Chapter 7

Chapter VII—Big Berthas and the Big Four

> *"On the basis of clear documentary evidence scholars dissected the myth, propagated by those Powers, that Germany was wholly responsible in inaugurating the war (World War I)…. The gleaming mirage that pictured the World War was purely or even mainly a war for democracy and civilization dissolved beyond recognition."*

That is the scholarly, unbiased conclusion of those renowned historians, Charles A. and Mary R. Beard in their recent "Basic History of the United States." It is time to examine simple recorded history as an answer to those who have been selling a bill of goods.

> *"But what special reason was there for the United States to embark on a vast crusade for the purpose of saving democracy? For a hundred and twenty-five years our democratic republic had got along very well in a world full of emperors, sultans and despots. Why should we try to set up democratic states in Europe? The European peoples were capable of establishing democracies if they really wanted them. How Czarist Russia, an Allied nation afflicted with the most despotic government in the world, could be made safe for democracy was a question without an answer—at that time. But the democratization of Russia was not discussed: that part of the problem was simply ignored.*

> *"In all this muddled thinning there was a quixotic quality. Romantic expeditions to rescue the Holy Grail are thrilling when they cost little or nothing. They lose their charm when they involve the loss of billions of dollars and the lives of a great many young men. So far as making the world safe for democracy was concerned, the entire movement was nothing but eyewash and propaganda. On the part of the European powers*

the World War was a war of conquest."

That was written in "A New American History," by W. E. Woodward and well expresses the popular learned opinion of today. From "The Empire of 'The City'," by Knuth, we read:

> *"Since the Rothschild dynasty attained control of British finance 130 years ago, every major war has been fought to utter collapse of British opponents and unconditional surrender, and has left international finance omnipotent and unrestrained in organizing a new power-block to enforce the peace and to exploit the victory. Each of these successive power-blocks has failed in a brief length of time due to the desertion of an ally infuriated by the boundless greed of the British bankers, and has led to a new war. and these wars have been of progressively greater scope and fury."*

The last fifty years give grim evidence of Knuth's observation. In 1898 the Filipinos were allies of the United States in her war with Spain. Only a year later found the United States at war against her former friend, the Filipinos, and at peace with Spain. In 1904 American sympathies were with Japan against the aggressor, czarist Russia, which was decisively beaten. In 1914 Japan and Italy were beloved American allies. Later her ex-friends, Japan and Italy, became enemies at war with America and another ex-ally, Great Britain; and at peace with newly-found friends, the Reds. At times Americans love and hate the Chinese, Mexicans and Argentines by turns. Their friend Russia was having a terrible time beating another friend, Finland. Friend Russia was an ally of their enemy, Germany and divided friend Poland between them. America's present ally Russia soon went to war against her ex-friend, Germany, and formed a stronger friendship with her enemy Japan. America declared war on ex-friends Finland and Italy and saved our principal historic enemy, England, from ignominious defeat.

The artillery and other weapons which Greek insurgents on the Left used to fight the British were given them by the British. Bulgaria sided with the Axis, whereas the Serbs heroically resisted Hitler. But now that the Serbs have been liberated and the Bulgarians conquered by the Allies, the same Bulgarian troops who fought for Hitler are "policing" the Serbians who fought on our side. The man who represented the greatest threat to the government of General de Gaulle in France was Maurice Thorez, communist leader. In order to get back to France from Russia, where he was a refugee from justice as a war deserter, he had to be pardoned and was pardoned by de Gaulle! The same Americans who are most angry over British interference in the domestic affairs of Italy and Greece were most enthusiastic over Russian interference in the domestic affairs of Hungary, Rumania, Poland, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Persia.

Referring to a more recent event, the Chicago Tribune writes editorially:

> *"History records few more sardonic and cynical reversals than the present spectacle in Java, where three months after a supposed war to the death between Japan and Great Britain, Japanese troops are now fighting under British command against the Indonese nationalists. A British spokesman has paid the Jap[anese] the compliment that they are 'good troops,' and is pleased to say that they are 'very good' about taking Indonesians prisoners instead of shooting them out of hand. The civilized world, including Americans who remember the death march of Bataan, is apparently expected to be overcome by admiration.*
>
> *"The new found alliance between the surrendered Jap[anese] garrison in Java and its English protectors may seem strange in view of the hostilities but recently ended. The British hardly can feel any great attachment to the Jap[anese] when they recall the disastrous reverses at arms they sustained at Japanese hands in Hong Kong, Malaya, and Burma. Yet a*

dispassionate analysis might suggest sound grounds for the new entente.

"A consideration which cannot be overlooked is that the Indonesians, in their fight at Soerabaja against the British and their Indian mercenaries have put up a defense which has been much more stubborn and successful than was the British defense of Singapore against the Jap[anese]. The Indonesian rabble in arms has proved a match for the empire's trained and well equipped troops. The British, with a considerable respect born of recent experience in the field against the Japanese soldiery, have with some logic shunted their task to their former enemies, in the evident hope that the Jap[anese] will prove more successful."

American armed might, as well as that of the other great (God save the mark!) allies, was not directed by the principles of justice nor by the welfare of peoples cherishing the blessings of liberty and freedom. It was directed by the international caste of Untouchables who frequently start a nice war somewhere in order to increase the national debts of their slaves in order that the increased interest thereon would enhance their fortunes, or because it is profitable to overthrow a government it was formerly profitable to support, or to subdue a country either to sack its wealth or to keep an honest and efficient monetary system from showing the dishonesty and inefficiency of their own.

Shortly before World War I, H. G. Wells, English writer and historian, in his book entitled "Social Forces in England and America" wrote as follows:

"We in Great Britain are now intensely jealous of Germany. We are intensely jealous of Germany not only because the Germans outnumber us, and have a much larger and diversified country than ours, and lie in the very heart and body of Europe, but because in the last hundred years, while we have fed on

> *platitudes and vanity, they have had the energy and humility to develop a splendid system of education, to toil at science and art and literature, to develop social organization, to master and better our methods of business and industry, and to clamber above us in the scale of civilization. This has humiliated and irritated us rather than chastened us."*

Mr. Wells further informed readers that one must learn German "if one would be abreast of scientific knowledge and philosophical thought, or see many good plays and understand the contemporary mind."

That was Mr. Wells' solemn and convincing opinion shortly before the first World War. A little later, when the war had broken out, he turned his honest conviction down to the lying "propaganda for proper geese," as the Duke of Bedford calls it, in order to make the world fight the war of financiers and fools. Said Wells then:

> *"That trampling, drilling foolery in the heart of Europe, that has arrested civilization for forty years, German imperialism and German militarism has struck the inevitable blow."*

When a person considers the cold facts of the cause of World War I, he fully recognizes the abominable infamy of such propaganda. To get Germany off its leading position into which it had moved by honest toil, as Wells stated, instead of subjugating and robbing the world, as England had done, not for years, but for centuries, the holocaust of war was started. To secure the participation of Russia in the conflict, Russia was promised unhindered passage through the Dardanelles—a promise completely ignored when the job was completed.

Russia, with the help of Serbia, concocted the murder of Sarajevo. When Austria's righteous demand for an explanation

failed, war against Serbia broke out. Russia came to her assistance, as was arranged. This in turn involved Germany as an ally of Austria in case of Russian attack, as was also intended. Siberian army corps, held ready for months, crossed the German border before the war was declared. France then declared war on Germany, and England joined her henchmen in a great conspiracy to get rid of a successful competitor.

The United States placed in the same situation as Germany or Austria could not have acted one bit differently than they did. Yet, in spite of this evident aggression or part of the Allies, the world was propagandized with the lie: "Germany wants to rule the world." The world must come to realize that Germany had simply become a victim of the "evil genius of Europe."

