


## The Omnipotent Rothschilds : Where is the Evidence? Part-3

Zahir Ebrahim | [Project Humanbeingsfirst.org](http://ProjectHumanbeingsfirst.org)

Continuing from [Part-2](#), where Baron David de Rothschild was quoted proclaiming:



Caption World Governance By The Rothschilds, 2003 -  
Click to view GOVERNING BY NETWORKS (Image via  
bibliotecapleyades-net via bureaudetudes-org large 3 MB)

'We provide advice on both sides of the balance sheet, and we do it globally. ... We have had 250 years or so of family involvement in the finance business, ... There is no debate that Rothschild is a Jewish family, ... For a family business

**to survive, every generation needs a leader, ... Then somebody has to keep the peace. Building a global firm before globalisation meant a mindset of sharing risk and responsibility. If you look at the DNA of our family, that is perhaps an element that runs through our history.'** --- Baron David de Rothschild, The first barons of banking by Rupert Wright, UAE thenational.ae, November 6, 2008

When, in my state of perpetual confusion whereby my experiments in independent thinking sometimes get out of hand, I have immoderately challenged many a rebel leader on their omitting to mention the *Rothschild* name in their otherwise erudite critiques of modernity, I have always come up empty handed. This is amply demonstrated in my responses to [Salman](#)

[Abu Sitta](#), [Antoine Raffoul](#), [Ismail Zayid](#), [Khalil Nakhleh](#), [Shadi Nassar](#), [Mustafa Barghouti](#) and [Anna Baltzer](#), [Jeff Gates](#), [Jeff Blankfort](#), [et. al](#). My most recent challenge was yet another unsolicited letter, this time to an old timer Western rebel of the United States of America, Mr. Jeffrey Blankfort. He courteously replied:

**'I do not mention the Rothschilds because I have yet to see a single shred of evidence that they control the world's money supply, the CFR, or anything else of such substance as to influence the way the world works. As far as I can tell whereas once members of the Rothschild banking family ran the banks of Western Europe, I see no evidence that they do so today. ... Again, if you have any direct evidence with unimpeachable sources that the Rothschilds are running everything or for that matter anything behind the scenes I would appreciate receiving it but lacking that up to now, I never mention their name apart from Walter Rothschild being the recipient of the Balfour Declaration.'** --- Jeffrey Blankfort replying to Zahir Ebrahim Nov. 11, 2010 (see full correspondence [here](#))

I was simply delighted that my new friend Jeff Blankfort had even bothered to write back, as most brilliant chiefs, both Eastern and Western, gallantly rising to defend the Palestinians as their own cause célèbre, simply tend to ignore the meddlesome and the confused who don't buy their craftsmanship. The crazy thing is, that among the Palestinians themselves, many appear to prefer running from Jew to Jew to solve their problems, as was observed by a Palestinian friend of mine out of sheer frustration: ***"We run from Jew to Jew, they create the problem, and also argue the solution, they control the full spectrum of our discourse as well as our existence."*** I promised Jeff: *"Thank you mon ami for your reply. I will compose a thoughtful reply later..."*

This [Part-3](#) attempts to respond to Jeff Blankfort's request for evidence for the trumpeting-defecating elephant in the bedroom. As quoted above, Jeff asked for ***"direct evidence with unimpeachable sources"***.

I will humbly endeavor to provide both – **direct, unimpeachable**. And before concluding, I will even suggest that the legal standard itself for proving criminal conspiracy is far less than what Mr. Blankfort has generously demanded from me, for the obvious reasons that even half-smart conspirators usually hide behind their errand boys, like the Mafioso, and don't leave their calling cards. More empirically however, unlike the dumb Mafioso who rob, extort, and kill

illegally thus enabling the state policing apparatuses to be used to juridically hang them, brilliant conspirators usually enact legalisms and statutes, and directly employ the state's governing apparatus itself to mask and legalize their dastardly plunders, their war-mongerings, their social-engineerings, and their pernicious subversions of the peoples' democratic institutions and constitution. Even the flag-waiving ordinary indoctrinated American understood how that craftsmanship worked when he and she witnessed the banksters' bailout extortion racket in October 2008 (see ['Why bluff Martial Law'](#)) and their subsequent brazen accounting of how they spent it ([watch](#)).

And yet, the law of un-intended consequences, i.e., nature, still has its ways to un-obscure the golem if one has the eyes and the will to perceive.

