RA13

THE ROCKEFELLER FAMILY & POWER NETWORK

Family, institutions, influence and the evidentiary boundary of Beter's "Rockefeller Cartel"

COMPLETE SOURCE-BASED STUDY

A forensic comparison of family history, Standard Oil, banking, philanthropy, policy networks and the Audio Letter narrative from 1975–1982.

First edition · 13 October 2026 · v1.0

Contents

What this volume examines	3
Method: actor, mechanism, decision, date	4
1870–1911: Standard Oil is real history	5
After antitrust: continuity must be demonstrated	6
The family was larger than Beter's four-man core	7
John D. Rockefeller 3rd: institutions and interpretation	8
Nelson Rockefeller: public office is not hidden office	9
Laurance Rockefeller: capital, technology and conservation	10
David Rockefeller: banking and international access	11
The Rockefeller Brothers Fund: real coordination, bounded scope	12
The Rockefeller Foundation: a name is not a command chain	13
CFR: documented elite networking	14
The Trilateral Commission: founding is documented, control is not inferred	15
AL02: an early 1975 model of political and economic control	16
AL36: the mature "dynasty" narrative	17
10 July 1978: John 3rd's death as a test case	18
26 January 1979: Nelson's death and competing accounts	19
AL42: a weakened faction is still a moving hypothesis	20
AL44 versus the later lives of David and Laurance	21
Influence: ownership, credit, appointments and agenda-setting	22
The danger of denominator-free network maps	23
Prediction, retrodiction and moving targets	24
Claim register: strongest supported propositions	25
Claim register: strongest contradictions and unresolved claims	26
Chronology: 1870–1979	27
What would materially strengthen the cartel hypothesis?	28
Overall assessment	29

What this volume examines

RA13 asks a narrower question than the phrase ‘Rockefeller power’ usually implies. It separates a real family, real corporations and foundations, documented political and policy roles, and Beter’s much stronger claim that these relationships formed a centrally directed covert cartel. Each proposition is tested at the level at which it can actually be evidenced.

The study therefore does not treat elite influence as imaginary merely because a universal command structure is unproven. Wealth, access, agenda-setting, philanthropy, banking and public office can create substantial influence. The analytical mistake would be to convert those different mechanisms into one undifferentiated verb — ‘control’ — without identifying who could compel whom, in which decision, at what date.

The Audio Letters are used as primary evidence for what Beter alleged, not as independent verification of those allegations. Institutional histories, court records and public biographies are used to establish documented roles and chronology. Where the two layers diverge, the divergence is stated rather than harmonized.

Documented influence and alleged centralized command are different propositions.

Method: S01–S18; primary claims are attributed to Beter.

Method: actor, mechanism, decision, date

For every network claim RA13 records four minimum elements: the actor, the mechanism of influence, the decision or asset affected, and the relevant date. A fifth element — observable consequence — is added when available. This prevents a family relationship, a board seat, a donation and corporate ownership from being treated as interchangeable forms of command.

Evidence is graded proposition by proposition: documented; documented but narrower than Beter's framing; unresolved in the consulted material; or contradicted by the consulted record. 'Unresolved' is deliberately not translated as 'false'. Conversely, the existence of secrecy or incomplete archives cannot by itself select Beter's explanation from all other possibilities.

Current institutional descriptions are not projected backward without qualification. The Rockefeller Foundation's present legal independence, for example, is evidence about institutional identity and governance today; historical control in a given decade still requires period records. Likewise, a later biography can establish a death date but not every confidential relationship during a lifetime.

Always specify the verb: own, appoint, fund, advise, convene, pressure, block, or command.

Editorial method; compare institutional records S05–S18 with Audio Letters S01–S04.

1870–1911: Standard Oil is real history

The historical foundation of Rockefeller wealth is not conjectural. John D. Rockefeller organized Standard Oil in 1870; the enterprise expanded rapidly, the Standard Oil Trust was formed in 1882, and the U.S. Supreme Court ultimately ordered the New Jersey holding company dissolved in 1911 under antitrust law. Those facts establish extraordinary concentration of industrial power in a specific sector and period.

They do not automatically establish a permanent command chain over every successor company after dissolution. The 1911 judgment matters precisely because it altered legal organization and ownership structures. A claim that coordination continued through nominees or informal relationships must identify the relevant shares, agreements, directors, voting arrangements or communications after the decree.

