

Special Memorandum

HOW TO EVALUATE A BRITISH INTELLIGENCE NETWORK

11 Dec. 1977

Like all good intelligence work, the effective assessment of a British network depends upon definable personal qualities of the professional analyst. You must know, and far better than the proverbial man-in-the-street, who you are, and for what purpose you are working. You must employ that developed sense of personal identity as your principal yardstick of judgment ~~of~~ recognizing the significance of behavior which is controlled by a different sense of personal identity than your own.

This point is of such crucial relevance to the subject to be considered here that ~~some further~~ qualification must be added.

For the proverbial average man-in-the-street, barring catastrophes, his daily life is ordered by relatively stable rules of social conduct. The habitual labels his mind attaches to persons, objects and circumstances provide him with what is usually sufficient guidance to his actions. Occasionally, catastrophes occur. His reactions to the labels he attaches to circumstances do not produce ^{acceptable} desired results. In consequence, his sense of power over his circumstances is weakened; his sense of identity is weakened. He may, consequently, "break down."

Whether behind a desk, or in the field, the world of the professional intelligence specialist's concern is approximately the direct opposite of the world as usually experienced by the man-in-the-street. Looking at this situation from the layman's point-of-view, it might appear

that in the world of the intelligence professional's daily concern all the labels must be judged false until the contrary is proven, and that the worst offense a professional can commit is to follow a predictable pattern of response to the circumstances with which he is confronted.

[On such grounds, the image of Plato's cavern ^{can} ~~has~~ been invoked in connection with intelligence work; it is sometimes described as the domain of "spooks."

[That comparison implies ^{possibly} a value-judgment on the two kinds of experience which is in fact wrong. The layman perhaps imagines that the difference between the ~~xxx~~ two worlds arises from an element of artificed unreality, the role of wilful deception, in the domain of the professional's concern. Conceding the fact of the ^{included} latter feature of intelligence work, the indicated comparison is ^{in fact} ~~otherwise~~ fundamentally in error.

~~In fact~~, the world explored by the intelligence professional is the world as it really is. It is the world of the man-in-the-street which is the false world, the masked reality. The business of the intelligence specialist is ~~that of~~ looking behind the mask.

^{in an exceptional case,}
[For example, ^{in an exceptional case,} among the stream of ordinary persons walking along a sidewalk, or engaged in any other ordinary aspect of life, one is an assassin or a spy. For ordinary circumstances, it is sufficient in practice to take the circumstance as it appears according to customary labelling procedures. To single out the spy or assassin, one must strip away the ^{mask} ~~disguise~~ from all of the circumstances, to the point that the object of one's search stands out.

The rather romantic choice of illustration, the assassin or spy, is offered only to introduce the more essential point. Real politics, including the shaping of public opinion, depends upon processes which, when wittingly exploited, are classified under the heading of psychological warfare. It is through such ~~things~~^{things} as slight alterations in the pattern of circumstances affecting ordinary people (and others, too) that a subtle ^{new} element of directedness is added to the course of experience, and political processes significantly shaped thereby without the ^{new} "victim's" awareness of that fact. That same quality of distinction between underlying reality and what ordinary opinion takes for reality extends in many ways throughout life.

In general, professional intelligence work is --or, ought to be -- a mastery of the underlying patterns which determine both ~~the reality~~ what the man-in-the-street takes for reality and, in large measure, the ^{decisions} ~~very opinions~~ of that observer.

It is useful to compare intelligence work with the efforts of clinical psychotherapists conducting interviews with schizophrenics. Much of the time, clinical schizophrenics of the type identified ~~by xxxxxx~~ in the classical literature are in fact communicating statements which can be ^{translated} into an intelligible form. A homicidal psychopath threatening to assassinate a hostage usually conveys a ^{"coded"} ~~secret~~ meaning within his exchanges with the police psychotherapist assigned to the negotiations. In both cases, as in intelligence work generally, the professional's task is to develop the skills to get behind the surface appearances to the governing reality behind the mask.

Although the object of ^{professional} inquiry is the reality behind the mask of ordinary appearances, the effect on the person coming from ordinary life into professional work is like that of plunging from ^{comfortable} reality into a world of ^{and stress} fantasy. The kind of sense of personal identity adequate for man-in-the-street life is shown to be inadequate. The effect ^{in the process} is more or less painful psychological stress. Not only are the labels and rules different than ordinary opinion imagines, but the way in which labels and rules must be defined ~~are~~ different in ^{but} quality.

Before referring to an extreme case, consider a few of the relevant ^{General} aspects of the problem of ^{involved} stress.

Imagine visiting a newly-discovered tribe of stone-age culture up in the hinterlands of New Guinea, and attempting --presuming you know the language -- of communicating the concept "ore" to these people. They would probably laugh at you. The concept of "ore" is not one to which they can react in terms of sense-discrimination ^{and} rules of conduct. Hence, they can not attach the notion of "I-ness"; their sense of personal identity, to the notion "ore," no matter how ^{ingeniously} you might describe it in their language. ⁿ

Similarly, the professional can not communicate the conceptions essential to his work to his wife's uncle, the old pal from schooldays, and so forth. He can not attach the "I" of his relations to such persons to those conceptions. Therefore, those conceptions are correspondingly ^{unreal} to his sense of "I-ness."

The difficulty is not that these ^{seemingly} eerie conceptions are not real. Through employing them for practice, one can adjust the course of national and world events with a power way beyond that easily imagined by the man-in-the-street.

radical//
 [The gap between the two conditions is not unridgable by ordinary mortals. In practice, the novice specialist works as part of a team with experienced professionals. In this relationship, the relative novice assembles or predigests information then used by the team as a whole, with the experienced professional assuming ^{team} responsibility for the "headier" aspects of conceptualization and executive judgment. In this arrangement, seeing the process work provides the novice with an appreciation of the ^{practical} power of the conceptions involved, and therefore a growing sense of their reality. By functioning in the team, the novice is able to progress in connecting his sense of "I-ness" to the demonstrated power of the conceptions developed and used by the team.

train ne
 [This approach succeeds, but by itself is ^{ultimately} inadequate. The development of top professionals requires something more.

[The extreme case, which we promised above, illustrates the point to be made.

not exact//
 [You have perhaps heard of the occurrence of incidents in which an intelligence field operative is "hugg out to dry." For one reason or another, he is cut off from his preestablished channels of communication and so forth. Abruptly, he has ceased to be part of the special social organism which has generally "mothered" him and buttressed his sense of "I-ness" in the spook world. The sort of cases ^{of this} which tend to ~~come~~ ^{draw} ~~notice~~ are those in which such an isolated individual undergoes a breakdown of sorts, such as plunging into some reckless action of the ~~sort~~ Clausewitz analyzes as the "flight forward" syndrome --for example, the person whose accumulated terror in sustained hovering under fire in a fox-hole impels him to burst out of the foxhole and rush charging forward "to get it over with, one way or the other."

[That sort of extreme case shows one side of the problem. The individual spook who is or imagines himself to be placed in physical jeopardy by sudden isolation merely illustrates the comparable but different case to which our concern is directed ~~xxxx~~ in connection with this memorandum. The point we wish to emphasize is the intellectual equivalent of the situation of the operative "hung out to dry," a similar sort of identity-crisis problem which often enough arises under circumstances of assured physical security. This is the case in which the nature of the conceptual problem posed evokes a kind of intellectual terror comparable to that of the cited "hung-out" spook.

[In general, there is a class of ~~xxxx~~ problems which the analyst's mind refuses to grasp because the judgment required compels him to wander into areas of thought in which the certainty of his sense of identity is threatened.

[The point we have been developing might be arguably less emphasized in preparing American intelligence professionals for the kinds of duties associated with the adversary relationship between the United States and Communist countries, or, earlier, in the course of the war against the Axis powers. For that sort of assignment, the issue is defined in relatively simple kinds of grey-grey to black-white terms, plus the Soviets have not developed the sort of ultra-sophisticated techniques which the British employ. At least, the Soviets are not so sophisticated in those aspects of the matter we must consider as foremost in respect to British operations.

[In the case at hand, the British case, the professional is dealing with an adversary agency and networks which represent a nominal USA ally vis-a-vis the Warsaw Pact nations.

Although Britain was overtly the United States' chief adversary from 1776 through 1863, during the present century such ^{perceptions} perceptions of a distinctly American, non-British identity have been significantly blurred, where not altogether obliterated by the growing influence of a political vocabulary in which the essential distinctions between the United States and Britain are defined as virtually non-existent. Moreover, during the past century, there has been generally accelerating increase of direct British influence within the United States' own policy, military and intelligence establishments. Although certain strata of Americans may curse out Britain for one or more specific reasons, most Americans lack the sharply-defined development of their sense of identity essential to recognizing a British network of influence.

H
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A

This problem is of crucial importance ⁱⁿ most assignment-desks. During the nineteenth century, most of the world was the playground of British intelligence. Broadening the category to Anglo-Dutch intelligence, the British intelligence networks, through Fabian Society and other channels, controlled the world's anarchist movement, essentially controlled the leadership of the Socialist International, and exploited those and other vantage-points to effect successive, massive penetrations of first the Soviet Union and later the other nations of ^{Communist} Eastern Europe. A careful study of the ^{Footnotes} in Burton's unexpurgated Arabian Nights affords useful insights into a highly-developed, even then, British method for manipulating leading figures and factions within Islam generally, and the Arab world most emphatically. Africa, Latin America, the present government of China, and all of the Asian sub-continent and southeast Asia are traditional playgrounds of British intelligence networks. In a great number of cases, in most areas of assignment, the leading local politician is a British agent of influence, full-time or part-time, and what first appear solidly established as Soviet or some other nation's agents may turn out in fact to be part of a British network coming at you through the

The challenge is increased by the fact that the British commonly engage in a variety of practices which violate the ABCs of ^{country} American moral sensibilities. It is frequent practice in British networks for the controllers to double or triple their own agents, including major celebrities in various fields. In the same nation, the British are usually ^{ironing} ~~back-~~ing several ^{essentially} opposing factions simultaneously.

Despite such complications, a professional who has sufficiently developed an American sense of identity, and who knows the genetic characteristics of the British mind from that standpoint of comparison, can smell out the British ideology with the efficiency a man knows has cat has encountered a skunk. Within this broader area of British ideological influence, one is then obliged to discriminate mere ideological influence from, respectively, networks of British agents of influence, and hard-core British intelligence networks.

For example, ^{in a well known case} the editor of the New Republic is a straight British agent. Other political strata in the USA which ^{promote} share the New Republic's outlook and "political line" are generally, more broadly, British agents of influence. A still broader circle which thinks along lines of liberalism similar to that of the New Republic are merely victims of British ideological influences. Once the appropriate political power of smell has been cultivated, ^{the study} study of pedigrees, and of operational features of the problem under study enable one to proceed to the finer distinctions.

Given the considerations we have developed above, we have adopted a corresponding approach to presenting the problem of British intelligence. We develop the conception

of British intelligence from an historical standpoint. We begin by summarizing the relevant features of the American Revolution and United States' problems with British subversion and related operations during the 1776-1863 period. While this first section introduces crucial elements of the problem, ~~to you,~~ it has the associated task of indicating the most obvious steps the professional must take to the purpose of developing the necessary strong sense of American identity. In that first and the following section, we emphasize the historical background ^{proceeding} to the development of the British intelligence system of the past ¹⁰⁰ ~~three~~ hundred years. In the third section, we use an historical approach ^{for} to presenting the nature of the problem British intelligence represents for American interest at the present time.

[In general, again as implied above, we design this memorandum as a contribution toward solving the special problem to which we have devoted special attention so far. If the American sense of identity is sufficiently developed along the lines to which ~~we~~ point here, the professional "hung out to dry" for a time, or faced with the equivalent intellectual problems will have at least an improved likelihood of survival and success.

1. WHAT IS AN AMERICAN ?

ff [The American Revolution and the establishment of the United States as a constitutional democratic republic are not merely events that happened approximately two centuries ago. [Those victories of the forces associated with Benjamin Franklin involved ~~the~~ one of the greatest and most masterful political-intelligence operations in history. Using the most sophisticated methods developed up to that time, the forces around Franklin rallied what was then the most literate and most cultured national population in the world, not merely to secure independence from the British monarchy, but to free the new nation from the policies, institutions and characteristic world-outlook of British law and government. The purpose of this great undertaking was to establish on this planet, for the first time, the secure foundations of an enduring economic and political order in agreement with the moral requirements of our people as human beings.

[Despite subsequent numerous and sometimes extensive digressions from those original commitments and principles, the institutions established by the founding fathers have predominantly shaped our national character, imbuing that character into the generations of immigrants and their descendants who blended with ^{the} our original population-stock to form our present population.

[During the early decades of the nineteenth century, the accomplishments of Benjamin Franklin and his collaborators came to be widely known in the United States as "The

American System." This term was adopted most emphatically for the purpose of emphasizing our national differences with, and deep antagonism toward the form of capitalism and government which existed in Britain, and also to emphasize the qualitative difference in ways ~~about thinking~~ of thinking about both man and nature characteristic of the two opposing cultures. In this section we shall describe the American System, emphasizing its specific differences with the British System, and summarize the relevant features of the way in which the United States was brought into being.

The American Anti-Malthusian Revolution

To describe the American System, one is obliged, for the sake of efficiency, to approach the overall subject along the same broad lines as did the leading American political-economist of the nineteenth century, the Whig leader Henry C. Carey. The place to begin is with an identification of the crucial differences in economic thought and policy between the Americans and the British. Once that is accomplished, ~~it~~ one can ~~not~~ summarize the political differences between the two systems ~~with such reduced labor~~.

For purposes of ^{direct} reference, the best summaries of the American System as an economic system are provided by Carey's writings of the pre-1860 period and by three reports to Congress provided by Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton during the first administration of George Washington. The latter three are Hamilton's report on public credit, proposal for a national bank, and his 1791 Report on Manufactures. It is in the last of those three that Hamilton summarizes the rigorous proof for the American System.

The leading points of difference between the American and British notions of economic policy are summarized as Hamilton's conception of the development of the productive powers of labor, and his devastating refutation of the British doctrine of rent.

The British theory of rent argued that agricultural lands (and also forests and mineral resources) were naturally provided in varying degrees of fertility. They continued this argument to assert that the naturally rightful income of the landlord was based on the natural difference in fecundity between the best and worst land. That sums up the argument in brief, but that is the gist of the British, or Physiocratic doctrine of "ground-rent." The entirety of the political-economic theory of British and like-minded economists, the doctrine of "marginal utility," is directly and axiomatically derived from that doctrine of "ground-rent."

Hamilton showed, and Carey restated the devastating empirical proof from American experience showing that the British doctrine was an absurdity. Carey, moreover, drew the relevant further conclusion that the influence of the British landed aristocracy and its financier-partners in controlling the British monarchy was the actual source of the nonsensical ground-rent or marginal-utilitarian dogma.

Hamilton showed, and Carey redemonstrated a half-century later, that in the American experience all the best agricultural land was the fruit of a cumulative developmental input by farmers. He showed that the average fecundities of land vary directly with the equivalent of capital investment in improvements in land. Therefore, there is no difference, in terms of a purely physical analysis of capitalist economy, between a capital investment to create a productive work-place in industry and the investment in improvements in the land, ^{liverstock} and tools of agriculture.

Hamilton's second devastating exposure of the frauds of British economic conceptions and policies was his proof that all material wealth is derived from advances in the productive powers of labor. His method was to take up the Physiocratic dogma which states that all wealth is ultimately derived from the bounty of nature, and that, therefore, industry makes no ~~net~~ contribution to the net-total of national wealth. He demonstrated that by adding industry to agricultural production the total number of persons sustained^{ed} by the economy was increased, and, furthermore, that the development of manufacturing caused an increase in the productivity of agriculture.

His next step in the argument was ~~to~~ consider^{ed} the expansion of wealth. He premised his argument chiefly on the empirios of American experience, but used this limited empirical evidence in such a way as to make an argument of universal applicability. He stressed the role of what he termed "artificial labor," the use of machinery and tools with new sources of energy which supplemented the role of muscle-labor. By situating the use of such "artificial labor" with the effects of progress in science and productive technologies, he showed that the superior incomes and productivities of American labor^{or} or English labor involved a process governed by emphasis on those technological innovations which increased the productivity of labor.

Thus, he inferred, and correctly so, the advancement of the technology of production in practice is ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ the source of increases in the rate of wealth produced, and hence, in the final analysis, the source of all material wealth.

