

BIG OIL AND THE WAR ON DRUGS AND TERRORISM

The "Big Oil" chessgame, aided and abetted by the so-called wars on drugs and terrorism, has made most of humanity its pawns and has expanded corporate control over our lives.

by Siegfried E. Tischler, PhD
© March 2004

Visiting Professor
University of Graz, Austria
RIAU University, Indonesia
Email: setex01@yahoo.com

BLOOD, TOIL AND OIL

The year 1859 saw the publication of *The Origin of the Species* by Charles Darwin as well as the founding of the Red Cross by Henry Dunant, after he'd experienced the suffering of the ordinary soldier during the Battle of Solferino (France and Sardinia under Napoleon III fought Austria under Francis Joseph I).¹ This progressive humanitarian measure was paralleled by the founding of the conservative elitist Anthropological Society of Paris by Dr Paul Broca, who had started to "pickle" the brains of eminent deceased personalities.

Strange things were happening in a world where artificial lighting had turned night into day and where man extended his effective life-span by some 30 per cent.² The first oil-well near Titusville in Pennsylvania had been drilled; John Davison Rockefeller and Maurice Clark formed a trading company which would soon become Standard Oil, forming a huge monopoly by concentrating 96 per cent of the refining capacity of the USA in the one hand.³ In the beginning they profited from provisioning troops in the War of Union against the Confederates, then later from outfitting (arming) "pioneers" in their war against nature and humanity.⁴

The year 1859 also saw the start of huge migration of Ashkenazi Jewry from what is now the region of Ukraine into western parts of Europe. The "Eastern Jews" swamped Europe and brought with them little else but the shirts on their backs.

Immediately these immigrants made their presence felt in all walks of life.

When in 1863 the carnage due to modern weapons had taken a huge toll on the largely volunteer forces of both combatants in the American War of Secession, conscription was introduced (first by the Confederates). Until then, the landowners of the South had been fighting for their "rights" while the soldiers of the North had been spilling their blood in order to maintain the tax income for the Union. The new Union President Abraham Lincoln⁵ had the "daring" idea to get motivated fresh blood into the reservoir of cannon-fodder by promising Blacks their freedom if they helped to defeat the South.⁶ In two years, the war was won for the North and the Negro was then nominally freed but still stayed a *de facto* slave. Almost 140 years later, one wonders whether emancipation was the same kind of labelling fraud as was the eventual outcome of the Civil Rights movement.

It is now hardly ever commented on, but the American Civil War "happened" while the oil industry was being established. Some 600,000 lives were ruthlessly wasted between 1861 and 1865 for "ideals" which, when viewed today, were phoney (at best) and to no material effect (as in the betterment of people's lives). What had really happened was that a very few people had laid the foundations for very great wealth and dominance.

ROCKEFELLERS AND ROTHSCHILDS

John D. Rockefeller was born in Richford, New York, on 8 July 1839 (d. 1937) and educated in the public schools of Cleveland, Ohio. He became a bookkeeper in Cleveland at the age of sixteen. In 1862, he went into business with entrepreneur Henry Flagler and Samuel Andrews, the inventor of an inexpensive process for the "refining" of crude petroleum. In 1870, their company was renamed as Standard Oil (of Ohio) Company. In 1872, J. D. Rockefeller founded the South Improvement Co., which by 1887 had amalgamated all but a few per cent of America's refining capacity in one hand and became a corporate giant of such

vast might that it was, in effect, "running" America. The USA was fighting another brutal "War of Independence" (this time from Standard Oil), which it won in 1911 when the Rockefeller monopoly was dismantled. Just as in the case of the other War of Independence, victory was an elusive concept.

The rest of the 20th century has been called by many in very simple terms as "Rockefeller's revenge". To all intents and purposes, this was a "re-revolution", as it effectively re-established the dominance of the oil industry over American politics and the American people. What has changed is that not only have the American people been pushed around the chessboard, but most of mankind has been made into pawns in the game of "Big Oil".

In 1823, US President Monroe declared (in wise prescience) the Americas "off-limits" to any other polity, and the world was divided into the "Western hemisphere" and the rest. Zischka⁷ gave a chronological account of the oil industry's early development. It turns out that in the early 20th century there were two major players on this stage, with an early contender for "second place":

- John Davison Rockefeller, son of a Rabbi-cum-haberdasher and purveyor of comforts to the men in the Pennsylvanian oil fields, focused his attention on the "downstream" side of the oil industry and by the late 1880s established an almost total monopoly on transport and refining of crude oil.

