Chapter 8

Chapter VIII—Round Two

> *"During the whole of this eight months (the 'phoney war' 1939-1940) lengthy negotiations were conducted by the British Foreign Office and Mr. Chamberlain' and the German Foreign Office and Hitler, by which from our side, we offered to stop the war if Germany would agree to a Gold Standard and International Usury, while Germany offered to stop the war if we would agree to allow her to develop her barter-trade system and give her back some of her colonies…. Then followed the Atlantic Charter meeting of Roosevelt and Churchill, attended by Mr. Montague Norman (Governor of the Bank of England), when, as stated above, Churchill pledged this country to support America's plan to get the world back again onto a Gold and Usury standard when Hitler was defeated." (From June-July number of "The Members Bulletin," England.)*

> *"The war had been decided upon long before the Polish Corridor question turned up." (U. S. Ambassador Bullitt's statement to Karl von Wiegand in spring 1939, in Paris.)*

Now let's see how and why.

> *"Who asked for revisions of the neutrality law? Was it American labor? Did the call come from the farmers? From the pulpit? From the homes of Americans? From American youth?*
>
> *"No, it came from the war hounds of Europe. It is supported by the manufacturers of munitions who are seeking the profit which they cannot make under the present law. If the law is revised and adopted according to the New Deal's program, the European war will become our war. Then, the old cry of save the world for democracy will arise again, as it did before when the United States entered the world conflict!*

> *"If the belligerents become financially pinched after two or three years of war, an effort will be made to collect for the munitions which they will have purchased in America and the burden will again fall on the American taxpayer. If I believed in going into this thing at all, I myself could not sap from the lives of helpless children a few dollars to get cash. You cannot be a national benefactor and a Shylock at the same time."*

It is with a deep sense of guilt and with a heart weighed down by reverent respect for such statements as the above by Senator William E. Borah, spoken in opposition to the revision of the neutrality law in 1939, that Americans now contemplate their latest road to war. Speaking in the Senate against the enactment of peace time conscription, the words of another former Senator, those of Rush D. Holt, come back to haunt their readers:

> *"This bill is the old story of trade and money—the story that has led many a young man to have his head blown off on the battlefields of the world, the story that led many a young man to the living death of shell shock. These boys want jobs to live, not jobs to die. They want to build, not destroy. Their hope is the science of chemistry to make this a better world in which to live, not a world in which to spread poison gas. Their hope is the science of mathematics to build homes, not to draw charts for the dropping of bombs. Their hope is the march of progress, not the march of death. Conscription? For what? Everyone who is familiar with the developments in Washington knows that this conscription is for the possible use of the drafted overseas. Diplomatic reports state that those on the inside predict that we will be in the war this fall or next spring.*
>
> *"Some of the same financial institutions that made millions out of the last war are behind the spreading hysteria for our involvement in this one. The same international lawyers. who*

were later shown to be tied financially and employed by foreign governments and corporations in the last World War, are preaching that we 'take steps short of war' but they know that 'short of war' in the long run will mean the elimination of the phrase 'short of'…. One individual who has proclaimed that we should declare war and fight the battle over there does not in the same statement tell you of his financial holdings in airplane manufacturing concerns that build bombers, pursuit planes, and the like.

"Our defense does not rest across the sea. It rests in every home in the land. It rests in our factories. It rests in our everyday life. It rests not upon the navy of any foreign power. It rests in you, one hundred and thirty million persons who know that America's hope is peace."

A book "Propaganda in the Next War," suppressed outside Britain proper, also knew what was going on behind the scenes and comes from England. It reveals the following:

"The next war (World War II) will be billed as a fight between democracy and dictatorship. We shall most certainly represent the struggle in the propaganda we shall be compelled to do toward France, the United States of America, and our empire as a democracy and freedom versus dictatorship and dictatorship. It will need a definite threat to America, a threat, moreover, which will have to be brought home to every citizen, before the Republic will again take up arms in an external quarrel. The position will be considerably eased if Japan were involved and this might and probably would bring America in without further ado. At any rate, it would be a natural and obvious object of our propagandists to achieve this, just as during the great war (World War I) they succeeded in embroiling the United States with Germany."

