The Venetian Takeover of English Banking

Lesson by Dr. Douglas Gabriel

Douglas Gabriel gives a brief introduction to the summarized article below. We suggest that you listen to his lecture first, then continue reading for details.
The oligarchical system of Great Britain is not an autochthonous product of English or British history. It represents rather the tradition of the Babylonians, Romans, Byzantines, and Venetians which has been transplanted into the British Isles through a series of upheavals. The status of Britain as the nation foutué of modern history is due in particular to the sixteenth and seventeenth century metastasis into England and Scotland of the Venetian oligarchy along with its philosophy, political forms, family fortunes, and imperial geopolitics. The victory of the Venetian party in England between 1509 and 1715 built in turn upon a pre-existing foundation of Byzantine and Venetian influence.

Venetian influence in England was mediated by banking. Venetian oligarchs were a guiding force among the Lombard bankers who carried out the “great shearing” of England which led to the bankruptcy of the English King Henry III, who, during the 1250’s, repudiated his debts and went bankrupt. The bankruptcy was followed by a large-scale civil war.

It was under Venetian auspices that England started the catastrophic conflict against France known today as the Hundred Years’ War. In 1340, King Edward III of England sent an embassy to Doge Gradenigo announcing his intention to wage war on France, and proposing an Anglo-Venetian alliance. Gradenigo accepted Edward III’s offer that all Venetians on English soil would receive all the same privileges and immunities enjoyed by Englishmen. The Venetians accepted the privileges and declined to join in the fighting. Henceforth, English armies laying waste to the French towns and countryside would do so as Venetian surrogates. France was in no position to interfere in the final phase of the rivalry between Venice and Genoa, which was decided in favor of Venice. The degeneracy of English society during these years of Venetian ascendancy is chronicled in the writings of Chaucer – the greatest English writer of the age – who was an ally of the anti-Venetian Dante- Petrarca- Boccaccio grouping.
Henry VII’s suppression of the oligarchs displeased Venice. Venice also did not like Henry’s policy of alliance with Spain, secured by the marriage of his heir to Catherine of Aragon. Henry VII in fact sought good relations with both France and Spain. The Venetians wanted England to become embroiled with both France and Spain. Venice was also fundamentally hostile to the modern nation-state, which Henry was promoting in England. When Henry VII’s son Henry VIII turned out to be a murderous pro-Venetian psychotic and satyr, the Venetians were able to re-assert their oligarchical system.

Henry VIII was King of England between 1509 and 1547. His accession to the throne coincided with the outbreak of the War of the League of Cambrai, in which most European states, including France, the Holy Roman Empire (Germany), Spain, and the papacy of Pope Julius II della Rovere joined together in a combination that bid fair to annihilate Venice and its oligarchy. The League of Cambrai was the world war that ushered in the modern era.
in the modern era. Henry VIII attracted the attention of the Venetian oligarchy when he – alone among the major rulers of Europe – maintained a pro-Venetian position during the crisis years of 1509-1510, just as Venice was on the brink of destruction. Henry VIII was for a time the formal ally of Venice and Pope Julius. The Venetian oligarchy became intrigued with England.

In 1527, when Henry VIII sought to divorce Catherine of Aragon, the Venetian-controlled University of Padua endorsed Henry’s legal arguments. Gasparo Contarini, the dominant political figure of the Venetian oligarchy, sent to the English court a delegation which included his own uncle, Francesco Zorzi. The oligarch and intelligence operative Zorzi, consummately skilled in playing on Henry’s lust and paranoia, became the founder of the powerful Freemasonic tradition in the Tudor court. Later, Henry VIII took the momentous step of breaking with the Roman Papacy to become the new Constantine and founder of the Anglican Church.

He did this under the explicit advice of Thomas Cromwell, a Venetian agent who had become his chief adviser. Thomas Cromwell was Henry VIII’s business agent in the confiscation of the former Catholic monasteries and other church property, which were sold off to rising families. Thomas Cromwell thus served as the midwife to many a line of oligarchs.
Under the impact of the War of the League of Cambrai, the Venetian oligarchy realized the futility of attempting a policy of world domination from the tiny base of a city-state among the lagoons of the northern Adriatic. As was first suggested by the present writer in 1981, the Venetian oligarchy (especially its “giovani” faction around Paolo Sarpi) responded by transferring its family fortunes (fondi), philosophical outlook, and political methods into such states as England, France, and the Netherlands. Soon the Venetians decided that England (and Scotland) was the most suitable site for the New Venice, the
future center of a new, world-wide Roman Empire based on maritime supremacy. Success of this policy required oligarchical domination and the degradation of the political system by wiping out any Platonic humanist opposition.

