

---

## Book Review

---

### A 'conspiracy' book by the conspirators

by Carol White

---

#### The Anglo-American Establishment

by Carroll Quigley

1981 Books in Focus

---

This book opens with a deliciously conspiratorial note from the publisher, Stephen A. Zarlenga, to the effect that the manuscript of this book was discovered under mysterious circumstances on the Island of Rhodes in 1967, eighteen years after Quigley had written it. Why did Quigley write it? Well, he says in his preface that his purpose was not to attack the Anglo-American establishment to whose purposes he subscribes, but to expose the conspiratorial method by which it operates to its own detriment.

Under the circumstances one wonders why it was suppressed for 33 years, only now to see the light of day. Reading the book does not provide the answer.

As one who has also written a book on the subject, I found the author's concurrence with my surmises about the importance of the Cecil Rhodes circle in the 19th-century British Round Table grouping satisfying, although, typical of his general method, Quigley failed to identify the historic role of the Cecil family from the time of Francis Bacon's uncle, William Cecil, the evil counsellor of Elizabeth I. The most damning part of the book, as an exposé of British policy, is his dating the Round Table commitment to force Nazism on Germany, to the immediate post-World War I period.

That said, and the publication of his later work *Tragedy*

and *Hope* taken into consideration, a book which dealt with much the same material in greater detail, what made this book worthy of being metaphorically, at least, banned in Boston? And why publish it posthumously now?

An excerpt from the book, selected by the publishers for the jacket, encapsulates Quigley's stated purpose:

"It is not easy for an outsider to write the history of a secret group of this kind, but . . . it should be done, for this group is, as I shall show, one of the most important historical facts of the twentieth century. . . . I suppose in the long view my attitude would not be far different from that of the [society] . . . but agreeing with the group on goals, I cannot agree with them on methods. . . . In this group were persons who must command the admiration and affection of all who know of them. On the other hand . . . in this group were persons whose lives have been a disaster to our way of life. Unfortunately . . . the influence of of the latter kind has been stronger. . . . I have been told that the story I relate here would be better left untold. . . . The last thing I should wish is that anything I write could be used by the anglophobes . . . but I feel the truth . . . once told . . . can be of injury to no men of good will."

Clearly the book has a natural market among the wide circle of conspiracy buffs who have been cultivated by the radical right. Nonetheless, I venture the following hypothesis: I suggest that this book has mysteriously surfaced at this time as a deception operation by the same circles whom it purports to criticize. I suggest that they have done so to counter the far more devastating revelations about the Anglo-American establishment published in this journal and associated publications.

- The British monarchy runs the Anglo-American establishment as a top-down operation. It is a truly ludicrous supposition that Cecil Rhodes concocted the Round Table grouping from whole cloth, on the model of the Jesuits, and that Round Table strategists William Stead and Sir Alfred Milner were attracted to Rhodes by his ideological conviction. One has merely to reflect on the historic role of that far more powerful conspiracy, the East India Company, to recognize that the methods of the Round Table have been the methods of the British oligarchy since they lost the United States.

Quigley himself documents the role of Lord Esher, Reginald Baliol Brett, who as Governor of Windsor Castle served as the direct liaison from the monarchy to the group from the time of its formation. Rhodes from his earliest days in Africa was financed by the Beit Trust. His success in capturing 75 percent of the diamond trade in fact substantiates the claim that once he proved his capability, he was always under assignment from the government circles which assumed the responsibilities of the East India Company.

The diamond trade is a well-known medium of exchange for drugs, a trade patronized by the Crown and upper reaches of the British aristocracy. Milner joined Rhodes in South

Africa as High Commissioner, appointed by the Crown.

It is of course obvious, upon consideration, that the major areas of concern to the Round Table group are precisely those which the East India Company was forced to service, the Round Table's more liberal policy lines merely reflecting the realities of the would-be empire-builder in the modern world. If it was unpalatable to Americans in 1921 to designate the American branch of the Royal Institute of International Affairs by its name, necessitating the subterfuge of calling it the Council on Foreign Relations, how much less palatable for Quigley to give full cognizance to the "Royal" in its title.