Pierre Van Passen in "Days of Our Years," a worthy book on this phase of European troubles in spite of its other shortcomings, comes as near as anyone in summing up informed opinion when he writes:

> *"Those war lords (the Kaiser and Hindenburg) had been victims of circumstances as much as the humblest privates in the ranks. The war had not been started because the Kaiser decreed it. Germany had been maneuvered into a position where there was no other way out of war. The cause lay much deeper. There was something in the nature of the constituted order which produced wars as naturally as toadstools came to the surface after a spell of rain in the forest. . . . The German people are not more barbarous than any other nation. War is not the consequence of animalistic instincts in man, but a result of profound social antagonisms which pitch vested interests against natural forces. Not only the war, but the ruin and decay which come over every land after the war, are the outcome of the same fundamental maladjustment: The exploitation of a productive majority by a moneyed minority."*

More proof that forces other than Germany caused World War I comes from Lord Lothian, first-ranking diplomat of the British Government. Lord Lothian said:

> *"Now the Versailles settlement was based on the theory of the whole responsibility of Germany for the Great War. I do not think anybody who has made a serious study of pre-war history, or even of the events which immediately preceded the war, can hold that view today. In my view Germany had no more responsibility for the war than anybody else, for two reasons; First of all because of her challenge to the British fleet—at one time she put down a program of building ultimately involving a fleet greater than the then British fleet; secondly because of her belief in and practice of what are called her politics by force, diplomacy by force.*
>
> *"On the other hand, nobody had ever yet suggested the Germany was responsible for the assassination of Franz Ferdinand, which precipitated the crisis. Further, what finally made the war inevitable, according to the strategic facts known to everyone at that time, was the mobilization of the Russian armies, which inevitably brought into play the Schieffen Plan"*

(The Shieffen Plan was, and is a pattern of military strategy).

On April 1, 1917, John Haynes Holmes said in a sermon:

> *"If you tell me that this war is fought for the integrity of international law, I must ask you why it is directed only against Germany and not also against England…. If you say that it is fought in vindication of national honor, I must ask you why no harm has come to the honor of Holland and Scandinavia. . . . If you say that this war is a life and death struggle for the preservation of civilization against barbarism, I must ask you why we remained neutral when Belgium was raped, and were at last aroused to action, not by*

the cries of the stricken abroad, but by our own losses in men and money."

Testifying at the same executive session of the foreign relations committee at which he was asked about secret treaties, President Wilson declared that the German submarine attacks were not responsible for American entrance into the war, as is often heard. He was examined by Senator McCumber as follows:

McCumber: Do you think if Germany had committed no act of war or no act of injustice against our citizens that we would have gotten into this war?

Wilson: I do think so.

McCumber: You think we would have gotten in anyway?

Wilson: I do.

"Intellectually, the establishment of belief in German war guilt was a difficult task. However, with the appeal being made to emotion rather than intellect fewer difficulties were presented. Primarily it called for omission of the consideration of certain actions by Serbia, France, and England. For instance, the responsibility of the Serbian government for the tragedy at Sarajevo was ignored or written down. Russian mobilization was discounted as soon as British censorship went into effect. French encouragement of Russian pugnacity was not revealed. The British failure to curb the belligerent attitudes of France and Russia was hidden behind the publicity given to Grey's attempts to hold back Austria-Hungary….

The attempt to prove Germany's guilt also called for the removal of the causes of the war with the Balkans to Berlin. This was done by placing emphasis on the events after Germany and France had declared war rather than on those preceding

this step. . .

Perhaps the most persuasive arguments of the British on the origins of the war were based upon the contention that they entered the war to protect Belgium, i. e., in defense of Belgian of neutrality. It was made to appear convincing by ignoring the whole series of events between 1901 and 1914, and by omitting from the published documents certain vital correspondence.

It was possible that England might come to the assistance of some small nation such as Belgium even if British interests were not involved. However, British participation in the war had been guaranteed by steps taken long before German troops crossed the Belgian frontier. Page admitted that the British would have been found fighting with France even if France had violated Belgium. (From Intimate Papers, II, 319)"

This is the authoritative conclusion of H. C. Peterson in his scholarly book, "Propaganda for War. It was the international bankers which were back of the gigantic propaganda drive. Thus on November 24, 1916, Morgan cabled Paris: "We want you to know that we are engaged in steady educational work to prepare the way for another French loan. A Mr. Davison, one of the Morgan partners, was especially interested in keeping the Federal Reserve and the government from interfering with their work. He kept in constant touch with members of the board and occasionally even called upon the President. The British Chancellor of the Exchecquer was "greatly impressed with the skill and usefulness of . . . (Davison's) propaganda."

Paul Warburg, father of the Federal Reserve Bank recorded:

> *"There has been going on quite an active press campaign, the object of which was to show that unless we granted foreign credits quite freely, the country ran the risk of being choked with gold with the attendant consequence of inflation of prices and credits." After reporting to the Cabinet that*

> *the financial press in America was "preparing the way for fresh loans to the allies" Sir Gilber Parker added the interesting information that the Financial and Commercial Chronicle has supported all the loan operations of the allies.*
>
> *. . . The paper has . . . special affiliations with Standard Oil interests."*

The secret document cabled by American Ambassador Page in London to the State Department in March, 1917, proved, as will be seen, that American finance must keep the other strongholds of the Goliath of greed in England and France from collapsing. It looked black for this inkpot kingdom when the job got too big for such private agencies as Morgan, Kuhn-Loeb, Rothschild and Companies. So Uncle Sam was to be dragged in and save their plight lest it be said that the flesh and blood of millions are worth more than the paper and gold of the few!

> *"As a banker and creditor, the United States would have a place at the peace conference table, and be in a much better position to resist any proposed repudiation of debts, for it might as well be remembered that we will be forced to take up the cudgels for any of our citizens owning bonds that might be repudiated."*

Those are the words of the President of the Bank Board of the United States, Mr. E. P. C. Harding, speaking just previous to American entrance into World War I. The American people in general might not have known why they got into that bloody mess, that cesspool of suffering, misery and futility; but the bankers did. It was to make good the bonds of this hydra of hypocracy bought at their own risk and invested in an Allied victory. When it became evident they were betting on the wrong horse, the avalanche of blood, tears, sweat, poverty and death were unleashed upon innocent victims to make good the sport of high finance.

The world should realize that international finance so controlled the fate of men and their governments that these denizens of death in the inaccessible heights of their gilted sanctuaries deluged chaos upon the earth and dragged America into the bloody, slimy pit in order that they might have a strong support upon which to stand head and shoulders above the common fate. Long ago Americans began to suspect that their government did not go to war because it was influenced by Germany's violation of Belgian neutrality or by Germany's sinking of a couple of ships violating the German right to impose contraband, or by her efforts to induce Mexico to make war on them, or by the danger that a German victory would make this country next on the German list of invasions.

Before the Nye Investigating Committee J. P. Morgan and his partners admitted doing everything "lawfully" possible to help England and France win the war; that defeat of England and France would mean great losses to them personally; that they made $30-million on shipments alone; that they were the fiscal agent for Great Britain in this country and were making huge purchases of supplies, guns, and munitions for its allied client. The investigation brought out much. There was much more it did not bring out, not because of any fault on part of the investigators, but because Morgan messengers hot-footed it to Roosevelt with the information that unless these hearings were stopped, they would be forced to reveal facts embarrassing to the administration-banker alliance. Funds for the continuance of these vital procedures were refused appropriation. Patriotic organizations offered money for their continuation but it could not be accepted.