In the English monthly, "The Word," Glasgow, was written:

> *"In considering a book by a pro-war author, Mr. Waverly Root, a writer in 'Reality' points out how the latter confirms the fact that Marion Eccles of the Federal Reserve Board and Montague Norman of the Bank of England agreed not later than 1935 on the joint policy of killing Hitler's financial experiment by all methods, including war, if necessary. Norman's job was to engineer Hitler into the dilemma of having to reverse his financial policy or commit an act of war. He was to deliver into Hitler's hands a secret ultimatum which virtually required him to keep the peace and at the same time destroy the trade and employment boom in Germany. The first condition meant that Hitler was not to acquire any real credit across Germany's border except by negotiations approved by Norman. The second meant that he was to put an end to the use of Germany's real credit except in the principles believed in by Norman and Eccles, which of course do not utilize a country's real credit to the full at all."*

The "200-Family Monopoly" of France, "The Hundred Families That Rule the Empire" of Britain, and "America's Sixty Families" compose a Who's Who which tells the world What's What. Herein is found why America participated in another killing campaign with a profuse outpouring of blood which was belittled by the benefactors and a stupendous granting of money which was accepted with a sneer and without as much as a promise of intention of even partial payment. Herein is learned how truly independent the financial fakirs have left America, and how truly Colonel Charles A. Lindbergh could say:

> *"It is amazing that one should have to plead for American independence in a nation with a heritage such as ours; in a nation which in its infancy revolted against foreign control, and whose people have fought time and again against the armies and interference of the Old World. Yet the independence and the destiny of America were never more in jeopardy than they are today.*

"We won our independence from England when we were a nation of less than 4-million people. We numbered only about 10-million when the Monroe Doctrine was established. With a population of 35-million, even though we had just previously emerged from four years of Civil War, we made France remove her invading armies from Mexico. Later in the century with a population of 75-million we forced Spain to withdraw entirely from the New World.

"Why then, with 130,000,000 people, are we being told that we must give up our independent position, that our frontiers lie in Europe, and that our destiny will be decided by European armies fighting upon European soil? . . .

"We find the same men who have led us to the greatest national debt in our history, now telling us that as a nation we are weak and unprepared; that we must appropriate more billions of dollars, and devote more years of time to building up our military forces. . . . These same leaders who have failed to solve our peacetime problems . . . tell us that the best way to defend our country is to defend England. All the lessons of Europe have passed unheeded before us."

Thus it is with truth that Former President Herbert Hoover in an interview article for the September 1947 issue of the American Magazine could say that America should have stayed out of World War II. Mr. Hoover stated what every informed person knows to be a fact, but what only a few have the courage to say. It is evident that the former President has no further political ambitions, for if he had, such a statement would have drowned his chances for success by raising the enmity of the monied plutocrats, of plunder and their shouting internationalists. Only a few had the intestinal fortitude to side with Hoover and yet only a few opposed his stand. This meager opposition is significant in view of the fact that it was safe politically to do so. That more did not attack Hoover's stand might be due to intellectual convictions that

he was right.

The replies from 100 American professors of history and international relations to a questionnaire sent out by the National Council for Prevention of War are very illuminating. Here are the questions and answers on the two all-important topics:

> *Q. "Do you believe that Germany and her allies were solely responsible for causing the World War?*
>
> *A. "Yes, 3; No, 95; Others, 2.*
>
> *Q. "Do you believe that Germany was more responsible than any other power for causing the World War?*
>
> *A. "Yes, 32; No, 56; Others, 12."*

Back in 1932 the London International Bankers arranged with Dr. Schacht, President of the German Reichbank, and Mr. Thyson, a German industrial baron, to finance internationalists' schemes in Germany. Hitler smashed this plot by dismissing Schacht who was merely the German representative of the international financial fraternity who was conducting the Reichbank as a German branch of the international banking omniscient octopus. The official report of Schacht's dismissal crashed all newspaper propaganda gates. It was laughable to see the columns upon columns, all in the nature of a warm approbation of Dr. Schacht, whose "financial genius and conservative financial methods had saved Hitler Germany from collapse," while Hitler was bitterly criticized because of his "foolish act of ousting Schacht." Surely Hitler had made another of his many big mistakes, each one of which would be to emaciate Nazi Germany. That Germany became stronger stems from the ouster of this Dr. Schacht, international banker colleague, who in the vicious and curious logic of the money powers was a genius and the savior of Germany.