Beter's later narrative treats Standard Oil as the origin of a much broader twentieth-century power structure. That genealogy is a hypothesis about continuity. RA13 accepts the documented starting point while requiring separate evidence for each later extension into banking, media, intelligence, foreign policy or unrelated corporations.

A documented monopoly is strong evidence of industrial concentration, not a blank cheque for later universal-control claims.

Sources: S05, S06.

After antitrust: continuity must be demonstrated

The breakup of Standard Oil did not erase the Rockefeller fortune. Shareholders received interests in successor firms, and the family remained wealthy. It is therefore reasonable to study continuing economic influence. The key methodological question is whether continuity of wealth equals continuity of centralized operational control. Those are not identical.

A network can retain influence through ownership, personal ties, financing, board service or shared strategy even when formal legal unity disappears. But each mechanism leaves a different documentary trail. Cross-directorships can be mapped. Shareholdings can be dated. Lending relationships can be read in contracts. Informal coordination is harder, yet it still requires some affirmative evidence if it is to be asserted as fact.

Beter often moves from the historical existence of concentrated Rockefeller interests to a unitary ‘cartel’ that can direct large sectors of public life. RA13 keeps the inference visible. It neither assumes that antitrust ended all influence nor assumes that surviving influence proves the full cartel model.

Continuity of wealth continuity of command.

Sources: S05, S06; inference tested against later institutional sources.

The family was larger than Beter’s four-man core

John D. Rockefeller Jr. and Abby Aldrich Rockefeller had six children: Abby, John 3rd, Nelson, Laurance, Winthrop and David. Beter’s mature faction narrative repeatedly foregrounds four brothers — John 3rd, Nelson, Laurance and David — while excluding Winthrop from the supposed command core. That selection is part of Beter’s model, not the family tree itself.

This distinction matters because ‘Rockefeller family’ can refer to genealogy, while ‘Rockefeller faction’ is an analytical or conspiratorial category that selects particular relatives and associates for assigned functions. The two sets overlap but are not identical. A study that silently equates them would convert an allegation about a small inner group into a claim about every relative.

The Rockefeller Brothers Fund also complicates a four-man picture: its own history states that five brothers founded it in 1940 and initially made grants collectively. That is genuine coordination in philanthropy, but its existence cannot by itself establish Beter’s separate assertion of covert command in banking, war planning or intelligence.

Genealogy is observable; membership in an alleged covert command group requires separate evidence.

Sources: S07–S12, S17; Beter framing S02–S04.

John D. Rockefeller 3rd: institutions and interpretation

John D. Rockefeller 3rd's public record includes major philanthropic and cultural activity and long engagement with international affairs. These roles matter because they show substantial resources and institutional access without requiring speculation. A source-based analysis should begin with those documented functions before assigning hidden ones.

Beter assigns John 3rd a coordinating role in a worldwide power structure. That is a stronger proposition. To move from philanthropy and institution-building to covert strategic command would require evidence of instructions, operational authority or decision chains linking him to the claimed actions.

His death in a car crash on 10 July 1978 is a firm chronological anchor for later Audio Letters. Beter interprets the death as a severe blow to the brothers' coordination. The event is documented; the political meaning he assigns to it is an inference requiring independent support.

Event and interpretation must stay in separate columns.

Sources: S02, S07, S12.

Nelson Rockefeller: public office is not hidden office

Nelson Rockefeller held unusually visible political power: he was governor of New York and became U.S. vice president after Gerald Ford nominated him under the Twenty-fifth Amendment. The Senate records his oath on 19 December 1974. These facts are strong evidence of access to executive power and national policy.

Beter's early Audio Letters go much further. He portrays Nelson as the political operator of a family command structure and links his vice presidency to a plan for dictatorship. That proposition is testable only through evidence of the alleged plan — documents, participants, instructions and implementation — not through the mere fact that a wealthy politician became vice president.

This case demonstrates why public power should not be minimized. One need not accept a secret dictatorship plan to recognize that a vice president, governor and presidential aspirant had real influence. Conversely, the reality of that influence cannot be used as a substitute for evidence of every covert purpose attributed to him.

Real public power can be substantial without proving an additional secret chain of command.

Sources: S01, S08, S16.