Every time the committee wanted legitimate papers from the files of the notorious war mongers they were refused. Constant wrangling did no good. Only threat of prosecution would bring the papers into the open where their smell so violently assaulted the nostrils of peace-loving and patriotic citizens. Certain quarters attempted to becloud the issue by saying

these investigators should respect private files. But when these private individuals were reasonably indicted as operating public welfare against its better interest, when papers of public importance should logically be open to public inspection, as long as the good of a few is subject to the common good of the many, the position of these critics is as ludicrous as their purpose. Epithets of “coward,” or “traitor ghoul dipping into the graveyard of history,” were flung at Chairman Nye by his fellow Senators, Glass of Virginia and Connally of Texas, who refusing to admit facts they could not explode, got out their buckets and brushes and began smearing.

The big bankers knew that where the government’s treasure (money) was there its heart would also be. That was in the war. A war to make the world safe for Democracy? A war to end wars? Those were actually the ideals of some of the noble representatives outside the influence of the banks. But when they arrived to take part in the treaty negotiations they were continually embarrassed to discover the existence of secret treaties which prevented the American delegation from furthering the kind of peace it had been talking about, just as Roosevelt’s secret agreements hampered the work of American delegates after the late war.

Americans had better realize that before making the world safe for Democracy, they had better first make Democracy safe for the world by separating it from the dictatorship of high finance. Americans must also realize that before engaging in another war to end wars, they had better first try a just peace to end wars.

The conduct of American affairs had followed the traditional Washingtonian policy of “no foreign entanglements” until her International masters compelled her to conduct her affairs on an international basis even though it meant great sacrifices on which none but the International masters would profit. On the very day the United States entered World War I the government took over the Morgan burden of $400 million loaned

to the British Government and placed that burden on the backs of American taxpayers who are still bending under that burden, paying interest and principle on that same amount into the treasury, not of the government, but of the privileged money men. Such debts have since increased many times over, and have each time increased the taxpayers burden in the same proportion.

Interlocking directorates and financial investments enable bankers to influence war mongering groups, control profitable munition manufactures, and extend their tentacles into the money bags of commerce. In 1915 Germany was becoming England's rival in the European field of commerce which indicated an increase in German prosperity and a menace to the rule of Capitalistic countries. This would have to be stopped. Following the same pattern some twenty-five years later it is significant that the first saber-rattling speech given by Franklin D. Roosevelt in the preliminary skirmish of World War II, was delivered at Chautauqua, New York, shortly following the release of figures showing the German exports had surpassed those of England for the first time since World War I.

If international finance had cared to give up the choicest profits of war, the Allies could have brought the German military machine to its knees before the end of 1915! But the greedy monster is influenced by neither patriotism, honor, nor shame. Impervious to any noble aspiration and scornful of everlasting disgrace, it sought only dollars. It knew that if things got too hot on the battle fields, its American branch would come to its rescue. That is just was done—and at a nice profit, too. They loved war because they knew that killing their fellowman was the most profitable business in the world.

The only reason World War I did not break out in 1908 instead of 1914 is because the British bankers did not seem to be any too sure of American participation in their behalf, since the Federal Reserve System had not as yet been set up in the

United States. Without Uncle Sam as trigger man it would have been plain suicide for John Bull to have picked a fight with the Kaiser. Note the dates and the principal events:

1908—German trade expansion was depriving Britain of her European and American markets.

1910—The British feverishly pressed America for a central hank of issue as an American branch of international finance controlled from London.

1913—The Federal Reserve Act was finally established.

1914—World War I began.

Merely a set of coincidences? Let’s see. By 1890 the English bankers were alarmed over the loss of two-thirds of the English European markets at the hands of German expansion. The bankers’ study into the causes were equally frightful. German industry was foremost in the manufacture of Precision Tools, Chemicals, and Dyes—the three articles which are the foundation of modern industry. But worse yet, the English bankers found that German trade with Europe and the United States was conducted without the need of bankers financing.

The decrepid system of English finance did not and never will allow England and her vessels to compete with soundly-financed systems by becoming more powerful themselves. They meet competition, not by becoming more prosperous but by making their competitors less prosperous. This ultimately leads to war if these other nations will not accept the “benevolent” aid of a few billion dollars, or some other form of subjugation to British finance. Germany obstinately continued to prosper on a system of Trade and Barter with the surplus products of German factories and laboratories, which were in great demand, and were exchanged for the surplus food and raw materials of other nations.

Particularly distressing to the English bankers was the

discovery that Germany was establishing a vast lay-out of plants and laboratories for the manufacture of Precision Tools, Chemicals and Dyes in the United States. Moreover, heavy German investments in American factories and railroads were proceeding to erect an industrial system that would deprive English utilities, dominated and owned by English banks, of her American markets as they were being deprived of European markets.

England could not hope to match the intelligence, efficiency and prosperity of Germany's modern and resourceful Industrial Empire. She would have to meet this competition by tearing down the advancements of modern science and the progress of human civilization. It is no wonder that Woodrow Wilson later admitted in a moment of frankness: "We fought a commercial war."

This German-American setup frustrated the International Bankers' plan to dominate the world by shifting gold from one nation to the other. One of two things had to disappear, either the World Plan of International Banker or the Industrial power of Germany. To assure the success of the former, the banks began searching for allies. Thus in 1904 a secret treaty for stealing Morocco and giving it to France was signed by England and France. The banks hoped German resistance to this theft would offer an excuse for hostilities. Germany had reasons to resist because for twenty years previously most of the hydro-electric, railroad and sanitary equipment of Morocco had come from Germany and had been paid for with the surplus products of Morocco—another example of prosperity without borrowed money from the banks. Germany did resist this plot.

Friction dragged on through the following year and in 1906 the International Bankers proposed arbitration with Teddy Roosevelt as arbitrator. Since he was secretly on their side, this move would assure a report in the favor of high finance as well as embroil America on their side. The almost faultless

booklet, “Forty Years of Roosevelt” by T. W. Hughes, sums up the situation in 1908 as follows: “By secret treaties with Russia, Rumania, Greece, France and Belgium, England had completely encircled Germany with a wall of steel, and by the nearly secret Reciprocal Trade Treaties of Theodore (Roosevelt), England had cut off most of the food and raw materials upon which Germany must depend in time of war.”

In “The Coming War” by Francis Delaisi, Member of the French Chamber of Deputies, written in 1911, translated and published in Boston in 1915, the author told how Germany had been an agricultural country up to the time of Bismark, but the land was so poor that 300,000 Germans had to emigrate every year. When Bismark came to power his chief desire was to make Germany an industrial nation like England.

Thus factories began to spring up in Germany. Soon the Germans were giving England real competition. Delaisi stated that England would bring war on Germany to get rid of the competitor and England could easily do this by blockading German ports, for Germany had to import her raw material, manufacture finished products and then export them.

Delaisi wrote there was only one difficulty, and that was that there were two side doors to Germany, through Holland and Belgium, but Belgium was a neutral country, whose neutrality had been guaranteed by certain countries, and when England blockaded Antwerp, the Germans would march into Belgium just as every nation would react under such circumstances. There would be war on the continent, and Germany would want to borrow French money. Delaisi said that the French should say to the English: “You cannot have our men,” and to the Germans: “You cannot have our money.” He said that was what the French people would say if they were consulted, but the financial oligarchy which rules “democratic” French will sell the lives of hundreds of thousands of Frenchmen for some foreign concessions. And when World War I came it did just that.