The first reaction was to wonder why the international bankers did not stage a dance of joy instead of expressing their deepest concern for Hitler. The explanation lies simply in recognizing who Schacht was, and, for that matter, still is. At present he is working with British and American zone officials on a plan of "financial reform" for Western Germany. Enough said. With that in mind, readers will find much significance in the acquittal of this same Dr. Schacht in the war trials of Nurenberg.

The story of the plot between Schacht and the London bankers is so vital to the understanding of the reasons for World War II, and was so well told in the House of Representatives by Rep. Alvin E. O'Konski during the 79th Congress that it is now quoted at some length:

> *"As early as 1923 the international do-gooders in America, who saw a lot of business and profit in Germany, started to rebuild Germany's war machine. Instead of murderers in World War I the international do-gooders now started to tell us how wonderful the German people really were. The international do-gooders now were telling us that America could not prosper unless Germany prospered…. If our boys who were killed in this war in Europe only knew that it was American money that was responsible for their death—international do-gooders never think of death—they think only about business and profit.*
>
> *"But this is just the beginning of the bloody trail of America's international do-gooders. Because in 1930 these greedy business manipulators said there is more business to be had from Germany if we would only make the German people more prosperous and happy. So in 1930 the international do-gooders put through the Young Plan and America gave Germany another loan of $300-million. With this second loan from the U. S. A. the Krupp munition works got bigger and better and really started to turn out guns and gases. Herr Thysen got some more money from this second U.S.A. loan and made more*

billions with which he later financed Hitler.

“During all this time that America’s international do-gooders were shedding tears for the poor German people, German taxes were lower than those in the U.S.A., France, Britain, or any other country of note. During this time when our international do-gooders were shedding tears for the poor German people, Germany built not one but seven stadiums in the world. U.S.A. could not afford even one for itself because the international do-gooders wanted it that way…. During this time Germany built railroads that not even the U.S.A. and Britain could afford….

“We were beginning to get breadlines in America at this time while the German people accumulated savings accounts of $3-billion…. Business gets better as wars get bigger. This is the type of thing our international do-gooders like Baruch specialize in. Between 1918 and 1932 our international do-gooders, bleeding for the poor people of Germany, got the U.S.A. to loan Germany $1,364,000,000. Besides this American business men invested $250-million during the same time. During this time we also stepped up our exports to Germany to be sure Germany would not starve and that she had everything she wanted. This type of thing took place until 1937 when Hitler announced to the world that the sucker game was over. . .

“Who made Hitler? Nobody but America’s international do-gooders gave Hitler the money to make the weapons that killed our boys…. The fact is that without America’s help Hitler never could have become so powerful as he did. It was America’s help that built Germany. It was America’s help that financed Germany’s war machine. We were depriving ourselves of everything. But the international do-gooders said we cannot prosper unless Germany prospered. So we made Germany prosper so much that as a result 800,000 of our own boys paid with blood to destroy Germany again.”

There is voluminous evidence to prove the charge that the United States built up Germany and established Hitler in power. For example, two volumes of Foreign Relations for 1930, published by the American State Department shows that American bankers, chiefly J. P. Morgan and Company, gave Germany a credit of $300-million for the year 1930.

It would be an error to say, as Representative O'Konski implies, that American interests were totally responsible for all Hitler's power and progress. These interests did give him his start. He accepted their money and used their Reichbank until he saw their purpose. Hitler then established a system which began by kicking the international bankers out of office, and ended in a happy and prosperous country; so much so that the London Times openly avowed that British financial and economic authorities were staggered by the "miraculous feat of Nazi finance."

People wondered why Germany had no difficulty in financing the war, why she did not have to increase taxation, compulsory savings, or issue enormous war loans. Instead Germany managed to cut taxes during the war, public savings banks touched new records month after month. Money was so plentiful that interest on State loans was reduced.

It was simply that after using the international bankers for a start, Hitler evolved a national policy that was much superior to their own. It was because his success was overcoming the old system as practiced by the international bankers that caused them to bring into play their plan for war—a plan formulated at the beginning of his experiment.

The Economic Reform Club and Institute, of London, said in their monthly bulletin for December, 1940:

> *"Another hierarchy has fallen. For years we have hung on the words of these great men, these experts, at whose lightest word Britain would stop to listen; these bankers, from whom,*

year in and year out, statesmen and captains of industry obediently took their orders. And now the oracles are dumb. The veil of wisdom is rent, disclosing a fifty-year-old gramophone bound in hide. The seat of economic authority is vacant. Where shall we turn for guidance?