Laurance Rockefeller: capital, technology and conservation

Laurance Rockefeller's biography documents a broad but intelligible portfolio: venture-capital investment, aviation and aerospace interests, science and technology, conservation, resort development and leadership in major nonprofit organizations. These are genuine connections worth mapping because they place one family member at the intersection of capital and emerging technologies.

Beter expands those connections into a covert strategic role within the alleged cartel. The evidentiary step is therefore not whether Laurance had technology investments — he did — but whether those investments were directed as components of a centralized clandestine political program. Public sector breadth is not the same as covert operational unity.

The chronology supplies a particularly strong later test. The Rockefeller Archive Center records Laurance's death in 2004. Any 1979 claim that he had already died must therefore explain decades of independently documented public life; absent extraordinary evidence, the ordinary biographical record weighs decisively against the earlier death claim.

A broad investment portfolio is evidence of reach, not by itself evidence of one hidden mission.

Sources: S04, S09.

David Rockefeller: banking and international access

David Rockefeller's documented career provides the strongest public example of international financial influence in the family's generation. He rose through Chase Manhattan, became chairman and chief executive in 1969, and developed extensive relationships with political and business leaders around the world. His biography supports the proposition that he was an unusually connected banker.

Beter's model treats those connections as components of a wider command structure. The distinction is crucial: a bank can finance, advise, negotiate and create dependence without owning the borrower or directing every political decision. A banker can have privileged access without possessing unilateral authority over the governments he meets.

Again the death chronology yields a direct falsification test. The Rockefeller Archive Center records David's death on 20 March 2017 at age 101. This is incompatible with Beter's AL44 claim that David had died in February 1979, unless one adds a further replacement hypothesis for which separate evidence would be required.

Access and leverage are measurable; omnipotent command is a different claim.

Sources: S04, S10.

The Rockefeller Brothers Fund: real coordination, bounded scope

The Rockefeller Brothers Fund is an important control case because it documents actual family coordination. Its history states that five brothers created the Fund in 1940, pooled resources and initially made grant decisions collectively. This is not an inferred network; it is an institutional arrangement with a stated purpose and governance history.

That very clarity shows how evidence should work. We can name the organization, founding date, participants, decision mechanism and philanthropic object. Later non-family trustees and generational transitions are also documented. A covert-command claim should ideally approach the same specificity, even if surviving records are necessarily less complete.

The Fund therefore neither disproves nor proves Beter's cartel. It demonstrates that elite families can coordinate significant resources in transparent or semi-public institutions. The analytical boundary lies between evidence for a particular coordinated institution and extrapolation to unrelated governments, banks or military operations.

Where coordination is real, identify the institution and its decision mechanism.

Sources: S11, S12, S17.

The Rockefeller Foundation: a name is not a command chain

Organizations carrying the Rockefeller name are often treated in popular diagrams as if they were departments of one headquarters. That inference is unsafe. The Rockefeller Foundation states that it is legally independent, with its own resources, trustees and mission, and that it does not control other Rockefeller-named entities.

A current governance statement cannot settle every historical question, but it establishes a critical default distinction: common origin, family association or name does not itself demonstrate common operational control. Historical periods still need their own trustee lists, grants, correspondence and legal documents.

This is especially relevant to Beter's use of foundations as instruments of political power. Foundations can shape research priorities, professional networks and public debate through grants. That influence can be studied empirically. The stronger allegation that grants were centrally directed components of a clandestine world strategy requires a different evidence set.

Common name common command.

Sources: S15, S17.

CFR: documented elite networking

David Rockefeller's Council on Foreign Relations role is not speculative. CFR's historical roster records him as a director from 1949 to 1985 and chairman from 1970 to 1985. That is significant institutional access over decades, and it supplies a concrete basis for studying how private policy forums connect business, government, academia and media.

What the roster does not establish is that CFR members receive orders from a Rockefeller command center or that the organization controls U.S. foreign policy. A forum can shape agendas, circulate ideas, provide social capital and reduce the cost of coordination without becoming a sovereign chain of command.

The appropriate research questions are narrower and stronger: which people met, which reports were produced, which recommendations entered government debate, and which decisions can be causally linked to the network? Those questions allow serious study of influence without upgrading association into obedience.

A network can matter greatly without being a government.

Sources: S13, S18.