To situate Hamilton's argument properly, one must reject the fraudulent, but commonplace assertion which insists that the young United States was backward relative to England, and that England was the ^{most} advanced industrial nation of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. The argument in favor of England is fraudulent on all counts.

In terms of culture, the English-speaking American colonies and young United States were vastly more advanced than Britain. Revolutionary ^{and} America had ^{an} a ninety percent literacy rate, more than double that in England, and real wages in America were approximately proportionately greater too. Once French aid contributed to freeing America from the prohibition against industry which England had demanded, the new American industries were almost uniformly more advanced in technology and productivity than those in England. As for England being the world's leading industrial power during that period, that is sheer nonsense -- as the impact of the French armies under scientist Carnot's reforms and logistics illustrates, France was the largest, most powerful and most-rapidly-progressing industrial power in Europe during the eighteenth century. (The problem of the French economy, as distinct from French finance, was that, somewhat like Poland or the Soviet Union today, its advanced industrial sector was burdened by a miserable relative backwardness in the ^{French} serf-ridden agricultural sector.)

Moreover, the relative position of England and France during the eighteenth century is illustrated by the fact that unemployed skilled English workers migrated in large numbers to France in order to gain skilled industrial employment. ^{One of} The key ^{is} to the business ^{is} ~~lies~~ in the fact that the industrial development of England had been laid down during the sixteenth century, under the Tudors, and during the short period of Commonwealth prosperity in the middle of the seventeenth century. It should be added that the ~~principal~~ principal source of English financial power

British-produced exports, but the City of London's profits ~~is~~ derived from its financial control of trading in products produced by other countries.

Hamilton's economic policies are complemented by his credit and banking policies.

When Washington assumed the Presidency in 1789, the new nation was bankrupt. Hamilton, operating on the basis of the United States' commitment to rapid industrial development, instituted credit and banking policies which restored the nation's credit, and, indeed, used the national debt as a lever for securing the foreign capital desired to aid USA low-interest capital-formation. The key was the National Bank of the United States. By taking ^{control of} the nation's credit away from private-banking interests, such as the Manhattan bankers, and concentrating national credit and control of credit in an incorporated National Bank, Hamilton converted the outstanding USA debt into shares in that bank. By regularizing the debt, he sharply reduced interest rates. Because the nation was engaged in rapid rates of capital-formation in ~~public~~ productive public works such as canals, as well as industry and agricultural expansion, the Bank's investment-aiding policies resulted in a growth of the US economy and tax-base at more rapid rates than the expansion of debt.

As a result of the combined high-technology capital-formation policies and National-Banking policies, the United States quickly became the most prosperous and credit-worthy nation in the world -- unless Andrew Jackson took over the Presidency, stopped fostering technological progress, dissolved the National Bank, and turned the management of national credit over to the Manhattan banks -- leading into the financial collapse of 1837.

Despite the Jackson, van Buren and similar administrations, the first decades of the young United States embedded Hamilton's policies so deeply into American institutions and traditions that the policy-heritage of the young republic sufficed to make the United States' ^economic growth the wonder of the world. The difference between the economic history of the United States and Britain is that American policies turned a wilderness into the greatest economic power on earth, while the British, with ~~much~~ ^{the} vaster natural resources and areas controlled by the British Empire, squatted in persisting relative decay while driving the majority of the Empire into even more backward conditions than the British ~~conquerors~~ ^{it} found ~~them~~.

The Humanist Republic

The political side of the American System was not a feature added onto Hamiltonian economic and credit policies. The two facets of the American System -- the economic and the political -- were rightly considered mutually interdependent.

The political facets of the American System are properly defined in ~~two~~ ^{two} successive steps. First, fundamentally, the United States was defined as a constitutional republic, in which connection the term "republic" has a rigorous meaning not to be found in ^{lexicons of} the modern British ideology. Second, the form of republic chosen was the democratic republic. These concepts, and the precise distinctions ~~to~~ to be made between them, are so relevant to intelligence practice today that we ought not to sidestep this aspect of the US constitution for sake of brevity here.

~~AMERICAN~~

The notion of a republic is ~~generic~~ generically a conception which is limited to those currents of thought successively identified as platonian and neo-platonian. The essentials of that ^{notion} of the republic, in neoplatoic terms of reference, ^{are} ~~is~~ as follows.

The first premise is that man as a species is ^{empirically} qualitatively distinguished from all forms of animal life by the ~~human~~ power of creative thought. The reality of this power is demonstrated by man's success in increasing his power over the laws of the universe through scientific and technological progress, as manifest in man's ability, through scientific progress, to not only increase the ecological population-potential of the human population, but to do this while raising the standard of living and productive power of labor. The fact that man's increasing mastery of the laws of the universe through science has such effects, shows that human existence as a whole has a necessary purpose in the sense of direction, and that in the process of progress man is increasing his agreement with the laws ruling the universe.

This principle has two, interrelated consequences for political policy. First, because the progress of human existence corresponds to successful increases in man's creative mastery of universal law, all societies are properly ^{self-}governed by natural law in that way. ~~In other words,~~ Societies --nations-- must be constituted in a way which coincides with the knowable principles of ^{increasing} agreement with natural law. Natural law means the laws governing the universe, not the sort of pseudo-natural law recommended by the followers of Hobbes, Locke, et al. Second, a human society ~~is~~ worthy of that name must be a form of society in which a premium is placed on the creative-mental powers of the individual citizen.

[To recapitulate a most vital point. In a society which follows a ~~mal~~thusian, neo-malthusian or analogous policy, the ^{relative} absence of technological progress eliminates the placing of a premium on those qualities of scientific and analogous discovery which demand exercise of the creative powers. Where man is not valued for his creative-mental powers, the ~~distinction~~ moral distinction between man and some baboon-like creature tends to evaporate. In contrast, in a society which places a practical premium on technological progress, it is the creative potentialities of the human mind, rather than man's mere biological existence otherwise, which are the location of the value which the society places on the individual and the individual upon himself.

[In the long course of development of neoplatonic humanism, although humanists have always been associated with "city-building," it is the moral side of technological progress which has been consistently defined as primary. The primary concern is to provide a form of society in which man esteems himself and others for man's human qualities of creative mind, in which the individual's creative contributions, ~~but~~ making a general contribution to the knowledge and practice of the whole society, enables ^{reciprocally} the individual to find a positive connection between his individual existence and the interest of the entire society.

[The notion of a republic is of a state ^{self-}governed entirely by the cited humanist principles. It is a state committed to ^{perfection} perfection of man's knowledge and practice in respect to the laws of the universe, to man's increasing dominion over nature in this way. It is also a state in which the fostering of the creative potentials

of the individuals not only provides the source for the discovery and transmission of advances in knowledge and practice, but in this way provides the individual with a practical basis for self-respect, with certain knowledge that he is necessary to his society. By looking at himself and others on the basis of those principles, the moral ^{relationship} ~~order~~ among the citizens of the nation is properly ordered.

So far, this outline might stir up the objection among readers that the argument we have employed so far goes beyond the knowledge formally emphasized in schools and so forth. Hence, the objection follows: How is it possible that the majority of the American population, whether before or during the American Revolution, during the first years of the young republic, or presently, ^{could} ~~can~~ be governed by such republican principles?

The conclusive response to such objections illustrates ~~the~~ fundamental epistemological principles of advanced intelligence work.

^{Principal}
The ~~first~~ point to be made is that the urban American population of the middle eighteenth century possessed a more ^{effective} ~~advanced~~ knowledge of the basic principles of humanism than is possessed by the university-educated ^{strata} generally of the USA population today. In this respect, the Harvard University of today is a repository of ignorance by comparison with the ferment educated New England represented during the days of Increase and Cotton Mather. The group around William Penn and his secretary James Logan in Philadelphia were among the most sophisticated political thinkers in the world during that time.

[We shall touch repeatedly upon facts buttressing that point at appropriate locations throughout the following pages.

4 [The second point to be made involves a study of the way in which the advanced knowledge of humanism among American leaders was shared with the larger population. [The first point to be considered under this heading is that the core of the American English-speaking colonists of the seventeenth century ~~was~~ is not to be described as collections of religious zealots fleeing from persecution in Europe. They were religious, and they were persecuted or more mildly repressed in Europe for their ideas. However, at the same time, they were groups representing the best-educated sections of the population of England -- as is illustrated by the fact that the literacy of the American colonists was more than double that of the British population.

[The second point to be considered under this heading is that the purpose for the seventeenth century American English-speaking settlements was, in the decisive cases, a policy first developed by the English humanists of the sixteenth century Tudor period, notably the Dudleys and their faction. The English humanists adopted the project of creating colonies in the New World for the purpose of establishing humanist republics which, in turn, would serve as a model and lever for establishing such republican forms in Europe itself. During the seventeenth century, the supporters of that English humanist policy were located within what was known as the Commonwealth Party, the party of the poet, musician and leading political thinker, John Milton.

The libraries, church sermons, and emerging press of the American colonies strongly reflected that purpose. Libraries^{in the cities} of a few hundred or ~~more~~³⁰ books owned by a few leading colonists were the centers of cultural influence. The writings of Milton and other English humanists shared with the King James Bible the foremost position in the popular culture.

The third point to be considered under this heading is the evidence of the literature of the eighteenth century America, in which we note the way in which America's leading thinkers used a blending of historical and other educational material with popular practical issues of the day, to win the popular mind to support of policies derived from the most advanced humanist thinking. A reading of the network of newspapers led by Franklin, ~~at~~ noting the kinds of popular writings, those of Hamilton, Paine and others, which mobilized the population on these issues, shows sufficiently to prove the point that humanist principles presented in a specific, practically-oriented way, were indeed the kernel of popular support for the Revolution and adoption of the constitutional republic.

In general, as we have already emphasized, the popular opinion of reality, the popular interpretation of the rules of behavioral response to perceived reality, represents the mask of determining reality. The way popular opinion perceives and responds to reality is, at best, a simplification of and disguise for the underlying processes and principles which are in fact operative and determining. It is in the masked form so indicated that principles of reality are embedded in the popularized values attached to institutions.

A [To a significant extent, all effective political leaders understand that point, if sometimes half-wittingly. Politics generally has been centered in mobilizing for principles through the medium of propaganda attached to the so-called practical side of current issues. The leaders of the American Revolution understood that in a relatively extraordinary way, as the political literature and related features of the eighteenth-century evidence illustrate.

[Before turning to the distinctions of the democratic republic, we summarize the guiding principles behind the establishment of the United States as a republic.

[Through^{o.t} neoplatonic humanist thought over the centuries of the Christian ~~era~~, including reference to such key works as St. Augustine's City of God, Dante Aligheri's De Monarchia, and the Concordancia Catholica of the great fifteenth-century Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, the notion of a republic is that of ~~xxx~~ a nation which, as a whole, governs itself according to a process of discovery of the lawful ordering of the universe. This ~~xxxxxx~~ conception of natural law is often associated in the literature ~~up~~ into the eighteenth century as the process of perfection. The duty of the nation is to perfect its agreement with the principles of universal natural law. For practice, this obligation takes the form of scientific and technological progress, whose immediate moral purpose is to evoke the individual citizen's essential human quality of creative mental powers as the means for making conscious and efficient the universal value of the individual person for the progress of society.

[The notion of the republic is of a state whose ruling agencies are committed absolutely to governance by those principles. The formal aspect of the republic is represented by the effort to set forth bodies of constitutional and subordinate law which approximate the requirements of a state acting in submission to the principles of natural law.

It is within that conception of the republic that the ~~THEIR~~ rigorous conception of individual freedom is located. The essential quality of human freedom is the creative mental power of the individual to make discoveries which advance man's knowledge ~~of~~ an^d practice in conformity with the principles governing the universe. Freedom is not liberty to violate the law, but the obligation and right of the individual to advance the condition of society beyond the limits defined by existing knowledge of law.

By means of a single valid discovery, the individual increases the powers of many members of society, and thus advances the power of the society as a whole. Hence, freedom is not something a republic tolerates, but is something a republic must foster in the fundamental interest of the republic as a whole.

The humanist conception of capitalism adopted by the founding fathers is precisely ~~xxxx~~ an approach to realizing the principle of freedom. By fostering individual and group initiative in invention and in ~~the progress of~~ technological progress, the republic unleashes the potential creativity of its citizens ~~for~~ to realize progress.

It is properly emphasized at this point that the eighteenth and nineteenth century British conceptions of capitalism were opposite to those of the young American republic. British rationalization for its form of capitalism was derived principally from the line of what is called today "philosophical radicalism." The exemplars of this viewpoint were formerly Thomas Hobbes, John ~~xxxx~~ Locke, David Hume, Jeremy Bentham, Thomas Malthus, James Mill, David Ricardo and John Stuart Mill. In ~~xxx~~ the later nineteenth century and early twentieth century, the same philosophical radicalism was continued as the ideas of Schopenhauer, Fries, Stirner (in Germany), Bakunin, Proudhon, and the British Fabian Society, and was transplanted into the United States

James and John Dewey. John Stuart Mill (for economics and sociology) and the evil Bertrand Russell (godson of Mill) are among the central, godfather figures the American intelligence specialist confronts in treating modern techniques of British intelligence operations, and the influence of the American pragmatists is frequently the key reference-point for counterintelligence concerning British penetration of the United States.

The characteristic of British philosophy is ^{its policy} that the effort to master knowledge of natural law is to be outlawed from the processes of determining social policy. The principal formal source of this doctrine in British thought is Francis Bacon and Bacon's protégé Thomas Hobbes. Hobbes rejected violently all notions of natural law, and substituted for natural law the ethics of a lifeboat manned by baboons -- "The war of ~~all~~ against all." Hobbes proposed the dictatorship of the biggest and toughest baboon as the only approach to peace and order. Hobbes' successor within the outlook of Francis Bacon was John Locke. Locke adopted axiomatically the same view of man as Hobbes, but proposed a different approach to the problem so defined, the method of the "round table" -- the representatives of various factions in society meet to arrive at a kind of "social contract," which they accept for a variously longer or briefer period as a pragmatic agreement, ^{this} an agreement reached without regard to principles, by a method which intrinsically repudiated the existence of principles. Jean-Jacques Rousseau was the Geneva banker-promoted complement for the British way of thinking in eighteenth century France.

The British Hobbesians and Lockeians rejected the humanist conception of capitalism. They denied any binding moral purpose for society and denied any principle as governing a state but the maintenance and engrossment of its power.

In alliance with the bucolic, land-owning British aristocrats and the Physiocratic French aristocracy, they regarded industry as a necessary evil, and regarded agriculture, raw-materials extraction and trade as the only ~~axiomatically~~ axiomatically desirable elements of economy. Furthermore, as the British doctrine of ground-rent and the French serf-owning aristocrats Physiocratic doctrines indicate, they regarded agriculture and other extraction from natural resources as the only true source of wealth, and were downright hostile to any policy of directed technological progress for the nation as a whole.

Thus, where the American System defined profit as the source of new capital-formation for expansion and technological progress in manufacturing, mining, infrast^ructural works and agriculture, the British system defined profit as an extension of the principle of landlord's ~~ground-rent~~ ground-rent. In the British, anti-American version of capitalism, the notion of the mortgage, bond, bill~~188~~ exchange and stockholding was an extension of the aristocratic principle of land-owning.

Despite Thomas Jefferson's opposition to Hamilton on many points, Jefferson essentially agreed ^{to such} with the fundamental differences between the American and British systems. In general, the American Revolution was fought because London attempted to suppress the development of technological progress and manufacturing in the United States. The British proposed to ~~it~~ impose Adam Smith's colonial policy on the Americans, to keep the Americans as a source of agricultural and ~~raw~~ raw-materials wealth, under the rule of increasing British taxation and no technological progress.

The American national-banking policies reflected that same difference. In the American System, it is the duty of the Federal government to control national credit and to undertake public works to the purpose of ensuring a flow of low-interest credit and other preconditions for high rates of technological progress and capital formation in

to the principles of the American system, must control national credit, and dominant² the private banking system to ensure the "climate" indispensable to high rates of industrial-capitalist and agricultural technological progress and capital formation. Government must also foster technological progress, by encouraging inventions, and must take the leadership in guaranteeing education for the citizens such that the potential productive powers of labor keep pace with technological progress in production.

