

[return to updates](#)


DID BLACKROCK/VANGUARD BUY THE ENTIRE WORLD?

by Miles Mathis

I got into this one in a weird way, as usual. I was researching famous 19th century author Bret Harte, who wrote about cowboys. You won't be surprised by what I found first: his grandfather was an Orthodox Jewish immigrant who was one of the founders of the New York Stock Exchange. Searching on the foundations of the NYSE, I tripped over the fact that it had been sold in 2012 to ICE. What is ICE? It is a company started by Jeffrey Sprecher, also Jewish, of course. ICE was backed by Goldman Sachs and Morgan Stanley at its startup in 2000, and we are told by mainstream sources that Sprecher “gave” 80% control to them. I assume the correct verb is “took”. They took it. We aren't told if they still had 80% control in 2012, when ICE took over the NYSE. But I take this to mean that Goldman Sachs (and perhaps Morgan Stanley) now own the NYSE. Morgan Stanley faded in 2007-8, as everyone knows, so maybe they aren't part of the mix like they were. Or—since that whole collapse was faked and managed as well—maybe Morgan Stanley just went undercover. Whatever the case may be there, we have to ask who owns Goldman Sachs. Are you ready? **Blackrock** is the top investor, and **Vanguard** and State Street are right behind. Together, they own almost 20% of Goldman Sachs.

And who owns Blackrock? As usual, that information is denied us. We are told that Blackrock is owned by shareholders, and that Fink, the top shareholder, only owns about 1%. If you believe that, you need serious help from Makemake. These investment groups were created to hide ownership, and they do it very well. Any research puts you on a merry-go-round, where one investment group is owned by another investment group, and then back to the first one. As with the *Forbes'* lists, the richest people are permanently hidden: they don't make any published lists. We may assume the Rockefellers and Rothschilds and the other usual suspects are being hidden, and maybe some others we don't even know about (like Stanleys or Spencer-Churchills).

But I did find some information that is not hidden which is very interesting. [At Fintel.io](#), we get a breakdown of what Blackrock and some of the others actually own. Chew on this to start with:



As you see, almost overnight Blackrock's value rose about 23 times, from about 80 billion to about 1.8 trillion. What happened in January of 2017? Oh yeah, Trump was sworn in as our newest fake President. But since Obama had been President before that, and since he was already Goldman Sachs lawnboy, what does that make Trump? Trump is 23 times further up Goldman Sachs wazoo than Obama was? How is that possible?

I leave that to you to figure out, since I have more numbers to spring on you. On that same page, we learn that Blackrock's top holdings are—in this order—Apple, Microsoft, Google, Amazon, JPMorganChase, Facebook, Johnson&Johnson, ExxonMobil, Berkshire Hathaway, Bank of America, Wells Fargo, Pfizer, Chevron, UnitedHealth, Proctor&Gamble, ATT, Verizon, Citigroup, VISA, Intel, Home Depot, Cisco, Comcast, DOW, CocaCola, Pepsi, Boeing, Merck, Oracle, Disney, PhilipMorris, MasterCard, McDonalds, GE, Walmart, 3M, IBM, Honeywell, TI, Invidia, Amgen, UnionPacific, BristolMyers, Abbott, LockheedMartin, GoldmanSachs, Adobe, MorganStanley, **and about 4800 more major** holdings!

Blackrock owns 53 billion of Apple, 45 billion of Microsoft, 40 billion of Google, 36 billion of Amazon, 24 billion of Facebook, 25 billion of JPMorganChase, 23 billion of Johnson&Johnson, 20 billion each of ExxonMobil, Berkshire Hathaway, and Bank of America, and so on, for a total of about 2.1 trillion.

Now you know why Apple and Microsoft have never really competed with one another. They are owned by the same people, so competition would be illogical. Two platforms were promoted from the beginning, to give the *illusion* of competition.

Blackstone's current portfolio is much smaller, about 20 billion, down from 36 billion in 2015. They appear to be shifting assets to Blackrock, closing many positions. But they are still heavily invested in Cheniere, Gates, Hilton, and La Quinta.

What about Vanguard? Curiously, [Vanguard's page](#) is almost identical to Blackrock's page. They have about 4100 holdings with a total value of 2.3 trillion, with the top holdings being—in this order—Apple, Microsoft, Google, Amazon, JPMorganChase, Facebook, Johnson&Johnson, BerkshireHathaway, ExxonMobil, Bank of America, etc. Look familiar? The same holdings as Blackrock *in the same order*. Vanguard owns 59 billion of Apple, 54 billion of Microsoft, 45 billion of Google, 41 billion of Amazon, 28 billion each of JPMorganChase and Facebook, 27 billion of Johnson&Johnson, 25 billion of BerkshireHathaway, 24 billion of ExxonMobil, etc. This indicates to me that Vanguard and Blackrock are owned and run by the same family/families, and are actually connected. As with Blackstone/Blackrock, we are sold a split to make it look like the companies aren't related, when they are. This immediately raises the percent ownership by a large margin (about doubling it in most cases). For instance, Blackrock/Vanguard own 112 billion of Apple. Since we may assume Apple's valuation of 500 billion is vastly inflated, Blackrock/Vanguard may own most of it. Or, other investment groups like State Street may also be fronts for the same family, being part of the same consortium. That would be my guess.