President Wilson, while getting U.S.A. into World War I against his promise to keep out, under the pretext of a holy crusade for Democracy, truly spoke words of disillusion when he admitted after the war that it was made because of commercial rivalry.

The American Government had entered into Reciprocal Trade Treaties with every country in Europe except Germany. The result was that all the surplus products of these European nations could be bought by the United States would be paid for principally with gold. The citadel of corruption (International Banks) did not trust open conflict because of a new policy by which the United States must not only win the war for them but finance it as well. For safety this required the establishment of a central bank of issue in the United States under the domination of English finance.

The International Bankers tried to run Theodore Roosevelt for a third term just as they did the second Roosevelt who was as much a champion of high finance as was Theodore. Both were totally unfit to hold office in any constitutional government. After the first Roosevelt refused to run for a third term, he was asked to select as a successor a man “who would listen to reason.” William Howard Taft was the man, but instead of adhering to the policies of Roosevelt and the ruinous ravages of his bosses, Taft pursued the course of the founding Fathers of America and the Constitution. This turn of events so shocked Teddy that he and his London fellow conspirators cut short their famous hunting trip into Africa and hurried back to London.

Taft had to be replaced. The big bankers and their agent for this purpose, Colonel House, knew William J. Bryan and Champ Clark were the two men the American people favored for Taft’s successor But these men could not be controlled—would not “listen to reason.” So House spent a week with a comparatively unknown, Woodrow Wilson, at Sea Girt, New Jersey, and found him “safe.” Thereafter House and the bankers got busy buying

bosses and delegates. The nomination of their candidate, Wilson, was a foregone conclusion before that national disgrace, the farcial, cheaply-staged side show where candidates are bought and principles sold, and known as the National Convention, was ever held.

Their master stroke of strategy was in getting enough people to vote for him after he had been selected. This proved to be so difficult that they had to invent a scheme to keep them from voting for his opponent Taft. So they ran Teddy on a third party known as the Progressive Party.

Says T. W. Hughes in the above mentioned booklet:

> *"There have been some rotten campaigns in Denmark, New York and Chicago (1940) but nothing before or since has equalled the campaign of 1912, with its unadulterated putridity and its criminal betrayal of the hopes and interests of the American people. For we know now and many of us knew then, that the Big Bankers hadn't the slightest hope that Teddy would be elected for a third term and that the only reason he had been sent into the campaign was to split the Republican vote, and thus defeat Mr. Taft who would not play the Banker's game, while electing Mr. Wilson who would play that game. And play it he did, whether he ever fully realized it or not.*
>
> *"It was the Republican Party which made him (Roosevelt) Governor of New York, and the Republican Party which made him President of the United States; therefore when in the campaign of 1912 his desertion of his Party made possible the election of Wilson and the War and tragedy that followed; it was a circumstance that can neither be lightly dismissed nor ever forgotten."*

Thus the completion of the final detail of getting the United States to finance as well as fight their war was the project immediately after the election of Wilson. By December of 1913

this had been assured when President Wilson signed the Federal Reserve Act. Quoting Hughes again:

> *"In April, 1917 the International Bankers could rub their hands in glee and say, 'We planned it that way.' And so today, from our too much disinterested vantage-point, we can look back over that period of seventeen years from 1900 when Theodore was elected Vice-President to 1917 when Woodrow Wilson took us into War, and see as in some vast panorama an unbroken series of wars and revolutions in which thrones toppled into dust, empires followed suit, and Kings, Emperors, Czars and Sultans joined the ranks of the forgotten men, and over which and through which the Four Horsemen, War, Pestilence, Famine and Death rode like the Valkyries of some demoniac Wagner.*
>
> *"Thus it happened that from the days of Woodrow Wilson until the coming of the second Roosevelt, our people increasingly declared that 'never again would we leave our own to stand on foreign ground,' and that never again' would American wealth and manhood be used to save British Imperialism, in the name of a false Democracy. But again they were doomed to disappointment for the wars and depressions that had brought to the International Bankers not merely an increase of wealth and power, but more important still the certainty that another seventeen or twenty years would bring them the completion of their World Plan for World Domination."*

For the first few years in office the high-principled, inexperienced Wilson pursued the traditional American policy of Washington and Jefferson. The following words of Washington could well have been those of Wilson:

> *"Why quit our own to stand on foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the coils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor or caprice?"*

Jefferson's philosophy also coincided with the slogan of Jefferson, namely, "Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none."

Wilson was a sincere intellectual and while free to act as such, did so. In his first Lusitania note in 1915, he said:

> *"The example of America must be a special example. The example of America must be the example of peace, not merely because it will not fight, but of peace because peace is the leading and elevating influence of the world and strife is not. There is such a thing as a man being too proud to fight."*

The next year was a campaign year, and Wilson naturally aspired to be re-nominated and elected for a second term. He overlooked no opportunity to remind the people that he had "kept us out of war," and every speech he made carried the implied promise that he would not only continue to keep us out of war but that he stood squarely, and unyieldingly for the foreign policy laid down by Washington, Jefferson and Monroe. The people believed and applauded him when he declared that he would keep the United States out of the European conflict. Over and over he insisted that America heed the wise counsel of Washington, and observe the Monroe Doctrine.

In Chicago on the 31st of January, 1916, President Wilson said:

> *"I believe that we can serve the nations at war better by remaining at peace and holding off from this contest than we could possibly serve them in any other way. Your interest, your sympathy, your affection may be engaged on one side or the other, but it is your duty to stand off and not let this nation be drawn into the war."*

In a speech at Des Moines on February 1, 1916, he said:

> *"There are actually men in America who are preaching war, who are preaching the duty of the United States to do what it never would before seek entanglements in the controversies which have arisen on the other side of the water—abandon its habitual and traditional policy and deliberately engage in the conflict which is now engulfing the rest of the world. I do not know what the standard of citizenship of these gentlemen may be. I only know that I for one cannot subscribe to those standards."*

A little knowledge of the conspiracy of International finance would have identified those "men in America who are preaching war" and given the reasons why America must "abandon its habitual and traditional policy and deliberately engage in the conflict now engulfing the rest of the world."

In his speech of September 2, 1916, accepting the renomination he said:

> *"We have been neutral not only because it was the fixed and traditional policy of the United States to stand aloof from the politics of Europe . . . but because it was manifestly our duty to prevent, if it were possible, the extension of the fires of hate and desolation kindled by that terrible conflict."*

But, unfortunately, it was the International Bankers who were running the show, not Wilson. Events were shaping up in such a fashion that the course of American ideals would soon be reversed with all the grace and elegance of a figure skater. In August, 1914, the French made a request to J. P. Morgan and Co. for a loan of at least, a hundred million dollars. Morgan replied that such a transaction was impossible at that time because of the objections of the United States government. In his cable he expressed belief that after a little while it might be a very possible and excellent thing to do. France was not satisfied with this refusal and again requested the loan

just five days later. The Paris firm of Morgan, Harjes and Co. cabled repeated demands.

When these frantic calls leaked out, Morgan cabled his Paris firm in part as follows: “We have issued statement today stating French Government have not applied to us for loan but that private interests have asked if we could consider making a loan in case French Government would desire.”