"The pill is not easy to swallow but in our search for economic wisdom we must turn straight from the Bank of England to Hitler, not stopping at the London School of Economics. Having now commended our great economic experts to the care of the museum authorities, we turn to our new tutors.

"What is the secret of Hitler's financial miracle? Here further shocks await us. Everything is upside down. The State controls the banks (instead of the banks controlling the State). Monetary policy is subservient to national interest. Credit is based upon productive capacity (not debt) thus enabling Hitler to use all the labor, material and equipment that he has.

"The prospect is disturbing. Applied to peace-time industries, instead of armaments, such a monetary system would result in an overwhelming output of wealth. Used by a democratic state in the interests of the people, there would be nothing to prevent the entire population from having enough to eat and wear."

The real reasons for the international bankers taking over Hitler and Germany were: (1) When Hitler and Germany were prepared, Germany would attack Russia and thus end the danger of Communism sweeping through Europe. (2) After a long and destructive war between Germany and Russia, both countries would be so exhausted that England and France would find it easy to quickly suppress what was left of Germany and Russia, and then could recover their European markets, restore their Balance of Power and remove any future threat of Russian

influence in Persia, Turkey or India.

Six years later in 1938, after Hitler kicked out the conspirator clique of international bankers and established a sound national monetary system and brought prosperity, and after Germany had built up a large and modern navy, a mechanized army and a large air-force, and had taken Austria and Czechoslovakia; Prime Minister Chamberlain met Mr. Hitler in the now famous conference at Godesburg.

In "Forty Years of Roosevelt," T. W. Hughes tells of this conference as follows:

> *"At this conference Mr. Chamberlain plaintively reminded Mr. Hitler that he had been given the money (international banker money) to rearm Germany; upon Mr. Hitler's definite promise that he would then attack Russia; And now that Germany was re-armed, the Rhineland fortified and Czechoslovakia out of the way, why didn't Mr. Hitler keep his promise and attack Russia? Mr. Hitler replied evasively that he still needed more time for preparation; and that being the best answer Mr Chamberlain could get, he made his sorrowful return to London. But at this conference Mr. Hitler had outsmarted Mr. Chamberlain, for the Prime Minister's words had all been taken down on a dictograph record and the record put aside for future use.*
>
> *"Some months later when it was clear that Hitler was double-crossing the International Bankers who had financed him and was not going to attack Russia, English agents went to Moscow and for two months tried to persuade Stalin to start a war against Germany. For that matter what did the International Bankers care whether Stalin or Hitler started the war, so long as both Russia and Germany would be exhausted by the war, and thus make it easy for the Big Bankers to regain control of Europe as above explained?*
>
> *"At the last moment when it seemed Stalin might sign up with*

Britain and France, Von Ribbentrop took his dictograph-record in which Mr. Chamberlain had reminded Mr. Hitler that Germany had been re-armed for an attack on Russia.

"Von Ribbentrop then said to Stalin, 'Do you now see the plot whereby Russia and Germany were to destroy each other so that the International Bankers through the armies of England and France could restore their Balance of Power in Europe?' Stalin did see; and startled the world by announcing an alliance with Germany."

An astounding side-light on this period of war preliminaries was written by Mr. Ladislas Farago in Ken magazine and inserted in the Congressional Record. He wrote in part:

"While there can be no doubt of the sincerity of Mr. Chamberlain's love of peace? his ultimate aim was the guiding motive which induced him to fly to Berchtesgaden and to Godesberg. The Four-Power conference in Munich, a long desired dream of Herr Hitler, was the climax of a scheme prepared four years ago by the directors of the Bank of England, in cooperation with an influential Carlton club clique and with the heads of Britain's armament factories.

"Hitler had disappointed his critics. His regime was no temporary nightmare but a system with a good future. and Mr. Norman (head of the Bank of England) advised his directors to include Hitler in their plans."

As for Mussolini's subservience to Hitler, it was Britain's and France's fault, not the Duce's. For in their blind attempt to uphold the status quo, the so-called democracies pursued such a warlike and menacing policy toward Italy that Mussolini was literally driven into the arms of the Nazis.

Until recent years Italy was on excellent terms with Britain, France and the other status quo powers. She was a member of

the League of Nations, a signatory of the Locarno Pact and the head of the Italian government, Benito Mussolini, consistently voiced his disapproval of the use of force as a means of settling international disputes.