Let me first state the criterion for proof as Blankfort did not stipulate any beyond "*direct, unimpeachable*". I intend to demonstrate that an omnipotent power exists, that such a power visibly existed not too long ago using unimpeachable sources, and since there is no evidence of such a power suddenly eviscerating, that by the sheer force of logic, it must still exist even if occulted from mainstream Americans today. And I will top that off with the confirmation of its own existence by the omnipotent power itself. I invite the readers to pretend that they are a jury member, and reach their own verdict whether the following can be sufficiently deemed "*direct evidence*" from "*unimpeachable sources*" to satisfy the request of Jeffrey Blankfort and all those like him who choose to willfully remain *innocent of knowledge* of the most glaring, trumpeting, shitting, elephant in the bridal suite.

First, the unimpeachable source: **Nuremberg Military Tribunal and its official Record**. I don't think there can be anything more unimpeachable a source than that, do you?

Let's first see what transpired at Nuremberg in the score-settling with victor's justice in the aftermath of World War II with respect to the Nazi banker most instrumental in financing the Nazi war machine, Hjalmar Schacht. While 21 Nazi chiefs were hanged ([watch](#)) by Robert H. Jackson, the chief prosecuting counsel for the United States ([watch](#)), the banker whom the chief counsel as the official representative of the United States government to the Nuremberg Military Tribunals, most wanted to hang, was set free due to the intervention from the Bank of England governor Sir Montagu Norman!

Say what? Bank of England is so powerful that it prevailed upon their own military Allies at Nuremberg to let go of the principal enemy who financed the destruction of entire Europe and of the British Empire itself – with agreement from all the Allied military high command and their

governments (with only Russia dissenting)? No, you did not read that in history books did you, nor did you hear Noam Chomsky talk about the inconvenient case of Hjalmar Schacht even when he waxes eloquence about victor's justice at Nuremberg by highlighting the case of Admiral Karl Dönitz, and evidently, nor did you hear Mr. Jeffrey Blankfort bring it up in all his dissent-ing critique of Noam Chomsky.

I get really confused when I encounter such blind-sighted omissions regarding the King of the Jews among the moral Jews who become dissent-chiefs for the dumb goy, and book-end their own dissent so wonderfully while still giving the illusion of vigorous debate. Chomsky explains this Machiavellian construction rather elegantly even as he implements it himself with involuntary help from his own antagonist, Jeff Blankfort, and the goyem cheer for their favorite horse – don't matter which horse wins, the real winners are those who benefit from the calculated omissions, the race course owners:

'This "debate" is a typical illustration of a primary principle of sophisticated propaganda. In crude and brutal societies, the Party Line is publicly proclaimed and must be obeyed — or else. What you actually believe is your own business and of far less concern. In societies where the state has lost the capacity to control by force, the Party Line is simply presupposed; then, vigorous debate is encouraged within the limits imposed by unstated doctrinal orthodoxy. The cruder of the two systems leads, naturally enough, to disbelief; the sophisticated variant gives an impression of openness and freedom, and so far more effectively serves to instill the Party Line. It becomes beyond question, beyond thought itself, like the air we breathe.'

'Democratic societies use a different method: they don't articulate the party line. That's a mistake. What they do is presuppose it, then encourage vigorous debate within the framework of the party line. This serves two purposes. For one thing it gives the impression of a free and open society because, after all, we have lively debate. It also instills a propaganda line that becomes something you presuppose, like the air you breathe.'

'The smart way to keep people passive and obedient is to strictly limit the spectrum of acceptable opinion, but allow very lively debate within that spectrum – even encourage the more critical and dissident views. That gives people the sense that there's free thinking going on, while all the time the presuppositions

of the system are being reinforced by the limits put on the range of the debate.’  
--- Noam Chomsky.

