

[return to updates](#)

How to Deconstruct a James Bond Film



by Miles Mathis

First published November 18, 2015

We start by realizing that Ian Fleming was an agent himself, so we have always been given clues via these books and films. We must assume the newer scriptwriters are also involved in Intelligence, either being agents themselves or being in constant consultation. The original and primary point of the novels and movies was as PR for Intelligence, but as the years have passed more and more clues are inserted into the films as well. I assume this is mostly as an inside joke: they know by now that almost no one is getting the clues, so they feel they don't have to be careful. But they also may be signaling one another and those on the outside (assuming anyone but me is still *outside* Intelligence). Regardless, the clues are quite easy to read, and as we will see they confirm my previous theory regarding a split in Intelligence and a worldwide turf war.

For a little background, it is worth reading the bio of Albert Broccoli, the producer of the Bond films from the beginning. His links to the Italian mob are admitted, although of course they aren't spelled out in detail. We are told he acquired his nickname "Cubby" from his cousin Pat DiCicco, who was a producer and mobster working for Lucky Luciano back to the 1930s. DiCicco was married to Gloria Vanderbilt, so we have that link here as well. The Vanderbilt name has just come up in the last two of my papers. Gloria also happens to be the mother of Anderson Cooper at CNN (who she allegedly gave birth to at age 43). You may want to ask yourself why this beautiful, rich and talented young woman would go to Hollywood at age 17 and marry this creepy Italian mobster 15 years her senior who viciously beat her. You may also want to ask why her early bio is scrubbed at Wikipedia. You get no information on her from 1941 to 1970, a nearly thirty year gap.



The short answer is not that the Vanderbilts were working for the mob, of course. Reverse that. The mob was a tool of the Vanderbilts (and other trillionaire families). Both the mob and Intelligence were tools of the Industrialists, and still are. So there is no chance DiCicco was beating Gloria Vanderbilt. That story is just used for misdirection. She may have been kicking *his* ass, but there is no chance he would lay a glove on her without the express written consent of major league ball.

Anyway, her husband DiCicco was a ranking mobster under Lucky Luciano. Luciano was the capo of the Genovese family, and is said to be the father of organized crime in America. For our purposes here, everywhere you see “mob” you can insert “Intelligence”, since they have been linked from the beginning. Intelligence has always been the bigger boss of all the mobs, in the beginning not really running them but simply *using* them whenever it was convenient. But after WW2 Intelligence basically took over all the mobs, wanting their business. Although before this they were allied, after this they were *merged*. This is why we have seen so many mob movies [think *The Godfather*] since the 1960's: Intelligence is trying to convince you the mob still exists in the old way, but it doesn't. The billionaire families now run everything.

This is exactly why Broccoli began producing the *James Bond* movies in the 1960s: Intel took him over and put him to work on their own projects. By that time, the mob had been completely consumed by CIA/MI6.

The same thing can be said for Harry Saltzman, the other early producer of Bond. Saltzman was Jewish, but of course the Jewish mob and Italian mob go way back. Remember, Lucky Luciano's right hand man was Meyer Lansky, “the Mob's accountant”. Luciano's main claim to fame was allying the Italian, Jewish, and Irish mobs, to create the uber-mob. So with Saltzman we probably see Intelligence consuming the Jewish mob along with the Italian mob. To study more in this vein, you have to look at the Kennedys and their movements against the mob in the early 1960s. They were moving before that, but the research becomes pretty easy then.

If you want to go back further, look at Thomas Dewey (yes, the same Dewey that lost to Truman). We

are told that as the Special Prosecutor of New York in the 1930s, Dewey broke up Luciano's huge and profitable prostitution business. But what they forget to tell you is that despite that, nothing was cleaned up in New York even for a moment. Prostitution continued to flourish and continued to be a huge business. So Dewey didn't "break up" anything. He just took over Luciano's business for his bosses. The exact same thing happened when the Kennedys "went after" the mob around 1960. What they were going after was their businesses.