The Duce put his words into practice by his action on July 25, 1934. On that day Nazi terrorists murdered Austrian Chancellor Engelbert Dollfuss, barricaded themselves in government buildings in Vienna and waited for German troops to march in and annex Austria to the Reich.

Within 48 hours of the putsch the Duce had sent 100,000 Italian troops to the Brenner Pass to warn Adolf Hitler that Italy would resist any Nazi interference in Austrian affairs. At the same time Mussolini called on France to uphold her part of an Anglo-French-Italian Treaty safeguarding Austria's independence by mobilizing troops on the Rhine and threatening to march if Germany attacked Vienna.

This the French government refused to do. Nevertheless Italy's prompt action forestalled the attempted anschluss and saved Austria for the international bankers. Otto Planetta, the Nazi ringleader, was sent to the gallows; the German ambassador was recalled; and 15,000 putschists were put in concentration camps.

Having left him in the lurch during the Austrian affair, the democratic powers further provoked Mussolini by the Franco-Soviet pact, which was signed on November 23, 1934. Drawn up by the Frenchman, Leon Blum and the Russian Maxim Litvinov-Finkelstein, the pact marked the official entrance of Red Russia into European power politics and contained secret military articles directed against both Germany and Italy.

The Duce, though still endeavoring to maintain friendly relations with Britain and France, warned that the Franco-Soviet pact was a dangerous threat to world peace and would in the end reduce Europe to a shambles. The war demonstrated the

accuracy of this prophecy.

The Treaty of London in article 15 insisted that Italy muzzle the Pope in his plea for peace. Nice people, these democracies who talk of peace and plan for war!

Just as in 1912 with the first World War brewing m Europe the Big Bankers wanted Wilson in the White House and wanted America to finance their war, so in 1932 with the second World War brewing in Europe they wanted Franklin D. Roosevelt in the White House, and again wanted America to finance the war. Thus whether Americans like it or not, it happened that in the summer of 1932 the International Bankers had two candidates running for the position of Chief Executive: Franklin D. Roosevelt in the United States and Adolph Hitler in Germany. That is how they both came to be elected.

Of these two men, Roosevelt happened to be in a land under the domination of international finance and, in fact, was himself an international banker. Perhaps that is why he could say “again and again and again” that he would not send American boys to foreign shores while plotting that very event; that is why Roosevelt was praised as the statesman of the world for giving Britain 50 American destroyers, while Benedict Arnold is called a traitor for trying to give to Britain a single unimportant fort. True, Roosevelt did not give them to an avowed enemy, but to a competitor, and also committed an act which would involve this country in the war and lessen the American forces to the extent of 50 destroyers. This deprived America of many of her effective anti-submarine vessels when submarines were the chief enemy weapon against American forces going abroad.

One of the most important statements given on Roosevelt and his international monetary intrigue was given in a speech by the Honorable John C. Schafer in the House of Representatives, Friday, June 30, 1939 and recorded in the Congressional Record of that date, P. 8463. It is a safe bet that scarcely one out

of a million ever heard of the speech although it would have revealed much in the way of disillusionment. The statement is as follows:

> *"The Washington Post of June 18th, in an Associated Press report, made the following statement: 'President Roosevelt told Congress today it would undermine the National Defense and return control of money to Wall Street and international bankers if it refused to continue his power to devalue the dollar.' This is a rather remarkable statement.*
>
> *"I hold in my hand a photostatic copy of page 31 of the New York Times of September 14, 1922, in which appears an advertisement of a new issue of 600,000,000 German marks, floated by United European Investor, Ltd., Franklin D. Roosevelt, President.*
>
> *"I have a photostatic copy of page 1430 of Poor's Register of Directors, 1929, wherein Franklin Delano Roosevelt is shown as a director of The International Germanic Trust Co.*
>
> *"I have here a copy of the prospectus and photostats of other records of the Federal International Banking Corporation, indicating that Franklin D. Roosevelt wrote the Foreword of the prospectus for this International banking outfit, and was hooked up in it with Robert Rowland Appleby, president of the British Empire Chamber of Commerce in the United States. His International Banking Corporation, according to its prospectus, was organized for the selling of foreign securities and bonds to the American people.*
>
> *"Mr. Speaker, in view of Mr. Roosevelt's international banking record, it is rather astounding for him to tell the Congress that it would 'Return control of money to Wall Street and International Bankers if it refused to continue his power to devalue the dollar.'*
>
> *"Our New-Deal President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, is an international banker of wide experience and former attorney*

