CHAPTER 7

MONEY, BANKING, DEBT, AND POLITICAL POWER

CREDIT, WAR FINANCE, CENTRAL BANKS, INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, CRISIS, AND THE NEW INFRASTRUCTURE OF MONETARY LEVERAGE

Sixbert SANGWA

Open Christian Press

2026

BOOK DOI 10.65655/ocp.m21

CHAPTER DOI 10.65655/ocp.m21.c31

PAWNS, POWERS, AND PRINCIPALITIES

Chapter 7: Money, Banking, Debt, and Political Power

Copyright:	© 2026 Sixbert SANGWA
Edition:	First independent chapter edition, 2026
Chapter DOI:	https://doi.org/10.65655/ocp.m21.c31
Book DOI:	https://doi.org/10.65655/ocp.m21
Publisher:	Open Christian Press, a publishing imprint of Open Christian University and Center for Faith and Work
Publisher website:	https://press.openchristian.education
Publisher correspondence:	editor@openchristian.education
Author correspondence:	ssangwa@openchristian.education
License:	Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0), subject to third-party source rights.

Suggested citation

SANGWA, S. (2026). Money, banking, debt, and political power. In *Pawns, Powers, and Principalities: Secret Networks, Global Power, and the Biblical End-Time Conflict*. Open Christian Press. https://doi.org/10.65655/ocp.m21.c31

Research note

This chapter examines financial power through institutions, laws, contracts, balance sheets, debt instruments, payment systems, archival records, and specialist scholarship. Investigative works are used as sources of claims and documentary leads whose consequential allegations require independent verification. Association is not treated as command, creditor relationships are not automatically treated as political control, and no ethnic, religious, national, or occupational population is assigned collective guilt.

Evidentiary language used in this chapter

ESTABLISHED | STRONGLY SUPPORTED | PLAUSIBLE | CONTESTED | WEAKLY SUPPORTED | UNSUPPORTED

These labels describe the relationship between a claim and the evidence located. They are not substitutes for argument and do not convert uncertainty into certainty.

PART III | MECHANISMS OF INFLUENCE: MONEY, NETWORKS, AND POLICY

CHAPTER 7

MONEY, BANKING, DEBT, AND POLITICAL POWER

Credit, War Finance, Central Banks, International Institutions, Crisis, and the New Infrastructure of Monetary Leverage

> *"The rich rule over the poor, and the borrower is a slave to the lender." (Proverbs 22:7, CSB)*

Money is easy to misunderstand because most of its power is exercised without spectacle. A tank displays coercive capacity. A prison displays legal force. A ballot displays political choice. Credit often works more quietly. A loan can keep a government functioning through war, allow a household to purchase a home, permit a business to build a factory, or rescue a bank during a panic. The same instrument can also create dependence. A borrower who must refinance may discover that the lender's judgment about risk has become a practical limit on policy. A state whose currency is distrusted may discover that foreign exchange reserves, bond markets, payment channels, and creditor conditions narrow its room for maneuver. A bank that controls access to payments can affect a person's capacity to participate in ordinary economic life even without possessing police power.

That is the central problem of this chapter. Financial institutions can perform indispensable public functions while also concentrating extraordinary leverage. The fact that a mechanism is useful does not make it harmless. The fact that it can be abused does not make every use abusive. The historian therefore has to resist two mirror-image errors. One treats central banks, commercial banks, international financial institutions, and payment systems as neutral plumbing whose political consequences need not be examined. The other treats every bank as part of one hidden command structure and every crisis as deliberately manufactured. Neither position is adequate.

Chapter 6 established that revolutionary crises can be financed, exploited, infiltrated, or redirected without proving that one financier authored every revolution. It also treated the Russian case and Antony Sutton's claims at the level appropriate to revolution itself. This chapter does not retell that history. It asks the prior and broader question: how does financial leverage work? The answer requires us to understand money, credit, public debt, central banking, international banking networks, financial crises, sanctions, payment rails, and the emerging architecture of digital money.

The biblical warning in Proverbs 22:7 is not a technical theory of bond markets. Wisdom literature describes recurring moral and social realities, not an iron law that every borrower is literally owned by a lender. Yet the proverb identifies a durable truth: debt can alter relationships of freedom and dependence. Scripture neither condemns every loan nor romanticizes wealth. It regulates lending, condemns exploitation, denounces dishonest measures, warns against partiality toward the rich, and insists that money can become a rival master to God. Jesus' warning that no one can serve both God and money (Matthew 6:24) is therefore not detached from political economy. It names the spiritual danger that arises whenever a human instrument of exchange becomes an object of trust, identity, domination, or worship.

1. Money, Credit, Debt, and Banking: The Machinery in Plain Language

Money is not identical with wealth. A society's real wealth consists in productive capacity, land, skills, energy, infrastructure, knowledge, institutions, goods, services, and human labor. Money is a system of claims and accounting that helps people exchange, price, save, and settle obligations. Economists usually describe money by three functions: it serves as a medium of exchange, a unit of account, and a store of value. In modern economies, much of what people call money exists not as notes in wallets but as bank deposits recorded on balance sheets.

Credit is a promise about the future. When a bank extends a loan, it creates an asset for itself, the borrower's obligation to repay, and normally credits the borrower's deposit account. Commercial banks therefore do not merely transfer pre-existing piles of cash from savers to borrowers. Within regulatory and balance-sheet constraints, bank lending creates deposit money. That does not mean banks can create unlimited wealth by typing numbers into computers. Loans have to be funded and settled; banks face capital and liquidity requirements; borrowers can default; central banks influence the price and availability of reserves; and the real economy constrains what nominal claims can ultimately purchase.

That description needs one further distinction because popular accounts often confuse bank deposits with central-bank money. Commercial-bank lending typically creates a new deposit at the same time that it creates a loan asset; banks do not simply wait for a saver to place an equivalent pile of cash in a vault before they can lend. The Bank of England has explicitly rejected the simplistic textbook picture in which banks merely lend out pre-existing deposits or mechanically multiply a fixed stock of central-bank money. Balance-sheet expansion is constrained by profitability, capital and liquidity requirements, funding and settlement needs, credit risk, borrower demand, competition, and the stance of monetary policy (McLeay et al., 2014). This is a powerful capacity, but it is not alchemy: creating nominal claims does not create real goods, energy, skills, or productive capacity out of nothing.

Debt is the legal obligation generated when one party receives value now in exchange for repayment later. Interest compensates the lender for time, risk, inflation, opportunity cost, and other factors. Debt can be productive when it finances assets or activities whose future returns exceed the cost of borrowing. It can be destructive when used to conceal insolvency, sustain consumption that cannot be supported, speculate excessively, or bind a vulnerable party to conditions it cannot realistically escape.

A sovereign debt is the debt of a state. Governments commonly borrow by issuing bonds, which are tradable promises to make specified interest and principal payments. Bond markets allow governments to mobilize resources beyond current tax revenue. They also create a continuous process of judgment. Investors ask whether a government will repay, whether inflation will erode the value of repayment, whether the currency will depreciate, and whether political or legal changes will alter risk. The yield demanded on a bond is therefore both a price and a signal of confidence.

Commercial banks accept deposits, make loans, provide payment services, and perform other financial functions for households and firms. Investment banks and securities firms underwrite and trade securities, advise on transactions, and connect borrowers with capital markets. Merchant banks historically combined finance, trade, government lending, and cross-border relationships. Central banks occupy a different position. Their functions vary by country and period, but they commonly issue or anchor the currency, provide settlement balances to banks, conduct monetary policy, act as lender of last resort, manage reserves, and sometimes supervise financial institutions.

A bond market is not a secret society. A central bank is not necessarily privately controlled because private banks interact with it. A commercial bank's influence is not proved merely by its size. Yet financial institutions possess forms of power that are structurally different from ordinary market exchange. The ability to extend or withdraw credit, determine collateral eligibility, influence benchmark interest rates, provide emergency liquidity, clear payments, purchase government securities, or deny access to financial channels can change what governments, firms, and individuals are able to do.

The most important distinction is between *capacity* and *intent*. A payment system may possess the capacity to exclude an account without having been designed for political exclusion. A central bank may possess powerful emergency authorities without manufacturing the emergency that activates them. A creditor may influence policy because the borrower needs refinancing without issuing a secret order. If abuse is alleged, the historical task is to identify who exercised the capacity, under what authority, through what mechanism, with what purpose, and with what effect.

2. Why Governments Borrow, and How Creditors Acquire Leverage

States borrow for reasons that are often ordinary. Tax receipts arrive unevenly while expenditures continue every day. Large infrastructure projects may provide benefits across decades, making long-term financing reasonable. Recessions reduce tax revenue at the same time social spending rises. Wars, natural disasters, pandemics, banking rescues, and other emergencies can cause expenditures to surge faster than taxation can be increased. Borrowing allows the state to shift part of today's cost into the future.

This capacity can strengthen government. A state with deep, trusted capital markets can mobilize extraordinary resources quickly. Britain's eighteenth-century fiscal development is a classic example. Scholars of the "fiscal-military state" have shown how credible public borrowing, taxation, and financial administration helped Britain sustain wars that required resources far beyond annual revenue (Brewer, 1989). North and Weingast (1989) famously argued that institutional changes following the Glorious Revolution increased the credibility of government commitments and helped lower borrowing costs. Their thesis has been debated and refined, but the broader point remains: political institutions and financial credibility can reinforce one another.

The leverage appears when a borrower cannot easily say no. A government that depends on continuous refinancing is exposed to changes in investor confidence. If creditors refuse to roll over maturing debt, demand higher interest, or move capital out of the country, policymakers may face choices they would not otherwise make. This influence need not involve a meeting in a private room. It can arise from decentralized market behavior. Thousands of investors acting separately can produce a constraint as real as one large lender.