In the British system, the London ~~banks~~ private banks and their narrow, special interests and policies were top dog in the capitalist economy. In general, London did not promote private investment in industry, but rather looted industrial profits, and held back capital-formation and industrial growth to increase the rent-like profits of the banks. This arrangement was ruled by a three-way alliance among the monarchy, the London private banks, and the landed aristocracy, a combination into which industrial interests of Britain forced its influence with great difficulties. Moreover, as the Malthusian policies of Bentham, Ricardo and others illustrate, where the United States promoted the improvement of incomes, productive employment and education of its citizens, the thrust of British banker's and aristocrat's policies was directly opposite. British industrial interests forced some progress in American-like directions only slowly and with great difficulty. Even when industry managed to force its way into a significant position of power, what it achieved was merely a place at John Locke's "round table" arrangement. As Henry Carey emphasized during the 1840-1863 period, Britain was a corrupted form of capitalism, inferior to, and in opposition to the principles of the American System.

^{the} ^{of the concept}
As₁ history₁ shows, a republic is any nation governed by neoplatonic humanist principles of government, whether a monarchy, an oligarchy, a dictatorship, or what-have-you. The practical questions to be posed for each such case emphasize the obligation of the state to be guided by and efficiently realize the proper humanist objectives of the state for the benefit of the nation as a whole.

[The question of who shall govern a republic is a question of what strata of society are competent to govern according to humanist principles. Which strata understand (or, are capable of understanding) humanist principles as they apply to the present development and tasks of the nation and its people?

[The case of present-day Iran illustrates the ~~conceptual~~ problem. The challenge of the Republic of South Africa also illustrates the importance of the point to be made.

[The present Shah^a of Iran has established himself in stated policy and ~~national~~ national economic practice as a Shi'ite neoplatonic humanist (in the Ismaili tradition). Using petroleum revenues as his lever, he has undertaken massive efforts for technological progress in his nation, including measures of land reform complementary to this purpose. Yet, critics of the Shah's government protest that Iran is not a democracy, and various intelligence agencies complement this criticism by organizing periodic riots in Iranian universities.^a

[Shall we bend before the critics of Iran and propose to turn the government over to a one-man, one-vote political democracy? Given foreign intelligence agencies' meddling within Iran, including British-linked agencies bitterly hostile to Iranian industrial development, what kind of a post-Shah government would Iran develop? Is the ignorant Iranian peasant yet qualified to control the governing institutions of Iran in a way consistent with even their own

One may, therefore, critically examine the way in which the Shah's government is approaching the problem of developing the most backward strata of the Iranian population. One ~~we~~ must wish for more efficient political methods of rooting out the penetration of certain anti-humanist intelligence networks from Iran's universities. One must, in the final analysis, desire the emergence of democratic-republican forms in Iran -- and everywhere else. The practical question is how to reach that latter objective in fact, without sacrificing the principles of a humanist republic in the process. The practical question is that of what instruments and policies will best bring us to the indicated goals in good order?

The apartheid policy of the Republic of South Africa is abhorrent to us in various ways. Yet, what kind of Republic, and what consequences for southern Africa generally would follow from giving power to a gang under the control of such British intelligence conduits as the London Institute for Race Relations ~~and~~ the Oppenheim interests? In the core of the Vorster government ^{base} there is a faction properly identified as "Pretoria humanists." This group is comparable, in the broad terms of the immediate discussion, to the humanist role of Iran's Shah. The discrepancy between this group on the one side and the ugliness of apartheid on the other must be corrected. By what means and instruments?

These sorts of problems should be directly compared with the basis and means employed to establish a democratic republic in the United States. Comparing this, as we shall do later on, with the way in which British intelligence provoked and manipulated the French Revolution directly indicates some most-important "do's" and "do not's" in the effort to achieve a democratic republic.

There are two principal features of the American Revolution which made a democratic form of republic feasible. The first, to which we have already referred, is the high literacy of the general population. The American people were culturally developed to the point where ~~they~~ were ripe, so to speak, to be made capable of governing ^{ing} a republic. This potentiality was exploited by Franklin and his collaborators to bring the majority of the population to a developed state of consciousness in which they were in fact capable of governing themselves.

A democratic republic is a process by which, so to speak, every citizen is on the road to being qualified to be President. In practice, the creative contributions of the individual citizen, expressed not only in the discovery, but the transmission and assimilation of knowledge, are a universal contribution to the republic. However, the problem must also be solved, of making this connection a conscious one for the individual citizen. For the individual citizen to be given the power to determine governments and by various means shape its policies, the individual citizen must competently judge which sort of representatives will represent the interest of the republic and what sorts of policies are in fact in the republic's interest. To know, the citizen must first of all be capable of knowing, and must also participate in processes by which such essential knowledge is imparted to him. Once he acquires such knowledge, his political judgment must be governed by that knowledge, subordinating narrowly-conceived immediate personal and sectional interest to the interest of the republic as a whole.

The citizen can not ^{prefer to} give up his perceived immediate interest to the interest of a republic unless he understands that the interests of the republic are the only basis on which his immediate individual interest can be satisfied. Either he must submit to authority (authorities who are wiser than he is), or he must possess the competence to understand this connection for himself or herself.

When this condition is achieved, the establishment of democratic forms of the republic does not represent a concession to the individual citizen. In a democratic republic, at least one properly functioning as such, the creative mental powers of the individual citizens contributes to the political process in much the same way that those processes otherwise contribute to technological progress. The combined creative brain-power of the citizenry is invoked to multiply the power of government to solve problems, to accelerate fruitful progress.

Thousands of years of military history illustrate the point in one of its important facets. Repeatedly, as in the case of Rome, a state has become a military power through the development of efficient methods of deployment of an army of citizen-soldiers, usually involving some institutions for universal or semi-universal conscription. As these states have decayed, the role of the citizen-soldier has been de-emphasized, in favor of the armies of mercenaries and satraps. Such states have then been destroyed by the first capable military force marshalled against them, whether over longer or shorter periods.

Nothing is more illustrative of this, perhaps, than the image of the foolish Roman heavy infantry (testudo), squatting on the field, its movements hindered by weight of armor and drill-deficiencies, while "barbarians" chopped its lighter auxiliary forces to pieces and then consumed the isolated testudo at leisure.

The American Revolution's military system benefitted significantly from such military advisors as von Steuben and French officers, but within the total, the American militia and skirmish-line innovations triggered a revolution in military technology which Franklin-influenced Carnot imparted to the armies of France, wiping out the military doctrine of a century in less than ten years of French victories.

It is relevant, in passing, to note how much Napoleon's military genius is overrated. It was Carnot's reforms which built upon the already-emerging influence of American Revolutionary experience in the pre-1789 French military, and welded that into the new French military system. It was that instrument, created by Carnot and his associates, which Napoleon had at his disposal. It is to Napoleon's credit that he employed the instrument brilliantly at times, but his failure to develop in his command-system the same sort of principles which Carnot developed in his side of the responsibility, exemplifies those follies which contributed much to the military aspects of Napoleon's undoing. Carnot, a brilliant scientific thinker in the second-generation of Franklin's French humanist collaborators, is overall the success story in the French military record of that time. Carnot applied the political implications of technological progress to the coordination of arms and deployment of the individual soldier, extending thus a process which had been unleashed by the American Revolution.

The same principle is illustrated by the record of the Israeli military forces against Arab nations. Granted USA aid, it is the Israeli militia-system, capitalizing upon the potentialities of a population enjoying a higher level of technological culture, which provides the instrument upon which the successes of Israeli commanders depend--together with the mobilized political ~~commitment~~ commitment of the individual soldier and small unit essential to victory in modern warfare.

The Vietnam experience ^{perversely} proves the same principle, while requiring one to go deeper into the basics of the point. Giap et al. developed military principles based on a militia conception appropriate to the population forces and other means at hand. This succeeded ultimately because the power of the United States was directed according to a bankrupt political strategy, and a growing nullification of the potentialities of the US citizen-soldier in consequence of the

The American military system was developed on the basis of the military doctrine of Niccolo Machiavelli, a doctrine which had been adopted by the English Tudor humanists, and was the military-doctrine reference-point for Franklin's co-thinkers in much of Europe, especially Germany's republican layers. Machiavelli's work on war and political strategy powerfully influenced the related areas of policy and practice among European and American humanists from the middle of the sixteenth century. The aspect we emphasize for present purposes is the principle of developing the militia, trained citizen-soldiers, as the arm of warfare.

The ability of the citizen-soldier to defend the republic reflects and otherwise intersects the general character of the citizen's relationship to the republic. The military side of this connection exemplifies the whole because it embodies the other qualities of the relationship in a political and military way. It is ^{in fact} the distinction between the soldier who fights because he is a soldier, such as the mercenary or conscripted ignorant peasant, and the soldier who fights because of and with the resources of his knowledgeable commitment to the nature and purposes ~~his~~ of his republic.

The ideal soldier, the ideal citizen, is the person who, as an isolated individual or in a small unit isolated from other bodies, is able to know what to do and to find within himself and means at hand the capabilities to do what must be done effectively. Just as such a soldier hazards his life for the republic, so the citizen otherwise contributes to the economy and the deliberative processes of national life with assurance that the successful progress of the republic and the meaning of his own life are one and the same thing.

Those principles we have identified are perceptibly embedded in our institutions and in the resources of character of a majority of our citizens. When these potentialities are evoked as a conscious world-outlook and commitment, we are confronted with the person who is in ^{the fullest sense} fact an American. By enriching this sense of American identity with knowledge and training, we ~~may~~ develop the sort of intelligence professional needed for all the tasks before us, including the problems represented by British intelligence networks.

How The Republic Was Won

This great venture, the American Revolution and the subsequent establishment of a constitutional republic, involved sustained and heroic efforts by the majority of our forebears. However, in this location it is more important to emphasize another facet of the whole undertaking. As we have already indicated, the American Revolution was the successful fruit of one of the greatest international intelligence operations in history, a decades-long, partly-overt, significantly-covert operation headed by Benjamin Franklin.

Franklin's own autobiography presents the reader with some hint of that fact. He organized a group of Philadelphia associates into a secret society called the "Junto." Once the group had consolidated its initial development, each member of the group was assigned the duty of organizing a similar group. Through this pyramid of nested secret cells, Franklin and his associates influenced the course of politics. The relevant archives in Philadelphia and the archives of Europe tell us of the much-larger operation which the Junto networks only typified.

It is necessary to trace matters ^{first} backwards from Franklin's young manhood.

Young Benjamin Franklin in Philadelphia became the protégé of the same James Logan for whom the library at the University of Pennsylvania is named. Logan was the secretary of William Penn, the founder of Pennsylvania, and both Penn and Logan were members of an international network known as the Commonwealth Party. As the name of the Party suggests, it was a continuation of the networks associated with John Milton, and represented the networks maintained by a hard-core of the British Commonwealth leadership following the Stuart Restoration of 1660.

The Commonwealth Party was allied with networks on the European continent. The most powerful of those continental networks was French-based, the Colbertistes. These networks were based on leftovers of the work of one of the greatest master-professionals of intelligence in history, the French interior minister, Colbert, otherwise famous for developing the foundations of French industrial-capitalist development during the first period of the reign of Louis XIV. During the last half of the seventeenth century and first two decades of the eighteenth century, the intellectual leadership of continental European humanist intelligence networks had been taken over by the German scientist Gottfried ^eLibniz, who had consolidated and extended networks in many parts of Europe, most notably in developing networks in Germany linked to the Cartesian-Colbertiste networks. A further element of the continental networks was that associated with the Dutch humanist faction, in which Spinoza figured as the leading intellectual figure.

[There was nothing accidental in the alliances. During the late fifteenth century and early sixteenth century, the central figure of the European humanist networks was Erasmus of Rotterdam. Although personally an extremely cautious figure, Erasmus' intellectual authority brought men of tougher *political* dispositions under his intellectual influence. Networks in Italy, centered around Venice-Padua and Florence, networks in France, already ~~established~~ ^{mentioned} by another of the great master-professionals of intelligence, France's King Louis XI (The "Spider King"), networks in Germany, in the Low Countries, and, most significantly, in England, were all drawn together in the Erasmian alliance.

[It was the *Erasmians* in England who led the ^{*European*} fight for humanism during the sixteenth century, together, principally with their Dutch humanist and French-humanist allies (the latter grouped around the French aristocratic house of Navarre). It was the *Erasmians* who developed the rudiments of modern capitalism in England, and actually launched the industrial revolution in England. The French *Erasmians* around the House of Navarre, which early included the writer François Rabelais, developed a faction which came to be known as the French politiques, a faction directly allied with the English *Erasmians*.

[During the last half of the sixteenth century another master-professional of intelligence intervened to give another impetus to the development of these networks: the Italian Giordano Bruno, later burned at the stake in 1600. (Contrary to the cover-story, Bruno was not executed for religious, but political reasons.)

[Bruno travelled from one center to another throughout Europe. His characteristic method was as follows. He would arrive at a location, secure a teaching position for himself, lay quiet for a while, building up a circle of followers, and also constructing a political profile of the opposition. Then, he ~~was~~ ^{issued} a challenge to the leading

their reputations for intellectual authority. Then, his pained opponents would launch repressive actions against him. At that point, Bruno would leave, leaving his established network in place, a network brimming with self-confidence in the power of the ideas and policies they represented. By this face-paced method, Bruno organized a ~~vaxx~~ system of cells throughout most of the centers of Europe, a network known as the "Giordani~~ata~~" spider's web. It was in England that Bruno's most important work was done.

With the execution of key members of the Dudley family by elements of the Tudor house allied to the Hapsburgs, the ~~intellectual~~ ^{political} fist had been taken from the Erasmian faction in England. Bruno's arrival in England supplied the new intellectual fist needed. Sir Philip Sidney made himself de facto one of Bruno's agents. The playwright Christopher Marlowe (whose Doctor Faustus was dedicated to Bruno), was another. Meanwhile, Bruno found time to be ~~was~~ key advisor to the Navarre kings of France. The circle in England most closely associated with Bruno ^{was} ~~were~~ sometimes known as the "Italians." William Shakespeare was a younger member of that circle.

The opposition to the humanists within England centered around Cecil, for whom Francis Bacon was an agent. (Hence, the notion that Bacon might have written or influenced Shakespeare's plays is doubly absurd, on the evidence of Bacon's own writings and the fact that he and Shakespeare belonged to opposite factions.) Cecil and Bacon were agents of the financial interests backing the Hapsburgs, as was the house of Stuart itself. ~~Hence~~, When James I ascended to the throne after the death of Elizabeth I, Bacon became James' Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Among those allied ^{generally} with Bruno in England was John Dee (and also the musician John Bull). Dee developed the basic techniques of political-intelligence practice which the British intelligence took over and tried to copy during the last part of the seventeenth century. Essentially, in terms of basic principles, British intelligence-network techniques have not essentially progressed beyond the range implied by Dee's work. Another key figure associated with Bruno's friends was the scientist, Gilbert, the leading physical scientist of the close of the sixteenth century, known for such crucial writings as his De Magnete. It was Gilbert against whom the scientific incompetent Francis Bacon conducted his campaign of attempted villification. Another member of the circle was the physician William Harvey, the Padua-educated humanist who is known for his demonstration of the circulation of the blood and lesser known for his origination of the conception of epigenesis.

With the accession of James I to the throne of England, and the miserable Bacon to the Exchequer, the industrial revolution launched by the Tudors was substantially undone. In fact, James I was a traitor, as were all the Stuart monarchs and would-be monarchs of England, James I himself in the pay and under the influence of the financial backers of the Spanish Hapsburgs. Sir Walter Raleigh, a politically weaker leader of the humanist faction, was beheaded, and other humanist spokesmen hounded. The economy of England fell toward ruin.

Despite defeats of the humanist factions in France and England, the anti-Hapsburg alliance of the networks continued. The policies of ~~Richieu~~ Richieu and Mazarin represented efforts to continue the anti-Hapsburg policies of the politiques. Colbert was a leader of the politique faction. The central force behind the establishment of the English Commonwealth, including John Milton, ~~were~~ ^{was} a new generation of the same faction associated with Giordano Bruno.

2
The defeat of the Spanish Hapsburgs in 1653, through France's continuation of Richlieu's policies, initially promised to open the way for a victory of the humanist faction. However, the anti-humanist faction in the Netherlands, centered around the corrupted House of Orange, immediately became the new central focus of the anti-humanist infection. Amsterdam, in alliance with the emerging banking interests of Geneva, took over control of the financing of world trade of Europe, and used the gained financial power in behalf of the efforts to destroy the humanist forces. Through English traitors working under Dutch influence, the Dutch-financed Stuarts were restored to the English throne in 1660, from which vantage-point the Stuart monarchs bargained to sell themselves at highest-bid prices to Amsterdam and Louis XIV.