To see how that works, notice that on the page for [GoldmanSachs at Yahoo](#), we are told BerkshireHathaway is a top institutional holder, owning almost 3 billion of the company. But we just saw that BerkshireHathaway is itself owned by Blackrock/Vanguard, so part of Blackrock/Vanguard's ownership of GoldmanSachs is hidden in the BerkshireHathaway line. Three lines lower, we see Bank of America owning 1.4 billion of GoldmanSachs. But since Bank of America is owned by Blackrock/Vanguard, we have the same thing again. You see how the same few families are hiding

behind a maze of shunts and fronts.

What this means is that whoever owns Blackrock/Vanguard also owns the NYSE and everything else. And what that means is that whenever you see [that common statistic](#) trotted out by “progressives” or “liberals”, where 1% of the people on Earth have 50% of wealth, you know you are again being conned. That statistic sounds bad, but even it is heavily spun. The truth is much much worse. The truth is that the top 100 families, which comprise only a few thousand people, own above 90% of everything, and they control the rest. That means that .0001% own above 90%. Which is around 20,000 times worse than the statistic the “liberal” press is trying to sell you. And you know why they are trying to sell it to you: the liberal[read fascist] press is also owned by the people that own Blackrock/Vanguard.

Despite that, I would guess the answer to my title is. . . no. Blackrock/Vanguard *didn't* just buy the entire world. The people behind it *already* owned the entire world, but they have been busy solidifying their positions in the past half-century. *And* they have been busy increasing the real and apparent value of their holdings, one by raking all old and new assets into their accounts, and two by inflating the value of those assets at all times.

So, should this make you suicidal? No. It doesn't make me suicidal. Why not? Because I have no desire to own the world or any of those companies. Owning the world or big companies has never been on my to-do list, frankly. In fact, if some god or alien lit on my lawn and offered me ownership of the world I would pass. I would say, “Have you got any better properties?” Just kidding, but you know what I mean. Owning the world doesn't even really register in my psyche. How can you own the world? Even owning a house or a car doesn't mean anything to me, so why would I want to own the world? As for owning big companies, I have better things to do. I don't even like any of the big companies or their products, so why would I want to own them? The only reason I would buy any of them is to shut them down—which is not a great investment plan, I am told.

Another reason this stuff doesn't get me down is because despite the fact that these people (think they) own the whole world and always have, it doesn't seem to be doing them any good. Why not? Because ownership of the world is pretty much meaningless, when you get right down to it. All ownership is meaningless. I remind you of two things: one, the Biblical quote from Matthew: *how does it profit a person if he gain the whole world and lose his soul?* Two, the Native American quote, to the effect that you can't sell the Earth. The white men wanted to buy land from the Natives, but the Natives couldn't make sense of the basic idea. They didn't create the land or own it, so how could they sell it? The same can be said of anything. The gods must see ownership as a joke, or worse, since how can we buy and sell what we did not create? Like most other things, ownership is just a test, and the degree to which you think ownership matters is the degree to which you are a fool. It is how the gods know exactly how shallow you are. At the end of the day, it isn't what you own that is important, it is what you *create*. If you don't see what I mean, apply the same logic to the gods. Are the gods worthy of esteem because they *own* the world? No, they are worthy of esteem because they *created* it. Ownership is an empty term, coined by empty people. Stewardship means something, but ownership is meaningless. These people didn't create the Earth so by what right should they own it? Besides, if you study the real history of ownership, these people didn't buy anything. They *took* it, which is not at all the same thing.

If you baked a cherry pie today or mended a sock, you are ahead of the guy who sat on his ass and created nothing while “earning” a million from investments. And I don't just mean you are ahead of him in the eyes of the gods, though I believe that, too. I mean that even if the gods aren't watching or

keeping score, you are still ahead of him. You can look with pride on your cherry pie, while his millions or billions only give him ulcers. Have you ever met or heard of a billionaire who seemed like he had it made? Have you ever looked in the face of one of these people and thought “He looks like a great guy”? I haven't. You see people on TV or in movies wishing they could trade places with the rich, but to me that is just more salesmanship. It is the wealthy selling themselves, as usual. I wouldn't trade places with them for anything. They are the ones that should wish to trade places with me, not the other way round.