That distinction is essential. Structural financial power is not identical to conspiracy. A government may adopt austerity because bond yields rise, not because one banker telephoned the finance minister. Conversely, a private group may deliberately coordinate pressure through a syndicate, a loan negotiation, or a threat to withhold credit. In that case the evidence should show the participants, terms, communications, and decision process. The same visible outcome can therefore arise through different causal paths.

Sovereign debt also creates a problem of time. Politicians can receive the immediate benefit of spending while future taxpayers inherit repayment. This does not make public debt intrinsically immoral. It does mean that debt can obscure the distribution of burdens. War is the most dramatic case. Citizens can be mobilized today with money borrowed against future revenue. The political cost of taxation is deferred while the state acquires immediate capacity to fight.

The Bible's concern with debt speaks most directly to human relationships, especially the protection of the poor, rather than to modern sovereign-bond theory. Yet the moral principles remain relevant. The law of Moses restricted exploitative interest among covenant brothers in situations of poverty and provided mechanisms that prevented permanent economic bondage from becoming the normal condition of Israel (Exodus 22:25; Deuteronomy 15:1-11). Those provisions cannot simply be copied into modern monetary policy, but they reveal God's opposition to financial arrangements that turn vulnerability into permanent domination.

A Christian analysis should therefore ask more than whether a debt contract is legal. It should ask who bears the risk, whether the terms are transparent, whether consent is meaningful, whether the weak are exploited, whether losses are socialized while gains remain private, and whether political leaders use borrowing to conceal costs that citizens have a right to understand.

3. War Finance and the Historical Growth of Public Debt

War transformed European finance because war demanded money faster than ordinary taxation could supply it. Armies had to be paid before victory. Ships had to be built before trade expanded. Weapons, provisions, transport, fortifications, and allies all required current resources. The state that could borrow credibly gained an advantage over the state that could not.

The Bank of England emerged directly from this environment. Founded by Royal Charter in 1694, it was created as a private corporation whose subscribers provided a large loan to the government during war with France. The Bank's own institutional history states this plainly. Its origin was therefore neither a fantasy invented by later critics nor proof of a secret capture. It was a documented bargain between public need and private capital: investors provided funding, received privileges and returns, and a new institution became increasingly entangled with the fiscal capacity of the state (Bank of England, 2020, 2024).

The long-term consequence was larger than the original loan. Public debt became an asset that could be bought and sold. Government credibility became tied to financial markets. The Bank gradually acquired functions associated with modern central banking, including the management of government finance, note issue, settlement, and financial stability. The state gained access to deeper credit. Financial actors gained a durable relationship to the state's fiscal machinery.

This is the first major mechanism of political-financial interdependence: the government needs money, and the financial system needs enforceable public promises. Neither side is simply the puppet of the other. Their power becomes mutually reinforcing. Governments create the legal order within which contracts, banks, and securities exist. Banks and investors help governments mobilize resources beyond immediate taxation. In crisis, the interdependence can become leverage.

The Napoleonic era, nineteenth-century state formation, colonial expansion, railway construction, and two world wars deepened the connection between public finance and international capital. Merchant banks placed sovereign bonds across borders. Governments competed for access to London, Paris, Amsterdam, and later New York. Creditworthiness became geopolitical capacity. Default or exclusion could constrain diplomacy and military ambition.

War finance also exposes the moral ambiguity of financial innovation. Credit can defend a nation from aggression. It can also enable a state to wage destructive war longer than current taxation would permit. A bond can represent patriotic sacrifice to one citizen and profitable exposure to conflict for another. The institution is not morally self-interpreting. The purpose, information, distribution of risk, and conduct of the actors matter.

This helps correct a recurring error in exposé literature. The fact that banks finance governments on multiple sides of a conflict does not by itself prove that the banks authored the conflict. International finance often follows commercial logic: diversification, repayment prospects, access to markets, state guarantees, and the possibility of postwar business. To prove deliberate authorship of war, a historian needs evidence of planning, intent, operational influence, and causal implementation, not merely loans made before or during hostilities.

At the same time, historians should not sanitize documented influence. Credit can determine whether a government can continue fighting. Loan negotiations can include political conditions. Financial houses can lobby governments whose policies affect repayment. Currency arrangements can constrain wartime choices. In such cases finance is not a background variable. It is part of the machinery of state power.

4. International Banking Houses and the Nineteenth-Century Network

The nineteenth century produced a dense transnational financial system before electronic communications, global institutions, or modern multinational banks existed. Merchant-banking houses maintained family partnerships, correspondent relationships, agents, information networks, and reputations across borders. They underwrote sovereign loans, financed trade, arranged foreign exchange, placed railway securities, and connected governments to investors.

Carroll Quigley's treatment of "financial capitalism" is valuable when read within this historical context. He described an international system centered initially in London, with important nodes in Paris and New York, in which merchant and investment bankers could influence governments through the control and placement of loans, the management of foreign exchange, and personal relationships with officials (Quigley, 1966, pp. 324-326). Chapter 1 has already used one short quotation from this passage; it need not be repeated here. The new question is whether the mechanism Quigley described corresponds to the broader historical record.

In general form, it does. Larry Neal (1990) documents the growth of integrated capital markets in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Niall Ferguson's archival history of the Rothschild banking house shows how a family partnership distributed across major European financial centers could transmit information, mobilize capital, and deal with governments on a continental scale (Ferguson, 1998). Other houses, including Baring Brothers, Lazard, Warburg, Schroders, Seligman, and later J. P. Morgan, operated in overlapping but competitive networks. These were not one institution. They differed in nationality, strategy, political relationships, and commercial interest.

The Rothschild example deserves particular precision because it has been surrounded by both real history and grotesque myth. The family's banking network became extraordinarily influential. Its members financed governments, handled bond issues, moved bullion, and possessed information advantages that mattered in an era of slow communications. Those facts are historically significant. They do not justify assigning collective responsibility to Jews, Judaism, or any ethnic population for the operations of a specific banking family. Nor do they prove that the family secretly controlled every central bank, government, revolution, or war. Collective-guilt narratives are not strengthened by repetition. They are weakened by the failure to identify specific transactions and decisions.

Financial houses did exercise power. A large government loan required syndication, investor confidence, and distribution. A bank that had successfully placed previous loans could become a gatekeeper to market access. Reputation functioned as capital. Information functioned as capital. Personal trust among elite actors functioned as capital. These mechanisms made influence possible without requiring an all-commanding council.

The network structure also explains why later investigators repeatedly encountered the same names. A small number of firms were genuinely central to major cross-border transactions. Their directors sat on company boards, advised governments, underwrote securities, and socialized with political elites. Repeated appearance is therefore evidence of concentration and connectedness. It is not automatically evidence that every connected actor obeyed one command.

This distinction matters spiritually as well as historically. Scripture condemns false witness (Exodus 20:16). A believer does not defend truth by making a charge larger than the evidence. If a bank manipulated a market, document the manipulation. If a financier bribed an official, identify the payment. If a family partnership used political access to protect an investment, establish the correspondence. Precision does not protect darkness. Precision prevents accusation from becoming darkness.

5. Central Banking: Public Function, Private Interest, and Concentrated Discretion

A central bank sits at the intersection of money, government, and the banking system. That position creates unusual authority. In ordinary times, monetary policy influences short-term interest rates, financial conditions, credit creation, asset prices, exchange rates, and inflation. In crises, the central bank may become lender of last resort, emergency market-maker, or provider of liquidity to institutions that cannot obtain funding elsewhere. It also commonly operates or oversees critical payment infrastructure.

The public case for central banking is substantial. Banking systems are vulnerable to runs because banks transform short-term, withdrawable liabilities into longer-term assets such as loans. If many depositors demand cash simultaneously, even a solvent bank can fail. A lender of last resort can provide liquidity against good collateral and prevent panic from destroying institutions that are fundamentally sound. Walter Bagehot's *Lombard Street* (1873/1999) became the classic statement of this problem, although modern central banking has evolved far beyond his nineteenth-century framework.

Central banks can also stabilize payments and create a common settlement asset. Without a trusted final means of settlement, private bank money can fragment during crisis. The central bank's balance sheet provides an anchor that allows one bank's liabilities to be settled against another's.

The difficulty is that stabilization requires discretion. Someone must decide what collateral is acceptable, which institutions qualify for support, how much liquidity to provide, what interest rate to set, and when to withdraw assistance. These decisions distribute benefits and losses. A central bank that raises rates to restrain inflation may increase unemployment and debt-service costs. A central bank that lowers rates or purchases assets may support demand while also increasing asset prices. Emergency rescue can prevent systemic collapse while creating moral hazard if market participants expect future protection.

Central-bank independence is an attempt to manage one political problem by creating another. Independence can protect monetary policy from short-term electoral pressure, especially the temptation to finance deficits through inflation. Yet delegation to unelected specialists raises questions of democratic accountability. The issue is not solved by saying the bank is "independent." Independent from whom, for which decisions, under what statutory mandate, subject to what oversight, and accountable through what procedures? Those are institutional questions, not conspiracy slogans.

The same precision is necessary when public debate uses the phrase "printing money." Modern central banks can expand their balance sheets electronically by creating reserve balances, lending against collateral, or purchasing securities. Quantitative easing, for example, consists of large-scale asset purchases financed by the creation of central-bank reserves; its principal channels run through yields, portfolio rebalancing, liquidity, market functioning, aggregate demand, and expectations rather than through a literal printing press (Bank of England, 2022). Such operations can have profound distributional and fiscal consequences, especially when asset prices, government financing conditions, and the central bank's remittances to the treasury are affected. Criticism is therefore strongest when it identifies the actual balance-sheet mechanism, legal authority, beneficiaries, risks, and exit strategy rather than treating every monetary intervention as one undifferentiated act.

