# Chapter 2

**Chapter II—Dove of Peace and Pigeon of War**

> *"The development of our financial oligarchy followed … lines with which the history of political despotism has familiarized us—usurpation by gradual encroachment rather than by violent acts; and by subtle and often long—concealed concentration."*

This statement was made by Louis D. Brandeis, former Justice of the Supreme Court. For most people the fact needs substantiation, so it will be worth while to look at the gradual encroachment by which our financial oligarchy has usurped the supreme prerogatives of any nation. The development of this theme and examination into the results of this usurpation is history's most sordid and mankind's most woeful page.

It is not necessary to look into the history of all banking in general. The banks of ancient Greece and Rome, the money changers of the time of Christ, the early Genoses and Venetian bankers, the tenth century banks of Lisbon and elsewhere, have no bearing on this work. This is strictly an outline of the monetary system which has given various nations of the world a ruin for their money.

From Roman times almost to the discovery of America there was no important addition to the world's supply of precious metals. Yet these metals were considered a necessary basis for the issuance of money although ordinary observation showed that a country's productivity generally increased gradually from generation to generation. The absurdity of basing this increase on the accidents of commerce and mining was not understood until it was virtually impossible for that faceless nonentity, the common man, to do anything about it.

Medieval Europe lived under a managed currency. It was managed this way: The comparatively fixed amount of gold and especially silver was made to fit increased production by reducing from time to time the weight of metal in every coin. This means of increasing the monetary supply offset the increased quantity of goods and kept the price level constant. Prices varied less in a hundred years than they often vary in one year of our own times.

In 1542 Henry VIII began to debase coinage. He did it in the hope that he would be able to pay some of his debts for nothing. Keeping secret what he was doing, he collected all the coin that was paid him and issued it from the Mint with a baser alloy. By doing this he was able to pay out one-forth more than he received. It was a clever trick, but was soon discovered. To prevent any disastrous results of this discovery, he simply raised the price of metals so that all who possessed gold or silver brought them to the mint. Then he went back to his old trick and reissued baser metal coins.

Foreign nations were reluctant to take this debased money. They did not care whether there was alloy in the coin or not, because most of the English coin got back to England anyway when they purchased goods from her. What they feared was a falling price-level. If they could have been assured that the coin would buy as many goods on the day when the debt should be collected as it did on the day it was incurred, they would have been perfectly willing to accept payment in paper.

It is elementary that if gold and silver came into England somebody brought them. Although much of it came as a result of piracy, most of it came from a new sort of trade—the exchange of goods against gold and silver. This new trade was carried on between England and Europe, especially Spain. The continent was getting consumable goods and England unconsumable metal. Since, as Adam Smith truly said, the one object of production is consumption, it is not surprising that with such a commerce as this the reign of Elizabeth, who succeeded Henry, should be

filled with the poor's complaints of their desperate poverty.

Why did Elizabeth tolerate this disadvantageous commerce? The notion that she did not understand the plain consequences of filling the country with silver and emptying it of goods is out of the question. The woman was no idiot. She knew it was against her interests but could not stop it because she was not free to follow a wiser policy. She was the servant of stronger forces that guided her. It was also against the interests of the impoverished masses because it caused an artificial scarcity of commodities. But it was quite definitely advantageous to the interests of those who sold goods in exchange for gold and silver.

These stronger forces, these men who profited on artificial scarcity at the expense of the masses, were goldsmiths, forerunners of international bankers. They were indifferent to the rise in prices for they immediately invested their gains in land and houses whose prices rose with the general upswing. They were in realty the masters of the state …. No one could prevent them from passing the burden of higher prices to the poorer masses. They were powerful enough to prevent the queen from passing on to them the burden of her increased expenses in the form of increased taxation.

When Charles came to the throne in 1660 a great issue had to be fought out. The new theory of monarchy was that the King should have no capital of importance but should be entirely dependent upon a regular income voted to him by Parliament. In this manner parliament hoped to be able to control the King's conduct and in practice took care to vote him an insufficient income, thereby compelling him to contract debts. Charles' policy had been to gain the throne on whatever terms he could and then attempt to find the means by winch he could trick those who restored him and escape their clutches.