> *for international bankers. Under his gold and silver policies the international bankers, foreign owners of, and speculators in gold, waxed fat when Mr. Roosevelt forced Americans to turn in their gold for $20.67 an ounce or to go to jail for five years, and then imported more than $10-billion (since more than doubled) worth of foreign gold at $35 an ounce. "Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt did not drive the money changers out of the temple of government. He drove them into the temple with the help of his Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morganthau, the son of Morganthau, the international banker, who married the favorite niece of Lehman Brothers, who are among the most powerful international bankers in America."*

No wonder he was the worst and most un-American of presidents.

The simple cause of the tragedy lies in the fact that America and her leaders championed money while the enemy championed work. America, the great democracy, was caught on the wrong side of the problem and fought to keep on being wrong. With her were the other "great co-operating allies."

Although American co-operation with England in the first war was insignificant compared with the cost of the late conflict, it is worth knowing and remembering. The figures are presented on the first World War because they are more definite; furthermore, there is no special need to hurry to the scattering and debatable figures of the late war when the lesson of the former carnage has not yet been learned. Cooperation with England in World War I cost America as follows:

Seven billions loaned during the war; seven billions paid her for her worthless stock, our supply of machinery and gold; 27 billions spent during the war for her war; 25 more billions of federal debts accumulated because of the war; after the war, 50 billions now owing by city, county and state governments,

because of inability to balance their budgets during these depression times largely made by English bankers, and more than 200 billions for 11 years of extremely contracted production; a grand total of 316 billions of loss suffered for the privilege of “co-operating” with England “to make the world safe for democracy.”

England, in turn, could say: “The war has cost us nothing” (Lloyd George). They had gotten the German colonies of great value, the German navy, the German merchant marine, the German gold and German machinery, also her military equipment and livestock so that millions of German babies might perish, and billions of indebtedness of foreign nations to England for money borrowed from her during the war England lent billions to European nations, with the necessary collateral for safe refund, while she borrowed from us with not a gesture of refund when due. For 20 years after the war England has kept on collecting the debts owed by France, Italy and other European nations, while refusing to pay her own debt to America, with our people starving because of the misery brought over us by England. No wonder, Lloyd George even boasted: “England made a profit out of the war.”

It would be thought that, after such experiences we would have learned our lesson. The American people as a whole had, but they were again in the hands of the same “co-operators” and so the cruel game went on with even more gigantic takes. They were again paying in money, wealth and blood and sweat and tears. But without control over distribution by means of a reliably circulating money, they faced the greatest tragedy in the history of our nation, and maybe in the history of the world.

Germany had kicked out the international banker and established a sound monetary system based upon the exchangeable wealth of the nation without gold or tribute to the Money Power.

> *“We were not foolish enough to try to make a currency coverage of gold of which we had none, but for every mark that was issued we required an equivalent of a mark’s worth of work done or goods produced.”**—Adolph Hitler.*

What heresy! Little pieces of paper made Germany in six years a nation whose power challenged the world, because those little pieces of paper put people to work, gave them food, unified them behind their leaders, and built a happy and prosperous country.

The key to the vault from which Hitler got the means to lead his nation out of the depression, on to capacity employment and ever increasing capacity production is found in Article I, Section 8, Paragraph 5 of the American Constitution. There it is stated in simple, insignificant words pregnant with fateful importance; That Congress shall have the power to coin (issue) money and regulate the value thereof. Some intellects with a Churchill-like complex would undoubtedly call the American Constitution “fascistic” for that reason, but it was sound Americanism long before fascism or Churchill’s childish sophistry were ever heard of.

Germany and Italy both ignored orthodoxy and fed their people by exchanging their industrial products for the food they could not produce themselves. They were condemned by the world’s “economic experts.” Barter was not accepted as legitimate trade. It did not gather interest. Trade was trade, in the opinion of the money power, only when men stood at ports entering cargoes into ledgers “Imports and Exports.” Barter only fed people and proved that the “orthodox economists” were most unorthodox.

Germany, like Italy and Russia before, was trying to escape the entanglements of world debt. England was quite willing to lend money to buy raw materials, but Germans insisted upon exchanging goods for goods. They would not be drawn into the

system of increasing debt, booms and slumps. The “Times” has since said that Germany’s barter system made her an aggressor in the world market.