It is therefore wrong to classify all central banking as private rule, but equally wrong to pretend that central banks are merely technical agencies with no political consequences. Their authority is legally constituted, economically powerful, and distributive in effect. The more a crisis enlarges their balance sheets or expands the range of institutions they support, the more important transparent mandates, audit, legislative oversight, and public explanation become.

6. The Bank of England: From Private Corporation to Public Central Bank

The Bank of England is often used as a symbolic origin point in narratives about hidden financial rule. The actual history is more interesting than either the official caricature of purely neutral administration or the exposé caricature of uninterrupted private control.

The Bank was founded in 1694 as a privately owned corporation. More than a thousand original subscribers provided capital that supported a government loan during war with France. Shareholders received dividends, and qualified shareholders could vote in the Bank's corporate governance. Over time, however, the institution developed public functions increasingly distinct from those of an ordinary commercial bank. It became central to note issue, government finance, monetary administration, and the stability of the banking system (Bank of England, 2020, 2024).

This mixed history matters because retrospective labels can mislead. Calling the eighteenth-century Bank a "private bank" is correct as a statement about ownership. It is incomplete as a statement about function, since public privilege and government borrowing were built into its origin. Calling the modern Bank privately controlled is simply wrong. The Bank was nationalized in 1946. It is now wholly owned by the United Kingdom government, with its capital held on behalf of HM Treasury, while specified functions are exercised with operational independence (Bank of England, 2020).

William Guy Carr's *Pawns in the Game* presents a much stronger story. Carr claims that Nathan Mayer Rothschild effectively gained control of the Bank of England following financial operations associated with the Battle of Waterloo and that this control became a foundation for a larger international system (Carr, 1955, pp. 204-205). The historical record supports Rothschild's major importance in British and European government finance. It does not establish the specific claim that he secretly acquired institutional control of the Bank of England in 1815. The Bank's own shareholder and governance records describe a broader proprietary structure, and serious histories of the Rothschild house do not provide a documentary chain establishing the kind of corporate capture Carr alleges (Bank of England, 2020; Ferguson, 1998).

The correct verdict is therefore differentiated. The extraordinary influence of major merchant bankers over nineteenth-century government finance is ESTABLISHED. Rothschild's prominence in sovereign lending and bullion operations is ESTABLISHED. The proposition that Rothschild thereby "controlled the Bank of England" after 1815 is UNSUPPORTED as stated by the evidence reviewed for this chapter.

A careful conclusion does not make finance less important. It relocates power from mythology to mechanisms. A government dependent on access to markets can be influenced by those who organize market access. A central bank can constrain government through monetary and financial conditions even when no private family owns it. The real architecture of power is often institutional rather than genealogical.

The Bank's wartime history also demonstrates why public and private finance cannot be neatly separated. During the First World War, the Bank helped sustain government borrowing and financial stability when ordinary market demand was insufficient. Its unpublished institutional war history records that the 1914 War Loan was not fully taken up by the public and that the Bank and other banks absorbed a substantial part of the issue. The record is important because it shows the central bank acting not merely as a passive cashier but as an active stabilizer of sovereign finance at a moment of national emergency (Osborne, 1926).

The 1915 war-loan record adds another dimension. Archival material shows that officials deliberately structured and communicated the issue so that the public would not be alarmed by the government's full financing requirement. That does not establish a hidden project of permanent financial rule. It does establish a narrower and more defensible point: in crisis, monetary authorities can treat information management as part of financial stabilization. The ethical question is therefore not answered merely by citing a legitimate public purpose. It also concerns transparency, proportionality, democratic accountability, and whether withholding material information changes the public's ability to judge the policy itself (Bank of England Archive, 1915; Osborne, 1926).

This is the pattern that will recur throughout the chapter. Legitimate public purpose can coexist with concentrated discretion. The existence of a good purpose does not prove every method was good. The existence of secrecy does not prove the worst imaginable motive. Historical judgment must follow the records.

7. The Federal Reserve: A Secret Meeting, a Public Statute, and a Hybrid Structure

Few episodes illustrate the need for evidentiary precision better than the creation of the Federal Reserve System. Popular accounts often divide into two camps. One describes the Federal Reserve as a straightforward public reform enacted after financial panics. The other describes it as a private banking conspiracy conceived in secret and imposed on an unsuspecting nation. Both contain fragments of the story. Neither is sufficient by itself.

The secret meeting happened. In November 1910, Senator Nelson Aldrich, A. Piatt Andrew, Henry P. Davison, Arthur Shelton, Frank Vanderlip, and Paul Warburg met at the Jekyll Island Club in Georgia to draft a banking-reform plan. The participants concealed the purpose of the trip, traveled under a cover story, used first names, and kept the meeting confidential for years. Federal Reserve History, drawing on participant recollections and archival sources, now treats these facts as settled history (Richardson & Romero, 2015).

Secrecy was not incidental. Aldrich and the participants understood that visible Wall Street authorship could make reform politically toxic. The 1907 panic had intensified public suspicion of concentrated finance. Some of the men at Jekyll Island were precisely the kind of bankers critics feared would benefit from a central reserve institution. Their strategy was therefore to separate the technical plan from the reputational burden of its authorship.

That fact should not be minimized. Private financial elites had privileged access to the design process for a public institution. They possessed expertise, relationships, and agenda-setting power. Their proposal was not written through an open participatory process. These are historically documented features of the episode.

But the Jekyll Island plan was not the Federal Reserve Act secretly signed into law unchanged. The meeting produced the architecture of the Aldrich Plan for a National Reserve Association. It became the subject of public controversy, partisan opposition, congressional debate, revision, and political compromise. Democrats criticized its governance as too favorable to large banks. After the 1912 election, Carter Glass, Robert Owen, President Woodrow Wilson, Treasury officials, lawmakers, and advisers developed the legislation that became the Federal Reserve Act in December 1913. The final statute retained important technical similarities to the Aldrich proposals while altering governance and political control (Broz, 1997; Richardson & Romero, 2015).

The strongest historical conclusion is therefore neither "nothing secret happened" nor "a private meeting passed a private central bank into law." The secret meeting and its influence are ESTABLISHED. The final system emerged through a broader political process and legal statute, also ESTABLISHED. The existence of private influence over institutional design is not the same thing as proof that the resulting institution became the private property of the meeting's participants.

The Federal Reserve's present legal structure is hybrid and deliberately complex. The Board of Governors is a federal agency. The twelve regional Federal Reserve Banks are congressionally chartered entities with public responsibilities and distinctive corporate features. Eligible member commercial banks are required to subscribe to stock in their regional Reserve Bank. That stock is not ordinary corporate equity: it cannot be sold or pledged as conventional shares can, and it does not give member banks normal ownership rights over the Federal Reserve System. The Board of Governors states explicitly that the Federal Reserve System is not "owned" by anyone in the ordinary corporate sense (Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, 2026b).

This does not make governance questions disappear. Member banks have a role in selecting some regional Reserve Bank directors, although statutory rules limit which directors may participate in the selection of Reserve Bank presidents and the Board of Governors exercises oversight. Monetary policy is made through the Federal Open Market Committee, combining the federally appointed Board with Reserve Bank presidents under a structure created by law. The system is therefore neither a standard cabinet department nor a private banking corporation.

The ownership question is further clarified by what happens to earnings. The regional Reserve Banks are not operated for the ordinary residual benefit of member-bank shareholders. After operating expenses, statutory dividends, and the maintenance of required surplus arrangements, Federal Reserve net earnings are generally remitted to the U.S. Treasury under the governing framework. That fact does not settle every debate about influence, representation, or central-bank independence, but it directly contradicts the common image of the Federal Reserve as an ordinary private corporation whose profits simply belong to commercial-bank owners (Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, 2026b).

This distinction directly affects the credibility of older exposé claims. W. Cleon Skousen, drawing heavily on Quigley, described the Federal Reserve as not genuinely governmental and implied that its institutional form concealed private international-banker control (Skousen, 1970). Carr went further, asserting that the system placed affiliated American and European bankers in a position to bring about and control the First World War and that the war itself served a revolutionary program (Carr, 1955, pp. 215-218). The Jekyll Island record verifies the private planning meeting. It does not verify these much larger causal claims.

The audit question is another example of how an initially plausible criticism can become inaccurate when repeated after circumstances change or when distinctions are ignored. Claims that the Federal Reserve has "never been audited" are false. The Board of Governors and the Reserve Banks publish audited financial statements, independent public accounting firms conduct annual financial audits, the Office of Inspector General oversees specified work, and the Government Accountability Office has statutory authority to review many aspects of Federal Reserve operations, with legal limits around certain monetary-policy functions (Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, 2025, 2026a). A critic may reasonably debate whether the scope of oversight is sufficient. That is different from saying no audit exists.

The Federal Reserve case therefore provides one of the book's clearest methodological lessons. A real secret meeting can be documented. Real private influence on public institutional design can be documented. The design can create powerful unelected or semi-independent institutions. Yet none of those facts licenses a leap to universal private ownership, secret authorship of wars, or total control of government. The evidence is strongest when the mechanism is specific.

8. The Bank for International Settlements: Central-Bank Cooperation Made Institutional

If Jekyll Island illustrates elite financial planning before a public institution existed, the Bank for International Settlements illustrates something different: formalized transnational cooperation among central banks.

The BIS was established in 1930 in connection with the Young Plan for German reparations after the First World War. Its original functions included facilitating reparations-related payments and creating a permanent forum for central-bank cooperation. The organization survived the collapse of the interwar reparations framework and evolved into a major institution for monetary and financial cooperation (Bank for International Settlements, n.d.-a; Toniolo, 2005).

The BIS is frequently presented in exposé literature as the hidden apex of world banking. Carroll Quigley's well-known discussion of interwar financial capitalism placed the BIS near the apex of a system of central-bank coordination and emphasized private meetings, personal networks, gold flows, and government loans (Quigley, 1966, pp. 324-326). That passage is historically significant, but it must be read in time. Quigley was describing a particular interwar configuration and the ambitions of particular financial actors. He was not writing the charter of an eternal world government.