At this time, William J. Bryan as Secretary of State sent an important letter to Wilson in connection with the attempts to float loans. He remarked:

> *“Money is the worst of all contrabands because it commands everything else…. If we approved of such loans . . . our citizens would be divided into groups, each group loaning money to the country which it favored and this money could not be furnished without expressions of sympathy. These expressions are disturbing enough when they do not rest upon pecuniary interests—they would be still more disturbing if each group was pecuniarily interested in the success of the nation to whom its members had loaned money. The powerful financial interests which would be connected with these loans would be tempted to use their influence through the newspapers to support the interests of the government to which they had loaned.”*

H. Davison of J. P. Morgan and Company, together with such other bankers as R. L. Farnham and Willard Straight, kept a steady pressure on the American State Department to overthrow the State Department’s restrictions on loans. They finally got the “Blood soaked boom” started by making a technical distinction between loans and credit—a distinction which J. P. Morgan admitted did not exist. But it served the propagandists with good copy to feed the public. It also allowed the State Department to say: “We didn’t give in. We don’t allow loans just credit.” The decision on the part of Lansing and Wilson

to change the loan policy in this way, and at the same time evade responsibility for the change, does not reflect credit upon the statesmanship of either of them, but does, perhaps, properly credit the effects of bankers' pressure.

This was an appropriate time for negotiations between J. P. Morgan and Company and the British government, with the object in mind of designating the Morgan firm as the controlling purchasing agent for the British government. These negotiations were completed January 15, 1915, and Edward R. Stettinius (later one of Roosevelt's Secretaries of State and head of the American delegation to the United Nations Organization) was placed in direct charge of buying for the British. Somewhat later in the year the Morgan firm also became the purchasing agent for the French government.

Hon. H. A. Michaelson, of Illinois, in the House of Representatives, May 26, 1921, said:

"In March, 1915, the J. P. Morgan Interests, steel, shipbuilding, powder and their subsidiary organizations got together twelve men high up in the newspaper world and employed them to select the most influential newspapers in the United States and a sufficient number of them to control generally the policy of the daily press of the United States.

"These twelve men selected 179 newspapers, they found it was only necessary to purchase the control of twenty-five of the greatest papers. The policy, national and international, of these papers was bought and paid for so much a month; this contract is in existence at the present time, and it accounts for the news columns being filled with all sorts of arguments and misrepresentations about the United States Army, Navy, the probability of the United States being attacked by foreign foes, suppression of everything in opposition to the interests served . . . stuff carried in daily press to commercialize public sentiment, sand-bag the National Congress into making wasteful appropriations."

M. Gabriel Hanoteaux, Minister of Foreign Affairs for France, stated:

> *"France was ready to make peace the latter part of 1914, but was persuaded not to by three Americans, Robert Bacon of the Financial House of J. P. Morgan and Co.; Myron T. Herrick, and Wm. G. Sharp, pledging to French officials that if France would continue in the war these three men would organize a propaganda to put the United States into the war on the side of the Allies."*

It has been said that as early as the end of the year 1914 the traffic in war materials with the Allies had become deeply entrenched in America's economic organization, and the possibility of keeping out of the war by the diplomacy of neutrality, no matter how skill-fully conducted, had reached the vanishing point.

Morgan's friend, Strong, and Delano, both of the Federal Reserve Board called upon Colonel House. As a result of this meeting, House wrote to President Wilson: "Delano and Governor Strong of the New York Federal Reserve Bank were here yesterday to see me concerning the serious condition that confronts us in regard to foreign exchange. They believe that unless the Federal Reserve System broadens its basis of credits that another month or two will bring about a crisis and almost a complete breakdown of our foreign trade . . ."

The complete take-over by the Internationalists was first indicated as a certainty when Secretary Lansing wrote Wilson:

> *My Dear Mr. President:*
>
> *Doubtless Secretary McAdoo has discussed with you the necessity of floating Government loans for the belligerent nations, which are purchasing such great quantities of goods in this country, in order to avoid a serious financial situation which will not only affect them but this country as*

well….

"If the European countries cannot find means to pay for the excess of goods sold to them over those purchased from them they will have to stop buying and our present export trade will shrink proportionately. The result would be restriction of outputs, industrial depression, idle capital and idle labor, numerous failures, financial demoralization, and general unrest and suffering among the laboring classes….

"I believe that Secretary McAdoo is convinced, and I agree with him, that there is only one means of avoiding this situation, which would so seriously affect economic conditions in this country, and that is the floatation of large bond issues by the belligerent governments.

"The difficulty is—and this is what Secretary Mc-Adoo came to see me about—that the Government early in the war announced that it considered 'war loans' to be contrary to the 'true spirit of neutrality.'

"The Practical reasons for the policy at the time we adopted it were sound, but basing it on the ground that loans are "inconsistent with the true spirit of neutrality" is now a source of embarrassment….

"Can we afford to let a declaration as to our conception of the "true spirit of neutrality" . . . stand in the way of our national interests which seem to be seriously threatened?"

Lansing.

This was the setting against which Wilson began to proclaim a doctrine which later became his favorite theme, the "self-determination" of small nations. He now foreshadowed the spirit which dominated the peace conferences, and finally revealed his plan for a League of Nations. Compare his statements of the American policy of peace before the buzzards

of Britain stealthily made him over and the statements of the international policy of greed and war which he uttered after the make-over became as apparent as it was real.

In his message to Congress, April 2, 1917, Wilson said:

> *"Our object—is to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world as against the selfish and autocratic power and set up amongst the really free and self-governed peoples of the world such a concert of purpose and action as henceforth will insure the observance of these principles.*
>
> *"The right," he declared in his concluding paragraphs, "is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free.*
>
> *"To such a task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes, everything that we are and everything that we have, with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured. God helping her she can do no other."*

Two weeks later the President, in a message to the American people commenting on "the entrance of our beloved country into the grim and terrible war for democracy and human rights," said: "There is not a single selfish element, so far as I can see, in the cause we are fighting for."

In December of the same year Wilson said in his Address to Congress:

“It is because it is for us a war of high, disinterested purpose, in which all the free people of the world are banded together for the vindication of right, a war for the preservation of our nation and of all that it has held dear of principle and of purpose, that we feel ourselves doubly constrained to propose for its outcome only that which is righteous and of irreproachable intention, for our foes as well as for our friends.

“The cause being just and holy, the settlement must be of like motive and quality. For this we can fight, but for nothing less noble or less worthy of our traditions. For this cause we entered the war, and for this cause we will battle until the last gun is fired.”

Those who sold their World War I President such a bill of goods were worthy predecessors for the one-world, do-gooder, communistic, starry-eyed, crack-pot, putty-brained left wing pressure groups who sold the World War II President on the principle of fighting for Christianity, civilization and democracy to be followed up with a United Nations Organization and a World Bank.

The most important single document directly affecting Wilson’s declaration of war was sent by the American ambassador to Britain, Walter Haines Page, himself an international banker, and deserves special attention.

Below is printed in full the document secretly sent by Ambassador Page to the Department of State on March 5, 1917 After having read it, learn this lesson: America went to war some twenty years ago to save the hide of the international bankers, politely referred to as the financial structure of Europe.

Ambassador in Great Britain to the

Secretary of State.

(Cablegram)
London, March 5, 1917, I p.m.

(Received March 6, 3:20 a.m.)

5794.M5644, February 9, 10 a.m.

"The financial inquiries made here reveal an international condition most alarming to the American financial and industrial outlook. England is obliged to finance her allies as well as to meet her own war expenses. She has as yet been able to do these tasks out of her own resources. But in addition to these tasks she cannot continue her present large purchases in the United States without shipments of gold to pay for them and she cannot maintain large shipments of gold for two reasons: first, both England and France must retain most of the gold they have to keep their paper money at par; and second, the submarine has made the shipping of gold too hazardous, even if they had it to ship.