The overall Venetian policy was to foment wars of religion between the Lutherans, Calvinists, and Anglicans on the one hand, and the Jesuit-dominated Catholic Counter-reformation of the Council of Trent on the other. The Venetians had spawned both sides of this conflict and exercised profound influence over them. The Venetians insisted on the maintenance of a Protestant dynasty and a Protestant state church in England, since this made conflict with the Catholic powers more likely. The Venetians demanded an anti-Spanish policy on the part of London, generally to energize the imperial rivalry with Madrid, and most immediately to prevent the Spanish army stationed in Milan from getting an opportunity to conquer Venice.

The destruction of the English mind was fostered by the Venetians under the banner of murderous religious fanaticism. Under Henry VIII, the English population continued in their traditional Roman Catholicism, which had been established in 644 at the synod of Whitby. Then, in 1534, Henry’s and Thomas Cromwell’s Act of Supremacy made the Roman Pope anathema. Those who refused to follow Henry VIII down this path, like St. Thomas More and many others, were executed. This first phase of Anglicanism lasted until 1553, when the Catholic Queen Mary I (“Bloody Mary,” the daughter of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon) took power. Mary re-established Papal authority and married King Philip of Spain. Bloody Mary’s main adviser in her proscriptions was Cardinal Reginald Pole, who had lived in Venice for some years and was part of the immediate circle around Gasparo Contarini.

Henry VIII had feared Pole, an heir to the Plantagenets, as a possible pretender, and Pole had done everything to excite Henry’s paranoia. Pole incited Bloody
Mary to carry out a bloodbath with 300 to 500 prominent victims. These executions of the “Marian martyrs” were immortalized in John Foxe’s celebrated *Book of Martyrs* (1554), a copy of which was later kept in every church in England and which attained the status of a second Bible among Protestants of all types. The events orchestrated by Pole seemed to many Englishmen to prove the thesis that a Catholic restoration would threaten their lives and property.

Bloody Mary died in 1558 and was succeeded by Elizabeth I, the daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn. From the Catholic point of view Elizabeth was a bastard, so it was sure that she would rule as a Protestant. Elizabeth forcibly restored her father’s Anglican or Episcopal Church.

Three times within the span of 25 years the English population was thus coerced into changing their religion under the threat of capital punishment. Three times, the supposedly eternal verities taught by the village parson were turned upside down, clearly because of dynastic ambition and raison d’état. The moral, psychological, and intellectual destruction involved in this process was permanent and immense.

Elizabeth’s anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish policies fulfilled the basic Venetian imperatives. The struggle against the Spanish Armada in 1588 also gave these policies an undeniable popularity. Elizabeth was for 40 years under the influence of William Cecil, whom she created First Baron of
Burleigh and Lord Treasurer. The Cecils were notorious assets of Venice; their ancestral home at Hatfield house was festooned with Lions of St. Mark. When William Cecil was too old to act as Elizabeth’s controller, he was succeeded by his son Robert Cecil, the 1st Earl of Salisbury. The Venetian-Genoese Sir Horatio Pallavicini was an important controller of English state finance.

Elizabeth’s economic policies had strong elements of mercantilism. The numerous industrial monopolies she promoted had the result of establishing new areas of production in the country. Cecil developed the merchant marine and the navy. There were taxes to support those unable to work, and a detailed regulation of jobs and working conditions. Many of these successful measures were coherent with the Venetian desire to build up England as the new world empire and as a counterweight to the immense power of Spain.

At the death of Elizabeth, Robert Cecil masterminded the installation of the Stuart King of Scotland as King James I of England. James I was an enthusiastic supporter of Paolo Sarpi in Sarpi’s 1606 struggle against the Papal Interdict. James I did this in part by the Pope. Venetian influence at the Stuart court was accordingly very great. Sarpi even talked of retiring to England.

James’s feeble pro-Spanish appeasement policy bitterly disappointed Paolo Sarpi, Cecil’s boss and the leading Venetian intelligence chief of the era. James made peace

Robert Cecil, 1st Earl of Salisbury
with Spain in 1604, ending 19 years of war. Cecil then tried to induce James into an anti-Spanish policy with a planned provocation – Guy Fawkes and the Gunpowder plot of 1605. Sarpi schemed to unleash the Thirty Years’ War (1618-1648) as an apocalyptic confrontation between Protestant and Catholic Europe, and he wanted England in the fray. James’s adviser, Sir Francis Bacon of the Cecil family, urged James to enter the war against Spain and Austria, but James first attempted to mediate the conflict and then did nothing. Charles I was equally disappointing: He married the Catholic Princess Henrietta Maria of France and helped France to defeat the French Calvinists or Huguenots – a Venetian asset – in their stronghold of LaRochelle.