The modern BIS is publicly describable. It is owned by member central banks, not by a secret list of private shareholders. As of 2026, its membership comprises sixty-three central banks and monetary authorities whose economies account for most global output. Its governance includes a Board of Directors, general meetings of member central banks, and management. It provides banking services to central banks and international organizations and hosts committees that develop standards, research, and cooperative frameworks (Bank for International Settlements, n.d.-b).

That institutional transparency does not make the BIS politically trivial. A forum that convenes the world's leading central banks can influence norms, supervisory standards, payment architecture, capital requirements, and the vocabulary through which financial risks are understood. The Basel Committee's capital and liquidity standards, for example, do not operate like a world legislature, yet they can shape national banking regulation through adoption by participating jurisdictions. This is a form of transnational governance by expertise, coordination, and standard-setting rather than direct sovereignty.

The distinction matters. International coordination can solve real problems that no national central bank can solve alone. Capital moves across borders. Banks operate internationally. Payment systems interconnect. Financial crises propagate through balance sheets faster than legislatures can negotiate treaties. Cooperation can reduce systemic risk.

At the same time, coordination among technically powerful institutions raises questions about transparency, democratic authorization, and the formation of consensus outside ordinary electoral processes. Those questions do not require the claim that the BIS secretly commands governments. They arise from the documented structure itself. When standards formulated in international committees become de facto prerequisites for market credibility, national discretion can narrow even when formal sovereignty remains intact.

The Christian concern is not that cooperation across borders is inherently a Babel-like rebellion. Scripture condemns human pride and idolatrous unity, not every form of international coordination. The moral question is what authority is exercised, what ends it serves, whether truth and justice govern the process, and whether human beings are reduced to variables in systems whose managers become insulated from accountability.

9. Bretton Woods, the IMF, and the World Bank: Distinct Institutions, Real Conditional Power

The International Monetary Fund and the World Bank are often grouped together in popular criticism as though they were one institution. They are not. Both emerged from the Bretton Woods conference of 1944, but they were created for different purposes and possess different legal and operational structures.

The IMF was designed to support international monetary cooperation, exchange stability, and balance-of-payments adjustment. Its modern activities include surveillance of national economies, policy advice, lending to member states experiencing external-financing problems, technical assistance, and management of Special Drawing Rights. The World Bank Group, by contrast, is primarily concerned with long-term development finance, poverty reduction, infrastructure, institutional reform, and related development objectives. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the original World Bank institution, was initially created to support reconstruction and development (International Monetary Fund, 2025a; World Bank, 2026a).

Governance is not one-country-one-vote in the simple sense. IMF voting power is substantially linked to national quotas, which also influence financial contributions, access to resources, and allocations of Special Drawing Rights. World Bank voting likewise combines basic votes with share-based voting tied to capital subscriptions. This gives large economies greater formal influence than small ones (International Monetary Fund, 2025b; World Bank, 2026b).

That is not a secret. It is a published governance arrangement. But publication does not eliminate the political consequences. Lending institutions can acquire leverage when borrowers lack alternatives. IMF programs can include policy conditionality designed to restore external stability and repayment capacity. Conditions may address fiscal policy, monetary policy, exchange rates, state-owned enterprises, banking systems, subsidies, taxation, or structural reforms. Defenders argue that conditions protect pooled resources and address the causes of crisis. Critics argue that the institution can impose a standardized policy model on societies whose voters did not choose it, sometimes with severe distributional consequences (Vreeland, 2007; Woods, 2006).

Both arguments can contain truth. A country that has exhausted foreign exchange reserves cannot obtain unlimited external financing without adjustment. A lender that provides public international resources has legitimate reasons to ask whether repayment and stabilization are plausible. Yet emergency dependence changes bargaining power. The borrower enters negotiations under pressure. The stronger the financing gap, the narrower the range of politically feasible refusal.

This is financial power in a form more visible than conspiracy and more consequential than rhetoric. The influence is written into loan programs, letters of intent, review schedules, disbursement conditions, and governance arrangements. One does not need to imagine a hidden committee when the documentary record already shows the mechanism.

John Coleman interpreted the IMF through a far more sweeping framework. In *Conspirators' Hierarchy*, he alleged that international bankers and a "Ditchley Group" planned in the early 1980s to engineer a breakdown of the United States banking system and transfer control of American fiscal and monetary policy to the IMF, ultimately making it a supreme authority over world banking (Coleman, 1992). The claim is extraordinary. In the material reviewed for this chapter, Coleman does not provide an independently verifiable chain of primary records demonstrating the alleged plan, legal implementation, or command structure. Public IMF governance documents do not establish it. The claim should therefore be classified as UNSUPPORTED unless authenticated minutes, correspondence, legal instruments, or other independent evidence emerges.

Rejecting that claim does not exonerate every IMF policy from criticism. It protects criticism from contamination by claims that cannot be substantiated. The actual IMF is already powerful enough to examine without inventing a secret constitution.

10. The Mechanisms of Financial Power: From Market Access to Payment Exclusion

Financial power is easiest to understand when broken into mechanisms. The first is *credit allocation*. Whoever decides which borrower receives financing, at what price, and against what collateral can shape investment and survival. At the household level this affects housing and entrepreneurship. At the corporate level it affects expansion and bankruptcy. At the sovereign level it can affect whether a government can refinance itself.

The second is *liquidity*. A solvent institution can still fail if it cannot meet immediate payment obligations. In a panic, access to central-bank liquidity can determine which institutions survive. This makes eligibility rules and collateral frameworks politically significant even when they are presented as technical.

The third is *currency hierarchy*. Not all currencies perform the same international role. Reserve currencies are used widely in trade invoicing, finance, reserve management, and cross-border debt. The United States dollar remains dominant in many dimensions of the international monetary system. That dominance reflects network effects, market depth, the scale of dollar-denominated assets, legal and institutional expectations, and geopolitical history, not merely government decree (Eichengreen, 2019; International Monetary Fund, 2025c).

The fourth is *payment infrastructure*. Economic exchange depends on clearing, settlement, correspondent banking, messaging, card networks, bank accounts, and other rails. An individual may possess legal property and still face severe practical exclusion if payment access disappears. A state may possess exports but struggle to receive value if correspondent banking relationships collapse.

The fifth is *sanctions*. Financial sanctions deliberately convert network centrality into geopolitical leverage. The U.S. Treasury's 2021 sanctions review described sanctions as an important tool of national security and acknowledged that their effectiveness rests partly on the strength and centrality of the U.S. financial system and currency. It also warned that alternative payment systems and digital assets could reduce future effectiveness (U.S. Department of the Treasury, 2021).

Sanctions demonstrate why control over financial infrastructure is political power. Assets can be blocked. Transactions can be prohibited. Banks can be required to reject specified customers or counterparties. Secondary effects can deter firms that are not themselves legally sanctioned because they fear penalties, loss of correspondent relationships, or reputational risk.

None of this is inherently secret. Sanctions programs are often publicly announced and grounded in law. The moral and political controversies concern due process, humanitarian effects, extraterritorial reach, proportionality, error correction, and the concentration of administrative discretion. A person or entity wrongly designated may face consequences before full judicial review occurs. A population can suffer from measures formally targeted at a regime. Financial power therefore raises questions of justice even when exercised transparently.

A modern case makes the mechanism concrete. In February 2022, during Canada's public-order emergency, the federal government brought temporary economic measures into force that directed financial-service providers to cease providing specified services to persons or entities linked to the prohibited blockades and allowed accounts to be frozen or suspended without a prior court order. Government testimony later reported that approximately 280 financial products, representing about CAD $8 million, were frozen while the measures were active, and that the emergency financial measures were revoked when the declaration ended (Department of Finance Canada, 2022a, 2022b).

The significance of that episode should be stated with equal care. It does not prove a permanent global system of political de-banking, nor does it settle the separate legal and political controversy over the invocation of emergency powers. It does demonstrate, as a documented matter of institutional capacity, how quickly access to accounts, credit, insurance, payment processing, and digital assets can become instruments of public policy when law, financial intermediaries, identity information, and compliance systems are linked. The subsequent public inquiry recorded both the breadth of the asset-freezing mechanism and the practical dependence of implementation on information supplied by law enforcement and financial institutions (Public Order Emergency Commission, 2023).

The sixth mechanism is *information*. Banks and financial platforms increasingly hold rich data about transactions, counterparties, locations, devices, identities, and behavioral patterns. Anti-money-laundering and counter-terrorist-financing systems require monitoring for legitimate public purposes. The same technical capacity can also support surveillance far beyond traditional banking if legal limits, data minimization, and due process are weak.

These mechanisms help explain why financial systems can function as political infrastructure without one hidden master. Power can be distributed across law, markets, software, compliance rules, central-bank facilities, correspondent banks, and international standards. The system may have no single operator yet still create gates through which economic participation must pass.

11. Sutton's Wall Street Thesis: What the Financial Mechanism Adds

Chapter 6 examined Antony Sutton's *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution* in the context where its central claims belong: revolution, foreign assistance, and the Russian crisis of 1917. The present chapter needs only the financial lesson that survives that examination.

Sutton's enduring contribution is methodological. He insisted that political history should be read alongside bank records, corporate directorships, diplomatic files, securities transactions, and commercial relationships. He named institutions and people rather than speaking only of abstract "capital." In doing so, he identified real connections that simplified Cold War narratives tended to obscure. Western financial and commercial actors could deal with revolutionary and Soviet institutions even when their public ideologies were sharply opposed (Sutton, 1974).

That observation is important because profit, geopolitical strategy, access to future markets, and ideological sympathy are different motives. A bank can lend to a government it dislikes. A corporation can trade with a regime whose political system it rejects. A state can license commerce with an ideological opponent for strategic reasons. Financial relationships therefore warn against assuming that public ideological conflict eliminates private or commercial cooperation.