Now came the age of the first rumors of invention. More and better roads and bigger and better ships opened the way for

the development of commerce. England could get from India the consumable goods she wanted and could get rid of some … gold and silver she did not want. Charles exploited this advantage and supplied paper money for the conduct of internal economy. Before his experimentation of negotiable paper he had, like his predecessors, issued his creditors tallies. These tallies were notched pieces of hazel or lindenwood about an inch thick. The amount due from the state was designated by notches cut into one of the flat sides and was written in ink on the two adjacent sides. The piece was then split lengthwise through the notches, one piece being given the payee, the matching piece being retained in the treasury as a method of preventing counterfeiting. When payment was made by the treasury the split edges were matched and were said to "tally," hence the derivation of the word tally.

The tallies proved to be inconvenient for negotiation. The wisdom of issuing negotiable paper was evident but not entirely new. Paper money had long since been invented in China and was now coming into use in various parts of the world. The English colonies were "beginning to utilize this convenient form of money. The goldsmiths were powerful enough to defeat the king's attempt. Had he succeeded, had it become recognized that when new money was required to keep an increased supply of goods flowing at a normal rate, it was the business of the government to issue it, the history not only of England but of the whole world would have been changed for the better. It will be seen how this ruinous system was maintained as a basis of today's finance.

The goldsmiths originally were the custodians of the metals people deposited with them for safe keeping. They would put these metals in a strong-box and issue receipts for the amount deposited. In a short time the depositors recognized the convenience of passing these receipts among themselves instead of going to the inconvenience of withdrawing their gold from the strong-box and exchanging the cumbersome metal. The

goldsmiths soon observed this practice and decided that since only a small portion of the metal was called for they could safely issue an increase of negotiable paper up to ten times the amount that was actually secured by gold—and gold they did not own at that Since they drew interest on these, it is easy to see that the practice was quite lucrative. It is also understandable why they should oppose the experiment Charles made with paper money. They brought into discredit the paper orders that Charles issued.

Conveniently for them, Charles issued the papers for large sums and the recipients naturally wanted to change them for smaller ones. The goldsmiths offered to change them and, in return for the king's orders gave their clients their own notes or promises to pay in the future. They refused to change these notes except at a large discount and thereby brought Charles orders into ridicule. Of course, they vehemently held that a stable price level could not be maintained under his policy. They also did what they could to persuade their clients that it would be foolish to change their notes to cash. Lies and intrigues have always been a necessary part of their trade.

The practice of clipping and melting coins naturally came into the hands of the London goldsmiths now for the first time emerging as bankers, or money-lenders. Clipping, incidentally, was the practice of chipping pieces of metal from the coins, thereby reducing their metallic content; milled edges, which could have been used long before they were, finally prevented this practice. These newly emerged bankers, according to Clarendon, "did not consist above the number of five or six men, some of whom were aldermen and had been Lord Mayors of London." The names of the two best known were Viner and Blackwell.

Thus in the year 1672, while he was in the middle of the Dutch War, Charles was saddled with a heavy expenditure which Parliament refused to meet by taxation and for which his

creditors were reluctant to accept his discredited paper orders. It was a big year for the new bankers. Somebody had to be blamed for the crisis of 1672 and, as it was not to be the bankers, the only alternative was that it would have to be the king. Therefore, from now on the bankers had two objectives, (1) to weaken the monarchy politically so as to make sure it did not strengthen itself financially, (2) to confuse the public over the story of 1672 so they would think it was the king and not they who were responsible for public suffering, thus diverting attention from inquiry into what they were doing.

In 1694 William II came to the throne of England. He soon discovered that he inherited the tremendous financial problems of Charles which were aggravated still further under his predecessor, Cromwell, who had opposed Charles. He needed increased expenditures because they were again at war with Holland. After various schemes had failed, a bill was piloted through Parliament by Montague, then Lord of the Treasury and a name still high in the ranks of international finance, which led to the establishment of the Bank of England under the leadership of a man named William Patterson.