The gut of the Stuart Restoration court was Dutch-bought. The ~~xxx~~ key Dutch ~~paid~~ agent~~x~~ was John Locke, who ~~together~~ with his protégé, Isaac Newton, aided the Dutch in bankrupting England during Newton's reign at the British treasury. Locke took over the Royal Society, identifying the deceased Francis Bacon as the Society's first member in ~~fact~~. The function of the Royal Society with respect to scientific work was, under Locke's zealous supervision to this point, the encyclopedic codifying of scientific knowledge in such a way as to root out the humanist influences. At the same time, the Royal Society functioned as a cover for Dutch ^{political} intelligence networks throughout Europe.

The fight of Colbert against Amsterdam and Leibniz's continuing war against Newton were ~~in-fact~~ manifestations of an intelligence warfare between the European humanists and the Dutch-centered anti-humanist networks.

These highlights of that aspect of history emphasize that the collaboration of the Commonwealth Party with the continental humanist networks was not a new turn in the situation. (The further background of this connection-at-roots we shall show summarily in the next major section of this report.) These networks have been in overlapping connection ~~for~~ since the fifteenth century, and actually, under different formal arrangements, much, much longer.

As Franklin^g proved himself, James Low^g aided him in developing direct contacts with such circles as those Colbertistes around Dr. Desquesnay and Vergeennes in France, as well as humanist networks in Britain. Essentially, Franklin proved himself to the point that he rose systematically within the ranks of the combined Commonwealth-Colbertiste-Leibnizian networks, such that ~~by~~ during Franklin's sojourn in Paris during the American Revolution he was de facto the leader of these networks as a whole.

Key in this was Franklin's emergence as a leading scientist of the eighteenth century. It is pure slander to view Franklin as a backyard tinkerer with kites. He was regarded by the leading scientific minds of the eighteenth century as "the father of electricity." On the basis of this and related accomplishments, Immanuel Kant described Franklin as "the Prometheus of the eighteenth century." ~~He~~ Galvani and Volta were among his correspondents. Otherwise, in his work with Priestley, Lavoisier and others, Franklin played an important catalytic-coordinating role in fostering the emergence of modern chemistry. ~~Franklin's~~ Franklin's correspondence and travels on behalf of scientific work, while exactly what they represented themselves to be, also served as a cover for his political organizing.

The case of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony is exemplary. Within the final movement of that symphony, preceding the chorale itself, there is a bass recitativ passage whose words are not supplied by Schiller's poem. These words ~~are~~^{are} taken directly from a eulogy to Franklin by Franklin's youthful admirer and collaborator Forster. This dedication to Franklin by Beethoven, approximately thirty years after Franklin's death, ~~was~~ is not properly astonishing. Beethoven had been part of ~~convex~~ republican networks since his youth in Bonn, and had continued his active network contacts in Vienna. Mozart, who Salieri later admitted poisoning in the 1820s, was also part of such networks during the 1780s. Mozart's composition of a piece for the glass harmonica, a musical instrument invented by Franklin, is also not surprising. ~~Note~~ is it surprising that Beethoven's teacher, Neefe, himself a student of Bach, arranged to have young Beethoven study with Mozart in 1787. Bach was a principal target of Anglo-Dutch anti-humanist networks, and was himself part of a humanist network.

Intelligence warfare is not a recent development. Over the centuries, there is scarcely a major figure in any aspect of science, art, as well as politics who was not in one of the two principal factions of humanist against anti-humanist.

To understand Franklin's work one must understand the element of duplicity necessitated by the covert aspect of his life's effort, including ^{aspects of} his famous testimony before the British parliament. Up to 1772-1773, following the Seven Years' war especially, the networks associated with Franklin were preparing for the opportunity to make their open move, including an open move to establish a republic in North America.

The occasion for this open move appeared in 1772-1773, in the wake of the bankruptcy of the banks of Amsterdam and Geneva. Turgot moved into the key ministry in France, beginning to accelerate the industrial development of France along lines elaborated by the work of Vergennes. During the same period, the forces in North America moved toward establishing a republic in what was to become the United States. It was agreed between Franklin's American networks' leadership and their French allies, that the industrial technology of France would be made available abundantly to foster industrial development in America.

French aid for the American Revolution was forthcoming as rapidly as Franklin's allies could force this through the French court. Meanwhile, military and other vital specialists recruited by humanist networks throughout Europe moved quickly and in a growing stream to join the Revolution. Through persistent effort, the League of Armed neutrality was organized among the major European continental powers. This League gave the American Revolution the decisive margin of strategic support required to win.

The British Counteroffensive

The winning of the war was not yet the winning of the republic.

Among the American colonies, the most important of the colonies not founded by Commonwealth Party forces was New York. New Amsterdam had been a Dutch colony given to England under treaty agreement. During the eighteenth century Manhattan became the principal focus of opposition to Boston and Philadelphia, the center for the combined financial interests of Amsterdam and London. It is not accidental that most of the attempted and successful subversion of the

United States to the present day has been organized with aid of London and Amsterdam linked financial interests in that city. During the period in question, London's Barings' bank was the principal financial interest working through Manhattan in the effort to subvert the independence of the new nation.

[A scandal in the state government of Pennsylvania during the period of initial independence exemplifies the treasonous role of Manhattan banks, and also provided a lesson which the constitutional convention used to determine the specific relationship among two houses of congress, the executive and federal court.

Legislative [The constitution of Pennsylvania provided for a single, popular-elected house of ~~representatives~~. Tory agents working in collaboration with treasonous Manhattan financial interests corrupted a majority of the Pennsylvania ~~the~~ assembly in an effort to revoke the charter of the Bank of North America. This bank had been founded during a difficult period of the war, had saved the situation of George Washington's army at a point when the Continental Congress was abbotaging aid, and had been intended to become the national bank of the new nation by the revolution's leadership. The effort to destroy the Bank of North America was immediately an effort by the Manhattan ~~and~~ London-linked interests to capture control of the nation's finance, while destroying the ~~the~~ only institution available for resisting British financial warfare against the nation.

[There were two varieties of Tory traitors in America during the last part of the eighteenth century. One group was made up of the open Tories, such as those who moved to Canada. The others were those who satyed behind, spreading poison, seeking to play upon narrow individual greedinesses and play up potential sectional conflicts. This stratum was ~~typified~~ typified by Aaron Burr and, later, by Martin

In response to this incident of the Bank of North America in the Revolution's home-state of Pennsylvania, and numerous other atrocities convinced the leaders of the Revolution that the point of crisis had been reached at which a new step was feasible and imperative. Hence, the constitutional convention, and ^{its} ~~the~~ secrecy arrangements, required to hinder the espionage and countermeasures of British agents.

The first principle of the Constitution is that of the centralized powers of the Federal republic. The second is a rejection of monarchy and of what is sometimes known as "Jacksonian democracy." Pro-British commentators have attempted to interpret the institutional provisions of the Constitution according to the Lockean notion of "checks and balances." That ^{pro-British} ~~view~~ is historically silly, ~~and otherwise anti-American.~~ The lesson of the Pennsylvania legislature's corruption in the affair of the Bank of North America was cited emphatically then and later to show exactly why the congress was composed of two houses, why the electoral college system --and not direct popular election of selection of the President; ^{was} ~~was~~ used, and what the conception of the Supreme Court was. Justice Marshall's tenure provides the best example of the actual thinking behind that ^{latter} institution. The Constitution ~~prescribes a prohibition against~~ the practices of "Jacksonian Democracy," and for excellent reasons.

The design of the institutions and processes of Federal government as represented in the Constitution is to prevent a majority of the electorate from defeating the humanist national-purpose behind the Constitution. This is most sharply illustrated by both the discussion of the organization of the Senate during the constitutional convention, and the way in which the discussed problem was resolved for practice.

The problem of constituting a democratic republic was -- and remains -- that of providing democratic selection of representatives in government, and enabling a legislative power to alter laws and practices, but without permitting that power of momentary majorities in ^{the} electorate from wiping out the principles of the constitutional republic. The six-year term for senators, with one-third elected each two years, exemplifies that intent. In the balance among Executive, Senate, Representatives, and Supreme Court, with the discrepancies among their terms, the founding fathers acted to prevent a momentary electorate-majority from imposing its will to set aside constitutional principles or to otherwise succeed in reckless adventures in policy. The resulting "inefficiency" in short-term exertion of the will of popular majorities was deemed the essential method for protecting the constitutional republic from subversion and major folly.

In general, the ^{design of} institutions of government ^{ment} consistently reflect the intent of the Constitution's authors to force government to reflect upon the implications and consequences of proposed policy. The nation is defined as the Declaration of Independence, authored in the main by the same persons, defines it. The nation belongs not to merely a current majority of the electorate, but to the combined past and present populations in behalf of the nation's present posterity. The nation must be preserved as a humanist constitutional democratic republic at whatever cost to ^{the} short-term interest this preservation requires. ~~Wherever~~ Wherever proposed policies are consistent with that interest, the deliberation upon and execution of such policies must be accelerated. Where the policy challenges a constitutional principle, by philosophical implication or consequences in practice, the Constitution's and institutions of government must intrude to exert an efficiently ruthless obstructive force.

It is purely anti-American, British ideology to assert that the U.S. Constitution defines a "social-contract" form of government. The undeniable burden of the whole body of public propaganda and related ~~proceedings~~ literary evidence pertaining to the American electorate's adoption of the Constitution shows that the Constitution was conceived on the basis of the demonstration that the experience of human history proved certain principles of government to represent irrefutable constitutional imperatives binding upon future generations. Those imperatives could be reformed, in the way of perfection -- correction and enrichment -- by subsequent experience and knowledge, but no government of the United States forever afterward might be permitted to go backwards in respect to ~~which~~^{at} the Constitutional republic of 1789-1793 represented. The Constitution is not an instrument for accomodation of whatever arrays of self-defined conflicting interest seek a British-type "round table" mutual accomodation. The principles which government must serve, even at expense to the strong desires of a momentary majority, are predefined beyond the proper power of any majority to reverse them.

Meanwhile, things were proceeding badly in France. One of the most thoroughly evil creatures in modern European political life, Lord Shelburne, had exploited the combined bankrupt~~y~~ and defeat of England to bring the interests of Barings and the British East India Company fully into his combination, and with aid of massive purchase of the majority of the members of the British parliament, brought the monarchy into his schemes, and his scoundrel-puppet, William Pitt the Younger, into the long tenure that wretched figure was to enjoy. With this power, and the failure of the French to adopt a national banking system such as that soon-to-be-established in the United States, a bankrupt England destabilized the world's richest and most powerful nation, France, and plunged France into the orgy of revolution.

The Necker household was ~~and~~ on familiar terms with the pathetic Robespierre, and through that connection re-enforced the influence, upon Robespierre and others, of Geneva's Jean-Jacques Rousseau. (The deeper significance of this we shall identify ^{later} ~~shortly~~.) After the Treaty of Vienna, Madame de Stael was noted, among other things, for her version of the preceding decades of French history, during the course of which she originated the fraudulent interpretation of the French Revolution which is predominantly accepted by the schoolbooks throughout the world today.

Prior to 1772-1773, Geneva had been the adjunct-ally of Amsterdam in financial rule of world-trade. With the hegemony of the Shelburne circles in England, London took over the dominant position formerly occupied by the Dutch, and, barring the normal baboonery within the lifeboat of the London, Amsterdam and Geneva financier allies, in respect to common opposition to humanism, Amsterdam and Geneva served as subordinated allies of London.

After wrecking France's credit, Necker discreetly stepped out of the trajectory of the financial collapse and political chaos he had contributed so much to unleashing. In due course, the siege of the Bastille by the Paris mob ensued, with a mob organized by the London-linked Duke of Orleans, a mob whose weapons were in chief supplied through intervention by the Duke.

The significance of the French Revolution for the United States, and the reasons for the growing hostility of the Federalists toward that Revolution's unfolding patterns requires the following interpolated points of explanation.

Prior to the 1789 events there had been two Freemason logges in Paris, and, in chief, two factions among those Freemasons, the networks of the two factions cutting across lodge lines. The principal leaders of the two factions were Benjamin Franklin, for the humanists, and the English-linked Duke of Orleans heading up the opposing, anti-humanist faction. Just as Freemasonry was the principal umbrella used for the American Revolution's networks at home, so the fight between opposing factions in France was largely a reflection of intelligence warfare conducted by opposing factions within the Freemasonry organization. Although many American leaders were not intimately familiar with the relevant French personalities and their varying qualities, Franklin and his protégé Thomas Paine were, although, from the standpoint of the evidence of Priestley's warnings, Franklin appears to have underestimated the full extent of the evil the British faction represented. Although Thomas Jefferson behaved quite foolishly during the 1790s on many crucial issues of US, domestic and foreign policy, the shifting attitudes of the Federalists toward the French events was based on a largely-correct and well-informed insight into the nature of the process under way.

Overall, the events of 1789-1792 were a mixed bag. The positive achievement of the French Revolution was its wiping out of the power of the landed aristocrats' faction, and the land-reform which gutted the institutions of serfdom. It was these landed aristocrats and their financier allies who had aborted Colbert's industrial transformation of France under Louis XIV, and who were the internal ulcer of French politics, culture and economy during the eighteenth century.

[In this connection it is important, for an understanding of the strategic implications of the 1789-1794 period, to emphasize that the well-meaning clock-hobbyist Louis XVI was not the French problem. To put the case of Louis XVI in the same social-political category with the landed French aristocracy generally is a fundamental error. From a political standpoint, the guillotining of Louis XVI was a monstrous folly, whereas the Commonwealth's decapitation of Charles I^X of England ranks among the most-warranted of capital proceedings in modern law. The problem of the French Bourbon monarchy had been the ability of the monarchy's enemies, the landed aristocracy and their financier allies, to sabotage the economic progress of France, as in the frustration of ~~King~~ Colbert's program and the dismissal and undoing of the work of Turgot.

[Since the League of Armed Neutrality had been a pro-humanist alliance of European monarchical regimes, it was inciting a foolish struggle to push the monarchs of the former League ^{mercilessly} into ~~submitting~~ the arms of British influence through the execution of Louis XVI. Once 1789 had occurred, the wisest figures among Franklin's former close associates aimed for the establishment of a French constitution based on the American model, retaining the king as a de facto president of the nation. Their objective was to put into effect the economic ~~reforms~~ and related reforms undertaken by Turgot briefly during the aftermath of the 1772-1773 events. In sum, to continue the undertaking of which the American Revolution had been a part.

[London's objective in this process was to wreck France, cultivating every possible variety of destabilization deemed useful to that purpose.

Among the most notorious of the instruments used by London were British agents Danton and Marat. Both were in fact British-trained operatives, trained in London by Lord Shelburne's organization, with Marat a personal protégé of Jeremy Bentham. At crucial points, Danton and Marat were sent back to France from London by Shelburne, Pitt and Bentham for the purpose of launching the infamous Jacobin Terror. The method the British used with Danton and Marat follows the same pattern the British used in numerous subversion operations in the United States, and the same method of mass riots and organized terrorism which British networks use commonly at the present date.

The British objective was to crush the Americans, and to crush all of those humanist forces which had been allied with the American Revolution throughout Europe. The benefit for which Shelburne and his protégé Pitt aimed in this war against humanism was total submission of the world to the City of London's control of the financing of world-trade and national debt, a submission which depended upon a "zero-growth" policy of enforced stagnation of technological progress throughout the world.

The deployment of Danton and Marat was into the Jacobin faction headed by that admirer of Rousseau, and intimate of the Necker household, Robespierre. The instrument which this British intelligence network used for the Terror project was the Paris mob. This mob, organized around Marat's demagogic ("Maoist") rag, The Friend of the People, was composed chiefly of a mixture of slum criminals and an influx of jobless, hungry peasants. The operation was based on the model of the use of the lumpen mobs of Rome to defeat the Gracchi faction and later destroy the Roman republic in favor of the establishment of the Empire.

Once France had been plunged into the center of what was to become an endemic state of general warfare on the European continent, and once the leading figures of the faction allied to Franklin had been murdered or driven into exile, the Jacobins and the Jacobinⁿ Terror ~~was~~ were brushed aside -- too late -- by forces including the great Carnot, a leader of the generation of scientists immediately junior to the stratum typified by Brissot and Lavoisier. This belated correction of the cancer of Rousseauvian influence is known as "Thermidor," and in fraudulent (or, simply credulously foolish) history textbooks and doctrines as the "Thermidorian Reaction."