Sutton is strongest where he documents a named relationship and lets the record carry the claim. He is weaker where a relationship is made to prove authorship. Chapter 6 showed this through the distinction between post-revolution banking relationships and the claim that those relationships prove pre-revolutionary command. The former can be documented. The latter requires additional evidence of timing, intent, transaction, and direction.

This chapter adds a broader reason for caution. Finance is inherently relational. Banks are expected to connect borrowers and lenders. International banks are expected to transact across borders. A director may sit on several boards because financial institutions specialize in intermediation. These features can create influence and conflicts of interest. They also create many connections that are ordinary consequences of the business model. A network map can therefore reveal concentration without telling us the purpose of every connection.

The proper use of Sutton is neither dismissal nor canonization. His claims should be decomposed. Where a transaction record exists, cite the transaction. Where a government file records a relationship, examine the file in context. Where Sutton infers a motive, label it as inference. Where he moves from cooperation to control, require command evidence. That discipline preserves the value of his archive-minded approach while rejecting conclusions that the sources cannot bear.

12. Carr, Skousen, and Coleman: Testing the Strongest Banking Allegations

Investigative literature often becomes most persuasive when it starts from a fact that official histories once neglected. The danger comes when the verified fact becomes a bridge to claims of much greater scale. William Guy Carr's banking narrative is a textbook example.

Carr was right that the Jekyll Island meeting was secret. Later historical research and participant testimony establish that. He was also right that private bankers played a major role in drafting the Aldrich Plan. Those facts deserve attention. But Carr then argues that the Federal Reserve placed international bankers in a position to bring about and control the First World War and that the war was fought to enable the Russian Revolution (Carr, 1955, pp. 214-218). The sources reviewed for this book do not establish a transaction-and-command chain sufficient for that conclusion. The claim is UNSUPPORTED.

Carr's treatment of the Coinage Act of 1873 reveals a similar problem. He alleges that European bankers supplied Ernest Seyd with $500,000 to bribe American legislators into demonetizing silver and presents later testimony as proof (Carr, 1955, pp. 204-207). The Coinage Act itself is authentic, and congressional records show that Seyd, a British monetary writer, provided technical comments on coinage legislation. Late nineteenth-century congressional debates also revisited the controversy over how silver was omitted from the standard coinage framework (United States Congress, 1873, 1893). What the evidentiary trail reviewed here does not provide is an authenticated primary record of the alleged $500,000 bribery fund, its source, recipients, bank transfers, or instructions. Carr's bribery claim is therefore WEAKLY SUPPORTED to UNSUPPORTED, depending on the specific subclaim. Seyd's involvement in technical discussion is established; the alleged bribery is not.

This distinction is important because the Coinage Act had real consequences. The United States moved away from the previous silver-dollar framework at a time when monetary standards were politically contentious. One can debate the interests that benefited from gold-standard policy without inventing proof of a bribe. The political economy is already significant on the documented record.

W. Cleon Skousen's *The Naked Capitalist* illustrates another amplification. Skousen quotes and interprets Quigley's discussion of financial capitalism but moves toward a more unified picture of international-banker control. His description of the Federal Reserve as essentially a private combine does not adequately distinguish the Board of

Governors from the regional Reserve Banks, the statutory limits on Reserve Bank stock, or the system's public governance features (Skousen, 1970). The concern about concentrated financial influence is legitimate; the institutional description requires correction.

Coleman's claims are broader still. He presents banking institutions, international organizations, policy groups, aristocratic families, corporations, and intelligence structures as components of a single "Committee of 300" hierarchy. Chapter 11 will give that thesis its principal treatment. For present purposes, his claim that international bankers planned a 1980s U.S. banking collapse to transfer American fiscal and monetary sovereignty to the IMF lacks the independent primary documentation necessary for an established verdict (Coleman, 1992). It remains UNSUPPORTED.

The pattern across these authors is instructive. They repeatedly identify real subjects that deserve investigation: concentrated credit, elite access, secret meetings, international coordination, crisis-driven reform, and the political effects of debt. Their weakness is often the transition from mechanism to universal command. Once "international bankers" becomes a singular actor with one mind, rivalries disappear, legal structures disappear, national conflicts disappear, chronology becomes elastic, and every outcome can be interpreted as intentional. A theory that explains both a bank's success and its failure as proof of the same hidden control becomes difficult to falsify.

Christian readers should resist the emotional attraction of total explanation. Scripture gives a total explanation at the level of ultimate sovereignty: God reigns, human beings are fallen, Satan deceives, and Christ will triumph. Scripture does not give us permission to invent a total human organization where historical evidence shows plural institutions, competing interests, partial alliances, and changing structures.

13. Financial Crises as Catalysts for Institutional Restructuring

Crises do not automatically prove conspiracy, but they often accelerate institutional change. This is one of the most important recurring patterns in financial history.

The Panic of 1907 exposed weaknesses in the American banking system and created political momentum for central-banking reform. The resulting National Monetary Commission, Jekyll Island planning, Aldrich proposals, Democratic alternatives, and eventual Federal Reserve Act were all shaped by the sense that the existing system could not safely continue (Richardson & Romero, 2015). The crisis did not determine one inevitable solution. It changed what solutions were politically possible.

The Great Depression produced an even larger restructuring. Bank failures, deflation, unemployment, and market collapse contributed to banking holidays, deposit insurance, securities regulation, changes in Federal Reserve governance, and a broader federal role in economic management. The Banking Act of 1935 strengthened the Board of Governors and helped move monetary authority toward the modern Federal Open Market Committee structure. Again, a crisis shifted institutional boundaries.

The breakdown of the interwar international monetary system and the Second World War created the setting for Bretton Woods. The IMF and World Bank were designed in response to remembered failures of the 1930s, including competitive devaluations, exchange restrictions, financial instability, and economic nationalism. The institutions were not inevitable. Their architects made contested choices. But without the preceding catastrophe, the political willingness to establish them would have been much smaller (Helleiner, 2014; Steil, 2013).

The global financial crisis of 2007-2009 produced another wave of change. Central banks expanded emergency liquidity, governments guaranteed liabilities, and regulators adopted new capital, liquidity, resolution, and macroprudential frameworks. The United States enacted the Dodd-Frank Act. Internationally, the Basel III framework tightened capital and liquidity standards. Crisis management expanded the recognized role of central banks as market backstops and deepened the public-private entanglement of modern finance (Bernanke, 2013; Calomiris & Haber, 2014).

Research on long-run credit cycles reinforces the point that banking expansion and crisis are not random curiosities. Schularick and Taylor (2012) found that rapid growth in credit has been an important predictor of financial crises across long historical samples. Credit can support productive development, but sustained leverage can also amplify fragility.

The key political concept is the *crisis window*. When existing institutions visibly fail, policymakers can adopt measures that would have been politically impossible under normal conditions. This does not prove the crisis was manufactured for the reform. It does mean that actors with prepared proposals, institutional access, and technical authority can gain disproportionate influence when decision time is compressed.

A serious investigation therefore asks two separate questions. First, what caused the crisis? Second, who used the crisis to change institutions? The answer to the second cannot be retroactively inserted as proof of the first. A central bank may benefit from expanded powers after a panic without having caused the panic. A government may adopt digital-payment reforms after an emergency without having created the emergency for that purpose. Yet if records show that officials anticipated a crisis and had plans ready, those plans are relevant to the history of institutional change.

This distinction protects the inquiry from both naivety and unfalsifiable suspicion. Crises are real accelerants of governance. Prepared actors matter. But benefit after crisis is not proof of authorship before crisis.

14. Currency Dependence, Sanctions, Capital Flows, and Geopolitical Power

The modern financial system has made monetary power inseparable from geopolitics. States do not transact in an empty space. They operate within currency hierarchies, payment networks, reserve arrangements, correspondent-banking relationships, legal jurisdictions, and capital markets.

The international role of the U.S. dollar is a central example. The dollar remains widely used in trade invoicing, debt issuance, foreign-exchange transactions, reserves, and banking. Its role gives the United States advantages, including deep demand for dollar assets and unusually powerful financial-sanctions channels. It also creates responsibilities because instability in dollar funding can propagate globally.

The United States Treasury's own 2021 sanctions review is unusually clear about the mechanism. It states that sanctions draw power from the strength of the American financial system and currency and warns that technological and geopolitical changes could reduce this leverage over time (U.S. Department of the Treasury, 2021). This is not a conspiracy allegation. It is a government description of financial statecraft.

Sanctions can serve legitimate purposes, including disrupting terrorism financing, constraining weapons programs, targeting corruption, or imposing costs for aggression. They can also produce unintended effects. Firms may "over-comply" by refusing lawful transactions because the compliance risk is too high. Humanitarian actors can lose access to banking. Ordinary citizens can suffer from currency collapse or trade restrictions aimed at governments. Targeted individuals can face severe consequences from administrative designation.

The Christian moral problem is therefore not solved by choosing "for" or "against" sanctions in the abstract. Justice requires attention to legitimate authority, evidence, proportionality, discrimination between wrongdoers and innocents, due process, and the foreseeable effect on the vulnerable. Scripture's insistence on just measures (Proverbs 11:1) applies by principle to systems that allocate economic penalties as surely as it applies to a merchant's scale.

Capital flows create a different form of leverage. Investors can move money rapidly across borders, especially in financially open economies. Sudden stops can cause currency depreciation, reserve loss, banking stress, and political crisis. Governments therefore monitor markets whose participants they do not fully control. The "discipline of markets" can sometimes restrain reckless policy. It can also punish populations for risks created elsewhere or generate self-reinforcing panic.

This is another reason totalizing language about "the bankers" is analytically weak. Modern financial power is partly centralized and partly emergent. Central banks make deliberate decisions. Large asset managers make deliberate decisions. Sanctions authorities make deliberate decisions. Yet exchange rates and bond yields also emerge from millions of transactions. Political dependency can result from structure without a single hidden instruction.