The Trilateral Commission: founding is documented, control is not inferred

The Trilateral Commission's own history says it was founded in 1973 by David Rockefeller. That establishes personal initiative in creating a transnational policy forum. It also establishes a legitimate subject for research into elite networks: membership, reports, convenings and movement of people between private and public roles can all be tracked.

The evidentiary mistake would be to treat founding a forum as equivalent to commanding everyone who participates in it. Members can disagree, governments can reject proposals, and a report can influence debate without being an executed instruction. The mechanism has to be shown rather than assumed from membership.

For Beter's cartel thesis, the Commission is therefore neither irrelevant nor self-proving. It is evidence that David Rockefeller deliberately built international relationships and policy discussion structures. The remaining question — whether that structure implemented a clandestine unified command — requires independent operational records.

Founding a forum proves initiative; it does not prove command over every participant.

Source: S14.

AL02: an early 1975 model of political and economic control

Audio Letter 2, dated 15 July 1975, is important because it captures Beter's model near the beginning of the series rather than after later events had accumulated. He portrays the four brothers as a coordinated unit whose plans for economic dislocation and dictatorship were already encountering setbacks.

The letter's evidentiary value has two layers. It is primary evidence that Beter publicly advanced these claims at that date. It is not, by itself, evidence that the alleged plan existed. Verification therefore turns to the specific events he connects to the plan: Nelson's vice presidency, economic conditions, Fort Knox, media behavior and later political outcomes.

This distinction protects a useful historical fact: the narrative really was being stated in the mid-1970s. A later researcher should not dismiss that chronology. But chronological priority is only one component of verification; a prior claim can still be mistaken about mechanism, causation or scope.

Date the claim first; then test the mechanism.

Sources: S01, S16.

AL36: the mature “dynasty” narrative

By Audio Letter 36 in July 1978, Beter presents a much more explicit historical theory. He describes the Rockefeller dynasty as a multi-generation power structure and depicts the four brothers as a coordinated leadership group over major Western economic and political interests.

Some components of the background are independently strong: enormous family wealth, prominent institutions, senior political office, global banking and policy networks. Other components are much stronger causal propositions: that those assets answered to one hidden command and that the command could direct wars, governments and intelligence operations.

RA13 treats AL36 as the clearest statement of the hypothesis to be tested, not as a bundle to accept or reject wholesale. A useful result can be mixed: high confidence in exceptional influence and network density, lower confidence in a single integrated command system, and contradiction for some specific later claims.

A mixed verdict is more informative than “all true” or “all false.”

Source: S02; comparison S05–S18.

10 July 1978: John 3rd's death as a test case

John D. Rockefeller 3rd died in an automobile accident on 10 July 1978. This is independently documented. Beter's subsequent treatment turns that public event into evidence of a deteriorating command structure. The chronological sequence is real; the causal interpretation is not contained in the death record.

A rigorous test would ask whether decisions attributed to John 3rd changed measurably after his death, whether documents from other participants identify a leadership vacuum, and whether institutions supposedly controlled by the four brothers altered behavior in a coordinated way. Without such links, the event remains compatible with many interpretations.

This is a recurring pattern in conspiracy analysis: a highly salient event can make a narrative feel explanatory even when the connecting mechanism is missing. RA13 preserves the event, Beter's interpretation and the missing evidentiary bridge as three separate entries.

A date can anchor a claim without proving its causal story.

Sources: S02, S07, S12.

26 January 1979: Nelson’s death and competing accounts

Nelson Rockefeller died on 26 January 1979. Public biographical records identify a heart attack. In Audio Letter 42, Beter alleges instead that Nelson was shot and that the public account concealed the real circumstances. Here the disagreement is direct and therefore analytically useful.

The burden of proof is asymmetric. An official or biographical account is not infallible simply because it is official, but overturning the recorded cause of death requires affirmative contrary evidence: medical documentation, credible eyewitness testimony, forensic evidence or contemporaneous records that survive independent scrutiny.

The material consulted for RA13 does not provide such corroboration. Therefore the defensible conclusion is not that concealment is metaphysically impossible, but that the shooting allegation is not established and conflicts with the available public record.

Contradicting the recorded cause of death requires positive contrary evidence.

Sources: S03, S08.