- Henry Deterding, an enterprising young Dutchman, was a clerk in a bank in Batavia (Jakarta) at the turn of the century when the Duri oil field in Sumatra was discovered. A fast learner, he became involved in the company holding the lease over this oil field and by 1902 had risen to the position of president of this company. Deterding was determined to seek domination over the oil industry via the ownership of concessions.

The "side show" developed in the northern foothills of the Caucasus mountains. Ludwig Nobel (brother of the inventor of dynamite, Alfred Nobel) was sent by his father (who at this time was an arms manufacturer supplying the Imperial Russian Army with guns) into the Caucasus region to secure a supply of walnut wood to be turned into gun stocks. Instead, he came back with ownership of the oil concessions on what is now known as the Baku region of Azerbaijan.

The House of Rothschild, through its various branches established in London, Paris and Vienna by the sons of Amschel Mayer⁸ (named "Rothschild" after the "red shield" sign on his house in the Frankfurt ghetto), financed:

- the Rockefeller oil empire in America;
- the emerging alliance (soon to be named Royal Dutch Shell) of the Dutch and English royal houses to take control over the oilfields in the Far East; and
- the Russian oilfield operations controlled by the Nobel family.

As always, the third player got mangled up in the tussle between the two stronger ones.⁹ After oil was discovered in the Persian Gulf region and the British secured control of it, the Nobel family was forced by a "no holds barred" price war between Rockefeller and Deterding to "sell out". In order to win this fight, Deterding teamed up with Lord Samuels of London, who had established the oil shipping industry.

While it would be too cumbersome to detail this epic struggle here, just one fact should make the attentive reader sit up: Josef Stalin spent his early political life as organiser of the Oil Workers

Union in and around Baku! Another fact to ponder: the Russian Revolution kept Russian oil off the world market for quite some time.

OIL, WAR AND TERRORISM

In the early 20th century, the British Empire began to fray around the edges and First Lord of the Admiralty Captain (later Lord) Fisher argued for (re-)fitting the Royal Navy with oil-powered engines to give these ships a definite speed advantage over coal-powered steamships. With the closest supply then being in the Persian Gulf, the British meddling in Middle Eastern affairs becomes understandable. This sounded the death knell for the Ottoman Empire, which was in control of this region until the end of World War I.

That virtually all the oil supplies for the German Empire came from the Mosul field in present-day Iraq explains the fighting in the Dardanelles (Gallipoli) during World War I. The German oil supplies had to be disrupted. When you look at the geography of the region and follow the railroad line from Mosul to Berlin, you will notice that, with the exception of a stretch of less than 100 kilometres, this line ran entirely in Entente territory. The little piece of land missing was Serbia! The assassination of the Austrian Crown Prince, Archduke Franz Ferdinand, on 28 June 1914 in Sarajevo (the capital of Serbia), takes on an entirely different "flavour". The rest is "bloody history", as Kronberger so bluntly puts it in *Blood for Oil*.¹⁰

After World War I, the domestic oil industry in America swamped the country with cheap oil. After the discovery of oil in Venezuela, the Smoot-Hartley Act enacted by the American Congress was ostensibly designed to keep oil from Venezuela destroying the price of this abundant commodity. However, what it did in effect was it exported American recession globally. The rest is—yet again—bloody history.

One of the (other) remarkable results of World War II was that the American oil industry got involved in the exploitation

of the Persian Gulf region.¹¹ From that time on, the Middle East was racked with one after the other war that sent the oil price spiralling skywards.

At the end of the 20th century, the American war machine had become so awesome that in the absence of a credible opponent a "replacement monster" had to be found.¹² This is where the perpetual "side show" of 20th century history comes in: the systematic terrorism with which Israel perpetrates genocide among the Palestinian owners of the land promised (but not given) to World Jewry by the British Empire causes symptomatic terrorism.¹³ The entire situation, caused by the Balfour Declaration, is unsolvable by peaceful means, as no amount of goodwill (from either side) will ever overcome the need for instability in the region to "justify" inflated oil prices and provide "use" for over 50 per cent of industrial production, which is arms related.