At this point, before I go any further, please permit me to dust out the following observation of novelist Aldous Huxley in the *Brave New World* to illustrate why I consider artful omissions and silence, as counter-intuitive as it might appear to the profoundly *innocent of knowledge*, to be a most powerful propaganda tool:


**‘The greatest triumphs of propaganda have been accomplished, not by doing something, but by refraining from doing. Great is truth, but still greater, from a practical point of view, is silence about truth. By simply not mentioning certain subjects, by lowering what Mr. Churchill calls an “iron curtain” between the masses and such facts or arguments as the local political bosses regard as undesirable, totalitarian propagandists have influenced opinion much more effectively than they could have done by the most eloquent denunciations, the most compelling of logical rebuttals. But silence is not enough. If persecution, liquidation and the other symptoms of social friction are to be avoided, the positive sides of propaganda must be made as effective as the negative.’** — Aldous Huxley, Preface (circa 1946) to *Brave New World*, 1931, Harper, pg. 11

I have to wonder about my sanity sometimes – why don't I get it when brilliant chiefs inexplicably dabble in their own thought control, in their own self-policing?

Why do I persist in experimenting with independent thinking? Just accept the pious statements of the Jewish chiefs that there is not a shred of evidence of the existence of the King of the Jews controlling the state of affairs in the world today, lest I be labeled a 'kook', a 'denier of established truths', and carted away to some re-education camp for my own, as well as other's safety! 'Denier' I have already been anointed by none other than a recovering Jew, a reformed Zionist, Christian friend of mine, [Israel Shamir](#)! Yes, I know I have accumulated some lovely friends in my few journeys into the unknown world of independent thinking! I now try my best to stay away from such confusions, and I believe this is one of my last few times as my new year's resolution!

Before we jump too far ahead as I briefly did in the preceding passages to give a taste of the acerbic logic about to develop, let's study this shockingly revealing fact of Hjalmar Schacht which is so uncontrovertibly recorded in the pages of victor's justice at Nuremberg, and the

circumstances surrounding this fact. The following is excerpted from David Irving's **Nuremberg, the Last Battle** ( [PDF](#) ). It appears in my document "[Monetary Reform: Who will bell the cat?](#)" as footnote [11] and [13] and is reproduced below along with the passage being footnoted:



Caption Nuremberg, the Last Battle: Bank of England overriding the victorious Allies and freeing the Nazi Banker Hjalmar Schacht from the hangman's noose

'Yes, confessionals after faits accomplis, is a characteristically "cleansing" Christian tradition. Somehow, it only seems to work for those in absolute power, never for the common man. **"You're right, we did it. We're very sorry. But thanks to you, we won't do it again"** [Ben Bernanke to Milton Friedman] doesn't seem to be part of the ordinary judicial system where the common man is made accountable for stealing bread. But it is part of the Nuremberg Military Tribunals which let Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, the former governor of the Reich Bank [11] – the bankster who orchestrated the financing for Hitler and enabled his war machine with funding from Wall Street [12] and the City of London financiers – go scot-free!

Whence such awesome power to even let a fascist banker who caused the destruction of all of Europe

– as per the Nuremberg established principle of **"all the evil which follows"** – become a prominent and influential member of the financial community once again in post-war Germany **"as though there had never been a blemish on his character"**? [13]

Footnote [11] Dr. Hjalmar Schacht (Reich minister of economics until 1937, Reichsbank president until 1939). David Irving, Nuremberg, The Last Battle, 1996, page 160.

"[Jackson] regarded the former president of the Reichsbank as the most contemptible of all the defendants. He had provided the finance for the spectacular rise and rearmament of Hitler's Germany. More than any other, this man's financial genius had paved the way for the violation of the Versailles

Treaty.” (page 157)

“Ambitious and arrogant, Schacht [Highest IQ 143, page 292] had walled himself in behind a belief in his own righteousness. He seethed with rage at being imprisoned with Hitler’s henchmen. He admitted to having violated the Versailles Treaty, but countered that since the Allies were in collusion against Germany this was no crime. .. He admitted rebuilding Germany’s run-down economy, but not for the purpose of waging war; Hitler had dismissed him as soon as he balked at the aggressive planning that began.” (page 293)

“Hjalmar Schacht – ‘after Göring the toughest of them.’ He [Jackson] had always regarded Schacht as one of the most despicable defendants. The banker’s arrogant attitude since the trial had begun only vexed him all the more.” (page 327)