AL42: a weakened faction is still a moving hypothesis

After John 3rd and Nelson were gone, Beter did not abandon the cartel model. Audio Letter 42 reframed it as a weakened leadership structure centered on the surviving brothers and possible substitutes. This adaptability is important when assessing falsifiability.

A model can legitimately evolve when new evidence appears. The problem arises when every adverse event can be absorbed without specifying what observation would count against the model. If deaths prove weakening, survival proves continuity, criticism proves loss of control and silence proves concealment, the hypothesis risks becoming difficult to test.

RA13 therefore asks each stage to state its own expected observations. If the alleged leadership changes, which institutions should change behavior? Which appointments should follow? Which financial decisions should differ? A model becomes stronger, not weaker, when it exposes itself to possible failure.

A good hypothesis states what would count against it.

Source: S03; editorial test of falsifiability.

AL44 versus the later lives of David and Laurance

Audio Letter 44 provides RA13's clearest hard contradiction. Beter states that all four Rockefeller brothers in his core group were dead and gives February 1979 dates for David and Laurance. Independent biographies record Laurance living until 2004 and David until 2017, with extensive public activities across the intervening decades.

One can preserve Beter's larger narrative only by adding another proposition — that later public David and Laurance were replacements or doubles. But an auxiliary claim does not erase the contradiction; it creates a new claim with its own burden of proof. It would require evidence capable of distinguishing replacement from ordinary continued life.

Without such evidence, the best-supported conclusion is that the death claims were wrong. This does not logically refute every statement Beter made about Rockefeller influence, but it materially lowers confidence in his claimed access to precise inside information about the faction's leadership.

This is a direct chronological contradiction, not merely an unresolved mechanism.

Sources: S04, S09, S10, S12.

Influence: ownership, credit, appointments and agenda-setting

RA13 distinguishes four mechanisms that can create real power without requiring a single secret headquarters. Ownership can convey voting and economic rights. Credit can impose contractual conditions and create bargaining leverage. Appointments can place people in decision-making positions. Agenda-setting can determine which ideas receive resources and elite attention.

These mechanisms can reinforce one another. A wealthy banker who chairs a policy institution may meet ministers, finance projects and support research. That combination is analytically important. But the resulting network remains a set of relationships until evidence shows a common command directing specific decisions.

The practical implication is that criticism of concentrated power becomes more precise when it names the mechanism. A documented loan covenant, board vote or grant is stronger than a diagram with lines between famous names. The diagram can generate questions; it cannot answer them on its own.

Network density can be measured; command requires evidence of direction.

Sources: S10, S13–S18; editorial synthesis.

The danger of denominator-free network maps

A network map becomes misleading when it shows only connections that support a thesis. If one banker sits on several boards, the visual can look like a command center unless the map also records how many other directors, institutions and competing networks exist. Without a denominator, density is easy to exaggerate.

The same problem affects family-name mapping. The Rockefeller name appears across institutions created at different times with different governance. Some have direct family history; some later diversified their boards; some are legally independent. A line on a chart should therefore carry a type and date: founder, donor, trustee, executive, lender, member, or merely namesake.

RA13's recommendation is simple: every line should be a proposition. If the line cannot be written as a dated sentence with a source, it should not be treated as evidence. This procedure does not eliminate hidden influence; it makes the visible part auditable.

Every line in a network diagram should be a sourced sentence.

Editorial procedure informed by S11–S18.

Prediction, retrodiction and moving targets

Beter's archive mixes forecasts, contemporaneous interpretations and retrospective explanations. They should not be scored together. A prediction deserves evaluation from the version available before the event, with the expected outcome and time window stated in advance. A retrospective explanation is evaluated by causal evidence, not by whether it can be fitted to known events.

The Rockefeller narrative changes as public events change: setbacks become evidence of weakening, deaths are integrated into succession, and later conflict with other factions explains reversals. Such evolution may be reasonable, but it complicates a simple tally of 'hits'. The original wording and date must remain visible.

RA13 therefore resists both selective debunking and selective confirmation. A correct chronology should receive credit. A contradicted death claim should count against confidence. An unresolved allegation should remain unresolved rather than being silently converted into either proof or disproof.

Score claims symmetrically: hits, misses and unresolved items all remain in the ledger.

Sources: S01–S04; methodological comparison with RA10 procedure.