This newly formed corporation promised to collect the required money from the public and to lend it to the king at 8%o interest, plus four thousand pounds annually for expenses. In return the bank received a number of privileges, the most important of which was the right to issue notes up to the extent of its loan to the government under their common seal on the security of the government. Furthermore, the bank was authorized to issue six million dollars worth of its own promissory notes that were to circulate as fiat money. These fiat notes had no form nor even a promise behind them, but they were the basis of credit loans for several times six million for which the bank was allowed to charge as much interest as it desired, or thought it could get.

Nothing was said about ever repaying the six million; it never

has been repaid. Parliament did not see the power it had bestowed, or that it had sold the control of the government to a gang of moneychangers.

If a one pound note, which this corporation had the right to issue, was brought by the holder to demand his pound, the Bank could by right demand the government to raise the amount by taxation. As Disraeli put it, “The principle of that system was to mortgage industry in order to protect property.” And as Patterson, who with Hublon was originator of the Bank explained, with charming simplicity:

> *“The Bank hath benefit to the interest on all moneys which it creates out of nothing.”*

The present Governor of our Federal Reserve Board says substantially the same thing of our system today. Chester G. Davis, former Governor of the Federal Reserve Board said:

> *“We Bankers have the power to create and destroy money. The power to create and destroy money is a gigantic power.”*

The terrible truth is just that simple. If they had engaged in such practices a few years earlier they would have been hanged or burned at the stake for engaging in usury, which was a capital offense on the statutes. The statutes remained but the Bankers could begin doing as they universally do now—make their own laws and their own exceptions.

The way the Bank created money out of nothing is further explained by Patterson: “If the proprietors of the Bank can circulate their own foundation of twelve hundred thousand pounds without having more than two or three hundred thousand pounds laying dead at one time, this Bank will be in effect as nine hundred thousand or a million pounds of fresh money brought into the nation.” In practice it did not keep a cash reserve of any amount approaching that proportion any more

than they do today. By 1696 it was circulating close to two million pounds worth of notes against a cash reserve of only thirty-six thousands.

The monarchy was caught in a trap from which it was never to escape. The maddest believers in the divine right of kings had never fashioned in their wildest imaginations a tyranny one hundredth part as strong and cruel as that which was foisted upon an unsuspecting people by this enactment. William III had been caught in what was perhaps the cleverest trick of blackmail in all history. If he repudiated his debts, his creditors would have supported James, and William would have lost his throne. If he tried to pay his debts he would have to get Parliament to vote him the money in extra taxation. The Bank had taken the precaution of seeing that their influence was sufficient to keep the money from being voted.

**Christopher Hollis**, in his books, "*The Two Nations*" and "*The Breakdown of Money*," has contributed much to the cause of Truth and is the outstanding source for much of the material on the early history of the Bank of England. He points out that if a corporation such as this newly formed Bank of England lends its money at interest and without risk, then relends the repaid loan and so on, never distributing more than a trifle of its profits either as wages or as dividends, then, however small its original capital and however moderate its rate of interest, it is but a simple proposition in mathematics that in the course of time it must necessarily become the possessor of the entire wealth of the country.

The Bank was conceived in intrigue, born in treachery, nursed in hypocrisy, weaned on deceit, raised on oppression and grew into the most insatiable monster of all times.

The Bank of England, which was a private corporation privately run for private profits, had usurped the sovereign rights of the English people. But this pattern was not to remain national in character for long. The first pronounced

indication of the international aspect of this system had its advent with the entrance of the name Rothschild upon the ledgers of European history.

The great Banking Empire was started in 1800 by Meyer Amschel Rothschild, who made an early and modest advent into the affairs of international finance by extending his first foreign loan to the Danish government. Shortly afterward he became trustee of the tremendous fortune of William of Hesse Cassel, who fled from his country before an invading French army. Meyer Amschel buried the fortune, periodically digging up parts of it to lend out at high rates of interest. The Rothschild domain became international when this man established his five sons in as many European countries. Amschel was set up in Frankfort, Germany; Solomon, in Vienna, Austria; Carl in Naples, Italy; James in Paris, France; and Nathan, the best known of all the Rothschilds, in London, England. Nathan was employed by the English treasury and quickly rose to power when he staked all he was worth on an Allied victory over Napoleon. Without doubt, some of the stories concerning his exploitation border on the dramatic and even fantastic. The more conservative historians such as Corti and Reeves relate the facts in a more reliable fashion.