“Even more irritating for Jackson was that Schacht was overheard in the cells confidently predicting that he would be acquitted. Irritating rumours circulated that the prosecution of Schacht was not in earnest. Letter-writers taunted Jackson that he would never succeed in convicting a big banker – whether friend or foe, they were the new Untouchables. He soon became aware that the Nazi banker did indeed have friends in the most unlikely places and influence everywhere. One day one of his team, the eminent New York international lawyer Ralph Albrecht, reported to him that the British assistant prosecutor Colonel Harry J. Phillimore – later a lord justice of appeal in London\* – had accosted him in the hall outside the courtroom and urged the Americans to relax their remorseless pressure on the banker. When Albrecht, perplexed, asked ‘Why?’, Phillimore uneasily explained that certain representations had been made by Sir Montagu Norman, governor of the Bank of England from 1920 to 1944. ‘It would be most unfortunate,’ murmured the British colonel, ‘if anything were to happen to Schacht.’ In fact Schacht had been an informer of Sir Montagu, secretly apprising him of the political and financial decisions taken at the highest level in Berlin for sixteen years before the war.” (page 328)

“There is in the records of His Majesty’s treasury in the British archives an illuminating file on the efforts made by Sir Montagu Norman to get Schacht released.” (page 329)

“He [Jackson] regarded the case against the banker as a test of the good faith of the entire prosecution. As he had said in a secret meeting of all the chief prosecutors in April, of which there is a shorthand record in his files, ‘If the court, for instance, holds that we have no case against Schacht, then it seems clear that we can have no case against any industrialist, as the case against him is stronger than the others.’ ... He [Jackson] privately recorded later, ‘I would at least stand out forthrightly in demanding his conviction, convicting him if I could.’ He harried the banker mercilessly in the witness box, addressed him as ‘Schacht,’ tout court, confronting him with the evidence of his participation in Hitler’s aggressive planning until eventually the defendant had to admit that he had been untruthful about his dealings with the Führer. Jackson showed the Tribunal newsreel film of Hitler’s triumphant return to Berlin in July 1940 after the defeat of France – long after Schacht would have had them believe he had fallen into disfavour. There was Schacht, in Prince-Albert morning coat and top hat, the only civilian among the generals waiting on the station platform to pump the Führer’s hand – indeed with two hands he caught hold of the Führer’s, stepped out of line, and followed him ‘in almost lickspittle fashion,’ as Jackson remarked later. And this was the Nazi gentleman for whom the British lawyer Phillimore and banker Sir Montagu Norman were interceding. All the more acute was Jackson’s fury when the Tribunal – with only the Russian judge publicly dissenting – acquitted Schacht. Biddle, who read out this part of the judgement, claimed some months later that he had also wanted to convict, but the British had insisted on an acquittal and had left him no choice.” (pages 329-330)

Also see page 392. <http://www.fpp.co.uk/books/Nuremberg/NUREMBERG.pdf>

Footnote [12] Antony C. Sutton, Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler, 1976  
[http://www.reformed-theology.org/html/books/wall\\_street/](http://www.reformed-theology.org/html/books/wall_street/)

Footnote [13] David Irving, Nuremberg, The Last Battle, 1996, page 402: “As he was released from his [Nuremberg] cell, German police stepped forward and arrested him. A German court sentenced him to eight years’ imprisonment as a major offender under the denazification laws enacted by the Control Council in Berlin. He served two years in solitary confinement, and was eventually released in 1948. The world of banking absorbed him again as though there had never been a blemish on his character.”

Let's also recall from my article "[Of Ostriches and Rebels on The Hard Road to World Order](#)" what Professor Carroll Quigley had stated about Montagu Norman, and all the other governors of world's private central banks:

'The powers of financial capitalism had (a) far-reaching aim, nothing less than to create a world system of financial control in private hands able to dominate the political system of each country and the economy of the world as a whole. This system was to be controlled in a feudalist fashion by the central banks of the world acting in concert, by secret agreements arrived at in frequent meetings and conferences. The apex of the systems was to be the Bank for International Settlements in Basel, Switzerland; a private bank owned and controlled by the world's central banks which were themselves private corporations. Each central bank, in the hands of men like Montagu Norman of the Bank of England, Benjamin Strong of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, Charles Rist of the Bank of France, and Hjalmar Schacht of the Reichsbank, sought to dominate its government by its ability to control Treasury loans, to manipulate foreign exchanges, to influence the level of economic activity in the country, and to influence cooperative politicians by subsequent economic rewards in the business world.' (Carroll Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, 1966, Chapter 20, page 324)