At this point of the account, two principal points are of foremost relevance to the intelligence professional concerned with the British problem. Perhaps the foremost of the two points is that the term, "Thermidorian Reaction" and the associated distinctions of "right" and "left" employed during the Jacobin reign have been employed during the approximate two centuries following as the model for "conservative-radical" and "right-left" political and political-intelligence operations. The second important ~~point~~ and related point is the myth of "Jacksonian democracy," and the slanderous and fraudulent historical interpretation of the U.S. Constitution popularized during the present century by such representatives of British ideology as Charles A. Beard and Thurman Arnold.

As we have indicated shortly before this point, one of the most commonplace tactics of British intelligence networks is the mobilization and direction of "radical mobs" for the purpose of defeating pro-industrial-development factions. Through British intelligence control of the key features of the Socialist International and by complementary means, ~~British intelligence networks~~ Anglo-Dutch intelligence networks have been the creators and controllers of most of the "radical revolutions" and kindred "sociological phenomena" of the past two centuries.

Although ~~Marx~~ Karl Marx repudiated Proudhonism and related expressions of British intelligence's model of "leftist" movements and philosophies, Marx was obsessively deluded with belief in the British model so-called, and in his conditional defense of the Jacobin left as progressive. The socialist movement after Marx went much further in the direction of adopting British intelligence's "left" tactics as either representing or converging upon proper political sociology of socialist tactics and strategies. Coupled with such documented facts as that the German Social-Democracy's Eduard Bernstein and August Bebel were both ~~spies~~ working for British intelligence, and that the world anarchist movement was a creation and remains a creature of British intelligence, this disgusting folly within the self-styled Marxist organizations has been the principal tool British intelligence has employed for the deepest penetrations of the leaderships of Communist parties, including Communist states.

This should not be interpreted to the effect of stating that radical movements are the specific attachment of Anglo-Dutch intelligence. The British method is to start up a variety of small movements, variously profiled as "left," "right" and "center." The assembly usually includes, in an theater of operations or national target, several purportedly Marxist groups, a few anarchist, some specifically "nationalist" or similar insurgencies, at least one "conservative" group, one or two professedly fascist groups, and a "liberal" group which plays the central position, spinning off its agents of influence into various other parties. By orchestrating an escalation of conflict among the various groups, by making and unmaking coalitions around generated conflicts, the process of social-political tension is furthered. By increasing social tension, the partisanship among what are initially relative handfuls of opposing deployed forces is spread like a toxin into surrounding,

9H more numerous strata of the population. [An analogy is the provoking of a brawl in a barroom. Two agents-provocateur enter an otherwise peaceful barroom and proceed to develop a fight with one another. By appropriate preliminary outbursts of cock-a-doodle-do accusations^s and counter-accusations preliminary to the rough sport, onlookers are drawn into the conflict, on one side or the other. The infection spreads from a few onlookers to more of the spectators. If the scenario is properly managed by the provocateurs, and if the latent tension among the targetted population is sufficient to be triggered by such means, the joint will be broken up, and semi-permanent factional hostilities can be fostered among factions of the population in the aftermath.

[That is the initial phasing of the operation. Since British intelligence has ground-floor control over the initiating forces, at suitable points a combination can be put together through which the target-population is placed under the hegemony of forces following policies agreeable to the Britishers' perceived interest. The befuddled man-in-the-street, who foolishly interprets the issues ~~xxxxxx~~ according to the profile of issues reported in the Reuters dispatches, mistakes the British intelligence network's artificing of the mask of reality for reality. Hence, a population made up of leaders and constituencies who are credulous enough to believe what they read in the Washington Post or London Times are psychologically and politically outflanked by British intelligence, to the effect that a relatively small ~~xxxx~~ proportion of ~~xxxxxxx~~ public and private institutions under British network control can seize control of affairs at the expense of a victimized, confused majority.

Which of the factions in such proceedings are truly British, in the sense of corresponding with fair approximation to the actual British outlook and policies? During the past three centuries, the home-party of British intelligence has been British liberalism, which is chiefly complemented by British control of the Socialist International and the Socialist International's close associates in the USA trade-union and other strata. Most of the British penetration and control of Communist parties is conducted through intelligence networks deployed within the Socialist International and its adjuncts.

The "extreme-radical" and "conservative" forces controlled or substantially influenced by British intelligence are commonly used only as a disruptionist element, but may be pushed into a dominant position for ~~for~~ a period to carry out some specific purpose. Classic is the fact that British intelligence put both Mussolini and Adolf Hitler into power. In the latter case, the British project increasingly took on a life of its own after 1936, producing, from the British standpoint, a Frankenstein's monster that went totally out of control and required destroying. In another category of special cases, during the period beginning the close of World War II, British intelligence has manipulated the conflict between the Soviet Union and United States, with aid of British agents of influence working both sides, to afford bankrupt Britain a degree of world-power which it otherwise could not have enjoyed. British influence in the Peking regime is a different version of the same ~~same~~ strategic application of special uses of the "left."

So, in France, British control migrated from Dabton and Marat to that Talleyrand Napoleon aptly described as "a piece of shit in a silk stocking." Talleyrand was an agent of Amsterdam and London, and, together with creatures of the same essential pedigrees, manipulated the Napoleonic regime from the inside to the point of ensuring a bled Europe's

The fraudulent evaluation of the U.S. Constitution by Beard, Thurman Arnold, et al. shows itself to be pure British intelligence influence when both the pedigrees of Beard et al. and the events of the ~~1780s and 1790s~~ 1780s and 1790s are known in their essentials. The connection of British-caused internal US problems to the Danton-Marat operation goes to the ~~the~~ vital points.

The centerpiece of British intelligence might be termed the "Circe Principle": If you can induce a man to transform himself into a pig, you can have his bacon. From this ~~standpoint~~ standpoint, the English use of "Old Hob" for the Devil's name coincides neatly with the implications of Thomas Hobbes' dogmas, and the outlook of ~~the~~ John ~~Locke~~ Locke, Shelburne, Bentham and Bertand Russell. As the pages of Marat's Friends of the People illustrate, if you can induce people to bring the potential swine in themselves to dominance in their outlook and behavior, they can then be directed to destroying their society's vital institutions. The feasible results include nations modelled upon the Animal Farm of British intelligence operative George Orwell, the 1984 design of the same author, or the Clockwork Orange nightmare of "technetronic"-plus-psychedelic present-day fads.

This was the principle of the game British agents employed to corrupt the Pennsylvania legislature in the affair of the Bank of North America, and to feed the chaos which developed under the Articles of Confederation. Toward the ~~middle~~ ^{middle} of the 1790s, British agents accelerated the eruption of "proto-Maoist" obscentities in the United States to the point of provoking the passage of the "Alien & Sedition Acts."

During much of this period the Rousseau-tainted future US, President Thomas Jefferson did not always conduct himself with wisdom and prudence. His lack of perception of the determining issues ~~within~~ behind developments in 1790s, France and his vacillations and retreat from unpleasant realities of foreign policy during his terms as President are related to these points.

Jefferson's Vice-President during his first term was the same British agent, Aaron Burr, later to lead a treasonous expedition against the United States in the effort to secure control of the Mississippi and Louisiana territory in behalf of British interests. Using the same principles embodied in London's deployment of Danton and Marat, if on a smaller and less catastrophic scale, Burr contributed to the election of Jefferson and himself by creating an electoral-fraud machine around a network of corrupted poor immigrants in New York City and other locations. The principal social targets of the Burr electoral-fraud operation were the potential swinishness which might be evoked among the most illiterate strata, the poor immigrants and the marginal elements of the rural population.

Jefferson grew into the Presidency, fostering technological progress and public education to that purpose, but was more or less inevitably as short-sighted in national defence policy as in foreign policy -- an error for which the United States was to suffer economically during the first decade of the nineteenth century and suffer most painfully when the British forced the War of 1812 upon the nation. During the 1790s emergency period, George Washington and Alexander Hamilton had recult the United States Army into the best quality of fighting force in the world, and ^{was} ~~was~~ not exactly neglecting naval development. This accomplishment was largely dissipated under Jefferson, with consequences which could not be quickly repaired at the point war was forced upon the nation.

Napoleon's Russian adventure of 1812 permitted the British to resume war against the ill-prepared United States, and the defeat of Napoleon's power enabled the British to continue the war against the United States. The effect of the Treaty of Vienna was to bring all Europe under the British-controlled Holy Alliance, the British "concert of Europe." The new issues of debts which London bankers imposed upon Europe created a situation through which British banking houses and their continental correspondents could manage politics and the course of wars on the continent by controlling the spigot of national credit of the respective nations. The League of Armed Neutrality which had made the victory of the American Revolution strategically feasible was wiped out, without visible prospect for reviving it or its equivalent. England was not able to conquer the United States directly, but strong enough to contain the republic, to manipulate its foreign commerce, and to weaken the nation in various ways.

The Manhattan-centered machine earlier headed by traitor Aaron Burr's local branch of the Democratic-Republican (later Democratic) Party was taken over by an Anglo-Dutch allied Manhattan financier Martin van Buren. The object of van Buren and his faction was to halt U.S. industrial progress, ~~manipulating~~ attempting to turn the United States back toward a predominantly agricultural orientation, as British policy for the United States prescribed. To accomplish this, the London-linked group of Manhattan private bankers had to seize the U.S. Presidency and dissolve the Second Bank of the United States, the successor to Hamilton's original Bank of the United States. The most massive corruption and vote-fraud was used in a combined effort to defeat John Quincy Adams in the 1828 election, and to put van Buren's puppet, Andrew Jackson into the White House.

Jackson was not ^{exactly} a novice in the business of betraying his nation to the British networks' schemes. During Burr's treasonous war against the United States, Jackson had withdrawn himself from deep involvement in the action just soon enough to prevent ruin of his later political career. In the 1828 election campaign, and in his administration, Jackson's political significance was his representing of the image of the rough, semi-literate frontier later eulogized by Turner and euphorically embraced by Theodore Roosevelt. More specifically, his aim was to dissolve the United States Bank and put the nation's credit in the hands of the group of London-linked Manhattan private banks for which he himself was the political puppet. In addition, presaging the "environmentalist" attempted sabotage of the US economy during the late 1960s and 1970s, Jackson blocked the establishment of the Smithsonian Institute as part of the package of measures he took to gut the nation's previous commitment to technological progress.

Under the Jackson and van Buren administrations, by 1837 the United States had collapsed into the famous, devastating financial panic of that year. The ~~new~~ credit of the United States, which in 1828 had been the most solid in the world, by 1837 was a wreckage. The cause of this collapse was principally the deliberate ^{inflationary} wrecking of the nation's financial strength by the London-allied Manhattan banks.

During the 1815-1840 period another major wrecking of the US economy was in progress. The City of London and its agent-networks compelled the United States to foster the expansion of chattel-slavery in plantation agriculture. The British acts against the slave-trade, adopted during this period, were a cynical fraud. For various reasons,

As Belmont stated candidly in his correspondence, the British policy of the 1850s and 1860s for the United States was to launch a series of operations for carving the North American continent into a balkanized agglomeration of squabbling petty dictatorships, to the point that the entire North American continent could be ruled from London completely. Two principal operations were launched from London in the effort to effect this project. The first was the splitting-away of the Confederacy. The second was the British-directed occupation of Mexico. The Confederacy was prepared during the administrations of the foolish Franklin Pierce and the treasonous Buchanan, both Presidents protégés of the de facto head of the national Democratic Party machine, August Belmont.

It is exemplary of the Civil War operation that while Belmont worked the operation from inside the Union (and, with aid of his Republican Party agents inside the Lincoln government), the treasurer of the Confederacy was a Rothschild agent -- like Belmont himself. With fellow Rothschild agents in New Orleans (e.g., Slidell), and a seeding of ~~many~~ merchants and financial agents throughout the Confederacy, the grand "balkanizing" project was on.

That project was defeated for a combination of reasons. Lincoln, whether he ~~fully~~ adequately appreciated the danger or not, acted in the main correctly in refusing to accept the division of the nation into Union and Confederacy. London did not imagine that Lincoln would have the guts to fight or the ability to conduct a war -- Buchanan, Belmont's protégé in the White House, had contributed much to that effect by looting the Union's stores in favor of the future Confederacy.

Secondly, as Henry Carey was the first to emphasize, Union wheat was a more powerful economic asset for the United States than southern cotton. Third, London failed to comprehend the pent-up social-political forces within the United States.

The course of the war into the close of 1862 had made the ultimate outcome clear even before Gettysburg. Indeed, Lee's advance to Gettysburg was an act of strategic desperation, the last desperate gamble for securing a short-term strategic military decision which would divert the juggernaut of forces otherwise ensuring Confederate defeat. The evidence portending Union victory and industrialist opposition within Britain itself accomplished a reversal in British Foreign Office policy. Eighty years after the 1783 Treaty of Paris, Britain for the first time honestly acknowledged the permanence of the existence of the United States. ~~It~~ At the same time London bent to full recognition of the permanence of the Washington Federal government, it turned its back on the complementary Mexican operation --leaving the French Foreign Legion and Maximilian to "hang out to dry" as well as they might.

This did not end British subversion of the United States, but rather channeled that subversion into new courses of action and new objectives. The last gasp of the old policy was August Belmont's 1864 campaign around the discredited General MacLellan. The new phase of British subversion was heralded by the assassination of Abraham Lincoln.

Although some elements of the Lincoln assassination remain obscured, with aid of continued suppression of relevant archives, the major policy-motives for the deed and the responsibility for it are definitely known. Booth was a British agent working with a British network, and Secretary of War Stanton was crucially complicit.

The Republican Party of 1860 was composed of two principal elements. The kernel of the Party, Frémont's party, was composed of Clay-Carey American Whigs, represented by Lincoln himself. The second element was led by Manhattan-centered forces, for which Secretary of War Stanton was among the most relevant elements in the Lincoln administration. The elements of policy of the 1860-1865 period bearing upon the mixed role of this second element of Republican leadership are Stanton's role respecting the initial assassination plot of 1861 as well as the actual Booth assassination, Stanton's role in sabotaging an effective Union military policy during the first period of the war, and the issue of Reconstruction, which the Stanton-allied wing of the Republican Party won in consequence of Lincoln's death.

Lincoln's Reconstruction policy was a humanist policy consistent with the American System: a policy of rapid economic development of the former Confederate states. The opposing faction demanded the equivalent of the "Morgenthau Plan" which Bernard Baruch and his associated Morgenthau projected for post-war Germany during World War II. Lincoln's death cleared the way for the "war-reparations" approach -- the carpetbagging and general looting policy, to the effect that large parts of those states did not recover their relative position until the industrial belt-ways and related developments of the ~~post-war period~~ 1950s and 1950s.

There is a direct connection between the victory of the "carpetbaggers" and the Morgenthau Plan. Bernard Baruch represented those Manhattan financial interests which represented during the present century the combination of ~~Bank~~ London-liked Confederate and Manhattan merchant-banking interests which had performed a crucial part in arranging the Civil War and conducting the carpetbagging policy.

The professional whose family backgrounds are those of ordinary folk has a considerable initial difficulty in grasping the fact that certain groups of persons unlike those of his own family background have ~~xxxxxxxx~~ policies continued into today which are consciously traced back into the early part of the nineteenth century in the United States, or among "established families" of Europe for even hundreds of years. This latter sort of phenomenon prevails for better or worse, according to the sort of tradition represented. Ordinary folk know their grandparents, more or less accurately, and have perhaps a hazy image of their grandparents. In certain circles, the cult of family tradition is a matter of stern indoctrination from early childhood, and is reenforced throughout life by close associations ~~of~~ among groups of families sharing common policy-traditions in this way.

To take the best ^{variety of} case, in France, for example, there are persons who consciously and more or less accurately can reach in terms of policy and issues back to approximately the time of Charlemagne in the struggle for humanism. In England and elsewhere, representatives of the opposite faction have ^{oppositely} similar ranges of recollections. In the case of Bernard Baruch, the reach back to the pre-1860 period was very short. Such ^{extended} long memories are a valuable tool, especially to those intelligence professionals obliged by their duties to "get inside" the mind of the British adversary. We shall develop this point appropriately in the following sections.

One further ^{Getysburg-time} feature of the Civil War period deserves mention here: the New York Draft Riots of 1863. This was one of the last major British destabilization operations run prior to the Lincoln assassination, the last effort directed to the London policies of the ~~pre~~ 1783-1863 period. It was a British operation in the tradition of Danton and Marat.