On October 11 and 12 and November 13, 1940, this organ of High Finance said:

> *“One of the fundamental causes of this war has been the unrelaxing efforts of Germany since 1918 to secure wide enough foreign markets to straighten her finances at the very time when all her competitors were forced by their own debts to adopt exactly the same course. Continuous friction was inevitable.”*

Germany adopted a new monetary policy after which, the “Times” said:

“Germany ceased to experience any financial difficulty.

“In this country the people suffer the burden of heavy and increasing taxation, but in Germany,” says The Times, “nothing is ever heard of the necessity of increasing taxation, compulsory savings, or the issue of enormous public war loans. Quite the contrary. Recently an important tax was abolished. Public savings bank deposits touch new monthly records again and again. Money is so plentiful that the interest rate on the Reich loans could recently be reduced from 4 1/2 percent to 4 percent. Hitler seems to have discovered the secret of making something out of nothing, and to have evolved a system based on perpetual motion.

“These changes may well call for drastic readjustments in our established conventions. A hidebound persistence of methods and doctrines which were sound fifty years ago may easily prove as costly in the financial and economic field of actual war. It might not lose the war; it would certainly lose the peace.

Germany was trying to break the credit ring of the money monopolists by the force of economic sanity—and that was unforgivable. She was acting like the worker who went on strike against a system which deprived him of adequate food supplies though he was quite willing to exchange his labor to pay for them.

In 1937 Hitler said:

> *"Germany will enter no more obligations to pay for her goods imports that she is not capable of fulfilling. The German Government thus takes the standpoint of the respectable merchant who keeps his orders in harmony with his power to pay."*

He said: "We laugh at the time when our national economists held the view that the value of a currency is regulated by the gold and securities lying in the vaults of a State Bank; and more especially we laugh at the theory that its value was guaranteed thereby. We have instead come to learn that the value of the currency lies in the productive capacity of a nation."

"Hitler's Official Program," published in 1938 by Unwin Bros., London, tells about the following evil intentions of this man—against the money power:

"(1) We demand the abolition of all unearned incomes.

"(2) —personal enrichment through war must be regarded as a crime against the nation. We demand the ruthless confiscation of all war profits.

"(3) We demand a generous provision for old age.

"(4) The common interest before self interest, that is the spirit of our program.

"(5) Abolition of the thralldom of interest, that is the

kernel of National Socialism.

“(6) The power of money, most brutal of all powers, holds absolute sway and exercises a corrupting and destroying influence on State, Nation, Society, Morals, Drama and Literature. There must be no wavering, no drawing back in this battle of giants; it is either victory or extinction.

“(7) The general welfare is the supreme law.

“(8) Finance shall exist for the benefit of state, the financial magnates shall not form a State within a State.

“(9) Usury and profiteering and personal enrichment at the expense, and to the injury of the Nation shall be punished with death.

“(10) The duty of the State is to provide the necessities of life, and not to secure the highest possible rate of interest for capital.”

That was the soundest economic platform written in recent ages. No wonder it was so successful in its purpose. No wonder a poll of American G. I’s showed that a startlingly high proportion of them believed “Hitler did the Reich a lot of good before 1939” and that Germany had some reasons for going to war. No wonder Lloyd George, England’s World I leader, after a personal visit said of Hitler: “There is no doubt that Hitler, so far as Germany is concerned, is the resurrection and the life.” “He is the savior of Germany, a great and wonderful leader;” “He is the George Washington of Germany.” No wonder the world financial monopolies stood aghast and then decided upon the eradication of this program.

If Germany succeeded in her plan of economic penetration, other nations would undoubtedly follow her example. The whole world would then exchange goods for goods on the basis of equality and good fellowship. No one would want to borrow and no one would have debts to pay. But it is from the pyramid of

debt that the Money Power rules the world. Thus Russia had incurred hostility for refusing to pay her debts, and Germany incurred hostility for refusing to contract new ones.

If the German monetary experiment had been permitted to develop on the basis of a friendly exchange of goods it would have provided the world with information to assist in solving commercial problems. Nations of the world would be well fed—but the financiers would lose their power and their profits. The big bankers were alarmed at the success of Germany' s money just as their families were alarmed generations ago at the success of Lincoln's money. The very words of consternation uttered at Lincoln equally describe their chagrin at Hitler's progress, namely: If that mischievous financial policy . . . should become indurated down to a fixture, then that government will furnish its own money without cost. It will pay off its own debts and be without debt. It will have all the money necessary to carry on its own commerce. It will become prosperous beyond precedent in the history of the civilized countries of the world."