This is where "terrorism", yet again, rears its ugly head. Alexandre de Tocqueville described *régime de la terreur* as a methodology to make the masses familiar with the realities created by elites.¹⁴

While all this was happening, events unfolded on the other side of the globe that went entirely unnoticed by most then, and hence their eventual outcomes (which determine the lives of a large portion of mankind at present) seem mysterious. That need not be, as there are sinister "games" at work which are so plain and obvious as *not* to be cases of the proverbial needle in the haystack!

At the end of the 20th century, the American war machine had become so awesome that in the absence of a credible opponent a "replacement monster" had to be found.

EUROPEAN COLONIALISM AND THE "OPIUM WARS"

From 1757, the British had a trade agreement with the Chinese Qing Dynasty which limited all trade between the two nations to the harbour of Canton (Guangzhou). In the early 19th century, British ships were carrying millions of kilograms of Chinese tea to England, while bringing as return freight only silver bullion.

When declining to open the Chinese market to British industrial products, Emperor Qianlong declared in the classic statement to King George III: "We possess all things. I set no value on objects strange or ingenious, and have no use for your country's manufactures."

Opium had long been known as an intoxicating drug in China, but its use was forbidden by imperial decree dating back to 1729.¹⁵ The English East India Company (EEIC) was cultivating huge poppy-fields in India¹⁶ and selling the drug illegally to China. So the earlier ban on the use was given added currency in 1796 by another imperial decree which banned the trading/sale of opium in China. When in 1833 the monopoly of the EEIC was broken up (an early case of "liberalisation"—with the usual catastrophic effects of unbridled deregulation!), China was swamped with opium from India and not only the idle rich but the common man became addicted to the drug. In late 1838, Emperor Qianlong sent his emissary Lin Zexu to Canton to stop the opium trade. This audacious man simply held the foreign traders hostage and demanded their departure under threat of their lives.

The British Trade Commissioner Charles Elliott collected all the opium from the (British) traders and handed it over to Lin Zexu, who proceeded to wash nine million Mexican silver dollars (the international currency of the time) worth of opium into the sea. The British despatched an expeditionary force, which easily won (due to modern arms and strategy) against a vastly superior number of ill-equipped soldiers, led by generals who had no idea of what modern warfare was all about.

With the signing of the Treaty of Nanjing (Nanking) on 29 August 1842, Great Britain's original goals were fulfilled: the *cohong* (the Chinese trading association through which foreigners—effectively, British traders—had to work) was abolished, four more Chinese ports were opened to trade (Fuzhou, Ningbo, Shanghai and Xiamen), and the island of Hong Kong was ceded to the British.

Just as World War II effectively had its roots in the insidious Versailles Peace Treaty, the Second Opium War was an inevitable outcome of the Nanjing agreement. When in 1856 the *Arrow*, a ship owned by a Hong Kong resident, was searched by a party of Chinese officials looking for a notorious criminal, the British flag was taken down and this escalated from a shouting match into a shooting war. This is when the French joined the fray and together British and French expeditionary forces threatened the capital, Peking (Beijing).

In the dictated Peace Treaty of Tianjin, trading rights and the rights to establish diplomatic representations in Peking were granted. When this treaty was to be ratified the next year, the British delegation (some 400 men on three ships) was routed and this then resulted in the forceful ingression of British and French forces into Peking in 1860. The Qing Dynasty lingered on until 1911, when it

finally broke up under Western pressure. What Voltaire had once called the most advanced and enlightened form of government had been reduced by "Western" *dum possum volo* ("because I can, I want") to an ineffective puppet regime.

This is one facet of the evil game which was played in the 19th century in East Asia. Another was the occupation of Vietnam by French forces in 1862.¹⁷

As France had no strategic interests in that part of the world at that time, this venture had to finance itself. It was of no material economic importance either, and one seriously has to wonder why France started nearly 100 years of misery for an untold number of people on the opposite side of the globe. In order to raise the money required to establish a multinational crime syndicate, the new colonial

power began to regulate the drug trade in the country. Until 1954, when the French were unceremoniously "kicked out" of Vietnam, elements of the French Secret Service were controlling the French military presence in Vietnam (French Indo-China). An (effectively private) army of up to 40,000 troops and some 350 French officers (Foreign Legion) had to be financed by the drug trade.

The entire French "colonial" enterprise in that part of the world was a largely private enterprise based on organised crime sanctioned at the highest political levels.

AMERICAN COLONIALISM AND THE "HEROIN WARS"

It now seems very strange that out of a French private adventure (which had made a few French entrepreneurs very rich) could develop the American nightmare of the Vietnam War. The old colonial powers had been running the colonial charade for centuries: entire nations were pressed into service to generate vast wealth for a very small number of people who were the froth on the sociologically fermenting vats that the "mother nations" to the colonial states had become.