2. THE ROOTS OF BRITISH INTELLIGENCE

It is necessary to include in the study of British intelligence such catalogue information as tables of organization and the other reference materials which this report presumes the reader has available from other sources. The point to be stressed at this juncture is that the student of British intelligence networks does not know the determining, "genetic" features of this adversary until he also knows the approximate three thousand years of intelligence practice which the classical studies of such locations as Oxford's Trinity and All Soul's Colleges have contributed to embedding in the relevant institutions' outlook and behavioral potentialities.

Both American and Soviet intelligence have tended toward a dangerously inadequate appreciation of the kind of observation we have just registered. During and following the last World War, the British cooperated generously with their American allies, and used this very cooperation the better to deceive and swindle their allies in crucial matters. The massive and growing British deep penetration of key Soviet policy and intelligence circles even at the highest levels, points to the Soviet blind spots. The way in which British manipulation of ^{conflict between} both the Soviets and the United States, to a significant extent from the inside of each, rounds out the broad scope of the evidence to be cited.

This brings us to the additional methodological point we have assigned to this present section of the report.

At the outset, we pointed to the importance of the intelligence professional's well-defined sense of American identity. In the preceding section we presented the outline of the historically-situated conceptions which enable the professional to sharpen that sense of American identity and define the crucial distinctions between the American and British outlooks. In the present setting, we focus on a further methodological point: the importance of task-orientation in shaping the criteria of evaluations.

The broad task of the American professional engaged in counterintelligence duties against a British adversary is to understand the adversary better than the adversary understands himself. Counterintelligence is usefully likened to hunting. By knowing the behavior of the beast, one knows where and how to bag it, given a reasonable amount of spoor. Men master beasts not essentially because of weapons; better weapons, speaking of essentials, have the effect of improving the score, rather than defining the essential qualities of man's conquest of the beast over the ages. Men master beasts because men can master the predictability of the beasts' nature. This aids man in finding the beast on ground to man's relative advantage, and also in defining those points of the beast's vulnerability best suited for conquest with the kind^s of means available. To defeat the adversary consistently in counterintelligence work, one must reduce the adversary to the relative position of the beast in the hunt. The essence of this precondition is knowing the nature of the beast better than the beast knows himself.

During the present period, intelligence operations against the British adversary are predominantly intellectual. Her Majesty's services and their allies and networks have some nasty killers at their disposal, ranging from special units to assorted terrorist riff-raff and disposal lunatics. That sort of nastiness acknowledged, the United Kingdom ^{as such} is economically pathetic. The specific nasties discounted, the residue of the British Lion's capabilities are akin to those of the Wizard in Frank Baum's The Wizard of Oz, the knack of commanding actually powerful forces indirectly, through the influence of artficed illusion. Thus, the odd hydrogen bomb at London's disposal is not truly an independent force in the super-power world. It is British intelligence and British intelligence alone that is the old Lion's last remaining major strategic weapon.

This does not signify that the British are not extremely dangerous. The intelligence capability is extraordinary relative to the developed such capabilities of other nations. The manner in which Shelburne, Pitt et al. outwitted all of Europe during the 1784-1815 period, at a time that Britain itself was already financially bankrupt, affords some raw order-of-magnitude measure of what a nasty intelligence capability can accomplish even amid relative giants. Unless British intelligence is effectively neutralized, it could shape current world history for the worse, very much worse.

What is being stressed is that if the nature of the British beast is correctly understood from the standpoint of an American identity, its conjuror's tricks publicly explained to the point they lose their power of deception, and the issue defined and contested on grounds where American overwhelming advantage of economic power comes into play, the nasty old Lion can be reduced to frustration, and caged.

To accomplish that feasible result, one must begin by reducing the adversary to the relative position of the beast in the hunt. One must first comprehend the predictability of the beast's character, thus establishing that qualitative margin of advantage by which he can be outwitted and controlled.

[This ought to imply that an evaluation doctrine which sought "impartial, objective" assessments of British intelligence networks is pretty worthless stuff. That particular point belongs to a more general case. That general case is the methodological point we take up here.

["Passive" or "contemplative" intelligence evaluations sometimes can not be avoided. Either no means for appropriate intervention into the subject area are accessible, or policy prohibits such intervention. Granting the cases in which such obstacles occur, the criteria of competent intelligence evaluations are always properly adduced through the analyst's assuming moral responsibility for the implied consequences of operations using the evaluation. Without that moral connectedness of the analyst to a directed interventionist policy, judgment wants for moorings in reality. The "academic" atmosphere thus cultivated fosters bureaucratic diseases in the regular organization; ^{in that circumstance,} one ignores the practical implications, and emphasizes instead propitiating the prejudices of visible authority for the advancement of one's career.

[The comparable case in eighteenth and early nineteenth century ~~xxx~~ military history is found in the way the doctrine of "cabinet warfare" persisted even after the lessons of the American Revolution and French military victories of the period up to 1805-1806. It appeared more desirable to responsible officers to further their careers by genuflecting before the "cabinet warfare" doctrinal prejudices of their superiors than winning wars.

Good intelligence practice frequently obliges the responsible official to go against the strong prejudices of persons to whom he is in one way or the other responsible. This is not done for the sake of being argumentative; it is avoided where unnecessary, and not pursued by novices and subalterns outside the precincts of the team. It is done, when necessary, on the obvious premise that the war must be won. It is also done ~~because~~ on the premise that if intelligence merely coincided with the prejudices of authoritative consumers, the consumer would have no need of any sort of intelligence but the peek-and-grab varieties. At the senior professional level, intelligence work is directly comparable to military general staff duties, and emphasize^d correcting significant errors in the judgments of superiors, as well as providing plans and so forth of the sort the superiors would not develop unaided.

Good counterintelligence against the British begins by defining British intelligence as an adversary to be defeated, ^{to be} ~~and~~ either destroyed or bent to one's will. This adversary relationship must be defined, in turn, in terms of well-defined strategic issues and objectives. If the American identity is properly developed, and if the characteristic "genetic" advantage of American forces over British is also well defined, the basic criteria are established, and the subsumed criteria will flow naturally from the evolution of the task.

British intelligence's genetic characteristics are primarily defined by the contrasting characteristic features of the British system's ideology with the world-outlook of the American System. In this aspect of the problem, the key behavioral features of the British side are those associated with the way in which the British define economic power: the financial control of markets of world trade and debt by the monetarist merchant-banks of the City of London and ^{its} ~~their~~ allies in other financial centers.

Move that sort of control out of the hands of the City of London and allied monetarists, by establishing world-rule for a hard-commodity, "Hamiltonian" sort of world monetary arrangement flowing from the principles of the American System, and the British adversary's strength in-depth is decisively depleted. The adversary will therefore use every trick of which he is capable to prevent that blow from being delivered. He will deploy his networks and other influence within the policy, military and intelligence establishments of the United States and other nations to attempt to frustrate such a measure; identify those who will play that British-agent role and publicly expose and destabilize them as British agents-in-fact. He will rally his Sunni networks in the Arab world in the effort to frustrate us. Expose these networks as agents of British imperialism and otherwise take effective neutralizing action against them. He will attempt to manipulate the ~~other~~ members of NATO into a hard confrontation with the Soviet Union; expose this, and blow enough British ~~agent~~ networks in the Warsaw Pact nations to decimate the British levers within those nations. He will deploy strikes, racial riots, and other major disruptions of that genre in the effort to destabilize governments as a preventive measure. So on and so forth. That defines the general nature of the adversary situation.

To discover and neutralize his networks and operations with the necessary degree of precision, we must turn to the historical approach. History of intelligence operations over approximately three thousand years of Mediterranean-region and European ^{culture} ~~history~~ are embedded in British intelligence's genetic character in two overlapping ways. Objectively, so to speak, British intelligence has directly inherited the accumulated tradition of the anti-humanist faction's networks going back continuously ~~for~~ almost three thousand years.

Subjectively, as we indicated at the outset of this section, British study of the classics, of archeology and anthropology have imbued British circles heading up Her Majesty's intelligence networks with an intimate comprehension of the repertoire of intelligence methods employed over that span of time.

Practices directly copied from Babylon of the eighth century BC are among the elements incorporated into present-day British intelligence practices. With a few cases of that sort included, the core of British intelligence borrowing from the ancient period, begins with the struggle between the Ionian faction and Pericles' faction in Athens, picks up tempo with the work of master-spy Aristotle, and chooses the side of the Roman Empire against the Roman republic in the issues and intelligence practices of the last century and a half before Christ. From the present era, the British emphasize the intelligence and related practices of Byzantium, shift attention to struggles within Islam, and then take the side of the Pierleoni faction and Spanish Hapsburgs, on the side of the Crusades and Inquisition.

We shall summarize enough of that span of background material to communicate the most essential points of concept and reference for the instruction of the professional. It is assumed that the professional will enrich his further development with studies-in-depth of the areas merely summarized here. We begin this account by identifying the environment in which intelligence-network practices emerged. We next focus on the case of master-spy Aristotle, identifying the view of Aristotle indispensable to the professional. We next focus on the crucial Roman case, which is the central classical reference-point for all British political and intelligence thinking since the seventeenth century.

That foundation lain, we ^{shall} trace the relevant major points of the Christian era into the establishment of the Lockean British Royal Society and the development of British intelligence up to the emergence of Shelburne's crew.

Ancient & Modern Intelligence

There is in fact a continuous history of overlapping intelligence-network operations from about 1,000 BC, initially centering in the rise of the Phoenicians. The available detailed knowledge of that development begins to be significantly known in depth from about 800-700 BC, with emphasis upon the Babylonian campaign against Tyre. (Solomon had been allied with Tyre, which aided Solomon in developing and extending what is now called Eretz Israel. Babylon used "turned" Hebrews, captive in Babylon, ~~into~~ ^{for} a subordinate, full-fledged intelligence operation against Tyre.) European history begins, together with the roots of the European history of intelligence, with the rise of such Ionian centers as Miletus, and the detailed record of that course of history erupts with the battles between the Ionian and Pericles faction centered around ancient Athens.

Although the record of intelligence available to Oxford University (and ourselves) dates in detail from about 800 BC, we are obliged to go back to about 1,500 years earlier to define the broad circumstances of Middle East and related developments in which the emergence of political intelligence and related network-practices occurred, the persisting rise of mercantile capitalism.

The first centers of the rise of civilization were the cities of the lower Euphrates of ancient Sumer, an (almost certainly non-semitic) ~~civilization~~ civilization which designated itself as "the black-headed people." These cities, which developed symbolic record-keeping, but not yet writing of a language, were essentially agrarian. Alexander Hamilton's and Henry Carey's criticisms of the inherent weaknesses of an agriculturally-oriented culture apply in principle to the weaknesses of the Sumerian culture.

The next step of human progress resulted from the conquest and assimilation of Sumerian cultural achievements by the Semites. Although the process developed over a long span, it incurs no error for our present purposes if we foreshorten the process through a long-span, passed-time overview of the essentials. The Semites introduced extended culture and trade. By 2,300 BC, this semitic development had produced a great civilization, with a written language, with indications of the development of a modern use of the bill of exchange, and with a strategic overview of policy. By combining the fostering of urban and related productive technologies with the developed agricultural basis, these ancient Semite "city-builders" fostered the enrichment of economy and rapid advances in general culture along the lines outlined by Hamilton in his 1791 Report on Manufactures.

Our knowledge of this sort of development becomes much richer during the Hittite period, during the middle of the following millenium. In "merchant ghettos" in the sites of ancient Hittite cities, cuneiform tablets representing a modern form of the bill of exchange and documenting some of the networks of commerce of that period show us ~~the~~ how much the leading thrust of commerce and culture had developed at that point.

The history of the development of language under the influence of the Semite's city-building cultures is one of the most important, and so far most-inadequately explored subjects bearing on our concerns here. ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Unfortunately, the growing influence of British linguistics has all but extirpated competent methods of philology from general advanced education and practice, to the effect that competent approaches to philological research have been pushed into isolated corners, where not entirely ~~extirpated~~ extirpated.

The essential points on the development of language are these. The superimposition of semitic rule upon the different language and culture of the "black-headed people" of Sumer introduced the element of abstraction between the Sumerian name for the ~~symbol~~ written symbol and the significance of that sound in the semitic language. The incorporation of Sumerian forms of agrarian city-organization into semitic culture, together with the records-system essential to that agricultural mode, caused the symbols to retain both their original, Sumerian significance and at the same time acquire a phonetic-code value in the semitic language, a syllabic value in semitic. So, semitic alphabets, including modern, reconstructed Hebrew, are not true alphabets in the sense of the Greek and Roman alphabets -- as is illustrated by the way in which the vowel is communicated in written Hebrew; it is a half-alphabet^{ic}, half-syllabic written form. According to specialists, comparable observations are to be made respecting the development of written Chinese, in the one case, and the different significance of written Japanese.

The cultural significance of this matter of written-language development in ancient times is illuminated by developments in European languages during the early and late Renaissance. The impulse of cultural progress has been associated, in every case we have adequate information, with the wilful transformation of language through the initiatives of leading writers who were also leading philosophical thinkers. The notion of perfecting the consistency of dictionaries and grammars, to the purpose of fixing a language in some fixed, pure form of its existing development, has always been associated with the destruction of intellectual progress. The cases of Dante, Erasmus, Rabelais and Cervantes illustrate the way in which leading influences have wilfully revolutionized languages to the purpose of increasing the capability of the language for communicating more subtle and sophisticated conceptions.

From written sources since Ionia, and more emphatically Renaissance into present experience, we have conclusive evidence bearing upon the political significance of the point just made. The simple peasant, living in isolation from significant change in the principal features of his life over generations, assigns a fixed value to objects, social interrelations, and to the implied actions he takes in response to these circumstances. For a stagnating culture, words and syntactical forms are correspondingly fixed, and vocabularies relatively small in common usage. Illustrative is the "baby-language" character of modern, demotic Greek, in contrast to classical Greek, a degeneration of the Greek language corresponding to the degeneration of Greek culture under long periods of Turkish rule, and continuation of the impoverished rural existence of Greek life even after the successive national emancipations from Ottoman rule.

Nothing is more correlative with the destruction of the ability of the people of a nation to think than the destruction of the power of communicating ideas, ^{which must} ~~resulting~~ from programs which attempt to fix the dictionaries and grammars and to extirpate "foreign influences" from the native tongue. Exemplary of the contrary is the significance of the sobriquet "Italian" for those Tudor humanist circles of which Shakespeare was a product. Florio's sixteenth-century dictionary of Italian-English most efficiently exemplifies the effect of English-Italian cross-fertilization in Tudor England in effecting a quantum-leap in the quality of the English language used by the urban cultured populations, and in contributing to English as a language capable of communicating more powerful conceptions. (What we properly should mean by "more powerful conceptions" is defined with reference to the notion of transfinite developed by the nineteenth-century scientist, Georg Cantor.)

The importance of this point for matters at hand is indicated, as a matter of a first step, by the case of Thales of Miletus. The common²place, e.g., British, textbook appreciation of Thales' philosophy is plausible to college sophomores, and ^{thirty} ~~thus~~ in fact shown to be silly. If Thales is appreciated for what he was primarily, a powerful political leader of an armed state and its economic development, the attempt to explain Thales from the standpoint of assuming him an "arm-chair," contemplative pedagogue, a "cracker-barrel philosopher," is clearly absurd. Once the problem of metaphor in naming new conceptions of scientific discovery is grasped, and Thales ^{was} ~~is~~ examined from the standpoint of leading work of nineteenth century mathematical physics (e.g., Weierstress, Riemann, Cantor, Klein), a correct appreciation of Ionian thought begins to emerge.

From approximately the time of Israel's David and Solomon to the present day, the continuity of political-intelligence networks is unbroken. Throughout this history, the issue has been the struggle of the humanists (the "city-builders") against the anti-humanists. However, although the factional history of these networks is continuous, the continuity over three thousand years is not defined along fixed national lines, but in overlaps, in the course of which the dominant national forces lined up on one or the other side of the issue change their allegiances, just as the sixteenth-century Tudor and seventeenth Commonwealth England, a bastion of humanism, became, beginning 1660-1688, the bastion of bestialism.

Another illustration of this is provided by the history of Islam. The prophet Mohammed was himself a humanist. After his death, his former opponents in such locations as Mecca made a coup from inside Islam. The center of resistance to this coup was soon located in Mesopotamia and later shifted to Persia and the newly-founded humanist Islamic city of Cairo. This humanist faction in Islam was known as the Ismaili faction, and was associated during the tenth and eleventh centuries with such leading scientists as Al-Farrabi and Ibn Sina. Against the Ismailis, the reactionary faction, which had taken over the Ismaili-created city of Bagdad, reached into the area of what is now Afghanistan, recruiting Seljuk Turks as mercenaries against the Ismailis. The Seljuk mercenaries in due course conquered Bagdad, and organized an anti-humanist Islamic movement, the future "Sufi" faction, around an eleventh-century religious fanatic, Al-Ghazali, and mobilized the most backward tribes within Islam in the effort to crush the humanist Islamic factions.