'It must not be felt that these heads of the world's chief central banks were themselves substantive powers in world finance. They were not. Rather, they were the technicians and agents of the dominant investment bankers of their own countries, who had raised them up and were perfectly capable of throwing them down. The substantive financial powers of the world were in the hands of these investment bankers (also called "international" or "merchant" bankers) who remained largely behind the scenes in their own unincorporated private banks. These formed a system of international cooperation and national dominance which was more private, more powerful, and more secret than that of their agents in the central banks. This dominance of investment bankers was based on their control over the flows of credit and investment funds in their own countries and throughout the world.' (Carroll Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, 1966, Chapter 20, page 326)

Is it too rude to ask – that if Montagu Norman is merely among the **“technicians and agents**

*of the dominant investment bankers of their own countries”*, then who is the dominant investment banker of England who has in fact controlled the Bank of England and the City at least since Waterloo?

### **Rothschild N. M. and Sons.**

This is what they confirm of themselves today on their own [website](#): ***Rothschild has been at the centre of the world's financial markets for over 200 years. Today, it provides Investment Banking, Corporate Banking and Private Banking & Trust services to governments, corporations and individuals worldwide.*** Baron David de Rothschild has already been quoted in the beginning of this article, proclaiming: ***'We provide advice on both sides of the balance sheet, and we do it globally. ... We have had 250 years or so of family involvement in the finance business'***

But here we shall just stick with Nuremberg for the moment.

Sir Montagu Norman, at the behest of the owners of the Bank of England, set one of their own criminal banksters free from the clutches of the hangman's noose. Those owners, both commonsense and force of logic suggests, commanded at least that much power which could trivially prevail upon all of the Military Tribunal members, except Russia who voted against it. Americans had lost 300,000 soldiers in that 'just war' against the axis powers, the United Kingdom had lost its empire along with its *jewel in the crown*, and Europe lay decimated, 6 million Jews exterminated – we won't quibble with the holocaust industry here – 20 million Russians butchered, and sum-total of 50 million human beings, mostly Christians, and most of them German civilians under the unspeakable fire-bombings of civilian cities by the Allies, lost their lives in the name of fighting the aggression initiated by the Nazis which was even termed ***“... the supreme international crime differing only from other war crimes in that it contains within itself the accumulated evil of the whole”***.

Just watch the video of the closing speech of Robert Jackson condemning the Nazis (cited earlier). It was a superlative public relations Tribunal, because, it was utmost important for the United States of America, the emerging superpower from the ashes of World War II, to pontificate to the entire world its moral and military supremacy, and condemn the abhorrence of aggression of the Nazis as it was itself entering a new Cold War with the new enemy. Nuremberg was entirely about public relations. And the United States judges at Nuremberg wanted to make an outstanding example of the Nazi war machine and its bankster to demonstrate their own moral high grounds.

Despite all of these empirical motivations, those who controlled the Bank of England, call it *Foundation-X* for the lack of a better handle to refer to this non-existent power which none can see, could spring one of their own from the sure jaws of death?

This incontrovertible fact and its significance indicates the existence of a power which is superior to the combined power of the victorious allies of World War II.

So, the evidence of Hjalmar Schacht being set-free unequivocally demonstrates at least the existence of an elusive omnipotent power in 1946.

And we already know that this immense power also existed in 1917, when the Balfour Declaration was issued in its name (see [Part-2](#)).

Foreign Office,  
November 2nd, 1917.

Dear Lord Rothschild,

I have much pleasure in conveying to you, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations which has been submitted to, and approved by, the Cabinet

"His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country"

I should be grateful if you would bring this declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist Federation.



Caption Revisiting the Curse of Canaan: The Balfour Declaration November 2nd 1917 - The first-cause of Palestinian genocide in the Land of Canaan is in the Name of a Rothschild and yet they don't know that name!

cataclysmic event where that elusive power could have disappeared. If one exists in secret classified archives, like aliens abducting them off the face of the planet, I do not possess such

Where did that amazing power, which was confirmed to exist in 1917 when it prevailed upon the British empire to grant the Zionists another's land, and again in 1946 when it prevailed upon the British and American empires to grant amnesty to their own arch enemy that had seen tens of millions of Christians dead, so suddenly vanish in the mere 60 years since?

Did the earth swallow it, did the sky absorb it, or was there an earthquake which sunk it?

What happened to it?

In my experiments in confusion, I valiantly searched for such a catastrophic event which could have silently vanquished that *Foundation-X* which had existed only 60 years earlier.