News of Blucher’s defeat two days before Waterloo caused a crash in the security prices. Nathan’s method of securing the news of battle caused him to receive reliable information ahead of anyone else. His agents employed carrier pigeons from the battlefield of Waterloo to the port of Ostend, from where it was brought to him across the channel by his own boat. A few maintain that the carrier pigeon detail is exaggerated since the ordinary means of transmitting news was relayed by personal couriers. However, all agree that he was the first to have an accurate account of the proceedings. When he learned that Napoleon had been defeated, he reported publically that Napoleon had won, thereby causing the security prices to fall completely. He and his agents bought up all securities they

could at disastrously low prices.

When the truth finally leaked out to the populace, securities rose rapidly in the midst of great rejoicing over the victory. Stocks rose to unprecedented heights and Nathan unloaded. Nathan boasted that he had multiplied the family capital 2,500 times in five years. Had he but doubled the fortune, it would have been an extremely profitable deal. Had he multiplied it ten times, it would have been phenomenal, but when he increased it not only by the hundreds, but even thousands of times, superlatives are helpless in conveying an actual picture of the results.

Rothschild was prepared to send a pigeon to Paris with news of French defeat in case the French won. He would then have gone before broken hearted France as he did England and told them of his profound patriotism, how he would gladly buy their worthless bonds…. Rothschild, like international bankers ever since, would have won, no matter who lost. Nations' toiling millions of honest citizens have only to tighten their belts, work harder and pay more into … Bankers' Banks.

It is no wonder the defeated Napoleon, one of history's greatest military generals, declared bitterly that the Rothschild clique was "without honor, without patriotism, and without any god than their own system of usurious profits."

It has been said that after Waterloo, no power resisted the usurer. Rother said of Nathan's influence,

> *"The Rothschild in this country has an incredible influence upon all financial affairs here in London. It is widely stated, and indeed is almost a fact, that he entirely regulates the rate of exchange in the city. His power as a banker is enormous."*

Disraeli said,

> *“He was lord and master of the money markets of the world and, of course, virtually lord and master of everything else.”*

That he was virtually lord master of everything else is easily understood by considering the function of money.

Kingdoms have toppled in Europe, empires have been shattered, customs have been lost in the dust of time, but the Rothschild brothers by intermarriage and close coordination of their money temples throughout the world, have built an international dynasty that grows more secure each year. For more than a century the Rothschilds have sat in their counting houses and controlled the military and economic destinies of the world. Their influence is still measured in the subservience of governments. In times of war they always stuck together regardless of the alignment of the embroiled nations. They pooled their resources when necessary and thus provided sufficient funds for the debtor combatant to emerge victoriously from the battlefields. Their loyalty was not to their adopted nations, but to their fortunes and one another. Like all international bankers ever since, they had no nationalistic patriotism. Their flag was colorless.

It is true that the original Rothschilds were also a force for peace, but only when peace better served their purposes. For example, James wrote to Solomon in 1831, “. . . everything now depends upon the foreign Powers, and that is where you must bring your influence to bear; for if we do not preserve peace no Power will be able to maintain its credit and rentes will not remain as firm as I hope.” At another time, Nathan wrote Solomon, who in turn passed the information on to Metternich,

> *“Our government has taken very strong measures against France, and these should make a very good impression throughout Europe; that is to say, if France does not remain quiet, but takes action against the other three Powers, we*

*shall join the three Powers, but if the other three Powers take action against France, we shall join France."*

Because money is essential for the transacting of business, it is not surprising that the Rothschilds were soon dominating all major business functions just as the Rothschilds of today should reach out into the steel, railroad, munition, aviation, news and other businesses. Schwmer says Amschel had his finger in every pie; he dealt with the business of the Federation as well as with that of the individual German governments, and supplied the money with the railways that were being constructed everywhere at the time. After railroads, they turned their attention to steamships. This is indicated by the very name of the big Austrian steamship line in which Solomon interested himself financially. "Lloyd" was the name given to the shipping company by the ship owners and insurers of men and merchandise (the first insurance was applied to vessels at sea) who met and did business in a London coffee house owned by Mr. Lloyd. Soon afterwards, large concessions for mining and establishing iron works were granted the Rothschilds. These broadening spheres of domination persevered from the founders to the present day.