And now for a short diversion, in which I continue the little sermon. I watched *Bedazzled* for the first time last week, and there is a surprisingly charming scene where Brendan Fraser's character is told by another character not to worry: he shouldn't fret about any deal with the devil because he can't sell his soul anyway. You can't sell your soul for the same reason you can't sell the Earth: it doesn't belong to you. You don't own it. It belongs to God.

You will say that is just another reversal by the Satanists in Hollywood, who want you to think you can cavort with evil spirits and not get burned. And it probably is. I don't think they are actual Satanists, but I see your point. They may indeed hope you read that scene wrong, and some people will. Just because you can't really sell your soul to the devil doesn't mean you can't be led down a horribly bad path, by a bad person and by your own bad choices. You certainly can, and a lot of people do. That can be read as a *figurative* “selling your soul to the devil” I guess.

But taken literally, I think the *Bedazzled* scriptwriters are correct, perhaps accidentally. You cannot sell your soul. You can make bad decisions and let yourself be destroyed in this lifetime. But the “devils” cannot buy what you do not own. They cannot destroy what they did not create. Even so, you should flee them. Even without that, they can create mischief enough. That is known.

Others will complain that I recommend the film at all. They will tell me it is purposely seductive, what with Elizabeth Hurley playing the devil and coming across as likable. Again, true. For those waffling in any way between good and evil, the film may be a danger. If you find the dark side seductive at all, don't watch it. Personally, I don't. Which is why I could be charmed by that one scene and ignore the rest. That is why I mentioned it, you know. Without perhaps intending to, it actually confirms my sermon. It confirms that there *is* a soul, and that it is more important than any pile of money or ownership papers.

Baking a cherry pie—or creating any other useful or beautiful thing—feeds not only the body but the soul. Pursuing and gathering riches does the opposite. To start with, it is a waste of time since ownership is meaningless. To give you another example: in the history of a great painting, say a Van Gogh, nobody cares who owned or owns it. They only care who created it. Van Gogh gets all the credit, doesn't he, not any owner. Does anyone care that the Vatican owns the Ceiling of the Sistine Chapel? No, the only reason anyone cares about the Sistine Chapel is that it houses great paintings, and the artists who created them get all historical credit, the owners none. Does anyone really care who owns the rights to the Beatles' songs? No. If anyone cares about Beatles' songs, they care who wrote them and sang them, and only that.

Pursuing and gathering riches is even worse than a waste of time, since it doesn't just score zero on the relevance scale, it scores negative. It isn't a creating, it is a *taking*. It isn't baking a cherry pie, it is stealing a cherry pie that someone else made, and that someone else needs to eat more than you do. But it is even worse, since the one who steals it doesn't gain from it. He may *think* he does, since he puts it in a gain pile and adds it to his total wealth. But every theft creates a hole in his spirit—which is

why the wealthy age faster and worse than normal people. You would think wealthy people would age better, since they have access to any and all health technology and care. But they don't. In general, they look worse at 60 than you do or will. Why? You already know why. Your soul shines through your face. I was going to say "like a light". But it is not "like" a light, it *is* a light, as we know from my work on the charge field. The soul isn't some nebulous thing that only exists in the 12th dimension; it exists in this world as *real photons*. It is as real as your arm or your leg. And so goodness and health are two names for the same thing, and bad people make themselves uglier, day by day.

I know some will say, "Oh, you are an artist, a man, and a throwback, so you think you can judge people by how they look. It isn't that easy." Well, it isn't that *simple*, but it is that easy. Yes, you have to take other things into account. Some people are healthier or prettier to start with, and some will encounter tragedy that is in no way their fault. So there is a varying baseline, that is true. But I am not talking about that kind of beauty anyway. I am talking about the "shining through" beauty, which anyone can have, and anyone can lose. As they used to say, "your first face you are born with; your second face you have to earn".

My point is best seen by looking at Hollywood stars, most of whom start out very beautiful. That is why they are chosen. The producers scan the families for the prettiest children and we go from there. But these Hollywood stars are also the most likely to lose the shine, for the same reason: they are from these families who exist on lies, stealing, and other wickedness. Very few of them age well; and yes, I do think with them you can very often tell who is the worst by who ages the worst. In fact, almost *all* of them age very poorly, so you only have to look at the handful who don't. If they keep the shine, it is for a reason. They have avoided some of the things their co-stars haven't. You can't keep the shine just by moisturizing or taking collagen, you know. You have to also maintain your spirit. You have to do good things, or at least refrain from doing bad things.