With their tirades about their own divine right, the early Stuarts were violating a cardinal point of the Venetian political code. Venice was an oligarchy ruled by, at most, a few thousand male nobles. In practice, power belonged to several dozen patrician leaders. But no single patrician was strong enough to dominate all the rest as dictator. The Grand Council (Maggior Consilgio) was
the general assembly of the nobility, and elected the Senate or Pregadi. The Grand Council, using a complicated procedure, also elected the Doge or Duke, who occupied the highest post in the state. The Doge was accordingly an elected and limited executive who served for life. This office was never hereditary; when one Doge died, a new one was elected by the Maggior Consiglio. The Doge was surrounded by his cabinet or Collegio, including the ministers (savi) of various departments. Under this system, the Doge was not the leader of a nation and the protector of all the people, as an absolute monarch might be; he was the chief functionary of a consortium of noble families who owned and ran the state for the private profit of their own fondi. For the Venetians, an oligarchy required the weak executive power of a Doge, and this was the system they wanted transplanted into their clone, England.

England was the country where the triumph of the oligarchs was eventually most complete. This is even clearer if we bear in mind that the English gentry and squires correspond to the level of count in the continental titled aristocracy. The English gentry were determined that they, and not intendants from the government in Whitehall, would rule in the shires.

Parliamentary leaders wanted to establish an oligarchy by the surrender of the King to Parliament so they could build up a navy and hasten the looting of the Spanish Empire in the Caribbean. They wanted a more vigorous pursuit of the slave trade. Pym and Hampden asserted Parliamentary authority by passing bills of impeachment and attainer against royal favorites like Strafford and Archbishop Laud, the head of the Church of England, who were both executed. In 1641, Charles I tried to arrest Pym and Hampden. The pro-Venetian City of London, the ports, and the south and east of England rebelled against this botched coup by the stupid King, who fled north. The English Civil War, or Puritan Revolution, was on. Many English were appalled by the miserable level of leadership and wretched programs of both the sides. The civil war was artificially imposed by two rival London cliques, both under Venetian influence.
England would be the only major European country in which a war of religion would be fought between two pro-Venetian Protestant factions – the Anglican royalist cavaliers and the Parliamentary Puritan Roundheads. During the first phase of the civil war, (1642-1646), there emerged two factions among the Parliamentarian Roundheads. A more conservative group favored a limited, defensive war against Charles I, followed by a negotiated peace. They hoped to defeat Charles by using a foreign army, preferably the Scottish one, in order to avoid arming the English lower orders. The Scots demanded for England a Presbyterian state church on the model of their own kirk – run by synods of Calvinist elders – but that was what the majority of the Long Parliament wanted anyway. So, this faction came to be called the Presbyterians. Among them were the Calvinist town oligarchy of London.

The other group wanted total war and eventually the execution of the King and the end of the monarchy and the House of Lords. This group was willing to accept a standing army of sectarian religious fanatics in order to prevail. This group was called the Independents or Congregationalists. They were favored by Venice. Oliver Cromwell emerged as the leader of this second group.
Oliver Cromwell was a Venetian agent. Prominent in Oliver Cromwell’s family tree was the widely hated Venetian agent Thomas Cromwell (1485-1540), Earl of Essex and the author of Henry VIII’s decision to break with Rome and found the Church of England. Oliver Cromwell (1599-1658) was descended from Thomas Cromwell’s sister. Oliver Cromwell’s uncle had married the widow of the Genoese-Venetian financier Sir Horatio Pallavicini. This widow brought two children by her marriage to Pallavicini and married them to her own later Cromwell children. So, the Cromwell family was intimately connected to the world of Venetian finance.

In March 1655, Cromwell decided in favor of a “thorough” Bonapartist military dictatorship. The country was divided into 11 ad hoc districts, and a major-general of the army was put in charge of each district. The major-generals controlled the local militia, ran the courts, appointed all officials, and suppressed public immorality. All of this was done arbitrarily, with little reference to law. The rule of the Major-Generals prefigured European fascism. But they alienated many oligarchs who found this interference far worse than that of Charles I.

The second Protectorate parliament was impelled by desperation to pass the Humble Petition and Advice, which urged Cromwell to take up the crown. But it was a doge’s crown, a limited monarchy of the House of Cromwell subject to Parliament. Under pressure from the army generals, Cromwell declined the title of king but accepted all the
rest. In February 1658, Cromwell dissolved his last Parliament, and died the same year. Finally, the army split into pieces; the commander of the winning piece, General Monck, joined the new Parliament in recalling Charles II, the son of the executed Charles I.