A resurgence of humanist developed ~~later~~ around an incredible figure known in the history-books as "The Old Man of the Mountain," the "Assassins." This new resurgence of the Ismaili faction (the Brothers of Purity) developed espionage, intelligence networks, and special operations to the highest degree, consolidating their influence and power in the Middle East until they were finally destroyed by the Mongol conquests. Meanwhile, one of the centers of Islamic humanism emerged in Spain, as well as the residues of Ismaili (Fatimid) influence in Cairo.

This is not merely relevant past history. At the present time, British intelligence in the Islamic world consciously copies the tactics of the Seljuk "Sufi" faction built around Al-Ghazali's doctrines, both to develop British intelligence's Sunni networks and to develop and control nominal Ismaili networks, the latter as a device for preventing an Ismaili Islamic revival from getting out of hand. The commentaries in Burton's unexpurgated Arabian Nights identify British consciousness of the techniques for manipulating ~~the~~ Arab and other Islamic leaders. This is key to British intelligence penetration of circles in and around the Saudi leading families, to operations within Libya, and to the recent outlawing of the writings of Ibn Sina in Syria and Syrian-controlled regions of Lebanon.

A British agent, either a recruited Moslem or an Oxford graduate undergoing the standard MI-6 conversion to Islam, works within Arab leading circles --or, in Pakistan -- as an ~~and~~ bastion of the kind of Islamic religious fanaticism associated with Al-Ghazali. This ^{was} found helpful by British intelligence in causing the overthrow of Pakistan's Ali Bhutto, in controlling one faction within the Iraq Ba'ath leadership, in manipulating the desert Arabs in Libya's Qaddafi government, or pushing similar doctrines within the byzantine factional life of Syria.

Returning to a more ancient precedent generously employed by British intelligence, it should be known today that most intelligence networks run a coopted religious cult or synthetic religion or two on their strings. Covers and conduits such as the Hare Krishnas, Moonies, Children of God are among the most notorious current synthetic religions of this sort. The Anthroposophical movement is an older case. The practice is as old as Babylon. It is also key to one of the most important aspects of British penetration of leading Communist circles.

Ancient Babylon was the first state to resort to wholesale production of synthetic religions as a principal feature of state policy for the manipulation of subject peoples and conducting of major intelligence operations. The Babylonian version of "Zionism," developed to destroy Tyre's traditional alliance with Israel (since Solomon's time), involved a rewriting of ~~the~~ Hebrew ~~religion's~~ history and reshaping of the religion, under which arrangement Babylonian-trained Hebrew agents developed an Israeli base against Tyre.

The Achaemenids of the Persian Empire, after conquering Babylon, reworked and expanded upon the assortment of synthetic religions inherited from Babylon.

This practice was developed into an orgy of synthetic cults by the Macedonian intelligence networks headed by Aristotle. Aristotle, whose contributions to political intelligence featured the systematization of political poisoning, also directed his networks' development of the techniques for codifying workable synthetic religions. The Ptolemy creation of the synthetic religious cults of Egypt, many of which were essentially political-intelligence network cover-operations, ~~was~~ is the most celebrated of these productions

Essentially, Aristotle was an intelligence agent of factions within the Macedonian court. Applying modern espionage laws to the case of Aristotle's residence in Athens, he would have been properly excuted as a Macedonian spy many times over. The work of Aristotle and his associates in developing lurid synthetic religions and in developing the practice of political poisoning (including the assassination of Alexander the Great) are but the more isolable particulars of Aristotle's significance. The key to Aristotle's role as a Macedonian master-spy is provided by what are usually termed his philosophical works, ~~his~~ the combined effort of Aristotle and his school to codify the body of existing knowledge to the purpose of extirpating the influence of the Ionian and Platonic (humanist) science from culture. This is the central feature of the new British intelligence system founded during the 1660-1815 period, and points to the crucial significance of the British Royal Society as the principal "mother" organization for British intelligence as a whole.

The background to Aristotle's case is ~~essentially~~ ~~this~~ crucially located in understanding the truth of the point that Athen^s Pericles was a Pers^{ian} spy.

What confuses ^{honest} historians on the matter of Pericles is their understandable error of simplistic thinking in imagining that "Persian spy" must signify agent of the Persian emperor's interest. They fall prey to the ~~the~~ romantic school of history. The fact of the matter is that the Persian emperor was in significant part a tool of that group of tax-farmers which controlled the Persian treasury. Pericles was a Persian spy not because he was an agent of the Persian monarch, but because he was an agent of those networks which were tied to the group of tax-farmers who have brought the Persians in and who viewed the Persian rule as a suitable instrument of their interests and policies.

The background to the case of Pericles is two-fold.

On the first count, the conquest of Phoenicia by Babylon-centered interests had brought the mercantile power and merchants of Phoenicia under the hegemony of the financial policies of those tax-farming interests which ~~then~~ viewed the Babylonian ruler as the suitable instrument of their interests and policies. In this way, Phoenicia was transformed from what it had been under Tyre, the leading political force for humanism, into an instrument and ally of the Babylon-centered anti-humanist interest.

In the course of this transformation of Phoenicia, the center of the humanist current and networks shifted to Ionia and Lydia (e.g., Croesus). As the example of Thales of Miletus reflects, this shift was accompanied by a quantum-leap forward in scientific knowledge and policy. At about the seventh century, Ionian power in the Eastern Mediterranean, and Carthaginian and Etruscan the Western Mediterranean, ^{took} ~~took~~ increasingly from the power and wealth of those Phoenician factions tied ^{then} ~~now~~ to the tax-farming faction nested in Babylon. The objective of the Babylonian tax-farmers became the destruction (and, naturally, also the looting) of Ionia and Lydia. Babylon lacked the means to accomplish this.

Indeed, ^{As} must be the case under regressive tax-farming practices, Mesopotamia and Babylonian power were savagely depleted by ^{monetarist} ~~tax~~ policies. With encouragement from the tax-farming interests of relevance, a number of adjustments in regimes evolved, culminating in the Persian rule. It was under Persian rule that the reach of the Babylonian tax-farmers was extended, leading to the conquest of Lydia and isolation and ultimate crushing of the Ionian city-states.

During this last phase, the key center of financial and political-intelligence operations against Ionia, Lydia and Ionian allies of mainland Greece was the cult of Apollo at Delphi, a Phoenician cult used as a cover for the principal Phoenician intelligence and related operations in the Aegean region.

Of the ^{second} ~~first~~ count, the less-civilized mainland Greeks were tied to emphasis upon agriculture, such that the corresponding sociological current in Greek life was a susceptible point of penetration for political-intelligence influence through Phoenician ~~network~~ network-channels.

(Bear in mind all along the future British intelligence responsables studying this history at Oxford.)

Pericles was a representative of ^{the} ~~that~~ group of families of anti-humanists. The ^{ambiguity} ~~double-ness~~ of his role in the policies of Athens coincides precisely with the proper understanding of his categorization as a Persian agent. This is not an isolated type of case; such kinds of agents are commonplace in history to the present day, sometimes termed the "agent of influence." The "agent of influence" is not a directly and totally controlled operative of the power which has an interest in him, but is controlled through third-factor considerations complementing the direct conflict of interest represented by the power whose influence he represents and the target nation. As long as the particular issues between the two principal interests are limited in range to those on which the agent of influence agrees with the policies of the foreign power he represents, he will work against his nation's interest for that foreign power's interest. If matters move outside that range, he may shift into opposition to the policies of the foreign power on that point. Modern cases such as that of Admiral Wilhelm Canaris belong to this category.

The systematic use of agents of influence as a major feature of British policy came into prominence during the Ministry of William Pitt the Younger. The case of the Sultan of Zanzibar is classic for that period. Study of British East India Company operations in India earlier ~~xxxxxxxx~~ is relevant to study of this British practice.

Immediately, Pericles' role as an agent of a foreign power was mediated through the cult of Apollo. Although he was involved in defense of mainland Greece, his domestic policy was anti-humanist (anti-Ionian), and his policy for Asia Minor was pro-Persian, going as far as he dared to sabotage and ~~for~~ otherwise frustrate aid for the Ionians. Exemplary of his anti-humanist policies is that massive "WPA" boondoggle known as the Parthenon. Just as the tax-farmers of Mesopotamia pursued the same policy through the Persian rule, economic-development processes were wrecked with aid of diversions of wealth into "WPA" boondoggles such as that at Ecbatana. The records of the Persian palaces compared with the quality of artisanship in work done at various periods, shows a correlated process of inflationary decay in the Persian economy and deterioration of the quality of workmanship. The Parthenon was the center-piece of such an anti-economic-development policy of Pericles' faction in Athens.

The last important reflection of the Ionian humanist faction at Athens was the school of Socrates and Plato. (The foregoing comment on Pericles is properly understood to indicate the real, political reason Socrates was condemned to death.) This coincided with the period during which the ~~xxxxxxxx~~ Phoenician faction, now thoroughly anti-humanist and montarist, had a developing interest in the potentialities of Macedon. From the beginning of his career, Aristotle was formally an intelligence operative for the Macedonian court, but more immediately an agent

of the networks associated with the Delphian cult of Apollo. Coordinate with Aristotle's work as a spy for Philip of Macedon, ~~in~~ assisting the Macedonian conquest of Athens and Athens' allies, Aristotle was simultaneously engaged-in the effort to destroy Plato.

In this connection, and to understand the special importance of Aristotle for intelligence history and techniques, one must brush aside the fraudulent representation of Aristotle circulated by his modern admirers. Although Aristotle was a ~~man~~ clever fellow, he was not a creative intellect in the sense of a scientific discoverer. The cultivation of Aristotles' reputation for discovery depends upon ~~the~~ ignoring the surviving evidence bearing upon the scope and included features of the extent of knowledge known to educated Greeks immediately prior to Aristotles' birth. Furthermore, Aristotle did not ~~write~~ ^{organize}, but directly or indirectly supervised the writing of much of the ^{literary} material attributed to him. What he did was to assemble existing knowledge in various fields --aiming at something like an ~~early~~ prototype for the seventeenth century Encyclopaedia Britannica, while editing this material in such a way as to extirpate the Ionian (humanist) world-outlook from the matter so transcribed and codified.

The case of music is illustrative. It is credulously assumed that the well-tempered scale was ^{originally} developed by Bach and his immediate predecessors. The Ismaili scholar and scientist, Al-Farrabi, writing in the tenth century, fully documented the well-tempered system and analyzed it in exactly those terms known to Bach and others. In fact, ^{the humanist} Bach and his collaborators developed the modern well-tempered system on the basis of Al-Farrabi's writings as transmitted into Northern Europe from musicians of sixteenth century Italy. Al-Farrabi, commenting of this system, reports ^{that} it ~~is~~ ^{was} already very old. This is corroborated by a contemporary of Aristotles', who incidentally had broken with Aristotle.

The pythagorean doctrine of music (and epistemology) was not a stepping-stone in human knowledge, but a backward pendency which was linked to Phoenicia and Egypt, and which coexisted with contemporary humanist currents which already had a more advanced view on the topics associated with the pythagoreans.

To this end, Aristotle travelled to various locations, reminding one in this connection of the contemporary Italian journalist ^{Orsini} Fallaci, gathering together political and other doctrines already developed, and then appropriately distorting the information gathered to his purposes, much as Fallaci writes the fruits of her interview^s with celebrities. As a political-intelligence complement to this proceeding, the Aristoteleans and their patrons attempted to isolate spokesmen of the humanist faction and eliminate the influence of ~~humanist~~ writings.

Aristotle did not invent the technique. The cult of Apollo and relevant activities of the sophists show that the technique of castrating and banalizing ideas, as a way of neutralizing the influence of scientific and related conceptions, was already well developed. Aristotle and his associates merely systematized that practice on a grand scale.

This, as we have already emphasized, was the technique emulated by the British Royal Society. The objective of the method is to establish the hegemony of one's way of thinking about man and nature in all those dimensions of knowledge which influence the mental development of ^(in 10/11) influential people in all aspects of life, including the essential fields of

technological knowledge. In this way, the ideological influence of one's point of view is spread broadly among target populations, causing victims to act unwittingly as de facto agents for the kinds of outlook on which one's own policy depends. By spreading ideology throughout all branches of knowledge in this way, including the rewriting of current and past history to this same effect, one is creating also the psychological ground among target populations for recruitment of agents of influence and outright agents.

[In British practice this is, as with Aristotle, directly overlapped with the production of synthetic religions.

[The British intelligence's Sunni networks in the Islamic world exemplify this. The British have studied the history of Islam as well as extensively profiling Islamic populations. Knowing that England can not impose the cult of Her Majesty the Queen and red beer on Arabs, British intelligence assigns itself the task of defining a form of Arab ideology through whose influence the Arabs can be manipulated to serve British interests even against the interests of the Arabs themselves. Naturally, lawfully, the religious fanatic doctrines of Sufi Al-Ghazali form the center-piece for that project, since the irrationalism of Sufism, the denial of knowable laws of the universe as relevant to social policy, now as formerly induces the victim of the Sufi doctrine to ^{prefer} ~~place~~ the abstract service of religious fanaticism into ~~opposition~~ to the contrary evidence of reality. Naturally, the cult of the Arab Bedouin, the mentality of the most backward and irrational^{ist} social strata among Arabs, represents the complementary feature of the effort. Thus, the British

combine a profile of the Arab with identifiable elements of Islamic belief, which latter beliefs are then rearranged and reinterpreted to arrive at a new, synthetic Islamic religious beliefs, which is credible enough to be insinuated among Arabs without upsetting them because of its synthetic features.

The more important application of the same principles used in formulating synthetic religions is the work of British intelligence in developing a synthetic Marxist ideology. The neo-platonic element of Marx's method and conceptions have been extirpated, with aid of a fantastic and absurd doctrine represented as "dialectical materialism." On this count the crucial, methodological implication of Marx's work is removed and replaced by a synthetic "dialectical materialism" which employs the same nominal terms and phrases as Hegel and Marx. In addition, the this-emptied Marxian political-sociology is replaced by a derivative of the Rousseauvian doctrine, converging upon the doctrines of Karl Korsch and the Frankfurt School. The autochthonous struggles of the proletariat against "big industrial capital" become the doctrinal center of the ~~Communist~~ synthetic Communist doctrine.

Although this British synthetic version of Marx influenced Bentham-admirer Leon Trotsky, ^{was} ~~is~~ deeply embedded with aid of such Anglo-Dutch agents of influence as Bukharin and Riazanov, the supplementary technique for manipulating the official ideology of the Soviet leadership is as follows. The British "double" certain of their agents as pro-Communist. Leading celebrities, such as a J.B.S. Haldane, are more useful for this purpose. Through this and supplementary work to a common effect, networks of Communist sympathizers and official Communist parties are built up in the capitalist

sector, through which instruments British intelligence networks shape prevailing ^{to} Communist ^{to} through in the capitalist sector toward conformity with the current British version of synthetic Marxism. By creating Communist and Communist-sympathizer networks which are overtly anti-capitalist and more-or-less ^{to} pro-Soviet, this doubling of British agents and agents of influence penetrates directly into the Soviet leadership itself. These channels of ideological influence become major conduits for such "Rote Kapelle" techniques of planting agents within Communist command-structures, and for recruiting both agents-of-influence and outright agents within the centers and peripheries of those command-structures.

H

Lest one be too readily tempted to ridicule the Arabs and Soviets on such accounts, the British have also created a synthetic American ideology, centered around the elements of "Jacksonian democracy" and the notions of "free enterprise" espoused by the British-linked William F. (for Fabian) Buckley. The New Republic, its sponsors, its allies, and its admirers represent a suitable first research-topic for tracing-out the British intelligence penetrations of the United States. Canadian networks, based on the circles around Lord Beaverbrook (and Beaverbrook protégé William Stevenson) are a second most-suitable topic. The practical relevant ^{for} this for high-priority counterintelligence tasks is illustrated ⁱⁿ for the Canadian case by the 1973-1974 project, fortunately aborted through apt USA counterintelligence probings, for launching a 1974 wave of "Black September" terrorism in the United States and Canada. One of the conduits used for this was a network based in Yemen, which some credulous souls, including credulous Warsaw Pact agencies, ascribe as pro-Soviet. More important was the coordinating role of top Canadian British SOE personnel whose other principal known activity is the Canadian route of penetration of Peking. This is the same network which runs the Maoist operations inside the USA, and which radiates strong influences into the liberal-radical minority of our population and institutions.

