcript. It's a very important tool for people to use when you are ready to start delving into this information in greater detail, because as much ground as I was able to cover in the three hours of this combined documentary, there's still so much more that needs to be said and so much more information that helps to color in this image that I've only sketched the broad outlines of here. And the transcript, along with the hyperlinks to source documentation is a good way to start filling in the different pieces of this puzzle.

But it doesn't end there, and I'm not going to end this story there because I could've easily made several documentaries instead of just this one - and trying to condense it all into one. There's so much more that needs to be said and certain things that only appear in the documentary for one or two minutes can and should be developed into entire hour-long explorations - so that's exactly what I'll going to be doing in the coming weeks and months: I'm going to be further developing some of the ideas that are introduced here, and some of the characters and history, and fleshing them out in podcast episodes on CorbettReport.com where we'll explore these issues in much greater detail, so please stay tuned for that.

And as I say, once you've started getting into this research and looking at some of the source documents, and you're familiar with this material and you want to share it with others, then

CorbettReport.com/bigoil is the place to go - and the place to send people to - for that exploration.

Other ways that you can help with this work, rather than simply spreading the information - which is the first and foremost and most important thing - but [...] the other thing you can do is to get physical hard copies of this, because there are people out there who don't trust anything they see on the internet, but if it's on a physical disk they'll be more receptive to it - well that's fine, and other people just want a physical hard copy. You can purchase a physical hard copy of the documentary: both *How Big Oil conquered the world* and *Why Big Oil conquered the world*. They're available in a 2-DVD set that is now available from CorbettReport.com/bigoil [...], it's two disks, it's the three-hour documentary in complete form here.

So, that's a valuable resource and I, as always, highly encourage you to make copies of this and hand it out to everyone and anyone: friends and neighbors and coworkers and total strangers and anyone else that you think would be receptive to this information, because this is a huge, huge topic and no one of us has all the pieces to this puzzle: it's only through all of us coming at this material from our different perspectives and experiences and our different knowledge bases that we'll be able to really construct the big picture of what's happening here.

So, as I say, lots more coming on this material in the coming weeks and months to help flesh this out at CorbettReport.com but in the meantime please do go to CorbettReport.com/bigoil for all of the information regarding this documentary. I think it's the most important information that we can be talking about right now, and I hope you will join me in that conversation at CorbettReport.com/bigoil. Thank you.

James Corbett, July 2017.