America had to learn that one cannot break a deal with one of the oldest civilised nations, Russia, for the simple reason that one was able to (the USA used nuclear bombs to shock Japan into surrender, and the deal that Stalin and Roosevelt had made regarding the sharing of the territorial spoils after World War II was "off"). The Korean War was the outcome of this broken promise. What was "sold" to the unknowing populations as a clash of ideologies was little more than the grandstanding of intellectual midgets: "Look! I have a bigger nuke than you!"

The Korean Peninsula was brutally separated into two halves in order to achieve what had been arranged by Stalin and Roosevelt a decade earlier: a sharing of the region! While the people in the North had no political rights by law and were slaves to a "one size fits all" economy, the ones in the South also effectively had no "rights" and were pressed into the service of Korean and American economic tyrants.

To the average American citizen (especially in those days), the "developing" situation in Vietnam seemed to be a continuation of the clash of ideologies that had gone on a decade earlier on the "other peninsula over there".

Plotinus, the Alexandrian philosopher of the second century AD,

Alexandre
de Tocqueville
described
régime de la terreur
as a methodology
to make the masses
familiar with the
realities created
by elites.

cautioned that every evolution had to be preceded by an "involution". So what wound the clock in Vietnam?

In 1954, when French General Navarre lost the strategic, fortified city of Dien Bien Phu to the Vietcong under the brilliant leadership of General Giap, the colonial adventure of the French in the Far East became an orphan in need of a generous "uncle". Always happy to prop up a repressive regime which provided the "freedom" for corporate economy to wreak havoc, the USA was drawn into the next vortex of military conflict. What started as a loan of military "advisers" developed into a full-blown military conflict of epic proportions.

The sociopolitical effect of this scenario on the entire world was incredibly hefty. All of South East Asia was turned into a brothel for American soldiers on R&R, and again this war was largely "run" by the American Secret Service. Air America, the aviation wing of the CIA, was for a long time the biggest airline in the world.¹⁸ While the military was fighting a war in accordance with political doctrine and within the framework of international law, the CIA financed the destruction of much of South East Asia and American (Western) society by drug running.

Only few ever saw that the arrow was also the target: a logically thinking democratic society would not permit its own dregs to pervert the methodology of government into the *modus operandi* of an organised crime syndicate. Blum points out that over the two decades of (official) American military presence in South East Asia, the region was turned into the (clandestine) producer of some 70 per cent of the heroin and opium supply that is consumed in the USA.¹⁹ The dealing of drugs and arms is an essential part of the destabilising tactics²⁰ which have been and still are visited on the most populous region on Earth.

It is interesting to note that while in the 19th century the British used China as their playground and sold drugs there which had been produced in India (using the military power of the Empire in order to do so), the USA used a phoney war (financed by the American taxpayer) to set up the logistics needed to produce the drugs required to turn the American people into zombies. In both instances the "social cost" was immeasurable, the beneficiaries were an extremely small number of "personalities", and neither of the two episodes had been possible without the knowledge, condoning and complicity of the highest levels of government (and "high society").

Who can be surprised to learn that the Israeli Secret Service, the Mossad, "runs" a similar operation in Lebanon? Local opposition to this illicit drug industry is (as Robert Fisk pointed out in the *Independent* of 11 December 2002) the major drive behind the Hizbollah "terrorism". In early 2003, the newspapers and TV news channels were having a jolly good time "informing" the world how Israeli-based operations were swamping the yuppie scene with the drug ecstasy. That the largely Jewish-owned media was reporting on such antisocial Jewish activities hinted at a more important agenda.

This was closely followed by the media-induced SARS hysteria. The "Rape of Iraq" will relieve Israel from having to buy expensive oil and ensure that "Big Brother" for a long time to come will render ineffective Arab opposition to the kind of treatment handed out to the Palestinian people.

The Iran-Contra Affair overshadowed much of the Reagan administration, and the shady "activities" at the Mena Air Field in

Arkansas (while Bill Clinton acted as Governor of the state) led up to the G. H. W. Bush presidency. All this will surely be followed by disclosures of similar "activities" in the meantime (if and when the present stranglehold over the media is broken). Robbins²¹ details the involvement of the CIA (through Air America) in all of these strange affairs.