The Fall of the Roman Republic

Reading matters in historic sequence, after the case of Aristotle, the next major topic of outstanding importance for comprehending British intelligence networks is the case of the fall of the Roman republic and the subsequent development of the Roman Empire. The British ~~we~~ have been hostile to the republic and enamored of the Empire, and, as in the case of the Jacobin Terror under British agents Danton and Marat, have emulated the use of anarchist mobs in the fall the republic as a principal British Foreign Office stock-in-trade.

We shall first summarize the relevant facts concerning Rome itself, and then outline what the British have taken from their study of that subject.

Contrary to well-trodden mythical ground, Rome's only notable contributions to human knowledge were the military system developed by the Roman republic and the improvement of brick-making. Not even Rome's most fanatical scholarly admirers have been able to disprove ~~and~~ Rome's intellectual mediocrity to that point. Rather, accepting such inescapable facts, they have attempted to circumvent their embarrassment in the matter by crediting the Roman Empire with the development of law. Unfortunately for the Romans, an examination of Roman law from the standpoint of the kind of social policy it ordered and reflected compels us to the conclusion that the merits are Roman imperial jurisprudence are essentially negative.

An overall assessment of Roman-Italian ancient history as a whole properly begins with a glance toward a recurring phenomenon of history. We borrow from the lexicon of modern biology and term this phenomenon political neotony. The regularity of this phenomenon is so important that, although it does not represent a law of human development in itself, it reflects principles which appear to be laws and are shown to be lawful principles after more rigorous investigation.

First, we describe the biological conception from which we borrow. There are cases in the transformation of one species to another, such as the much-cited case of a creature called amphioxus, in which members of an existing species ~~are~~ about the epigenetic development of the individual short of the normal adult form, with the ~~simultaneous~~ concomitant appearance of sexual maturity in a juvenile phase of the overall epigenesis. As in the case of amphioxus, the juvenile form is often distinguished from the normal adult form by a lesser degree of behavioral specialization. This is significant in the transformation of species in the respect that the development of conditions which make an adult form "unsuccessful," as the Darwinians put the matter, the reversion to a less-specialized, more plastic form, may provide part of the approach to a solution to the environmental problem represented. These neotonous forms of species can obviously represent the branching-point for positive evolution in that line. That is the image we transfer to the realm of historical phenomena.

In the decay of what are relatively the more advanced forms of society, the decay itself involves acquired institutions which prevent the society in question from correcting its behavioral errors of development. This point is associated in fact with the pattern of takeover of such ~~weakened~~ weakened, leading forms of development by a relatively less developed, "outside" population and culture. If the conquer-

ing or assimilating "outside" culture assimilates the essential features of culture which were viable, without also assimilating the institutions responsible for the collapse, then the conquest or assimilation provides the basis for a potential advance of culture above the levels attained in the best periods of the predecessor society. The semite development into the Phoenician culture, premised upon the conquest of the Sumerian culture, and so forth and so on, and that qualitatively higher level of culture represented by Ionia, over Phoenicia, are illustrations of this.

The development of the Roman republic, and the republic's early conquest and assimilation of adjoining Italian peoples, occurred during the general decay of Hellenistic culture, a decay which reverberated into the formerly-powerful Etruscan culture, and the internal decay of the Greek colony-states to the south. In that respect, the principle of neotony applies to the rise of the Roman republic against the backdrop of general decay in Mediterranean culture's principal forces. However, although Rome assimilated more advanced technologies and other elements ~~from cultures~~ from previously-dominant cultures, it failed to pass over from this to providing an impetus for a further general advance in culture as such.

Such a failure of Rome was not ~~unavoidable~~ purely and simply an outgrowth of the flaws in the aristocratic social order of the republic itself. The campaign of the brothers Gracchi, at the close of the second century BC, for a comprehensive land-reform would have caused, if successful, a new forward movement in the quality of Mediterranean culture as a whole. The defeat of the Gracchi, and the sequelae flowing from the way in which that defeat occurred, ensured that such a ^{happier} development did not ~~emerge~~ ^{emerge}. The result was, in fact, a form of cancer known as the Roman Empire.

As we shall show, if summarily, the epithet, cancer, for the Roman Empire, is an appropriate borrowing from biology.

The specific strength of the Roman republic was its militia-system. This made fulsome use of the combat potentialities of the whole male population, such that ~~the whole male population~~ the echelons of infantry deployed for battle excites admiration among the student of military subjects to the present day. One of the best parameters for tracing the fall of Rome is the effect of the policies of the late republic and the worse policies of the Empire in destroying that combat potentiality of the Italian population.

The problem involved is by no means peculiar to Rome. The problem corresponds to a repeating pattern in the collapse of large-scale cultures in the ancient world -- and after Rome. In most of the viable forms of society in the ancient world, the military system was premised upon a militia of the farmers and urban populations. In ancient Mesopotamia, for example, the holding of land by the individual farmer was known as the "bow-tenure system."

What repeatedly ruined Mesopotamian cultures was the effect of monetarist tax-farming policies upon the bow-tenure system. If the farmer could not pay the tax-fee dictated to him by the tax-farmer, the tax-farmer took the land, until such time as the debtor could pay the tax plus, often, a substantial additional penalty. The tax-farmer meanwhile used the land as his own, ~~but~~^{by} employing wage-labor and later slave-labor. As a result, the essential maintenance of land was neglected, production dropped, and the militia-system was depleted of its bow-tenure base.

These patterns, associated with monetarist forms of tax-farming, were repeated wherever the anti-humanist faction seized control. Mercenaries, sometimes introduced as a tax-collecting force -- aliens and others with no ^olyalties

placement for the militia-based system of warfare, and as mercenary forces grew, the costs of maintaining them, and the use of looting as a rough-and-ready form of logistics, increasingly depleted the economies upon which these "all-volunteer armies" squatted.

[A mercenary force may develop superior military skills relative to a militia-based force. This is a short-haul advantage, which ~~is~~^{may be} a decisive relative advantage as long as wars are relatively short-haul affairs. However, such mercenaries are not only politically-unreliable on record, but they ~~lose~~ what they gain in short-haul combat skills they lose in terms of in-depth combat capabilities. Any war which draws out the factor of in-depth combat capabilities will tend to accomplish the defeat of a highly-skilled force of mercenaries.

[One aspect of in-depth war-fighting capabilities is the role of innovation. An inferior force of militia-based forces may win a protracted war (for example) with aid of its greater susceptibility to innovation over a rigidly-doctrined mercenary force. This does not mean that a healthier, militia-based society will automatically defeat the forces of a decaying society based upon a ~~militia~~ socially-detached professional military force. That result will occur only if the potential feature of advantage of the former can be exploited under the circumstances, and if it is properly exploited.

[Correlated with these observations is the repeated reassertion of the crucial role of infantry each time this or that change in the military arts appeared for a moment to have, finally, for once and for all, ~~been~~ rendered the infantry obsolete or subordinate.

[Another relevant feature of the world young Rome faced was the use of satrapal allies. The potential consequence of that military policy was underlined by Alexander the Great's rout of the vast Persian army, a potentiality demonstrated earlier by the march of the Greek "ten thousand" home through much of the Persian Empire. This was crucial in the Punic wars, in which Rome ultimately destroyed a Carthage whose military and related culture was at core much higher than Rome's own. It was also demonstrated afresh in the military defeat of Napoleon. With the deep decay of the older Mediterranean cultures under the hegemony of the tax-farming faction during the Hellenistic period, ~~all of the~~ ^{indicated} political ~~advances~~ ^{pages} came soon to lie with the Roman republic's system.

[Hannibal, by violating a fundamental rule of warfare, not taking Rome and eliminating the adversary at his base, set into motion all the potential weaknesses in his own military force which enabled Rome to defeat him. (The British admiration of Fabius Cunctator is not to be emulated by serious people. Fabius had the distinguishing quality of command known as cowardice, which happened to work out in an uncritical retrospective view of the matter. ⁹ Fabianism, whether during the Punic wars, or in the period since 1783, succeeds only if adversaries are foolish enough to permit it to succeed.) Hannibal's strategic self-obligation was ~~to~~ force cowardly Fabius to either fight him on Hannibal's terms or accept the loss of Rome itself. Only to the extent that Hannibal played into Fabius's cowardly game, trying to force a fight--which Fabius avoided -- on Fabius' choosing of ground, did he lay the basis for his defeat by incurring the protracted war.

(The case of Hannibal should not be simplistically compared with wartime partisan warfare in Yugoslavia or with the Vietnam War. The conduct of warfare must be either the virtual obliteration of the adversary, or bending him to one's will. One lowers the threshold for the latter sort of victory by offering the adversary a form of ~~self~~ government which is to his advantage, although not necessarily to the advantage of the political and related institutions under which he fights war. In the case of wartime Yugoslavia taking all of the principal bases of the occupied country did not enable the Nazis to secure peaceful occupation for such reasons, they did not offer an acceptable alternative to partisan forces being encouraged by the allies. In Vietnam, the probable turning-point was the decision by Washington to dump the "Big Minh" alternative. Certainly, the schemes proposed by the British, Thompson, from the experience of the staged ^{civil} war in Malaysia, aggravated the problem to the point that an overblown special-operations action became the Vietnam War.)

(By defeating Hannibal and taking over Sicily, Rome had defeated the main ~~foreign~~ expeditionary forces of its only real competitor in the western Mediterranean. By pursuing that to advantage and playing upon the ~~weak~~ inherent weakness of the Carthaginian satrapal system, Rome won Spain and the rich grain-production of Carthage itself.

(The fault flowing from the Punic war conquests was the effect of the looting of the conquered victims on the Roman economic and social system. The emergence of latifundia employing slaves, latifundia which were the fruits of war-loot, ~~land~~ and by taxing away Roman soldier's farm-lands during those soldier's military service, the ability of Italy to feed itself was depleted.

The reforms proposed by the Gracchi attacked this evil directly. The Roman Veterans were to be settled upon plots, and the latifundia and slave-system broken up.

The faction opposing the Gracchi was principally the monetarist faction allied with the latifundists. These forces used the slum-gangs of Rome, a slum population created by the Roman monetarist policies, as a mass of murderous gangs against the Gracchi faction, essentially as London used the Jacobins of Danton, Marat and befuddled Robespierre to murder the leaders of the humanist faction and to wreck the French currency and economy from within with anti-industrialist welfare schemes. In fact, London consciously imitated the slaughter of the Gracchi faction as the model for Shelburne's and Bentham's deployment of Danton and Marat.

The defeat of the Gracchi meant that the Roman economy was based on systematic depletion of the existing internal economy. Consequently, Rome could survive only by looting foreign areas, in increasing extent, in order to secure sufficient loot to compensate for the internal decay of Rome itself. If we collapse Rome's ^{history} from about 100 BC to about 400 BC into the 1929-1945 span of ~~Hitler~~ the policies introduced by liberal Hjalmar Schacht to Germany, we have a most appropriate comparison of the two cases. The difference in ~~time-frame~~ is essentially determined as the difference between the economic characteristics of relatively primitive Roman technology with the dynamic of a modern industrial ^{society} ~~economy~~.

The Roman Empire was a social cancer growing within the Mediterranean world and adjoining regions. The more it grew, the worse its internal sickness became. The signs of its doom were clear a century after its establishment. Satrapal armies replaced the Italian-militia based legions. By Constantine's time the Western Empire was already in wreckage.

[Roman jurisprudence was the administrative side of the process. ^{Romans} ~~the~~ institutions, including the institutions of law, were shaped to perpetuate the cancerous features of the ~~Roman~~ imperial system, and to prevent changes in that system which might have aborted the cancer. The philosophy of law inevitably reflected the Roman administrative outlook on man and nature, the anti-humanist world-outlook consistent with the horror that Rome was.

[During the eighteenth century, the British and their agents, such as British agent Montesquieu in France, deepened their obsessive fascination with the Roman Empire. With the emergence of Shelburne's faction as the dominant force in England during the last decades of the eighteenth century, British policy was based on a commitment to world empire, a world empire conceived on the basis of studies of Rome. Gibbon's famous history was a part of the intelligence-focused policy research deployed by leading British circles to this purpose.

[The British imperial ambition and policy, the "Pax Britannica," and British admiration for Roman imperial jurisprudence are to be contrasted directly with Immanuel Kant's outline of a republican basis for universal peace and the conceptions of republic law associated with the American Federalists. We consider the point of difference in law first.

[The feature of Roman law which attracted British interest was that Roman law is intrinsically immoral. It denies the proper governance of nations by criteria of moral purpose derived from demonstrable principles of the lawful ordering of the universe. Such a denial of a natural-lawful basis for constitutional and positive law is termed nominalism, ~~nominalism~~ Nominalism is, in turn, the characteristic philosophical feature of anti-humanism.

[In neoplatonic and ~~other~~ allied humanist notions of law, the state is responsible for the consequences of its policies and actions according to definite criteria. These criteria, already given before in this report, assume the practical form of tests of progress for the benefit of the present population and its posterity as a whole. In a republic, that is a society which regards itself as obliged to discover and act in efficient conformity with natural law, policy must subordinate itself to its consequences in that way.

[If ~~first century~~ the Rome of the Gracchi period had been in fact a republic, the evidence of the consequences of the latifundist policies would have been decisive evidence before the law obliging the state to disband the latifundia and otherwise implement the kinds of reforms the Gracchi proposed. Rome ~~in fact~~ set the special privileges of the monetarist faction above the ^{vital interests} ~~welfare~~ of the nation.

[If the world is dominated by a system of republics, as Kant rightly understood --as far as he progressed in this matter, then the fundamental interests of all such republics are not only defined in the same general way by natural law, ~~by~~ by serving natural law a nation serves the interest of the entire species, just as a creative person in a nation contributes to the interest of the entire nation. ~~Thus,~~ A system of such republics is a basis upon which universal peace could be durably established. One might be obliged to wage war to realize that potentiality, however ...

[The British system centered around the objective of bringing the world's commerce and debt under control of the City of London banking interests. This was pursued by a policy which did not significantly contribute to, but mainly parasited upon ^{even} British industrial interest. So, British

policy was based on a parasitical subsistence of the ruling British aristocratic and financial strata, sucking ~~the~~ largesse from other nations. Worse, to maintain British hegemony under conditions of British semi-stagnation of internal technological progress (the Malthusian policy developed by Shelburne and Bentham before Malthus' writing), other nations must be kept at a lower state of development than England. Consequently, other nations could not find a basis for living at peace with England in terms of a parallel or intersecting comm^ality of vital interests.

[The British Pax Britannica of the Shelburne group and its successors was based upon two complementary instruments. One was playing off other nations against one another to the point of facilitating British domination of them all. The second was to establish control over a growing debt of foreign governments and internal economy, and to use this debt not only as a source of wealth for London, but as the means for regulating the ability of nations to make war or pursue other significant national enterprises. In this way, the British imagined that they had corrected the errors in the Pax Romana. This method of dominating continental Europe (most emphatically) was known as "The Concert of Europe." The Holy Alliance (the prototype for the British creation of NATO's immediate forerunner under British agent Henri Spaak) of British agent Metternich was the first formal institution of such a "Concert of Europe." (Specifically, the Rothschild's paid for Metternich's mistress, controlled the Austrian treasury, and placed a Rothschild agent in each Austrian diplomatic mission.)

[The policy of developing United States' world power under the terms of the American System is to maintain the highest rates of productive capital-formation, with high emphasis of technological progress and education in the United States, such that, as a republic, the sheer economic power of the United States in terms of its export capabilities establishes the nation's influence in world affairs. Since other nations benefit from high-technology capital imports from such a United States, such United States world-influence --under such circumstances -- coincides with their interest. The notion of ~~An~~ American Empire is an abhorrence to the American System.

[The British, however, exist by looting other nations. They do this by colonial methods or simply through the City of London's control of the world's monetary system under monetarist policies. In every way, British influence and power are contrary to the vital interests of the people of every other nation. Thus, only through either direct imperial arrangements or under British-style "concerts" in each region of the world can the British weaken and bend the will of other nations to tolerate British hegemony.

[If someone introduces into the analysis of a British-style world configuration of power the standards of natural law, then the law itself judges that England must be stripped of its influence over the world. Hence, British insistence upon nominalist doctrines of law and British foreign policies ~~nothing~~ are interdependent political conceptions.