I am sorry to report here that there is no known documentation existing on planet earth in the annals of public archives which records any such

powers to access those classified documents, let alone unlock them of their public relations baggage. We shall just wait for [Wikileaks](#) to let us know if UFO-Abduction is indeed that elusive cause of their sudden vanishing from the face of the earth. [Julian Assange](#) has already hinted: *“it is worth noting that in yet-to-be-published parts of the cablegate archive there are indeed references to UFOs.”*

In the meantime, back here on earth outside the Plato's cave, by the sheer force of inevitable logic, I must rationally conclude that such a power, *Foundation-X*, still exists right here on earth. And, since I have also not found, despite vigorous search in libraries and on the web, any evidence that the *Foundation-X* ownership surreptitiously changed hands except from generation to generation within the same DNA cess-pool, and as admitted by the scions now wielding the baton themselves, then, whomsoever were the owners of *Foundation-X* in 1946, and in 1917, are still the owners today.

### **Casa de Rothschild!**

Let me know if this sufficiently constitutes Jeff Blankfort's requirement for evidence: ***“if you have any direct evidence with unimpeachable sources that the Rothschilds are running everything”***

Now let me briefly examine the legal requirement for evidence in the United States. The following definition is excerpted from my Editorial: [Some Dare Call it Conspiracy! Are you among them?](#) April 19, 2009:

**Conspiracy:** “in law, agreement of two or more persons to commit a criminal or otherwise unlawful act. At common law, the crime of conspiracy was committed with the making of the agreement, but present-day statutes require an overt step by a conspirator to further the conspiracy. Other controversial aspects of conspiracy laws include the modification of the rules of evidence and the potential for a dragnet. A statement of a conspirator in furtherance of the conspiracy is admissible against all conspirators, even if the statement includes damaging references to another conspirator, and often even if it violates the rules against hearsay evidence. The conspiracy can be proved by circumstantial evidence. Any conspirator is guilty of any substantive crime committed by any other conspirator in furtherance of the enterprise. It is a federal crime to conspire to commit any activity prohibited by federal statute, whether or not Congress imposed criminal sanctions on the activity itself.” -- Columbia

Permit me to highlight the core legal standard in that passage with emphasis:

- 1) The conspiracy can be proved by circumstantial evidence.**
- 2) Any conspirator is guilty of any substantive crime committed by any other conspirator in furtherance of the enterprise.**
- 3) A statement of a conspirator in furtherance of the conspiracy is admissible against all conspirators, even if the statement includes damaging references to another conspirator, and often even if it violates the rules against hearsay evidence.**

My goodness! The entire gang of banksters despite their web of control can be roped in even if one conspirator can be indicted. I have just demonstrated the corrupting power of the banker fraternity, and shown that the Casa de Rothschild exists today because it existed in 1917 and 1946 by the evidence of Balfour Declaration and Nuremberg Military Tribunals, respectively. This fraternity has such immense powers that it can legally enact Federal Statutes, like the Federal Reserve System of the United States, by having the American Congress enact their preferences into law. When such an extortion happens, the above artfully defined definitions of conspiracy become irrelevant. The law of the sovereign becomes the ultimate arbiter of what is crime and what is virtue, as aptly demonstrated by Saint Augustine of Hippo in the 4th century:

**“When the King asked him what he meant by infesting the sea, the pirate defiantly replied: *‘the same as you do when you infest the whole world; but because I do it with a little ship I am called a robber, and because you do it with a great fleet, you are an emperor.’*”** (*The City of God against the Pagans*, Page 148).

This modus operandi, of theft of public's wealth by legalism enactment by the sovereign, also appears to be right out of the *Protocols*. Witness [Protocol 1](#), items 3 through 5 which lend an empirical definition to the term “legal” when applied to control the masses:

3. It must be noted that men with bad instincts are more in number than the good, and therefore the best results in governing them are attained by violence and terrorisation, and not by academic discussions. Every man aims at power,

everyone would like to become a dictator if only he could, and rare indeed are the men who would not be willing to sacrifice the welfare of all for the sake of securing their own welfare.

4. What has restrained the beasts of prey who are called men? What has served for their guidance hitherto?

5. In the beginnings of the structure of society, they were subjected to brutal and blind force; after words – to Law, which is the same force, only disguised. I draw the conclusion that by the law of nature right lies in force.