This means someone like Heather Graham must be doing something right. Yes, we know she sleeps a lot, so that is part of it; but it has to be more than that. I just Googled on her, and she is now selling the #MeToo movement, trashing Harvey Weinstein, so she isn't completely divorced from the propaganda. I am not really sure how to explain that, but my feeling is that she is protected by her own ignorance. She is known as one of the dumbest people in Hollywood, and that may be her saving grace here. I suspect she is absolutely clueless about any larger issues, and is just being used. You will say that shouldn't protect her, but I think it does. The blame attaches to those who run the projects and who join them knowingly. Children and other innocents like Graham skate through in the eyes of the gods.

In regard to movie stars and other celebrities: because they started out very beautiful, the loss of the shine is easier to spot, even for those who don't have an eye for it. Not everyone can see when eyes go dark, apparently. I point it out, but most people don't see it. But when a beautiful movie star goes dark, it is very obvious, since the whole face tends to crash. The effect isn't subtle. And it usually doesn't happen at 50 or 60, it happens before 40, sometimes before 30, which is all the more shocking. I won't name any names, because I don't need to. Examples will come to mind.

So what does it all mean? It means that the rich haven't got anything figured out. They are far more lost than you will ever be (hopefully). They are very concerned about aging and mortality, and yet they age quicker than any of us. I am telling them there is a solution to their problem, and it costs very little. The greater part of it doesn't cost anything, since it consists of doing the right thing—which is free. If they learn to shepherd their own souls, they can age far more gracefully. No, they won't live forever, but the wise don't wish to live forever anyway. Far better to come back as a child, and you can't do that without dying.

Another thing this tells us is that all those beauty sites telling you how to age gracefully also have it mostly wrong. Yes, you have to take care of the body as well as the spirit, and they get some of that right. You have to sleep a lot, drink a lot of water, eat good food, refrain from smoking and drinking, and all that. But that isn't enough. That isn't even half of it, as the movie stars and models know. Some of them do all that and still look like garbage by 40, and it is because they neglect their souls. They rot from the inside out, and no amount of moisturizer can counteract that rot.

You can't moisturize photons. You can only channel them or block them. Somehow and in some way, it appears that goodness channels them and wickedness blocks them. I can't tell you exactly how. I can't point to a clear mechanism. But in some way and by some set of terms this has also been known for millennia. Furthermore, *each of us knows this from birth*. It is part of our set of instructions, like the ability to walk or talk. You couldn't possibly learn to talk if you didn't already have a fundamental understanding of language hardwired into your brain. That is something I learned from Chomsky, though he didn't invent the idea. In the same way, you couldn't possibly learn morals—right and wrong—if you didn't already have a fundamental understanding of morality from the beginning. As I have said before, for the most part you don't have to be taught right from wrong. In fact, in our culture you have to be *untaught* basic morality. Your natural instincts have to be subverted in order for you to thrive in our “civilization”.

What does this have to do with investment groups like Blackrock and Vanguard? Everything. As usual, I am talking to them as well as to you. You and I don't have the *physical* power to stop them, since they own everything, including the military. But they have the power to stop themselves. At some point in history, these people will realize that world ownership isn't all it's cracked up to be. After 40 centuries of failing at the game of life, they may finally learn the basic lesson. They will cede ownership of the Earth back to the Earth and get on with life as it was intended to be lived. Maybe it was required that they actually gain the whole world before they could lose it. In other words, they had to definitively achieve their final goal: full ownership of the world and all its parts. They now have that, on paper, with full graphs and charts. There is no longer any doubt of it.

But I would ask them, is the taste sweet or is it bitter? What did you have to give up to achieve this goal? Your looks, your family, your self-respect, your sleep, your health, and even your place in history. You can hire people to sell you while you are alive. Your children and grandchildren may continue to promote you to promote themselves. But you have no real place in history. No one really esteems the rich. The plutocrats have always been hated and they always will be—for good reason. You aren't hated from envy, as you like to think. You are detested because you are detestable. You are liars and cheats and thieves. Once the world reaches a true age of enlightenment, you and all like you will be forgotten forever. If you are remembered at all it will only be as examples of what paths a wise man avoids.

So why wait for history to decide this for you? Why not decide it for yourself now? You don't have to slog through several more miserable lifetimes to learn this lesson. Why not learn it now? **Start the age of enlightenment tomorrow and you can live the rest of your life in it.** You can begin sleeping, begin cleaning up your surroundings, begin doing the right things, and within a few months the shine will creep back into your face. By the time you die as a more beautiful person, you may have gained some true and deserved respect from those around you, and from those who come after. And if you do all this, you can then be reborn into this enlightened world you have allowed to exist. You won't have to fear coming back as another miserable rich person.