Claim register: strongest supported propositions

Several propositions emerge with high confidence. Rockefeller wealth and Standard Oil's historic concentration are documented. The family created durable philanthropic institutions. Nelson held major political office. David held major banking and policy-network roles. Laurance invested in advanced technologies and conservation. These facts establish exceptional social, economic and institutional reach.

A second tier is also supportable with qualification: family members sometimes coordinated resources and initiatives, and elite forums can influence policy agendas. The Rockefeller Brothers Fund is a clear example of formal coordination. CFR and the Trilateral Commission are clear examples of real networks involving David Rockefeller.

None of those supported propositions, standing alone, establishes Beter's full claim of centralized covert command over governments, wars, intelligence services and broad corporate systems. The missing step is not small; it is the mechanism that turns influence into obedience across institutions.

The strongest conclusion is exceptional influence plus a large evidentiary gap to universal covert control.

Sources: S05–S18.

Claim register: strongest contradictions and unresolved claims

The strongest contradictions concern Beter's 1979 death claims for David and Laurance Rockefeller. Their later documented lives extend to 2017 and 2004 respectively. Maintaining the original claim requires an added replacement theory for which the consulted sources provide no independent support.

Other major claims remain unresolved rather than directly contradicted: a single secret Rockefeller command over broad Western institutions, specific covert responsibility for military crises, and hidden direction of particular governments or intelligence operations. The consulted public record does not establish these mechanisms.

Nelson Rockefeller's alleged shooting also remains unsupported and conflicts with the recorded cause of death. These findings do not erase documented elite power. They limit how far that power can responsibly be described without importing Beter's conclusions into the evidence itself.

Contradicted claims reduce confidence in claimed privileged access even when other background facts are correct.

Sources: S03, S04, S08–S12.

Chronology: 1870–1979

1870: Standard Oil is organized. 1882: the Standard Oil Trust consolidates properties. 1911: the U.S. Supreme Court orders dissolution of the New Jersey holding company. 1940: five Rockefeller brothers establish the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. These dates define the institutional background before Beter's Audio Letters.

1970: David Rockefeller begins his period as CFR chairman. 1973: the Trilateral Commission is founded. 1974: Gerald Ford nominates Nelson Rockefeller as vice president; Nelson takes the oath on 19 December. 1975: Beter's AL02 presents an early version of the four-brother power model.

10 July 1978: John D. Rockefeller 3rd dies. 27 July 1978: AL36 presents a mature dynasty narrative. 26 January 1979: Nelson Rockefeller dies. 31 January: AL42 interprets the faction as weakened. March 1979: AL44 states that David and Laurance are also dead — a claim contradicted by their later documented lives.

Chronology is the skeleton; causal claims are the muscles that still require evidence.

Sources: S01–S18.

What would materially strengthen the cartel hypothesis?

The cartel hypothesis would be materially strengthened by dated operational records showing a common decision center: instructions distributed across nominally independent institutions, minutes identifying shared strategic authority, financial transfers tied to specific covert actions, or independent witnesses whose accounts converge on the same command mechanism.

Evidence should also survive negative controls. If the same institutions sometimes oppose one another, those cases must be explained. If supposed subordinates make decisions contrary to the alleged center, the model should specify whether that is autonomy, defection or evidence against the command claim.

Declassification and private archives could change particular conclusions. RA13 is therefore a dated assessment, not a metaphysical declaration that hidden coordination can never exist. Its present conclusion reflects the evidence inspected as of 13 October 2026.

Future evidence can revise a conclusion; present uncertainty is not permission to fill gaps with certainty.

Evidence standard: dated operational documentation and independent corroboration.

Overall assessment

RA13 finds a substantial documented foundation beneath the broad subject: exceptional wealth, historic industrial concentration, major banking leadership, high political office, philanthropy and policy-network participation. Any serious history of twentieth-century U.S. elite power can reasonably study Rockefeller influence.

The evidence inspected does not establish Beter's strongest proposition that these relationships constituted one centrally directed covert cartel controlling governments, military crises and broad institutional systems. Several mechanisms remain asserted rather than demonstrated, while the AL44 death claims for David and Laurance are directly contradicted by later public records.

The most defensible synthesis is therefore neither dismissal nor endorsement. Beter identified real concentrations of wealth and real elite networks, then placed them inside a much stronger clandestine command model. The first layer is extensively documentable. The second requires evidence that, in the material consulted here, is incomplete or absent and in some specific cases contradicted.