Based on insights gleaned from these contortions, especially item 5), if you can enact Federal Statutes and laws to protect your graft by wielding the hidden might of your indomitable force, then, there is no “conspiracy” in the legal terms because you did not violate any Federal Statutes!

Isn't that just marvellous?

So, the House of Rothschilds, using their hired front men and political errand boys, backed by their interlocking interests in all the world's central banks, have protected themselves from that definition of Conspiracy by shrewdly employing the uber-Machiavellian Protocols!

But have they protected themselves from RICO?

See my [editorial](#) which contains an extended excerpt of laws from the late Eustace Mullins' 1985 book *World Order*, which could have potentially been used in earlier times.

I now believe that the accelerated pace towards world government today, under the complete co-option of all organs of state worldwide, makes the bankster fraternity almost immune by way of any legal recourse in the entire Western Hemisphere. They might occasionally sacrifice a red herring errand boy here and there at the altar of reform to keep the plebeians happy, if it ever came to that! These are the ultimate UNTOUCHABLES! No one can even see them.

I hope that between [Part-2](#) and [Part-3](#) of this series of my goyish attempts at independent thinking, there is sufficient grounds for courageous moral Jews like Mr. Jeffrey Blankfort to finally perceive their own brethren – the King of the Jews – who have bestowed upon Zionistan its creation. Its ethos. Its “iron wall” that none can breach. Their full spectrum interlocking

control of the world's private central banks continually enables them to implement their own two centuries old familial boast ***“give me control of a nation's money supply and I care not who makes its laws”*** with such brazen impunity that it is almost always accompanied by the thunderous applause of European and American goy statesmen and law makers. The King of the Jews have inflicted upon the entire Jewish peoples a calumny that the Jews shall not be able to outlive even if they exist for another 3000 years! See: [From Genesis to Genocide in Palestine : The Golem Is Not Jewish!](#). The following sentiment barely captures it:

'If fair punishments are ever to be awarded for their crimes against humanity for just the past 100 years in any Just court of law, Adolph Eichmann would have to be retroactively let go by resurrecting his soul from his grave with high honors and awarded multiple peace prizes plus compensation, in order to administer hanging and extraction of restitution as the graduated scale of ultimate punishment for the ultimate prime-movers of all wars and pestilence before which their errand boys' and patsies' crimes against humanity pale in comparison.' --- <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/11/rescuing-thestruggle-for-palestine.html>

All persons of any faith (or no faith) not entirely consumed by depravity, apathy, Faustian pacts, and if I might be so bold as to emphatically add, pious hypocrisy, should have no qualms calling a spade a spade. What prevents one from doing so, is suggested in my pamphlet: [How To Return to Palestine This Day Forward](#).

What can one do about it today? Practicably nothing, as suggested in: [“Of Ostriches and Rebels on The Hard Road to World Order”](#).

But I pray that I am mistaken, that Machiavellian political science and infinitely deep pockets of the oligarchy exuded through their tax exempt foundations, private central banks, income tax levied upon masses, and national debt levied upon nations – an inflexion of power which can bring combined superpowers to their knees – can straightforwardly be trumped by copious narratives of dissent chiefs and plebeians' abundant prayers!

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen of the jury.

**Source URL:** <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2011/01/omnipotent-rothschilds->

where-is-proof.html

**Part-3 Correspondence version URL:** <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/12/my-confusion-pt3-omnipotent-rothschilds.html>

**Mirror URL:** <http://bloghumanbeingsfirst.wordpress.com/2011/01/05/omnipotent-rothschilds-where-is-proof-by-zahir-ebrahim/>

**Source PDF:** <http://humanbeingsfirst.files.wordpress.com/2011/01/omnipotent-rothschilds-where-is-proof-by-zahir-ebrahim.pdf>

---

The author, an ordinary researcher and writer on contemporary geopolitics, a minor justice activist, grew up in Pakistan, studied EECS at MIT, engineered for a while in high-tech Silicon Valley (patents [here](#)), and retired early to pursue other responsible interests. His maiden 2003 book was rejected by six publishers and can be read on the web at <http://PrisonersoftheCave.org>. He may be reached at <http://Humanbeingsfirst.org>. Verbatim reproduction license at <http://www.humanbeingsfirst.org#Copyright>.

---

01/05/2011 08:00:11 5758