The system is nevertheless vulnerable to concentration. If a small number of currencies, correspondent banks, clearing systems, custodians, cloud providers, or payment platforms become indispensable, governance decisions by those institutions can have effects resembling public power. The central question becomes access: who may participate, under what rules, based on what data, with what right of appeal?

15. From Digital Payments to CBDCs: Capability, Programmability, and Surveillance Risk

Money has always depended on technology. Coins required metallurgy and mints. Banknotes required secure printing and legal trust. Telegraphy transformed correspondent banking. Electronic settlement transformed wholesale finance. Digital money is therefore not a sudden departure from an otherwise non-technological past. What is new is the degree to which identity, transactions, compliance, software, and money can be integrated into the same technical environment.

A central bank digital currency, or CBDC, is a digital liability of a central bank intended for use as money. A *retail* CBDC would be designed for households and businesses. A *wholesale* CBDC is intended primarily for settlement among financial institutions. Those categories matter because the social risks and policy purposes differ substantially.

Central banks have investigated CBDCs for several reasons: declining cash use in some jurisdictions, competition from private stablecoins and cryptoassets, payment efficiency, financial inclusion, resilience, cross-border settlement, and preservation of central-bank money as a monetary anchor. In a 2025 BIS survey of ninety-three central banks, 91 percent reported that they were exploring a retail CBDC, wholesale CBDC, or both, with wholesale projects generally more advanced (Illes et al., 2025). Exploration, however, is not implementation. Surveys include research, proofs of concept, pilots, legislative work, and live systems at very different stages.

By 2026, BIS research had moved beyond isolated digital-currency experiments toward a broader discussion of tokenised monetary and financial architecture, including unified-ledger models in which central-bank money, commercial-bank money, and financial assets could interact on programmable platforms (Bank for International Settlements, 2026a). The term programmable requires particular care. A programmable payment can execute automatically when specified transactional conditions are satisfied, for example delivery-versus-payment in securities settlement. That is not the same claim as a government programming a citizen's retail money so that it may purchase food but not fuel, or so that it expires on a particular date. Technical capability, policy intent, legal authority, institutional governance, and actual deployment are separate evidentiary questions. The fuller digital-governance architecture belongs to Chapter 15; the present chapter is concerned only with the financial capacity that such architectures can create.

This distinction is often lost in public debate. Critics sometimes treat every reference to programmability as proof that social-control restrictions are already planned. Advocates sometimes respond as though the concern were irrational because their preferred design does not include such restrictions. Both positions can be too simple. If money becomes software-mediated, the system can potentially support rules that cash cannot. Whether those rules are technically available, legally permissible, institutionally controlled, or politically intended must be established jurisdiction by jurisdiction.

Privacy is therefore not peripheral. BIS research and central-bank consultations repeatedly identify privacy as a major public concern. The technical design can range from systems that minimize central-bank access to personal transaction data to systems in which intermediaries perform identity and compliance functions while the central bank sees only limited information. Offline functionality, tiered identity, cryptographic privacy, transaction limits, anti-money-laundering rules, and law-enforcement access all involve tradeoffs (Bank for International Settlements, 2023; Sun et al., 2025).

The political question is larger than whether a central bank employee can read a purchase history. A digital monetary system may depend on interoperable identity systems, banks, wallet providers, telecommunications, cloud services, cybersecurity, compliance engines, and legal databases. Exclusion at one layer can propagate across others. A person whose identity credential fails may lose access to a wallet. A person falsely flagged by compliance software may face account restrictions. A government that links legal penalties to financial credentials may gain a faster mechanism for enforcement.

These are capability questions, not accusations that every digital-payment project intends total surveillance. The evidence standard must remain strict. A privacy-preserving design should be recognized as such. A proposal for transaction-level restriction should be named precisely if it exists. A hypothetical capacity should not be written as a current policy.

The same discipline applies to de-banking. Banks already close or restrict accounts for fraud risk, sanctions compliance, anti-money-laundering obligations, commercial risk, reputational concerns, and other reasons. Some closures become politically controversial when customers believe they were targeted for lawful views or associations. Such cases require jurisdiction-specific evidence. The broader structural point is simpler: as cash use declines, losing access to digital financial services becomes more consequential. A society that depends on financial intermediaries should therefore treat due process, notice, appeal, error correction, and access to basic payment functionality as serious civil questions.

This is where the modern financial system begins to intersect with later prophetic chapters. Revelation 13:16-17 describes a future regime in which economic participation becomes linked to allegiance to the beast. The text is explicit about coercive economic exclusion in that eschatological setting. It does not say that a CBDC, a debit card, a digital identity system, or any present central bank is itself the mark of the beast. To make that identification now would go beyond Scripture.

What can responsibly be said is narrower. Technologies that make economic access more centralized, identifiable, interoperable, and conditionally permissioned can create capacities that would make certain forms of exclusion easier to administer than in a cash-dominant society. That is a technological-enablement observation, not a declaration of prophetic fulfillment. Chapters 17 and 18 will assess the convergence question after the historical and institutional evidence has been assembled. Chapter 19 will present the book's full case for the pre-tribulation Blessed Hope.

The Christian response in the present chapter is therefore neither panic nor technological worship. Believers should ask sober questions about architecture, law, privacy, due process, interoperability, and the right to transact. They should also refuse sensational claims that turn every payment innovation into a prophetic countdown. Biblical watchfulness is strengthened by truth, not by false alarms.

16. The Ethical Guardrail: Institutions and Individuals, Not Collective Guilt

Financial history has repeatedly been corrupted by collective accusation. Because some influential banking families were Jewish, anti-Semitic writers converted the conduct of identifiable firms into allegations against Jews as a people. Because some bankers were Protestant, Catholic, Masonic, aristocratic, American, British, German, or otherwise connected to large social categories, later polemics sometimes treated those categories as causal explanations. This is bad history and bad theology.

An institution acts through identifiable human beings, legal mandates, boards, committees, contracts, policies, and transactions. If N. M. Rothschild & Sons underwrote a government loan, the unit of analysis is the firm, the transaction, and the people involved. If J. P. Morgan & Co. advised a government, the evidence concerns that relationship. If a central bank makes a disputed decision, the inquiry concerns its statutory authority, decision-makers, rationale, and effect. Ethnic or religious ancestry does not substitute for mechanism.

The safeguard is especially necessary because the history of finance contains real concentrations of power. Denying anti-Semitic mythology does not require denying the historical influence of Rothschild banks. Rejecting anti-Catholic or anti-Masonic collective guilt does not require pretending that individual Catholics or Masons never exercised political influence. Precision allows both truths to stand: particular actors may possess great power, and populations are not collectively guilty for the acts of particular actors.

Scripture forbids partiality and false testimony. James condemns churches that honor the rich merely because they are rich (James 2:1-7), but he does not authorize hatred of wealthy people as a class. His later denunciation of rich oppressors is directed at concrete conduct: withheld wages, luxurious self-indulgence, and the condemnation of the righteous (James 5:1-6). The moral category is oppression, not ancestry.

This is also why the word *banker* must not function as a mystical explanation. Bankers compete. Banks fail. Banks sue one another. Regulators punish banks. Governments nationalize banks. Political leaders pressure central banks. Central banks resist political leaders. Financial institutions form alliances and then break them. A claim that an undifferentiated class called "the bankers" controls all sides of every conflict cannot explain these documented rivalries unless it becomes so elastic that no evidence could disprove it.

The church must be more truthful than the propaganda it criticizes. Hatred is not discernment. Scapegoating is not courage. A false accusation against a powerful person remains false, and a false accusation against an unpopular group remains sin. The biblical command to expose darkness (Ephesians 5:11) never cancels the command not to bear false witness.

17. Evidence Verdict: What the Financial Record Actually Establishes

The financial history examined in this chapter supports a strong but bounded conclusion. Money and credit can create political leverage. Private and public financial actors have exercised concentrated influence. Secret planning meetings have occurred. International central-bank coordination is real. Loan conditionality is real. Sanctions convert financial centrality into geopolitical power. Digital money can increase the technical capacity for monitoring and conditional access. None of these facts, separately or together, establishes that one hidden banking hierarchy commands every government, war, revolution, central bank, and economic crisis.