- Quigley claims that the Round Table group were a bunch of idealists who gained inordinate power over government by attaching themselves to the Cecil circles, and that they were unchallenged in this power because they also controlled the media, in particular the *London Times* and *Economist*, and were thus immune from criticism. With the caveat that this power was delegated to them by government, that is by the monarchy itself, this was surely the case. However, Quigley then claims that with the advent of the Labour government to power in 1945, and the aging of some of its founding members, the Round Table grouping was eclipsed as a force.

Not only is this preposterous viewed in retrospect, at the time of Quigley's writing the connections of the Round Table grouping to the Fabian Society, which spawned the Labour Party, were well known.

- Quigley lied about the true nature of the Round Table grouping, even while he pretended to criticize it. He describes it as imperialist in foreign policy and concerned with social welfare domestically. It is truly amazing that this ardent supporter of Sen. Joseph McCarthy should not have noted that Mr. Toynbee, the Director of Intelligence for the Royal Institute, who had officially served in that same capacity during the war for the British Foreign Office, was a self-avowed communist sympathizer.

Perhaps the most amazing omission from this tell-it-all book is the true role of Arnold J. Toynbee.

As early as 1948, when returning GIs were just settling down to enjoy the fruits of victory, of celebrating the defeat of fascism, Toynbee quite openly plotted its reemergence in the book *Civilization on Trial*.

"Briefly stated, the regular pattern of social disintegration is a schism of the disintegrating society into a recalcitrant proletariat and a less and less effective dominant minority. The process of disintegration does not proceed evenly; it jolts along in alternating spasms of rout, rally and rout. In the last rally but one, the dominant minority succeeds in temporarily arresting the society's lethal self-laceration by imposing on it the peace of a universal state. Within the framework of the dominant minority's universal state the proletariat creates a universal church, and after the next rout, in which the disintegrating civilization finally dissolves, the universal church may live to be the chrysalis from which a new civilization

eventually emerges."

The tactic with the U.S.S.R. was to encourage Jacobin tendencies at the expense of those forces seeking détente and technological development. What may be less clear is the extent of British penetration into the Russian Orthodox Church-controlled wing of the KGB. Toynbee writes in *Janus at Seventy-Five*:

"For nearly a thousand years past, the Russians have been members, not of our Western Civilization, but of the Byzantine—a sister society, of the same Graeco-Roman parentage as our own. Nevertheless, the Russian members of this Byzantine family have always put up a strong resistance against threats of being overwhelmed by our Western world, and they are keeping up this resistance today. In order to save themselves from being conquered and forcibly assimilated by the West, they have repeatedly been constrained to make themselves masters of our Western technology."

A more succinct statement is found in his 1953 *The World and the West*.

Toynbee wrote there: "It looks as if, in the encounter between Russia and the West, the spiritual initiative—though not the technological lead,—has now passed, at any rate for the moment, from the Western to the Russian side. . . . [This] does not, of course, mean that communism is destined to prevail. . . . All the same, communism's success, so far as it has gone, looks like a portent of things to come."

It is beyond the scope of this review to document Toynbee's actual role in turning the KGB into a serviceable asset of British intelligence, but it should suffice to note that Quigley, up until the time of his death in 1977, never identified the evil of this man who carried the mantle of Rhodes and Milner.

In the same book, Toynbee wrote: "In the new gods who have made their epiphany [a reference to the Roman Empire] we are at last in the presence of divinities to whom we can devote ourselves with all our heart, mind and strength. Mithras will lead us as our captain, Isis will nurse us as our mother. Christ has emptied himself of his divine power and glory to become incarnate for our sake. . . . The new religions which were being offered to all men and women without respect of persons would have stuck in a philosophers' throat if the missionary had not sugared the strange pill for him. . . ."

"After the Greeks and Romans had conquered the world by force of arms, the world took its conquerors captive by converting them to new religions which addressed their message to all human souls. . . . Is something like this historic denouement of the Greco-Roman story going to be written into the unfinished history of the world's encounter with the West? We cannot say, since we cannot foretell the future. We can only see that something which has actually happened once, in another episode of history, must at least be one of the possibilities that lie ahead of us."

It was this perspective which Quigley did not see fit to attack.