We even have evidence of this from Lucky Luciano himself. Although already very rich and powerful, Luciano was severely beaten in 1929. The mainstream tries to tell us Masseria or one of the other bosses got him, but Luciano finally admitted in 1953 that it was G-men who got him. This tells us that as far back as the Great Depression, the mob was already under the thumb of higher powers. Even then we may assume it wasn't run by scar-faced illiterates from Sicily. Those were just the poster-boys. No, like everything else, it was run from Harvard and Langley and Rockefeller Center and so on.

So with that in mind, let us look at the new movie. In it we find an underground crime syndicate called Spectre, and the sign used by this group in lieu of a secret handshake or something is a ring with an octopus on it. This should remind us of two things, the second much more important than the first. The first thing it should remind you of is the film *Octopussy* from 1983. So the clue has been around for decades. In that film, the octopus was a tattoo worn by the Afghan lady Magda. The main plot concerns a rogue Russian General smuggling art out of Russia and into the West, [which ties into my article on money laundering](#). The second thing it reminds us of is the number 8, which we have seen is one of the favorites of Intelligence. It is used as a signal, if nothing else. We have seen in many previous papers that they like 3's and 8's, and I have shown you one of the reasons they like the number 8 is that it is both a Fibonacci number and a perfect cube. It is therefore considered to be a powerful piece of numerology. The *reason* it is considered to be a powerful piece of numerology is that it is a powerful piece of mathematics and physics. It is very useful to real physicists, so this is not just wuwu.

It is also possible the number 8 is telling us the number of families in the prime alliance. The creature has eight arms, those arms being what?—Rockefeller, Rothschild, DuPont, Vanderbilt, Kennedy, Morgan, Goldman and Oppenheim? I don't really know. That is just a wild guess based on my previous research, which is limited.

With a little research, I find most of my guesses confirmed by [this article at GlobalResearch](#). Curiously, it also confirms my use of the number 8. The author tells us, "In 1903, Banker's Trust was set up by the eight families". However, he prefers the Schiff and Warburg families over a couple of mine.

All that leads us into the centerpiece of the current film's plot, which is that MI5/6 have just been taken over by an unnamed *private* consortium, the Joint Intelligence Service. This *private* tag is glossed over in both the movie and in any retellings of it, but it is of high importance. Intelligence is supposed to be national, not private. However, we are being told some NEW private consortium is trying to take over national and international Intelligence.

Since I am writing for a US audience, it might help to put this in terms of US Intelligence. The new part of Intelligence here is DHS, which popped up about 14 years ago, and it was founded and is run by a private consortium that includes guys like Dick Cheney and Donald Rumsfeld. Now, these guys couldn't have gotten to where they are without the support of old-money families like Rockefeller, Vanderbilt, DuPont, etc., but it is possible they are working for one of these families against the others, trying to carve out a new niche. This they have done so successfully that it appears the other families

were alerted and are now moving against them. And so we see the turf war I sometimes allude to. Intelligence is now split and scheming against itself. It therefore sometimes seems that the US government is blackwashing itself, or blowing the whistle on itself. We saw that with Snowden's whistleblowing against NSA, which was basically just one arm of CIA blowing the cover of NSA. Since NSA is a sub-dept of DHS, we see how it is working there. We have also seen it in all the faked events of the last decade, which have failed ever more miserably. Someone is feeding truthers easy info, which is blowing the cover of what I assume are DHS faked events. We have seen this most recently in Paris, where the fake event is again unwinding in quick and surprising fashion. This indicates the turf war is international.

In the film, we also get an important clue when C, an agent above M, tries to shut down the 00 section that includes 007. This tells us that in the real world NEW Intelligence is trying to mothball Old Intelligence and steal their funding. Old Intelligence is of course fighting back. Making these Bond movies is one way they do that. Old Intelligence is still in control of most of Hollywood and British film, so they are blowing the cover of New Intelligence any way they can. That's why they create characters like C, who are not only said to be privately backed, but who are linked to underworld crime syndicates like Spectre. This makes them look like the bad guys. Of course, *all* of worldwide Intelligence is ultimately privately backed, but they don't want you to remember that. It is just a matter of what family is doing the backing. They are all linked to crime syndicates as well, or ARE crime syndicates—all the crimes being some variation of sweeping all existing wealth into the hands of few families.