Claim	Verdict	Evidentiary basis
Sovereign borrowing can create policy dependence when a state relies on refinancing, external currency, or emergency credit.	ESTABLISHED	Public-debt history, sovereign lending, IMF programs, bond-market behavior, and extensive political-economy scholarship.
War finance was a major driver in the development of modern public debt and central-banking institutions.	ESTABLISHED	Bank of England history, fiscal-military-state scholarship, and histories of European public finance.
The Bank of England was founded in 1694 as a privately owned corporation closely linked to government war finance.	ESTABLISHED	Royal-charter history, original subscription records, and Bank of England archival history.
Nathan Rothschild secretly gained controlling ownership of the Bank of England after Waterloo.	UNSUPPORTED	Rothschild influence in government finance is well documented, but the alleged institutional-control chain is not established by Bank records or specialist scholarship reviewed here.
Nineteenth-century merchant and investment banks formed dense international networks capable of influencing sovereign finance and industrial development.	ESTABLISHED	Banking archives and economic histories of London, Paris, New York, sovereign bond markets, and major banking houses.
The November 1910 Jekyll Island meeting was secret and materially influenced the Aldrich banking-reform plan.	ESTABLISHED	Participant memoirs, National Monetary Commission history, and Federal Reserve historical research.
The Jekyll Island meeting by itself proves that the Federal Reserve is privately owned and controlled by the bankers who attended.	UNSUPPORTED	The final Federal Reserve Act resulted from additional political negotiation; the modern system's statutory governance and ownership structure do not support ordinary private-ownership claims.
The Federal Reserve has never been audited.	UNSUPPORTED	Annual independent financial audits, Office of Inspector General work, published financial statements, and GAO review authorities are documented.
Ernest Seyd participated in technical discussion related to U.S. coinage reform.	ESTABLISHED	Congressional materials and contemporaneous monetary literature.
European bankers supplied Seyd with $500,000 to bribe Congress into passing the Coinage Act of 1873.	WEAKLY SUPPORTED / UNSUPPORTED	Later testimonial claims exist, but an authenticated payment, instruction, recipient list, or primary transaction record has not been established in the evidence reviewed.
The Bank for International Settlements institutionalizes cooperation among central banks.	ESTABLISHED	BIS founding documents, official history, governance records, and specialist scholarship.
The BIS is a secret world government that can command national governments at will.	UNSUPPORTED	The institution has significant coordinating and standard-setting influence, but no evidence establishes universal sovereign command.
IMF lending can give the institution substantial policy leverage over states facing external-financing crises.	ESTABLISHED	Published loan programs, conditionality, quotas, reviews, and specialist research.
A hidden 1980s banking plan transferred U.S. fiscal and monetary sovereignty to the IMF.	UNSUPPORTED	Coleman alleges such a plan, but the required independently verifiable primary documentation and implementation record were not located.
Financial sanctions use the centrality of currencies, banks, and payment networks as geopolitical leverage.	ESTABLISHED	U.S. Treasury policy documents, sanctions law, and observed financial restrictions.
CBDCs and tokenized payment systems can be designed with programmable features.	ESTABLISHED	BIS and central-bank research on programmable platforms, automated settlement, and digital-money architectures.
Every CBDC necessarily includes government-controlled spending restrictions or constitutes the biblical mark of the beast.	UNSUPPORTED	Designs vary widely; technical capability is not equivalent to policy intent or implementation, and Scripture does not identify a present monetary technology as the mark.
Declining cash use can make exclusion from digital financial services more consequential.	STRONGLY SUPPORTED	The conclusion follows from increased dependence on account-based and digital payment channels, while the degree varies by jurisdiction and continued cash availability.
Emergency legal powers can make access to banking and payment services an immediate instrument of public policy.	ESTABLISHED	Canada's 2022 emergency economic measures, Finance records, and the public inquiry document temporary account and payment-service restrictions.

The verdict is sobering precisely because it does not need exaggeration. Financial power is real. It is exercised through debt contracts, market access, interest rates, collateral, liquidity, settlement, sanctions, standards, data, and technological architecture. These mechanisms can be beneficial, abusive, or both in different circumstances. They can operate transparently or behind confidentiality. They can be coordinated by small groups or emerge from decentralized markets. The responsibility of the investigator is to distinguish these forms rather than collapse them into one mythology.

18. Biblical Discernment: Money as Servant, Master, and Instrument of Power

The Bible is not a textbook on central-bank governance, but it is unsparing about the spiritual dangers surrounding wealth, debt, exploitation, and economic power. Its most important contribution is not a prediction of modern banking institutions. It is a doctrine of allegiance.

Jesus' statement in Matthew 6:24 is absolute: a person cannot serve both God and money. The word often rendered *mammon* refers not simply to coins but to wealth treated as a power in which one trusts. Money becomes spiritually dangerous when it ceases to be a tool and begins to function as lord. A person may be poor and worship money through envy or desperation. A person may be rich and steward wealth faithfully. The decisive issue is allegiance.

Paul's teaching is equally precise. 1 Timothy 6:10 does not say money is the root of all evil. It says the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil. That distinction matters for this chapter. Banking is not intrinsically demonic because it handles money. A central banker is not an agent of Satan by profession. A bond is not sinful because it pays interest. The spiritual danger lies in greed, deception, oppression, idolatry, injustice, and the use of economic power to dominate others.

Scripture repeatedly connects economic sin with false measurement. "Dishonest scales are detestable to the LORD," says Proverbs 11:1. The ancient merchant's scale and the modern financial system are not identical, but the moral principle survives technological change. Systems that measure value, risk, creditworthiness, compliance, or eligibility must not be manipulated dishonestly. A sophisticated algorithm does not transform injustice into neutrality.

The prophets likewise condemn economic exploitation. Amos 8:4-6 portrays merchants who manipulate measures and exploit the poor. Isaiah 10:1-2 condemns unjust decrees that deprive the vulnerable of justice. James 5:1-6 denounces wealth accumulated through withheld wages and self-indulgence while the righteous suffer. These passages refuse the modern temptation to separate economic systems from moral accountability.

The borrower-lender relationship in Proverbs 22:7 therefore belongs within a larger theology. Debt can become a form of bondage. Wealth can become a false refuge. Creditors can exploit weakness. Debtors can act irresponsibly. Governments can conceal burdens in future liabilities. Citizens can demand benefits while refusing to acknowledge costs. Banks can take excessive risks under the expectation of public rescue. Regulators can become captured by the industries they supervise. None of these sins belongs to only one side of the balance sheet.

The spiritual conflict described in Ephesians 6:10-18 helps interpret the moral terrain without giving us permission to demonize individuals. The church struggles against spiritual forces of evil, yet the armor God provides is truth, righteousness, gospel readiness, faith, salvation, the Word, and prayer. That means financial investigation itself must be conducted in truth. A forged banking letter is not a weapon of Christian warfare. A fabricated quotation is not spiritual discernment. An ethnic stereotype is not prophetic courage.

The devil's strategies, as Scripture presents them, are morally intelligible. He lies (John 8:44). He tempts human beings toward idolatrous power (Matthew 4:8-10). He accuses (Revelation 12:10). Human financial systems can become instruments of those patterns when people lie about risk, hide losses, exploit the weak, corrupt rulers, or make economic participation conditional on sinful allegiance. Yet the same institutions can also preserve savings, finance homes, support businesses, stabilize payments, and fund humanitarian recovery. The moral judgment follows conduct and purpose, not the mere existence of an institution.

This is why the church must not replace one idol with another. Some people trust governments and experts as though official authority guaranteed truth. Others trust alternative commentators as though institutional rejection guaranteed truth. Some trust markets as though price were a moral revelation. Others trust state planning as though public ownership purified human motives. Scripture permits none of these salvific trusts. "It is better to take refuge in the LORD than to trust in humanity" (Psalm 118:8).

19. Economic Permission, Prophetic Warning, and the Blessed Hope

The future economic coercion described in Revelation requires sober attention. Revelation 13:16-18 portrays a regime in which buying and selling are restricted in connection with the mark, name, or number of the beast. The passage joins political authority, worship, deception, and economic exclusion. It is not merely a prophecy of inconvenient commerce. It describes a crisis of allegiance.

That text explains why Christians are right to care about systems capable of centralized economic exclusion. It does not authorize them to identify every new financial technology as the final system. The mark in Revelation is inseparable from allegiance to the beast. A bank account, tax identification number, biometric credential, CBDC wallet, or smartphone is not automatically that mark simply because it can be used for buying and selling.

The responsible eschatological conclusion is therefore one of *capability without premature identification*. Modern payment systems can make economic access more legible and controllable. Sanctions demonstrate that exclusion from financial networks can already be administered at scale. Digital identity and programmable platforms can increase the speed and granularity with which permissions are applied. These developments may form part of the technological environment in which future coercion becomes possible. Scripture, however, has not told us that any one current project is the direct fulfillment.

The church's readiness must therefore be deeper than technological prediction. A believer who correctly identifies every monetary innovation but loves money is not ready. A believer who tracks central-bank policy but neglects prayer is not ready. A believer who fears economic exclusion more than disloyalty to Christ has misunderstood Revelation's central demand. The saints overcome not by mastering the financial system but by faithful allegiance to the Lamb (Revelation 12:11).

This book adopts a pre-tribulation understanding of the Blessed Hope while recognizing that faithful evangelical Christians disagree about the timing of the rapture. The full exegetical case belongs to Chapter 19. The pastoral implication here is straightforward. 1 Thessalonians 4:16-18 directs believers to comfort one another with the promise of the Lord's coming. The next chapter of the same letter calls them children of light who must remain awake and self-controlled (1 Thessalonians 5:4-11). Titus 2:11-14 joins the expectation of the blessed hope to godly living in the present age.

Pre-tribulation expectancy is therefore not permission for date-setting, financial panic, or withdrawal from ordinary responsibility. It is a summons to holiness, courage, generosity, witness, and freedom from idolatrous dependence. Christians should pay debts honestly, avoid needless bondage, care for the poor, support faithful churches, practice generosity, conduct business truthfully, and refuse to make financial security their god. They should also think seriously about how their communities would care for one another if lawful economic participation became more difficult.

Readiness also means refusing the spiritual logic of panic. Scripture never commands the church to secure itself by mastering every hidden mechanism of the age. It commands believers to be faithful with what God has revealed: to walk in holiness, tell the truth, provide for households, care for the needy, resist idolatry, endure loss rather than deny Christ, and keep the gospel central. Financial prudence has value, but prudence becomes another form of bondage when fear of losing money governs the heart more than confidence in the Lord who owns the earth and sustains His people.

The most important financial preparation for Christ's return is not a secret portfolio. It is a heart that does not belong to Mammon.

For the reader who does not know Christ, the warning is more fundamental than any danger posed by banks, governments, digital systems, or future coercive regimes. Scripture says that every person is accountable to God and that sin separates us from Him. No amount of wealth can ransom the soul (Psalm 49:6-9). Jesus Christ died for sinners and rose again. Salvation is received by grace through faith, not purchased by money, status, secret knowledge, or political alignment (Ephesians 2:8-9). The most urgent debt is the moral debt we cannot discharge by our own merit, and the gospel announces that Christ has paid what sinners could not pay.