One is tempted to suspect that the surest way to stop the trafficking of drugs and rid the world of the drug industry menace would be via the immediate disassembly of the secret services. Countless numbers of lives would be saved (or made less miserable). Will this ever happen? The answer is simply, "No!" Such a move would remove one of the most effective "tools" of government (elitist) control over the masses: the ubiquitous use of the chimera of "national security" as a smokescreen behind which "secret" actions take place which ostensibly are in the interests of the nation.

CORPORATISM VERSUS DEMOCRACY

The New Political Order which comes hand in glove with the merging of Communism and Capitalism into globalist practices is a house of cards without any real sustainability. It is a sombre fact that some 200 multinational (transnational) corporations control and their shareholders own over 95 per cent of all "private" business which is not owned by individual privateers and are reaping most of the benefit. The flipside of this coin is the fact that all of this economic activity employs only some 0.3 per cent of the global workforce.²²

From this it follows that the corporate economy, which accounts for the majority of activities which continually and progressively degrade the quality of life (all life), is supported in all this by the private and public sectors: they not only provide the vast majority of all employment, which is to say the wherewithal to purchase the products of the corporate sector, but also generate yet again the majority of all tax revenue.

Yet corporate enterprises and entrepreneurs in 1983 paid 13.1 per cent of all taxes levied in Germany; after 13 years of the Kohl government, this figure

had been reduced to 5.7 per cent.²³ The Canadian corporate sector in 1955 paid some 25 per cent of all taxes; by 1998, this had been reduced to 12.2 per cent.²⁴

Moore²⁵ gives figures for the USA which tell the same "story":

- between 1979 and 2002, the income of the richest percentage of the American population rose by 157 per cent, while that of the poorest 20 per cent fell;
- profits of the richest 20 "concerns" of the world rose since 1983 by 362.4 per cent;
- after the latest round of "fusion" in the oil industry, the profits of oil companies rose by 146 per cent—at a time when the oil moguls decried the fact that they were "not making any money"! (It is a sore fact that the global economy, as some 80 years ago, is again literally drowning in cheap oil!);
- 44 of the biggest 82 corporations in the USA paid taxes at a rate of 17 per cent in 2001, while the "man on the street" paid 35 per cent; 17 per cent of US corporations paid no tax(!), while seven corporations (among them General Motors) in their 2001 tax returns claimed to be due amounts paid over and above that required;
- 1,279 corporations with incomes in excess of US\$250 million or more paid no taxes and declared no taxable income in 2001.

Over the two decades of American military presence in South East Asia, the region was turned into the producer of some 70 per cent of the heroin and opium supply that is consumed in the USA.

During the 1980s when the term "globalisation" became a catchword, many began to talk of the "two-thirds society". Martin and Schumann²⁶ spoke at the turn of the millennium of the 80:20 society. How much longer until "democratic" societies decay into a 90:10 or—as has to be feared with ever more reason—even a 99:1 "society"?

In the knowledge of all the above facts (which are little more than the tip of an iceberg), the only meaningful question can be: how can this have come to pass? Is this not an age where we have almost global democracy, where only a few rogue states still totally disregard human rights (with concentration camps and genocidal tactics aimed at ethnic minorities)? Is this not the "Information Age", where the news is reported "live" and we can know everything there is to know?

In Venezuela, a country which for the better part of a century has not been permitted stable government by an oil industry which thrives on instability, a former military officer is fighting a pretty hopeless war against American Secret Services. Army General Melvin Lopez said in an interview with the Venezuelan state-owned radio station on 21 April 2002 that American agents were behind the attempted *coup d'état* against President Chavez on 11 April 2002. Official American denials abound and have to be weighed against the "noises" from the White House: US President G. W. Bush, himself an appointed "Fuehrer", has been heard to demand the replacement of Chavez (who has been elected twice by overwhelming popular vote) with a "democratic" leader. It is not so much the intellectual level of the person that is permitted to make such idiotic statements, but rather that of his audience, which is cause for great concern.

AMERICA TERRORISES THE WORLD

The 11th day of September was a most remarkable day in the 20th century and early third millennium:

- in 1920, the League of Nations promulgated a decree giving the Balfour Declaration a status of international "respectability";
- in 1973, a CIA-sponsored *coup* led to the ousting of Salvador Allende, the democratically elected President of Chile;
- in 1995, a New York court found a group of Iranian exiles guilty of having placed and detonated a bomb in the underground parking space of one of the World Trade Center towers;
- in 2001, both World Trade Center towers collapsed after "Hollywood-style" attacks on them. None of the "evidence"

presented by authorities appears to merit any credibility; and it is not surprising that dubious language is used when the media crank out yet another "report" on the alleged perpetrators of this heinous act.