"The almost immediate danger, therefore, is that Franco-American and Anglo American exchange will be so disturbed that orders by all the Allied Governments will be reduced to the lowest minimum and there will be almost a cessation of transatlantic trade. This will, of course, cause a panic in the United States. The world will be divided into two hemispheres, one of which has gold and commodities and the other, which needs these commodities, will have no money to pay for them. The financial and commercial result will be almost as bad for one as for the other. This condition may soon come suddenly unless action is quickly taken to prevent it. France and England must have a large enough credit in the United States to prevent the collapse of world trade and of the whole European finance.

"If we should go to war with Germany the greatest help we could give the Allies would be such a credit. In that case our Government could, if it would, make a large investment in

a Franco-British loan or might guarantee such a loan. All the money would be kept in our own country, trade would be continued and enlarged till the war ends, and after the war. Europe would continue to buy food and would buy from us also an enormous supply of things to re-equip her peace industries. We should thus reap the profit of an uninterrupted, perhaps an enlarging, trade over a number of years and we should hold their securities in payment.

"But if we hold most of the money and Europe cannot pay for re-equipment there may be a world-wide panic for an indefinite period.

"Unless we go to war with Germany our government of course cannot make such a direct grant of credit, but is there no way in which our Government might indirectly, immediately, help the establishment in the United States of a large Franco British credit without a violation of armed neutrality? I am not sufficiently acquainted with our own reserve bank law to form an opinion, but if these banks were able to establish such a credit, they would avert this danger. It is a danger for us more real and imminent, I think, than the public on either side the ocean realizes. If it be not averted before its symptoms become apparent, it will then be too late to avert it.

"I think that the pressure of this approaching crisis has gone beyond the ability of the Morgan Financial agency for the British and French Governments. The need is becoming too great and urgent for any private agency to meet, for every such agency has to encounter jealousies of rivals and of sections.

"Perhaps our going to war is the only way in which our present prominent trade position can be maintained and a panic averted. The submarine has added the last item to the danger of a financial world crash. During a period of uncertainty about our being drawn into the war, no more

> *considerable credit can be privately placed in the United States and a collapse may come in the meantime."*

It was only a matter of hours after the receipt of this cablegram until Wilson had prepared his Declaration of War speech, thereby indicating that the war was not fought for even the most boasted of humanitarian reasons. Wilson further proved this when he confessed in St. Louis shortly before his death:

> *"Is there a man or woman, nay, is there a child who does not know that the seeds of war are sown in hot commercial rivalry?"*

> *"The real reason why some nations went to war against Germany was because they thought Germany would get the commercial advantage of them."*

That message of Page's does not tell the whole story of war plotting, intrigue and propaganda but does stress the why of American participation in the conflict. Some sidelights on Page are interesting because he proved to be a prototype of the present breed of American "statesmen" and "diplomats" who are more British than American.

Page was from the outset a British apologist and had, as he explained, no respect for international law: "International law is no strict code and it's all shot to pieces anyhow." The latter part of his statement is interesting, for England had done a great deal of the shooting. Orders in Council had completely set aside every safeguard of the neutral, particularly the law governing contraband blockade and continuous voyage, a fact which the law officers of the State Department sought in vain to impress on Mr. Page. He argued, as Englishmen argued, that since the Allies were fighting for the right, they were justified in whatever they did. When

right is the object—and “we” are always “right”—law is of no importance and may be ignored. Thus Page helped to introduce the Klu Klux spirit into international relations. He was, Americans are assured, a great American, and perhaps this fact proves it. The violators of the law have the right to define what is right and what is wrong contradicts, he is resorting to propaganda.

Typical of the nauseating namby-pamby naivete of the present UN-One World mental narcosis concerning British policy was his swallowed propaganda regarding German colonies. As late as the Spring of 1917 he wrote: “Mr. Balfour told me yesterday his personal conviction about the German colonies. His firm opinion is that they ought not to be returned to the Germans, first for the sake of humanity. The natives—the Africans especially—have been so barbarously treated and so immorally that it would be inhuman to permit the Germans to rule and degrade them further. But Heaven forbid that we should still further enlarge the British Empire. As a practical matter I do not care to do that.” The world now knows as Bryan, Clark and others knew at the time, that this statement was a thinly disguised falsehood.

Henry Ford sent a peace ship to Europe to stop World War I. When he returned from Christiana, Ford confided that he knew his trip would fail before he had left sight of the American shores. Asked how he knew the trip was doomed to failure he explained:

> *“On the way down the harbor I talked with two men who have studied war for years. They showed me that wars are matters of business, of profitism, of percentages; that, no matter what countries are at war, or who wins or loses the International Bankers make huge profits. They told me that, if I hoped to end war, I would have to deal with the International Banking Ring.”*

With the American Federal Reserve Banking System patterned after the designs of its real founders in London, England, where the international bankers still keep their headquarters, it is not surprising that these curious verities of co-operation should exist. It is no mere coincidence, therefore, that America's foreign policy should be what these English headquarters want it to be. That explains why the American State Department has such spineless characteristics which make it in effect an American branch of the British Foreign Office. It is useless to say politicians and their political parties make foreign policy when it is the monetary manipulators who make politicians and their parties. Politicians and their actions are themselves effects, not causes. Nor is it a mere coincidence that every American ambassador to England since the establishment of the Federal Reserve System has been an international banker. The list is as follows: Walter Hines Page, John W. Davis, George Harvey, Frank B. Kellogg, Alanson B. Houghton, Charles G. Dawes, Andrew W. Mellon, Robert Worth gingham, Joseph P. Kennedy, John G. Winant, W. Averell Harriman.

The merchandizers of murder profited not only on interest from greatly increased national debts, but also from war supplies manufactured by utility companies they controlled. They even sold to the enemy at enormous profits. They engaged in these traitorous deals even though they knew full well their munitions would kill their own flesh and blood. Thus throughout the first three years of World War I Germany received all-important cotton, necessary in the manufacture of explosives, from countries which England could easily have blockaded.

The Krupp works of Essen, Germany, sent armaments to France and received payment in gold. France also gave Germany the assurance that the blast furnaces taken by German arms early in the conflict would not be bombarded. On the other hand, American doughboys were ordered not to fire on certain German-

held munition factories which were producing instruments with which to kill them, because “they are owned by British interests.” During the war the Briey Basin was considered as holy and inviolatable grounds by the Internationalists; so much so that when an American officer wanted to bomb the arsenal out of existence he was forbidden to do so because, “if we shell Briey the Germans will, in reprisal, shell Dombasle.” Dombasle was an Allied arsenal.

French destroyers captured ships loaded with nickel bound for Germany and were brought as prizes of war to French ports; but they were ordered released by French officials and eventually reached the German port of Bremen safely. In 1915 French officers were ordered to conduct their campaigns in such a way as to prolong the war because the profits derived from it had to continue at all costs. If the ordinary soldier gave the enemy as much as a gun he would be promptly court marshalled, but if the money merchandizers of murder sell millions of weapons to the enemy they arc honored and praised in every conceivable way.

In return for magnetos for airplane engines, shipped by Germany, France gave bauxite, an indispensable ingredient in the manufacture of aluminum for Zepplins. Barbed wire strung out by the British at Ypres and on the Somme river, which became a deathtrap for much of the Prussian Guard, was manufactured by the Drahtwerke of Opel and Company and found its way through Holland to England. Australia shipped fat to Germany by way of Norway and Denmark. British ships carried copra from the Straits settlements, tea from Ceylon, coke and coal from Wales, as well as tar and glycerine for high explosives—all to Germany.

In spite of all this British traffic for the cause of Germany, the British government had the highhanded, unwarranted audacity to black-list fifty American firms “suspected of selling goods to the enemy.”