20. Conclusion: When Money Becomes a Gate

The history of finance does not support the claim that money is merely neutral technique. Credit creates relationships. Debt moves burdens through time. Bond markets can strengthen states and constrain them. Banking houses have used information, reputation, and capital to shape major political and industrial developments. Central banks stabilize systems while exercising concentrated discretion. International financial institutions can provide essential crisis finance while acquiring negotiating leverage over dependent borrowers. Sanctions convert network centrality into political power. Digital payment systems can increase efficiency while creating new questions about privacy, exclusion, and conditional access.

Neither does the evidence support a universal banking conspiracy that explains every major event. The Bank of England's private origin is real; later claims of uninterrupted family control are not established. The Jekyll Island meeting was genuinely secret; the conclusion that its participants privately own and command the Federal Reserve does not follow from the institution's legal structure. International central-bank cooperation through the BIS is real; universal sovereign command is not established. IMF conditionality is real; Coleman's alleged secret transfer of U.S. sovereignty is not established. Digital programmability is real; the claim that every CBDC is already designed as a system of total behavioral control is not established.

This evidence discipline does not weaken the exposure of power. It strengthens it. The church does not need myths to understand that money can become a gate. A creditor can say no. A regulator can say no. A sanctions authority can say no. A correspondent bank can say no. A payment platform can say no. A future political-religious system described by Revelation will say no to buying and selling unless allegiance is given where allegiance must not be given. The historical movement from physical cash toward increasingly mediated financial access therefore deserves careful scrutiny.

But Christians must refuse fear. Financial systems are not sovereign. Markets are not sovereign. Central banks are not sovereign. International institutions are not sovereign. The beast of Revelation will not be sovereign. Satan is not sovereign. The earth and everything in it belong to the LORD (Psalm 24:1). Christ has been exalted above every ruler, authority, power, and dominion (Ephesians 1:20-23).

The church's task is therefore neither submission to Mammon nor obsession with Mammon. It is faithfulness. We expose deception without fabricating evidence. We examine institutions without scapegoating peoples. We resist unjust exclusion without pretending every compliance rule is persecution. We use money without serving it. We borrow carefully, repay honestly, give generously, protect the vulnerable, and remember that our citizenship and hope are not secured by a bank balance.

The next chapter turns from money as a mechanism to the human networks through which ideas, careers, imperial visions, policy influence, and elite coordination can travel. The Rhodes-Milner-Round Table milieu will provide a different kind of test. There the central question will not be who creates money, but how informal networks become durable political influence across institutions and generations.

The Christian can enter that investigation without fear because the decisive question has already been answered. History is not owned by hidden financiers. It belongs to Jesus Christ. Therefore, while it is still day, the church should live with open Bibles, clean hands, generous hearts, alert minds, truthful speech, and lamps burning, awaiting the Blessed Hope.

REFERENCES

Bagehot, W. (1999). *Lombard Street: A description of the money market*. Wiley. (Original work published 1873)

Bank for International Settlements. (2023). *Project Tourbillon: Exploring privacy, security and scalability for retail CBDC*. BIS Innovation Hub. https://www.bis.org/publ/othp80.htm

Bank for International Settlements. (2026a). *Annual Economic Report 2026*. https://www.bis.org/publ/arpdf/ar2026e.htm

Bank for International Settlements. (n.d.-a). *History of the BIS*. https://www.bis.org/about/history.htm

Bank for International Settlements. (n.d.-b). *About the BIS: Overview*. https://www.bis.org/about/index.htm

Bank of England. (2020, May 19). *Who owns the Bank of England?* https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/explainers/who-owns-the-bank-of-england

Bank of England. (2022). QE at the Bank of England: A perspective on its functioning and effectiveness. Quarterly Bulletin, 2022 Q1. https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/quarterly-bulletin/2022/2022-q1/qe-at-the-bank-of-england-a-perspective-on-its-functioning-and-effectiveness

Bank of England. (2024, December 9). *Our history*. https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/about/history

Bank of England Archive. (1915). 4 1/2% War Loan 1925-1945 - issued June 1915 (20A29/3). Bank of England Archive. https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/CalmView/Record.aspx?id=20A29%2F3&src=CalmView.Catalog

Bernanke, B. S. (2013). *The Federal Reserve and the financial crisis*. Princeton University Press.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. (2026a). *Federal Reserve System audited annual financial statements*. https://www.federalreserve.gov/aboutthefed/audited-annual-financial-statements.htm

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. (2025). *Does the Federal Reserve ever get audited?* https://www.federalreserve.gov/faqs/about_12784.htm

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. (2026b). *Who owns the Federal Reserve?* https://www.federalreserve.gov/faqs/about_14986.htm

Brewer, J. (1989). *The sinews of power: War, money and the English state, 1688-1783*. Harvard University Press.

Broz, J. L. (1997). *The international origins of the Federal Reserve System*. Cornell University Press.

Calomiris, C. W., & Haber, S. H. (2014). *Fragile by design: The political origins of banking crises and scarce credit*. Princeton University Press.

Carr, W. G. (1955). *Pawns in the game*. National Federation of Christian Laymen.

Coleman, J. (1992). *Conspirators' hierarchy: The story of the Committee of 300*. America West Publishers.

Department of Finance Canada. (2022a, February 15). Canada invokes the Emergencies Act to limit funding of illegal blockades and restore public order. https://www.canada.ca/en/department-finance/news/2022/02/canada-invokes-the-emergencies-act-to-limit-funding-of-illegal-blockades-and-restore-public-order.html

Department of Finance Canada. (2022b, June 14). Remarks by the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance: Special Joint Committee on the Declaration of Emergency. https://www.canada.ca/en/department-finance/news/2022/06/remarks-by-the-deputy-prime-minister-and-minister-of-finance.html

Eichengreen, B. (2019). *Globalizing capital: A history of the international monetary system* (3rd ed.). Princeton University Press.

Ferguson, N. (1998). *The house of Rothschild: Money's prophets, 1798-1848*. Viking.

Helleiner, E. (2014). *Forgotten foundations of Bretton Woods: International development and the making of the postwar order*. Cornell University Press.

Illes, A., Kosse, A., & Wierts, P. (2025). *Advancing in tandem: Results of the 2024 BIS survey on central bank digital currencies and crypto* (BIS Papers No. 159). Bank for International Settlements. https://www.bis.org/publ/bppdf/bispap159.htm

International Monetary Fund. (2025a). *The IMF at a glance*. https://www.imf.org/en/About/Factsheets/IMF-at-a-Glance

International Monetary Fund. (2025b). *IMF quotas*. https://www.imf.org/en/About/Factsheets/Sheets/2022/IMF-Quotas

International Monetary Fund. (2025c). *External sector report 2025*. https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/ESR

McLeay, M., Radia, A., & Thomas, R. (2014). Money creation in the modern economy. Bank of England Quarterly Bulletin, 2014 Q1, 14-27. https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/quarterly-bulletin/2014/q1/money-creation-in-the-modern-economy

Neal, L. (1990). *The rise of financial capitalism: International capital markets in the age of reason*. Cambridge University Press.

North, D. C., & Weingast, B. R. (1989). Constitutions and commitment: The evolution of institutions governing public choice in seventeenth-century England. *The Journal of Economic History, 49*(4), 803-832. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022050700009451

Osborne, J. A. C. (1926). The Bank of England 1914-1921: Unpublished war history (Vol. 1). Bank of England Archive, M7/156. https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/archive/bank-of-england-1914-21-ww1

Public Order Emergency Commission. (2023). Report of the Public Inquiry into the 2022 Public Order Emergency (Vol. 3). Government of Canada. https://publicorderemergencycommission.ca/final-report/

Quigley, C. (1966). *Tragedy and hope: A history of the world in our time*. Macmillan.

Richardson, G., & Romero, J. (2015). *The meeting at Jekyll Island*. Federal Reserve History. https://www.federalreservehistory.org/essays/jekyll-island-conference

Schularick, M., & Taylor, A. M. (2012). Credit booms gone bust: Monetary policy, leverage cycles, and financial crises, 1870-2008. *American Economic Review, 102*(2), 1029-1061. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.102.2.1029

Skousen, W. C. (1970). *The naked capitalist*. Author.

Steil, B. (2013). *The battle of Bretton Woods: John Maynard Keynes, Harry Dexter White, and the making of a new world order*. Princeton University Press.

Sun, T., Koonprasert, T. T., Verrier, J., Reshidi, E., Reuter, M., Kao, K., Bechara, M., Dumitrescu-Pasecinic, A., Kubota, T., Zhabska, K., & Kunaratskul, T. (2025). *Central bank digital currency: Further navigating challenges and risks* (IMF Policy Paper No. 2025/041). International Monetary Fund. https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/Policy-Papers/Issues/2025/11/20/Central-Bank-Digital-Currency-Further-Navigating-Challenges-and-Risks-571285

Sutton, A. C. (1974). *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*. Arlington House.

Toniolo, G. (2005). *Central bank cooperation at the Bank for International Settlements, 1930-1973*. Cambridge University Press.

United States Congress. (1873). *Coinage Act of 1873, ch. 131, 17 Stat. 424*. https://fraser.stlouisfed.org/title/coinage-act-1873-1095

United States Congress. (1893). *Congressional Record, 53rd Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 25*. U.S. Government Printing Office. https://www.govinfo.gov/app/details/GPO-CRECB-1893-pt1-v25

U.S. Department of the Treasury. (2021). *The Treasury 2021 sanctions review*. https://home.treasury.gov/system/files/136/Treasury-2021-sanctions-review.pdf

Vreeland, J. R. (2007). *The International Monetary Fund: Politics of conditional lending*. Routledge.

Woods, N. (2006). *The globalizers: The IMF, the World Bank, and their borrowers*. Cornell University Press.

World Bank. (2026a). *History*. https://www.worldbank.org/en/archive/history

World Bank. (2026b). *IBRD subscriptions and voting power of member countries* [Data set]. https://financesone.worldbank.org/d/DS00051