That said, there *do* appear to be differences between Old Intel and New Intel. I am not linked to any of the old or new families—as far as I know—so I am free to be impartial here and tell what looks to me like the truth. Since things have gotten much worse since 2001, it is easy to conclude New Intel is worse than Old Intel. They both destroyed art and continue to do so, and so will be my sworn enemies until the end; but even so a step backward would be step in the right direction. That is to say, a reversal to the 1990s before DHS was created would be a welcome first step. Once all that mess is shut down we can talk about the next step.



Since we saw the Vanderbilt family linked to the producers of James Bond from way back, we may assume that family is OLD Intel. This suggests that Vanderbilt scion Anderson Cooper may be blowing the cover of events like Sandy Hook on CNN *on purpose*. I hadn't thought of that until just now, but it fits, doesn't it? Why else would he have given the truthers so much face time and air time, and done such a poor job of debunking them? This would mean that, like the horrible crisis actors we have found blowing these events in glorious fashion, Cooper may be only pretending to be shooting himself

in the foot. The obvious greenscreens he is using may be *intended* to fail, for example, and his outing by people like Alex Jones may be part of the intended fail. In other words, the news is not becoming more transparent and absurd by accident. It is an intended fail. I suspect the cover of all these events is being blown on purpose by Old Intel, and the long-term outcome—the end of which may already be in sight—is the defunding of DHS and downsizing of NSA.

This was confirmed once again just yesterday, when the *New York Times* surprisingly [came out against the CIA and NSA](#) in a prominent Op Ed piece. Since all the newspapers are now run out of Langley, this should look curious. Why is Intel attacking itself? Because Intel is split, and those placing this oped piece in the *NYT* are Old Intel. The expanded NSA is New Intel under DHS. Since they are attacking CIA director Brennan, they must see him as New Intel. Of course there is more to it than that, since the oped is about the Paris attacks. Notice that the authors take the event as given, even while criticizing the reaction to it. I assume this is the main point of the article: take the event as given. If they can get you arguing over the proper response to the event, they can prevent you from noticing it never happened.

But a secondary point of articles like this is indeed the defunding of DHS and the downsizing of NSA. Therefore, when I see these faked events in the media, I have to suppress my anger and realize that they are all part of a project I mostly approve of. I don't approve of fake events or of governing via lies, but I do approve of DHS taking a dive.

You see, it is probably felt by Old Intel that they cannot fight this war in the open. If they went public with all the excesses of New Intel, it would hurt Old Intel at the same time, since the excesses of Old Intel were only a fraction less than New Intel. They fear the public, apprised of the true situation, would wish to defund all Intelligence. So the only way they see to fight this war is by higher and higher levels of deception. Once DHS fails, we may hope to see some return to normalcy—or at least the sort of normalcy we saw before 2001—which was not normalcy, of course, but which was a somewhat less scary movie than the one we are now living in.

But back to the film. There we are introduced to the head of Spectre, Franz Oberhauser, previously listed as dead. That tells us many things. One, it is being admitted by the scriptwriters that deaths are faked. Funny that people accept fake deaths as a matter of course in films, but think it doesn't happen in real life. Two, the name is a clue, since it means Upper-Houser—of a higher house. That is what the wealthy families are, aren't they? They think they are of a higher house. This name also appears to me to be pointing at the name Oppenheimer, since heimer and hauser are very close. While haus means house, heim means home. So that may be a clue, and may confirm my guess about one of the eight families.

Well, it turns out this Oberhauser killed Bond's adopted father (this links us to the early Batman story, which is similar). He then faked his death and changed his name to Ernst Stavro Blofeld. Look closely at that name. It doesn't pass the literary smell test. My eyes and nose tell me we are dealing with another anagram there. We can pull a STEVEN out of there immediately, and maybe a FORD. STEVEN TARBOLLS FORD. Or STEVEN BALLORD FROST. Or STEVAN LORD BELFROST. Or we can pull an ALFRED as well. How about ALFREDT VON STROBELS? That may be grasping, but you see what I am doing. I think the FORD is most promising and you can work more on it if you like.