Exceptional influence: well supported. Universal covert command: not established. Specific 1979 death claims: contradicted.

Assessment based on S01–S18; source-access cut-off 13 Oct 2026.

Source register · 1

S01 — Peter D. Beter — Audio Letter 02 · 15 Jul 1975
Primary archive transcript for early claims about the four brothers, economic control and Nelson Rockefeller.
https://www.peterdavidbeter.com/docs/all/dbal02.html

S02 — Peter D. Beter — Audio Letter 36 · 27 Jul 1978
Primary transcript for Beter's mature dynasty/cartel model after John D. Rockefeller 3rd's death.
https://www.peterdavidbeter.com/docs/all/dbal36.html

S03 — Peter D. Beter — Audio Letter 42 · 31 Jan 1979
Primary transcript for Beter's interpretation of Nelson Rockefeller's death and the faction's weakened leadership.
https://www.peterdavidbeter.com/docs/all/dbal42.html

S04 — Peter D. Beter — Audio Letter 44 · 29 Mar 1979
Primary transcript containing claims that David and Laurance Rockefeller had died in February 1979.
https://www.peterdavidbeter.com/docs/all/dbal44.html

S05 — Rockefeller Archive Center — John D. Rockefeller, 1839–1937
Institutional biography covering Standard Oil's 1870 organization, 1882 trust and 1911 dissolution.
https://rockarch.org/resources/about-the-rockefellers/john-d-rockefeller-sr/

S06 — Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey v. United States, 221 U.S. 1 (1911)
U.S. Supreme Court decision establishing the antitrust judgment and ordered dissolution.
https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/221/1

S07 — Rockefeller Archive Center — John D. Rockefeller 3rd, 1906–1978
Biography and institutional roles of John D. Rockefeller 3rd.
https://rockarch.org/resources/about-the-rockefellers/john-d-rockefeller-3rd/

S08 — Rockefeller Archive Center — Nelson A. Rockefeller, 1908–1979
Biography and documented public career of Nelson Rockefeller.
https://rockarch.org/resources/about-the-rockefellers/nelson-a-rockefeller/

Source register · 2

S09 — Rockefeller Archive Center — Laurance S. Rockefeller, 1910–2004
Biography documenting venture-capital, science, conservation and nonprofit roles; death in 2004.
https://rockarch.org/resources/about-the-rockefellers/laurance-s-rockefeller/

S10 — Rockefeller Archive Center — David Rockefeller, 1915–2017
Biography documenting Chase leadership, international activity and death in 2017.
https://rockarch.org/resources/about-the-rockefellers/david-rockefeller/

S11 — Rockefeller Brothers Fund — RBF Founded
Institutional history: five brothers founded the Fund in 1940 and initially made grants collectively.
https://www.rbf.org/about/our-history/timeline/rbf-founded

S12 — Rockefeller Brothers Fund — Generational Transition
Documents deaths in the 1970s and the continuing leadership transition; identifies Laurance and David as surviving founders after 1979.
https://www.rbf.org/about/our-history/timeline/generational-transition

S13 — Council on Foreign Relations — Board of Directors / historical roster
Official roster recording David Rockefeller as director 1949–1985 and chair 1970–1985.
https://www.cfr.org/board-directors

S14 — The Trilateral Commission — About Us
Commission's own history stating that it was founded in 1973 by David Rockefeller.
https://www.trilateral.org/about/

S15 — The Rockefeller Foundation — About Us / independence statement
Current institutional statement that the Foundation is legally independent and does not control other Rockefeller-named entities.
https://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/about-us/

S16 — U.S. Senate — Vice Presidents of the United States
Official chronology of Gerald Ford's nomination and Nelson Rockefeller's oath on 19 Dec 1974.
https://www.senate.gov/about/officers-staff/vice-presidents.htm

Source register · 3

S17 — Rockefeller Brothers Fund — Mission / philanthropic tradition
Institutional account of coordinated philanthropy, later non-family trustees and generational continuity.
https://www.rbf.org/about-us

S18 — Council on Foreign Relations — Century timeline
Institutional chronology identifying Rockefeller's chairmanship and the Council's organizational development.
https://www.cfr.org/celebrating-a-century/timeline/