

16th December 2018

A Cautionary Tale

When it comes to passing unfavourable "Bills" through a "Parliament" perhaps nothing could be more prescient than the manner in which the United States gained its "Federal Reserve Bank" on the 23rd of December 1913 - it was the first thing that came to mind after reading Jo Johnson's comments in the Daily Express, 15th Dec 2018; about Theresa May Forcing her "deal" through our reluctant Parliament" before the 21st of January 2019 deadline.

Without going into too much detail, it is worth summarising how the US Federal Reserve came about - and its significance to Jo Johnson's claim.

The US Federal Reserve

The story begins in 1910 on Jekyll Island off the coast of Georgia (really) - the Island was owned by J. P. Morgan; *J.P. "Morgan bought the island and founded the Jekyll Island Hunt Club there, with an exclusive group of multi-millionaires he associated with. Future membership was by inheritance only"*

To that exclusive venue were invited the wealthiest members of American Society for a secret meeting lasting for 9 days - *"The meeting was cloaked in such secrecy so that the public would not surmise that the central banking scheme was an instrument of Wall Street, and if passed, the organization would be in their ultimate control."*

Those who attended: *"Senator Aldrich on this most enigmatic meeting were his private secretary, Mr. Shelton; A. Piatt Andrew, Assistant secretary of the Treasury; Frank Vanderlip, President of the National City Bank of New York (headed by James Stillman); Henry P. Davidson, senior partner of J.P. Morgan Company (regarded as Morgan's personal emissary); Charles D. Norton, President of the First National Bank of New York (thoroughly dominated by the J.P. Morgan Company); Benjamin Strong Jr., known as the "lieutenant" of J.P. Morgan; and Paul M. Warburg, partner in the banking house of Kuhn, Loeb and Company."*

Paul Warburg, the driving force behind the plan knew from historical problems with the idea of installing privately owned "Central Banks" in the United States, that, in order to pass a Bill through public opposition and a reluctant Congress the name for the Bill would be of vital importance; so instead of "central bank" it would be named as the "Federal Reserve System"

The Aldrich Bill, the first draft of the Federal Reserve Act, was heavily criticised and seen as more about *control* and *administration* than banking principles or economic management.

Using Propaganda and Misdirection In order to continue with the Bill, a media propaganda campaign was launched and selected "experts" were enlisted to sell the merits of the Bill - ensuring at all times that no connection with Wall Street or the group members was ever revealed. However, the *ruse* did not last as suspicions grew that it was a plan for a central bank and the Aldrich Bill was scrapped in 1912; by which time President Woodrow Wilson was in office.

In January 1913; Democratic Congressman Carter Glass submitted the first draft of the Glass Bill, which was *reminiscent* of the Aldrich Bill, on Banking Reform, *"but it basically read like the creation of a financial oligarchy made up of heads of a few large city banks making the decisions and structuring policy for countless smaller institutions."* *"The largest disparity of fair play for the smaller banks was the fact that none of them would have representation on the Federal Reserve Board."*

The Carter Glass Bill was kept secret from the central bank promoters-but a digest of the Bill was passed to Paul M. Warburg and opposition to the Bill mounted - though President Wilson supported the Glass Bill.

Note: "The framers of the Federal Reserve left the system's architecture in the hands of Paul Warburg. Since his ideologies on central banking were based on his experience with his native German central banking system, his concepts were quite literally foreign to many of the voters.

President Wilson's backing of the Glass Bill was in line with the democratic Congress - which favoured the Glass Bill: in preference to two other alternatives - the Owen Bill and the McAdoo Bill; but the Glass Bill was attacked in the Senate and Congress - who were strongly influenced by New York business and banking interests.

Amendments to the Owen Bill were added on the 18th December 1913, and the Senate passed it the next day by a vote of 54 - 34, with only three Republicans voting for the bill.