In 1920 the author of “Union Now,” Clarence K. Streit, wrote a pamphlet entitled, “Where Iron Is, There Is the Fatherland.” It related much of the racketeering in munitions during the World War. On page twelve he says:

“In each of the European countries the mineral interests were tending at a rapid rate, as in the United States, toward combination, centralization and internationalization. Above them all was the famous international banking family of the Rothschilds, … barons of Germany, England, France and Austria by business. And in the international Rothschild group when the war began, 210 shares were held by the Krupps (of Germany)….

“The wholesale slaughter of men, it cannot be denied, means good business to those who furnish the instruments of death. When war does not exist, these interests seek to cause it. That was shown by Liebknecht in 1913 when he exposed before the German Reichstag the policy of the Krupps, which was to subsidize French newspapers at Paris to attack Germany and then use these editorial attacks to convince the Reichstag that Germany for fear of France must increase her armament.”

Fortune magazine published a most illuminating booklet on why wars are fought and prolonged in this highly civilized world. The editors of this booklet, “Arms and the Men,” proved beyond doubt that the international munition makers, owned and directed by the international bankers, regardless of nationalities, worked for more, bigger and longer wars. The method used was as simple as it was profitable: If the enemy is running out of essentials with which to destroy their own armies, sell him what he needs from their own supplies. Nonsensical national loyalties must not hamper such glorious carnage. The source mentioned above is very specific even to detailing the amounts of materials graciously exchanged between the warring nations, and likewise lists the exact dates of these transfers. It also furnished the authoritative sources of its information.

In World War II there is mounting evidence of the same policy. Copies of the German Heinkel planes were used in Russia. British Rolls-Royce engines were powering German planes all the while English statesmen were speculating on what the German air fleet would do to London. While Mussolini thundered invectives against Communism and Soviet Russia, his Italian workmen were paid for constructing a cruiser for Red Russia at the port of Livorno. America exported tons of manufactured armaments and raw materials to Japan which were certain to be used in the slaughter of American sons.

To be specific about some of the ways of America's international do-gooders, here are some interesting even if disgusting figures taken from page 405 of the hearings before the Foreign Affairs Committee in 1945. When Japan attacked the United States at Pearl Harbor here is where her war materials came from:

Trucks, autos and parts, 91 percent given her by the United States of America. Copper, 93 percent given her by the United States of America. All oil, 60 percent given her by the United States. Pig iron, 41 percent given her by the United States. Scrap iron, 60 percent given her by the United States. Machinery and engines, 48 percent given her by the United States. High octane gasoline, 100 percent given her by the United States of America.

It can be seen from these statistics that an average of 75 percent of Japan's materials of war came from the United States. Without them the Japanese could never have started the war and would never dreamed of attacking at Pearl Harbor. These same vested interests responsible for this grant of supplies did not change their ways one iota even when American boys had American scrap iron shot into their flesh by the Japanese.

The International Bankers are the only people in the world who "granted" or could "grant" the funds with which to conduct a

war. It was to their advantage to help and profit from both sides.

Before the fall of France, Germany sold her thousands of carloads of coke every week and received in return thousands of tons of iron ore for the manufacture of munitions. The Italian rayon trust was controlled by British money, and a director of the Bank of England is also a director of this corporation. The Vickers Company of England owned large blocks of stocks in extensive Italian metal works. Douglas Vickers, two “Sirs,” and a Chancellor of the Exchecquer were all directors of a famous Italian electrical manufacturer. Railroad and power magnets in Germany functioned with English profiteering finance.

Upon the advice of Montague Norman, then head of the Bank of England, directors of large utilities began in 1934 to help Hitler. Their first move was to sponsor Hitler’s secret rearmament just about to begin in defiance of the known terms of Versailles. Using their controlling interests in both Vickers and Imperial Chemical Industries, they instructed these large armament concerns to assist the German program by every means at their disposal.

Representative Daniel A. Reed of New York had an article, “Inside the Four-Power Pact,” by Ladislas Farrago in Ken Magazine, inserted in the Congressional Record. This article continues the story as follows:

Both Vickers and I.C.I. were quite willing to cooperate, especially since this now official policy of London’s financiers was in line with their own anti-Russian plans. Long before Montague Norman decided to use Hitler, Vickers had created a ring of armament factories in all countries which seemed Russia’s potential enemies. They controlled the Societe Polonaise de Materielle de Guerre in Poland, the famous Mitsui Japanese Steel Works in Japan, the Vickers Terni and the Armstrong Pozznoli in Italy, and were working in close contact

with the Krupps and other large armament factories in Germany.

The Bank's pro-German policy even made the Royal Navy come across. The British Admiralty and the German naval command were pledged to work in the closest possible co-operation: Secret clauses provided for an exchange of naval intelligence, and diverse information and details of inventions concerning naval construction. The British commission suggested that Germany discard her metric system on naval units and adopt the English linear system in order to enable English armament manufacturers to supply ammunition promptly should the German navy become engaged in hostilities. Germany placed at the disposal of the British admiralty an invention by the staff of the Berlin Technical College for use in submarine construction.

The London war office was forced to take its proper place in the pro-German policy. The war office agreed to a Berlin suggestion to exchange officers of the fighting forces, and in 1934 three German officers came to London, while three English officers went to the Berlin War Ministry. During the same year English armament firms placed huge advertisements in the Militaerisches Wochenblatt, offering for sale tanks and guns expressly prohibited by the Versailles Treaty. A statement made by General Sir Herbert Lawrence, chairman of Vickers, furnished the necessary evidence that the British Government knew about and approved these advertisements.

Such articles as this make it evident that the present confusion and treasonable proposals concerning the atomic bomb are largely prompted by the fact that these sordid sources, these infernal interests, are not sure the "right" side will possess it in the next war.

Although the strongest adjectives and invectives fail to adequately describe such a course of business policy, the procedure goes at least as far back as Napoleon. The French Emperor needed $25-thousand to equip his army to battle

against the English and Wellington, and he borrowed it from English banks. The conqueror of Europe, as many after him, acknowledged one enemy greater than Wellington. That enemy was the international banking combine. Napoleon once remarked: “When a government is dependent for money upon bankers, the bankers, and not the leaders of that government, control the situation.” He aptly remarked another time: “Money has no motherland; financiers are without patriotism and without decency. Their sole object is gain.” Anyone knowing the facts of recent history can make the same statements in all truth.

Probing the munitions racket after World War I uncovered facts which stagger the imagination and previews of coming investigations into World War II financial conspiracies are no less ominous. It is quite evident that International Finance fared better in the second world conflict than it did in the first. One of the previews, for example, shows that the U. S. Steel corporation, whose products are so vital a factor in war, showed a loss of $6,524,001 in 1939 and a profit of $95,688,091 in 1941. The operating profits over a comparable period shows an increase of $178-million, a sum that would have purchased several war stamps.

Americans were not properly advised of such revelations as the following:

That the United States Steel Corporation and Bethlehem Steel Corporation charged Russia $349 a ton for armor plate, Italy $395 a ton, and Japan $406, but these loyal and patriotic Americans charged the United States Government prices from $411 to $604 a ton for identical plate. The cost did not exceed $315 a ton.

That thirty-seven percent of certain shell orders were delivered after the war ended. Some contracts which the government graciously permitted to be completed, even though never delivered, were held by French and British companies who did not want to shut down their factories.

That leading companies—all dominated by international financial interests—used war orders as a lever to expand plant capacity and obtain costly improvements at government expense. Many orders in no way required for victory were placed in their hands.