Thus today we find Melville Rothschild president of the National Bond and Investment Company. This credit syndicate purchases from automobile dealers notes arising from the retail sale of new and used cars. It places through an insurance agency, which is a wholly owned subsidiary, insurance securing the indebtedness of financed automobiles. Rothschild companies thereby collect several tributes from their victims, profits on the materials from which automobiles are made, from railroads over which they are carried, for interest charges on loans to car purchasers and then, as if that were not enough, it soaks them for the purchase of insurance to protect the loans.

Although many honors have been bestowed upon the Rothschilds

by subservient powers, no Rothschild has ever occupied a throne, probably because it was more profitable not to. When thrones became vacant they were asked to advise who should occupy them. It pleased, and still pleases, them better that all crowns, mythical and real, should be at their feet rather than that they should be wearing them on their heads. The majority of the European peoples, Borne long ago suggested, would have attained their freedom had not the Rothschilds and other financiers applied their wealth to the support of absolutism. Borne described the operations of the Rothschilds, showing how they would depress "rentes" just before underwriting a loan, and then artificially raise the price immediately after an agreement for a new loan was signed. Such was the game the Rothschilds always played, enriching themselves at the expense of the country they exploited.

Napoleon Bonaparte writing from Boulogne September 24, 1805, said:

> *"The evil originates in the bank having transgressed the law. What has the law done? It has given the privilege of coining money in the form of paper to a particular company. In a word in discounting after this manner, the bank is coining false money. So clearly do I see the dangers of such a course that, if necessary, I would stop the pay of my soldiers rather than persevere in it. I am distressed beyond measure at the necessities of my situation, which by compelling me to live in camps and engaging in distant expeditions, withdraws my attention from what would otherwise be the chief object of my anxiety, the first wish of my heart—a good and solid organization of all that concerns the interests of banks, manufacturers and commerce."*

When the present Duke of Windsor decided, as King Edward VIII, to abdicate his throne, it is significant that he first took refuge at the Rothschild castle at Enzesfeld, Austria. Writing of the event, an Associated Press article by Albert Wilson

says, “Depending on the flourish of a pen in the hand of a Rothschild, armies of Europe for a century have starved and lost or had their bully beef and won. Britain from the time of the Duke of Wellington; the rulers of Prussia, Bavaria and other states down to the time of the Kaiser; the builders of the Austrian empire and the Kings of the nations formed out of it; the Bourbons and the Republicans of France—all in their time have crossed a Rothschild threshold in search of their destiny even as Edward has.”

The domain of this famous banking family now reaches to the four corners of the earth. Their central banks in Europe are supplemented by other institutions in every large country of the globe. Lord Thomas Sivewright Catto, like his predecessor Montague Norman as governor of the Bank of England, and Thomas Lamont, like his predecessor J. Pierpont Morgan in the United States, are intimately associated with the Rothschilds and frequently confer with them. One of the largest enterprises operated by the clan is the World Bank [Bank for International Settlements] in Basel, Switzerland, which was part of the machinery of the League of Nations and the World Court The most ambitious objective imputed to this institution was a proposal by Lord Dudley a few years ago to set up a consolidation of world business, like world banking, under one huge control, to be dominated by the World Bank [Bank for International Settlements] at Basel, the Bank of England and the United States Federal Reserve Bank. If anyone discovers a similarity between this and the present World Bank, the World Court, and the United Nations Organization it will be discovered that the relation is not as accidental as it might sound. The biggest difference is that they are succeeding this time. This means that the second World War was for them an even bigger success than the first.

Many other names have shown up in the fields of international financing, but the broadening field originated and dominated by the Rothschilds has absorbed their policies and practices.