"What was of such scrutiny and interest was the fact that many members of Congress and the Senate at that time had left for their allotted Christmas vacation. It was so strange to so many that this bill was being voted on with such a great number of representatives and senators gone."

The Owen and Glass Bills merged to become the Owen-Glass Bill and was voted in by the House (298-60) and in the Senate (43-25) and signed by President Wilson on the 23rd December 1913 - The bill was signed into law as the Federal Reserve Act., and was fully implemented on the 16th November 1914

Citation: *Naclerio, Richard A., "The Birth of the U.S. Federal Reserve" (2015). History Faculty Publications. Paper 121. http://digitalcommons.sacredheart.edu/his_fac/121*

Britain: December 2018

Our Parliament rises on the 20th of December 2018 and many MP's will be heading home for the holidays - perhaps it is an ideal time for Theresa May to "force" the "Withdrawal and Implementation Bill" through with the least opposition; should many UK MP's go AWOL over the Christmas period. incidentally, next week is the 105th anniversary of the Federal Reserve Act - a template for monetary control of the populations of Europe.

The manner of the workings of the "Wall Street" bankers; as chronicled in "The Birth of the U.S. Federal Reserve" (included below) provides insight into how they operate: their clandestine manipulations and techniques of control; use of media propaganda, selected "experts"; opportunism, and "friends in high places" has become an art form when applied to the EU and UK when it comes to dealing with antagonism towards the EU - such as the 2016 EU Referendum - and illustrate that we are indeed dealing with dark forces determined to get their own way by any means; and at any cost.

The real purpose of the EU is to provide a means of controlling the populations of Europe, on behalf of international Bankers and Multinational Corporations - just as the Fabian Society established the Labour Party to control the working class on behalf of the Industrialists (the EU was also established by Fabian Society members; as was the Bilderberg Group)

Whenever the vote on the "Withdrawal and Implementation Bill" takes place, if ever; the public expect that all the MP's will be in place - not sneaking off on

some "Jolly" or taking an extended Christmas or other break - after all, we do not want a repeat of what happened in 1913 to the Federal Reserve Act - to happen to May's EU Withdrawal Bill - that must be totally rejected.

***Update (18th December 2018):**

Watching the debates in Parliament yesterday, two important matters became clear:

- (i) Theresa May will not countenance any other deal than the "WA" given to her by the EU, and specifically ruled out leaving the EU under WTO rules - under any circumstances;
- (ii) she was also claiming, that whatever alternative deal might be put forward: Norway, CETA+++, or reversion to WTO - the "Withdrawal Agreement" must also be agreed by the UK.

If the latter comment is true, that would mean that, even under WTO the UK would still be under EU control - if our parliament is forced to ratify WA (by running down the clock - which seems to be the current EU- HMG devised plan)

This is even more reason not to agree to it - instead Parliament must move to repeal European Communities Act (ECA) (1972) - Clause 2; which currently resides in the faux "The European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018" - which is only partly in force; without that repeal the population of the UK can never be free of political and economic control by the EU.

The European Union (Withdrawal) Act (2018) was derived from the "Great Repeal Bill (2016)" - a grand sounding name for a monumental deception on the public.

The "Withdrawal Agreement" is designed to replace ECA (1972) - but without any exit clause (e.g. Article 50); which might never be properly (completely) repealed - a sure and certain sign that the British Establishment planned, all along, to trample over the wishes of the British People; as expressed in the 23rd Jun 2016 EU Referendum.

Latest Update (18th Dec 2018)

Now it appears that Mrs May will offer three options to her Cabinet of Remainers:

- A Softer "Brexit"
- The WTO Option
- A 2nd EU Referendum

The terms of each option have not been disclosed.

It appears the in mid-January (14th?) Parliament will get to vote on each option; to remove those options not supported by Parliament - in that way Theresa May hopes to trap our Parliament into accepting "WA"- her UK Capitulation Treaty (the only deal the EU want)

The way that the latest plan appears to work is that each option will be voted upon and eliminated in turn - so, for example if all the options, other than WA are voted down that will only leave WA and Parliament will have been forced into a trap.