That between 1914–18 the profits of the J. P. Morgan corporation leaped to unknown heights. There is a dispute as to just what they were because the Morgan Company did not agree with the United States Senate. The Senate claimed the firm made $131-million in 1914, $348-million in 1916, $585-million in 1917 and $519-million in 1918, although the Morgan Company claimed that $444-million in the last two years, which was a good margin when the nations best men were fighting and dying for $30 a month.

That the Du Ponts, according to government investigators, had stooped so low as to bill the government $75 for the burial of every worker who died during an influenza epidemic at the Old Hickory Powder Plant, and had sold the bodies for $11 each as well. Industrial alcohol had been illegally withdrawn from the Old Hickory plant, it was also charged, and had been sold to Jess Smith, personal agent of Daugherty, for 30 cents a gallon. Smith resold at $10 a gallon, making a profit of $9.70 a gallon which he shared with persons unknown. A government investigator complained that his report exposing the complicated methods by which the Du Ponts had mulcted the government on a gigantic scale was shown by the Department of Justice to the Du Ponts so that lawyers might prepare a plausible defense. After repeated attempts to bring a voluminous and damning case against the Du Ponts to trial, First Assistant Attorney General John W. H. Crim blocked at every turn by Daugherty, resigned in disgust. The Du Ponts, politically powerful, arrogant, reactionary, were never prosecuted.

These examples are illustrative of and forceful corallaries to the already definitely established reasons for these forces

putting the United States into the holocaust. As Lundbeg in his epic “America’s 60 Families” writes: “The rich families, to be sure, wanted the war to be won, but they took care that the victory was as expensive as possible to the common taxpayers. They uttered no cries for government economy, as since they have done, so long as the public Treasury was at their disposal. Economy became desirable only when government funds were to be expended on war veterans and on the unemployed.”

It is a lie for anyone to say that in time of war the banks come forward with sacrifices, as all patriots should, and loan the government money at a very low rate of interest, to save the nation. The truth is Commercial banks never loan the government a red cent of their own money or of anybody else’s money already on deposit. They “purchase” government bonds by creating pen and ink money out of nothing with nothing behind this credit money except the bond itself. Worse yet, they can post this bond with the Federal Reserve and get its face value in cash money by paying the cost of printing such money.

The money interests never base their friendships upon common ideals or any claims of gratitude; they have their roots always and invariably in their own self-interests. Britain would have made peace with Hitler in 1939 if she had thought she would be able to secure an advantageous and more or less durable treaty. How many Jews Hitler massacred and how many concentration camps he maintained—and what went on in them—would have been held [by the international bankers] to be beside the point. And if Britain now shies away from Stalin’s friendship it is because Stalin will not profit the bankers to the extent American blood and riches will.

The Senate Munitions Investigation Committee under the chairmanship of Senator Nye, of North Dakota rose above the sordid political chicanery in which it had its first breath of life to become one of the most systematic, impartial and fruitful investigations ever conducted by the Senate. In

“America’s 60 Families” it was stated as follows: “Although one wing of the Du Pont bloc gave him (Roosevelt) support in 1932, his administration was to prove the most disastrous ever experienced by the munitions lords, for the President himself supported the Nye Munitions Investigating Committee which brought to view much Du Pont knavery. Apparently the Du Ponts felt that Roosevelt should have soft-pedalled this damaging inquiry early, as he subsequently did when it seemed likely to involve important British interests. The Du Ponts undoubtedly realized full well that no high principle actuated the New Deal leadership in permitting the Nye Committee to reveal them in as ugly a light as any rich family has ever been placed. They must have known, for example, how President Roosevelt terminated the Senate Banking and Currency Committee investigation of Wall Street as soon as it had successfully impugned New Deal foes and was logically ready to begin investigating the Wall Street machinations of high-ranking Democrats.”

Well might Senator Nye say of the Committee what he said of one of its members, Senator Clark, of Missouri: “May I say of him—the Senator from Missouri—at this time, that during these last few days he has had a large hand in the writing of history—history that may not be at once appreciated by America and Americans, but which another day will be basic to any intelligent undertaking looking to the recording of the facts prevalent during some of the most critical days of American history? The Senator from Missouri has contributed so emphatically in this making of history that there must in these hours be great rest and satisfaction in a certain grave where lie the remains of one who dared, back in those history-making hours, courageously uphold the finest traits and traditions which have entered into the making of America’s finer historical pages. I have reference to the memory of the distinguished father of Missouri’s able and courageous senior Senator.”

Senator Clark's father, referred to, was the famous Champ Clark, a people's choice for the presidency and possible candidate until Colonel House as agent for the citadel of corruption discovered, made and elected Wilson. Champ Clark was one of the six Senators who voted against Wilson's request for a declaration of War. The deluge of derision heaped upon his head at the time has now become a crown of wisdom and patriotic courage.

The Morgan Company, while purchasing agents in the U. S. for Great Britain and France bought nearly three billion dollars worth of goods in behalf of the Allies, and made a profit of $30-million on the deals. They also sold bonds of the Allies to Americans at still larger profits. Morgan and Company sold these bonds to raise money for Allied purchases because the Allies themselves did not have the resources to pay for their orders.

These bonds of England and France had no security behind them—only the word of England and France. These billions were in danger of becoming repudiated as the danger of English and French defeat approached. That is what was behind these words of the President of the Federal Reserve Board when he said: "We will be forced to take up the cudgels for any of our citizens owning bonds that might be repudiated." That is why it has been said that the bankers had bet on the wrong horse; they placed their stakes on the side that was losing.

Lord Northcliffe, who was in the United States as a British representative, sent to his government in 1917, when Treasury Secretary MacAdoo requested that someone in authority be sent to America to arrange for loans:

> *"They (financiers) are complete masters of the situation as regards themselves, Canada, France, Italy and Russia…. If Loans Stop, War Stops."*

It is astounding to learn that Americans suffered and died to

make good these involving loans of private bankers. But there is another fact equally startling, and even less known. It is: These loans with which world wars are fought are entirely fictional credit. In fact, there is not enough gold in the world to pay even the interest on these debts!

The nations' war debts were all contracted in gold and since there is scarcely $20-billion worth of gold in existence, the interest of the fictional war debts of $311-billion could not be met for a single year. The foreign Allies merely created credit with a stroke of the pen to wage wars for their ruthless rulers (financiers) and afterwards repudiate them to the government but not to the banks, as being unpayable.

In 1913, just before the outbreak of World War I the debts of 53 nations commercially affected, either directly or indirectly, totaled over $43-billion. Then came the tremendous burden of wartime taxation as an extremely heavy addition. Despite the tax increase the debts of these same nations at the end of the war was over $354-billion. And the bankers collect taxes on that increased amount. Hence one grasps the increased profit to the banks in wars, as well as the increased burden to the citizens of these nations—the subjects are taxed for the luxuries of their masters. Who the subjects are and who the masters are, remains self-evident.

When foreign governments repudiate their war debts to the United States, or when the United States cancels them, the banks simply turn to the United States government to collect their interest. This burden in turn falls on the American citizen from whom the government collects under its power of taxation.

These debts on which the bankers collect interest are so enormous that they do not represent money at all. They are merely measured in a virtually endless string of figures with a dollar sign stuck in front of them. They are definite, but not real.

Thus the Banks collect on the fictional credit money of war debts the same as they do on the fictional credit money of national peacetime economy which constitutes 95% of the nation’s money. Normal peacetime constitutes “business as usual” but the wartime deals bring a really heavy boom. Since one war every generation is about as much as people can take, “bargain sales” are offered in wars of smaller nations almost continuously somewhere in the world.

It is high time for beginning the basic remedy for wars, debts and oppression by permitting the Government to issue its own money which, under the Constitution, it and it alone has the right to do.