The Morgan dynasty, following the Rothschild practices, is even more alarming to the people of the United States. The philosophy of the late J. Pierpont Morgan is plainly indicated in a statement he made publicly, namely: “Anybody is justified in doing anything so long as the law doesn’t say it’s wrong.” According to this monstrous doctrine, it was not wrong to take the lead in getting us into war, getting money out of the United States government and out of the American taxpayers, and giving the American people the war, the death, and the taxes, because there was no law saying it was wrong. He might have gone further and said that even the existing laws did not mean anything to him if he didn’t want them to, for he often times proved what Montague Norman, former governor of the Bank of England, boasted—that he was above the law.

A few years prior to the late World War, the House of Morgan controlled about one-fourth of the corporate wealth of America. Morgan and his partners owned thirteen great banks and controlled 219 other banks, through the Morgan empire held directorships in 2,264 corporations in the United States. Financial assets which this mighty group controlled was estimated to aggregate 75 billions of dollars. Under direct Morgan control were the leading industrial companies and corporations, the top ranking banks and trust companies, our best railroad systems, the top utility companies and some of the outstanding insurance and holding companies. This machine has corrupted the economic system of the nation. It has thwarted every move in the direction of social betterment. It has plundered labor and agriculture. Step by step it has concentrated wealth in the grasp of a few individuals.

These money empires amply illustrate an observation made by Pope Pius XI, universally respected for his sanctity and wisdom. He wrote in the papal encyclical, “Quadragessimo Anno”:

> *“This power (economic domination) becomes particularly irresistible when exercised by those who, because they hold*

> *and control money, are able to govern credit and to determine its allotment, supplying so to speak, the lifeblood of the entire economic body, and grasping in their hands as it were, the very soul of production so that none dare breathe against their will."*

Before proceeding to see how they have taken over the United States, some of the other leading countries of the world, and how they caused two World Wars, it is worthwhile to see why the plain historic facts so far related are not more generally known. People often ask, "Why haven't we been taught these things?" There is a historic answer to this pointed inquiry aside from the disastrous effect the light of Truth and Knowledge would now have upon the iniquitous monstrosity of international finance that currently enslaves the world.

The facts concerning the origin of international finance, as well as those which follow concerning its development and domination are without exception not open to serious dispute. They are supported by numerous references and voluminous research. They are commonplace in numerous important books of admitted authority, but it is especially among reputable English authors that the material on the origins of the international system is to be found. Further valuable information is found among the opponents of the bills which enacted banking legislation. A study of University files and logical deductions from the "facts" given by "orthodox" historians are also valuable.

History, as it is taught, is marred by serious faults besides the usual accusation of occasional bias. The serious fault is the complete neglect of monetary history and the functions of monetary systems. The stories of any great catastrophe of history as told by a student of money and as told by an ordinary textbook are quite at variance. The textbook speaking of the War of American Independence, for example, explained it entirely by political causes. It is now the agreed admission

of the economists of every school that this view is a most serious distortion of the truth. There can be no dispute about the fact that our economy is built up by the bankers lending money they do not possess and never did possess. Nor can there be any sensible dispute about the importance of the fact. The textbook records that a war was fought; it does not record who directed the statesmen, who financed it or who paid for it. Historians reading the private papers of the Rothschilds found there a record of the intimate relations between every statesman of Europe and the members of the great family—a family not even mentioned in texts. The school books tell us that the Metternichs, the Bismarks, the Cavours, the Napoleons, and such like, were the masters of Europe. It is easily proved that these men were dominated by this greater power of finance.

Since most of the readers of this book will be those who have learned their history at school and have not had the time or inclination to study it since, it was thought wise to insert a few words on this aspect of history, for to them this narrative might seem like a wild fairy tale. Scarcely one of these facts will be found in the history books of our school days.

If the truths in these pages are admitted, and their importance is likewise admitted, why were we not taught them in school?

It is a story but little less sordid than the story of the bankers themselves. The highest institutions of learning, the Universities, especially Oxford, were Tory. “In those seats of education instead of being formed to love their country and its constitution, the laws and liberties of it, they are rather disposed to love arbitrary government and to become slaves to absolute monarchy,” was written by Brunet the historian of the reformation. It was he, incidentally, who first suggested the national debt which was so unpopular among the poorer classes because they had to support it with taxes.