2nd Referendum: There are problems related to timing if a 2nd Referendum is voted through - involving the need to extend Article 50 - thereby breaking faith with the wishes of the British people - since that would be seen as Parliament overturning the 23rd June 2016 Referendum.

The "softer "Brexit" has not been defined so far - but could simply refer to the "Norway" option - still an option?

CETA+++: is seen as a viable option to everyone apart from Her Majesty's Government (HMG) and NI, but it also has the Eire-EU invented "backstop" problem, probably suggested by Blair, which involves CETA+++ being offered to Britain - bit excluding Northern Ireland. The NI border problem was invented by the EU and Eire - as a means of annexing NI - in order to keep the whole of Ireland in the EU and isolate Britain.

The WTO: is the only one which actually does what the EU Referendum result requires - it is opposed by the Remain Government, Remain Cabinet, Remain Parliament and Remain Establishment, International Bankers and Multinational Corporations, Eire, the EU, Blair, Brown, Campbell, Major and Miller et al., not forgetting the EU's Remain Media outlets - the Brussels Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) who want the UK trapped under foreign control.

The WTO option keeps the UK together and prevents the political and economic control over the UK by the EU - it has therefore the highest probability of been voted down by Parliament which will not countenance the UK leaving the EU; under any circumstances.

Withdrawal and Implementation Agreement (WA): is designed to replace the ECA (1972) - but without an exit Clause (Article 50) which was contained in the Lisbon Treaty (2007) - it has been proclaimed as a worse deal than Remaining in the EU - however, that is simply a matter of timing.

What has become clear is that, far from negotiating any kind of exit from the EU; the EU and HMG saw the 2016 EU Referendum result as an opportunity to accelerate the plans contained in the Lisbon Treaty (2007) and destroy Britain (its History, Culture, Traditions, Heritage and Religion - the EU is an Atheist bloc) - at an accelerated pace, rather than; the more steady, slow and sure, stealthy manner that it has operated over the past 46 years.

In separate clandestine agreements, not voted for by Parliament or by Referendum, Theresa May has already given over control of the UK's Military; including its Civilian (Military) Research capability to the EU and agreed to the destruction of our Constitution and Legal System - including our Common Law protections. These were included in the Lisbon Treaty (2007) but fearful that they could not repeat those demands in a new Treaty (WA) which is being scrutinised by the public - whereas we were not allowed such scrutiny of that Lisbon Treaty (2007) - so they were done by separate agreements signed by Theresa May without consultation or approval - it is easy to see what the Remainers' have been up to these past two and a half years.

Up until now the EU has been gradually metamorphosing: from a "Common Market" (EEC) to its current invocation - and on route, it has been removing ever more power (competences) from the Member States without much fanfare; but now (under the threat from the populations of the Member States who are finally waking up to the EU's ambitions)) - now it has turned to using open aggression in the form of Withdrawal Agreement - in the same way that the EU plans are laying waste to Greece and Italy - which will be followed by the rest of the Member States, at a later date.

For the past 46 years the EEC(EU) has successfully hidden its true nature, and only recently has that been more generally exposed; to have ambitions to build a Military to rival Russia, China and the USA (Macron); to control the economies of all the Member States (Merkel) and to rule over their Constitutions and legal systems (Lisbon Treaty (2007) Yet the naive, or belligerent Remainers', claim that the EU is a force for peace and prosperity - despite the foregoing and the problems within the poorer Member States - where workers rights have been totally destroyed and "Zero-Hours contracts", Food Banks" and "Homelessness" are

the norm; as exposed by the "*gilets jaunes*" protests spreading out from France - these problems, and many more have been created by EU Liberalisation Directives and Regulations.

Following the removal of all other options (obstacles) the UK Parliament will likely bend to the will of the EU (Berlin)?