The entire world is effectively terrorised by a nation which has freed itself from all that was ever good about it.

Former Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill has written a book on his time in government. Most elucidating is that he mentions that President G. W. Bush issued orders to his government almost immediately after taking office (more than half a year prior to 9-11!) for actions which were later "sold" to the public of America (and the world) as retaliation for 9-11. In a *60 Minutes* interview on 11 January 2004, O'Neill talked to CBS News correspondent Lesley Stahl about this remarkable situation. This lets all the doubts which

surround the entire situation disappear.

It is high time for the thinking people of the world to take notice. The actions of "Big Oil", the "War on Drugs" and the "War on Terrorism" are turning our little blue planet into what German scientist and philosopher P. J. Beumer already recognised in his 1858 *Naturgeschichte* ("Natural History"): "a graveyard within which higher developed life will exist in the future"—presupposing that "present" life will prepare this "graveyard". ∞

The entire world is effectively terrorised by a nation which has freed itself from all that was ever good about it.

About the Author:

Austrian-born Dr Siegfried E. Tischler received his PhD in Geosciences in 1977 from Leopold-Franz University, Innsbruck. Since then, he has worked on five continents as a geoscientist in academia (with the Austrian Mining University), in government (as Director of Mining in Transkei, a former South African "Homeland" where he established a Geological Survey Department), and in industry (as Mineral Exploration Management Consultant).

In 2001, he took on an assignment as Visiting Professor in the Department of Sociology, University of Graz, Austria, to teach Ethics of Science within the framework of a course dealing with the management of crises and catastrophes offered to post-graduates within senior positions in government and industry. Since May 2003, he has been a Visiting Professor at the University of Riau, Indonesia, setting up a Centre for Ethics of Science. He is presently establishing a tanker ship cleaning business on Batam Island, Indonesia.

Dr Tischler is happy to receive and reply to comments emailed to setex01@yahoo.com. For a more detailed biography, visit <http://resumes.yahoo.com/setex01/siegfriedtischler>.

Dr Tischler will be speaking about global oil politics and related subjects at the NEXUS Conference in Brisbane in September 2004.

Endnotes

1. As with all "inventions", there is chauvinism clouding the issue. Anglo-American dictum has it that the nurse Florence Nightingale is to be credited with forcing the emergence of this humanitarian measure during the Crimean War (which "happened" some years later). For all it is worth, this simply shows that the inhumanity of technologically assisted warfare allowed people to "wake up".
2. It is amazing, but there is not one single investigation into the effects of this most extraordinary change in the "human condition" by institutionalised science. Nobody seems to have been concerned about the artificiality of it all—just like the way nobody seems concerned about the effects of industrialised agriculture and farming...
3. Zischka, A., *Ölkrieg: Wandlung der Weltmacht Öl* ("Oil-War: Change in the Global Power of Oil"), Goldmann, Leipzig, 1939; Kronberger, H., *Blut für Öl* ("Blood for Oil") Uranus, Vienna, 1998, ISBN 3-901626-08-5, six decades later updated the gruesome story of the second biggest "business" after the drug trade; Yergin, D., *The Prize: The Quest for Oil, Money and Power*, Touchstone, New York, 1993, ISBN 067-1799-32-0, has an encyclopaedic history of the oil business (*caveat lector*: this book is a factual treasure trove, but all too often it is apparent that "conclusions" reached are largely "white-washes" of white-collar criminality).
4. The corporate successor to Standard Oil (in a joint venture with I. G. Farben) was operating

concentration camps in Germany during World War II. See Tarpley, W.G. and A. Chaitkin, *George Bush: The Unauthorized Biography*; find a PDF file on the web with Google.com.

5. Lincoln now looks like quite a bit of a "straw man". Every respectable encyclopaedia will tell that the representative (and relative) of the Rothschild dynasty, Judah P. Benjamin (1811–84), acted at different times during the American Civil War as Attorney General and Minister of Foreign Affairs, Finance and War for the "South". The "Architect of the Secession" was able to flee to England after the Confederates had been defeated and worked there as a successful barrister. That his *Treatise on the Law of Sale of*

Continued on page 72