Therefore, a Whig history had to be written in order to show the people, “What are the methods bad princes have taken to enslave us and by what conduct we have been preserved.”

So the Whig history was written and titled, “History of Our Own Times.” The problem now was to get it read; to capture the educational machine. This was done by means of endowed teachers, professors and stooges, principally under the direction of Townsend and Gibson.

Now what was the history which these endowed teachers taught? It was an entirely new theory called the progressive theory of history. It was a theory which as a result of their activities was soon to be accepted without criticism. It was a theory designed to cover up the traces of truth. It was the avowed purpose of that history to create the feeling that, as bad as things might be at the moment, the lesson of history has been a lesson of steady improvement, that each present generation as always, as Macaulay put it. “the most enlightened generation of the most enlightened people that ever existed.” Where there was evil, that evil was the relic of an evil past; where there was good, the good was a product of the increasing advancement which runs through the ages and which was assuredly leading us to a yet more glorious horizon ahead. Doesn’t that theme sound more than vaguely familiar in our texts and propaganda of today?

This theory was not seriously believed in the 18th century and was taught to quiet those who did not belong to the ruling classes. Shortly after the end of the 18th century this progressive theory of history received general acceptance among those who claimed for themselves the prestige of educated people. It is certain, therefore, that the coming generations, during their formative years, and during the only years in which they might have leisure for study, did not come in contact with the most serious problem that had become a fateful reality, and yet, in this world of unreality, they acquired qualifications which they imagined entitled them to

positions of command in the realities of a real world. Admiration for Homer is indeed laudable, but to advise a young man whose business it was to reform the credit structure of a monetary system to read Homer every day sounds, in the light of reality, like the advice of a maniac.

Now, how did this perversion of history play into the hands of the all powerful bankers? Simply by making them secure against the dangers of publicity. The power of usury was about to extend its control over the state and its misled citizens.

After forty centuries, the students are still in the primary class as far as economics are concerned…. But the riddle of interest remained. Interest is a vicious means of enslavement that was born of hoardable money in the hands of man animated by self-interest.

Instead of slaying the monster, its safety has been guarded by depressions and wars throughout the ages. The founders of economic chaos remain as highly respected as though interest were a blessing or of divine origin.

Long ago, men worshipped the Golden Calf. This creature has given place to the God of Gold that created interest, and which has again been firmly entrenched, though in a veiled form, by the makers of the international Bretton Woods Agreement, the international bankers in order to enslave the nations and permit no escape.

Today the powers of finance control many universities, many newspapers and other publishing houses. For example, Paul H. Warburg, a co-founder of the Federal Reserve system, was also a chairman of the board of directors of the Carnegie Foundation, and personally approved all fellowships and professorships to Universities which accept their specialists. No one is so naive as to suppose he would appoint a man unsympathetic with his views. Many public schools and Universities are kept going by gigantic endowments obtained

through a usurious monetary system and preserve their secret manipulation of money by teaching false ethics and false economics. More of this subservience of professors to monetary interests will be seen when we deal with the causes of American entrance in the last World Wars.

The textbook publishers are often under the thumb of the bankers in several ways, one of which is calling in their loan in order to take the business and run it with someone who will be a stooge. A look at the publishers of most books that tell history from the financial standpoint, and not merely from politics, will show that they are virtually unheard of. In most instances the book is written by some obscure individual, who had to have the truth printed by a small publisher or printing shop where the real American spirit for Truth and Knowledge had not been purchased, suppressed, or tarnished. Yet in authority, style and other literary qualifications they are often superior to best sellers of larger publishers.

Christopher Hollis writes:

> *"So long as a few people have the privilege of inventing money, no one in the country except those few people can really own any private property at all. The rest of us and our fancied property are but tenants-at-will of the bankers in the sense that the bankers can, at any time they wish, force us to surrender it. It is idle to say that in practice this does not happen. In practice, this happens every day. Two hundred years ago Berkeley prophesied that it would happen. One hundred years ago Cobbett showed that it was happening. Today we see it happening all around us."*