Anyway, it is also interesting to find Quantum as a subsidiary of Spectre. Quantum interests me for several reasons, the first of which is the name. They seem to be admitting that new physics is a subset

of Intelligence. Some would link that to the Manhattan project, but I think it goes even deeper and farther back than that. I have proposed in papers on my science site that all quantum physics from the beginning has been a smokescreen, one manufactured to confuse and misdirect the public and midlevel physicists away from any any truth as well as away from the old rules of science. Physics is now sold as gross mysticism and strict dogma, which could not be further from the classical definition of science. This keeps the mainstream out chasing their tails while a few hidden insiders pursue the real work (or one hopes some real work is getting done somewhere by someone in physics—we don't see any of it in the magazines or journals). The second thing that is interesting about Quantum is its cover organization Greene Planet. In this way, they are also admitting that the mainstream environmental movement is a sham, hijacked long ago by the usual suspects.

In the next scene in the film, Oberhauser admits that Spectre is **staging** terrorist attacks around the world, **creating the need** for the Nine Eyes program. The timing of this admission seems curious, in that one of the largest of these staged terrorist attacks occurred in Paris while the movie was out in the US. At the same time these “real-life” terrorist attacks are hitting the mainstream media, the current James Bond movie is admitting they are faked. But no one is making the connection? How about this connection: Nine Eyes obviously refers to the G8 countries, which are really G9 (with Russia supposedly suspended). They are: Canada, Italy, Japan, Germany, France, Russia, US, UK, and EU. That's *nine*, just like Nine Eyes. So why don't they call it G9? Well, they like 8 better, so they just fudge it. But it is also because they decided it was too obvious having Russia on the list. That would just be admitting they are really our ally and have been all along. We still need them to pose as our big bad enemy, so Russia was supposedly suspended from the G9. Also curious is the inclusion of the EU. Since the European countries France, Germany, Italy, and UK are already listed, what is the EU? It is the bankers. They have a listing all their own, to indicate their importance. To be honest, they could rename the G9 the IB—International Bankers—getting rid of the countries altogether, but that would be a little too in-your-face.

Since this James Bond movie is *telling you* the terrorist attacks are staged, we may assume the same people making the movie aren't staging the attacks. QED: we see the split in Intelligence. New Intel is running the staged terrorist attacks and Old Intel is trying to blow their cover. Since New Intel is not powerful enough to stop the production of a film or to prevent their projects from being blown or to prevent Youtube videos from going up, we must assume Old Intel is in the driver's seat here. However, since Old Intel is not powerful enough to simply order New Intel to desist, we may have to wade through many more months or years of this awful turf war. The good news is that it would appear impossible for them to merge into an uber-Intel: there simply isn't enough money to fund all these unnecessary worldwide projects. The eight families don't appear to wish to fund both sets of Intel from their private coffers, and the national treasuries simply can't sustain current spending levels. So something has to give. I suggest we will see New Intel phased out. It is creating unhealthy levels of instability in the markets. They want a lot of instability in the human psyche, since we have seen this creates the need to buy. However, you can go too far in that regard. If humans become so unstable they can't hold a job, their health fails, and they can't function, their buying power hits the skids as well. You don't increase either productivity or consumption by giving everyone a nervous breakdown. They got some idea of that after 911, when everyone was so traumatized they stopped buying. Remember how President Bush had to go on TV and actually beg people to start buying again, to support the bankers, I mean the economy?