Observing these events, the pro-Venetian writer John Milton – who had been Latin secretary to Cromwell’s Council of State – lamented that the City of London had concluded that “nothing but kingship can restore trade.” Milton’s *Ready and Easy Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth*, issued in March, 1660, proposed a regime based on a Grand Council along explicitly Venetian lines, with life tenure and co-optation of new members. This could be obtained, Milton thought, by declaring the Rump perpetual and capable of co-opting new members when the old ones died off. Milton had wanted religious tolerance, but he was willing to sacrifice this to obtain an oligarchy without a single-person executive. Milton effusively praised Venice, which had made its “whole aristocracy immovable” with similar methods.

Today some members of the British oligarchy are calling for the end of the monarchy and the creation of a republic. We must recall that the last time this was tried, the result was the fascist dictatorship of Oliver Cromwell and his major-generals. A “republic” in Britain in the early 21st century might turn out to be a military dictatorship rather similar to Cromwell’s.

Cromwell’s rule marked the triumph of free trade, as it was understood at that time. All attempts by government to supervise the quality of production, to fix prices, to maintain jobs and employment, to influence labor-management relations, or to influence wage rates were wholly abandoned. The City of London demanded free trade.

The Anglo-Venetians decided that they were fed up with the Catholic,
pro-French and wholly useless Stuart dynasty. Representatives of some of the leading oligarchical families signed an invitation to the Dutch King, William of Orange, and his Queen Mary, a daughter of James II. John Churchill, the future Duke of Marlborough, was typical of James’ former supporters who now went over to support William and Mary. William landed and marched on London. This is called by the British the “Glorious Revolution” of 1688; in reality, it consolidated the powers and prerogatives of the oligarchy, which were expressed in the Bill of Rights of 1689. No taxes could be levied, no army raised, and no laws suspended without the consent of the oligarchy in Parliament. Members of Parliament were guaranteed immunity for their political actions and free speech.

Soon, ministers could not stay in office for long without the support of a majority of Parliament. Parliament was supreme over the monarch and the state church. At the same time, seats in Parliament were now bought and sold in a de facto market. The greater the graft to be derived from a seat, the more a seat was worth. Within a few years after the Glorious Revolution there was a Bank of England and a national debt. When George I ascended the throne in 1714, he knew he was a Doge, the leader of an oligarchy.

The regime that took shape in England after 1688 was the most perfect copy of the Venetian oligarchy that was ever produced. The Venetian Party was broadly hegemonic, and Britain was soon the dominant world power.

The struggles of seventeenth-century England were thus decisive in parlaying the strong Venetian influence which had existed before 1603 into the long-term domination by the British Venetian Party observable after 1714. These developments are not phenomena of English history per se. They can only be understood as aspects of the infiltration into England of the metastatic Venetian oligarchy, which in its British Imperial guise has remained the menace of mankind.
Dr. Douglas Gabriel summarizes *The Venetian Takeover of English Banking* which brings to light the Venetian plan to supplant the Roman Catholic Pope, the European monarchy and any others who tried to slow down their insatiable desire for hegemony. The Venetian Republic became the new model for ruling a kingdom through multiple committees of oligarchs who exercise total control over the civic population, including imprisonment for debt or even assassination of those who got in the way of the bankers making money. The financing of war became the biggest business these warlord bankers conducted. The control of kings, queens, popes and despots fell to the control of central banks that came to rule most European nations as monarchs were transplanted by Italian Republics.

**The Anglo-Venetian Alliance**

Webster G. Tarpley’s description of the influence of Venice on London (CityofLondon) in the article above is one that is seldom found in a history book. Yet, it is quite true and consistent with historians who “follow the money” to original sources. History is a collection of biographies and monarchies, doges, oligarchs, and greedy banking families who often fall prey to lower vices and become despots in the process. The battle between the “Republic” and the monarchy is described showing that the idea of the “divine right of Kings” was more an economic consideration rather than a religious one. A single monarch decided the fate, life, and death of their subjects based upon loans made by Warlord Banking Families. Those in control of money were more powerful than popes, kings, and queens. The financing of political aims could restructure a nation, a government, a continent.
We will see in the condensed and abbreviated article next in our banking series, by Gerald Rose, further substantiation of the same ideas that Venice and Italian central bankers molded the history and destiny of the British through devious and immoral plots to control and direct the monarchy through questionable banking practices. The continuing plans to turn the British monarchy into a Venetian Republic of oligarchs is obvious to those who follow the path of Italian banking families infiltrating British economics.