So which of the Eight Families is DHS a front for? My guess is Rockefeller. The Rockefeller family was always extremely powerful, but its power has increased greatly since 2001. Rockefeller is behind Berkshire Hathaway and Warren Buffett, and you now see them everywhere. As just one example, they

have been buying up all the available stock of GoldmanSachs, to the tune of around \$10 billion. That is a lot of stock. How do I know Rockefeller is behind Buffett? Just go to [this BloombergView article](#) of 2013, which tells us about the Northern Pipeline adventure and Benjamin Graham's start in the big leagues in 1926 courtesy of Standard Oil. Of course this same Graham was the mentor of Buffett. We are told Buffett built himself from the ground up like Horatio Alger and Jack London, but this is another fib. Like the rest, Buffett was born to wealth. He got his start in his dad's company, Buffett-Falk Investments. His dad was a four-term US Congressman, so far to the right he earned a zero rating from Americans for Democratic Action. So Warren had connections from the start. Buffett now pretends to be on the side of the little guy, but that is all another smokescreen for the incredibly gullible. He also claims he is giving away 99% of this wealth. Funny, Andrew Carnegie claimed the same thing and never got around to it. These guys never do. They just create fake charities as fronts for even more money-making.



In previous papers I have shown evidence Rockefeller is also behind the massive Blackrock and Blackstone investment groups, which are gobbling up the world in not-so-slow motion.

I will be told Cheney and Rumsfeld were enemies of Nelson Rockefeller in 1976, getting rid of him and others in the so-called Halloween Massacre. Doesn't that blow my theory? No, that was just multiple levels of staging. Rockefeller had no wish to run on what he knew would be a losing ticket—Carter's win having already been manufactured—and besides Cheney and Rumsfeld were Rockefeller boys from way back. Cheney rode Rumsfeld's coattails, and Rumsfeld got his start at A.G. Becker back in the early 1960s. Becker later merged with Warburg, but it had even older ties to Rockefeller. The Rockefeller and Becker families had been intermarrying for centuries. [Just check the genealogies.](#) Other than that, Rumsfeld came out of the Navy, and I suspect he was always ONI, inserted later into Nixon's administration as a mole—to play a part [in Watergate](#). The Rockefellers were also involved in that, of course, so they were allies in the hidden MATRIX.

You will say, “What if the Rockefellers and Rothschilds form an alliance? Could the top two families really pull off a worldwide takeover?” Although it is possible that is what we are seeing, it doesn't look like it is working. The world is a big place containing a lot of powerful and greedy people. Controlling them all from just two families would be a tall order, no matter how much money they have. The fewer insiders you have, the more outsiders you create. That is why they had the eight families to start with: this kept most of their potential enemies on the inside. But the more they concentrate power and wealth, the more enemies they create on the outside. Those enemies then ally against them. That is why extreme power concentration is inherently unstable, and why it has always failed historically. Whoever is doing the pushing right now appears to have pushed past the point of stability. They are

trying to force the current structures to yield in ways they simply will not yield. It is also why they have created the global spy network, with NSA snooping 24/7 and so on: not because they are afraid of you and me, but because they are afraid of an alliance of second-tier billionaires biting them in the ass (including of course their old enemies the aristocrats, some of whom are still around). They aren't spying on the general populace, they are spying on one another.

Which is why I continue to predict a correction. They are going to have to return to 1990 levels at the least, and probably to pre-Watergate levels. If they don't, they may cause a far greater correction *against themselves*, one they haven't even foreseen. I suspect this is what Old Intel is pushing. If they are smart, they are pushing for a return to the old days when power was shared widely, and when the general populace was under considerably less pressure from above. After all, it's not like the rich weren't already obscenely rich back then.

However, DHS has torn the curtain to such an extent already that even that amount of roll-back may not be enough to re-create stability. If they rolled back to pre-Watergate, that would take us to the 1960s, and we have seen that a large part of the events of that decade were already manufactured. Almost all the big ones were. Stability cannot be maintained with that level of deception. If Intelligence doesn't want to get drastically downsized, it is going to have to find some useful projects to get involved in. There is enough to do in this world without manufacturing jobs for yourself. They could start by rebuilding art history. That is a big job by itself, one that will require decades of service. If CIA and the families behind them wish to continue to see themselves as nation builders, they need to get busy rebuilding this one—and all the others.