What might have been a laudable program on the part of Germany was thus the principal cause of World War II. The fight between rival monetary policies was inevitable. The main object now was to find or, if necessary, make an "incident"—an excuse to say: "Germany wants War! Hitler wants to rule the world! We must fight for Christianity, civilization, and the four freedoms everywhere!"

At a meeting of the Chicago Flagship, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Theodore W. Miller, Past County Judge Advocate of the V.F.W. stated:

"If the international bankers and their controlled press were actually sincere in wanting to prepare against invasion by Hitler, they would do so by making this country economically sound. But they are not interested in making this country economically sound. It is their international banking racket,

based on gold, that they want to preserve with our lives and resources. These same international bankers dominated France, through their control of the Bank of France. Once these international bankers dominated Germany, through their control of the Reichsbank, but not any longer. That is why Germany is now economically the soundest nation in Europe if not in the whole world. These international bankers, headed by the Rothschilds and Morgan, still dominate England, through their control of the Bank of England. They dominate the United States and its servile government, through their control of the Federal Reserve flank and its member banks."

That is why Hitler failed in his attempted alliance with England. It will startle most people to learn that such a proposal was seriously offered by Hitler, yet such is a fact.

A witness (Dahlerus) said Hitler's proposals, which he took to 10 Downing street on Aug. 27, 1939, for submission to Chamberlain, Foreign Minister Halifax, and others were,

1. Germany would sign a pact of alliance with Britain.

2. England would help Germany obtain Danzig and the Polish corridor, but give the Poles the use of Danzig's port.

3. Germany would guarantee Poland's sovereignty.

4. Agreement on Germany's former colonies.

5. "Adequate guarantees" on the treatment of the German minority in Poland.

6. Germany would pledge to "defend the British empire with the German Wehrmacht wherever it might be attacked."

Before handing over the proposals, Dahlerus said, Hitler upbraided the British and asked bitterly why he found it impossible to reach an agreement with Britain. It is evident that Hitler did not realize the extent to which the International Bankers dominated England.

A few months after the ceasing of hostilities in Europe, it was frankly admitted in the press that Germany not only did not prepare for conquering the world, but had not even prepared for conquering her most obvious enemy, England. The fact is that Germany never wanted war with England or France but these latter did want war with Germany. They declared war against Germany when the Polish war trap was sprung as set by England, by encouraging Poland's resistance against Germany's justified demand for a correction of the Polish Corridor injustice, an injustice generally recognized as such the world over, and also by inducing Poland's intolerable provocation of border violations. National Unity, which every other nation is free to claim for itself, was simply to be denied to the Germans. It was incompatible with England's balance-of-power policy.

England, regardless of what her statesmen may claim, was not concerned as to the form of government in Germany, but she was much concerned in the success of the Hitler monetary system through which the control of money and the value thereof was completely in the hands of the government. It is not so in England, where the Bank of England, like the Federal Reserve System here at home and the bank of France in France, is privately controlled and manipulated, not for the interest of the people but in the interest of those who control gold and credit.

It was for this reason that the war was fought in Europe, that the youth of the belligerent nations was sacrificed in this contest between governmental control and private control of the monies of the world.

After learning these facts surely no one can help but realize that the "Unnecessary War" was a Money Lord's War.

At a meeting of the Economic Reform Club and Institute, London, England, Nov. 15, 1942, the existing gold situation was discussed. The opinion was generally expressed that it

would not be far wrong to say that the war is being waged between the Allies, who are on a gold exchange standard, and the Axis powers, who want to rule out, altogether, gold as a basis of currency.

The meeting agreed that there are indications of a well laid and maturing plan to put us all back on the gold basis as soon as possible after cessation of hostilities; and the probable underlying meaning of it all is the establishment of a financial system based on gold to operate the economic controls of a proposed world federation.

In this connection may it be remembered that one of the demands of President Roosevelt to Japan in the pre-war discussions was that Japan drop her monetary system (which by expansion endangers the interest exploitation) and adopt the American-British system (which by contraction safeguards interest exploitation.)

The war and the peace would be lost by the democratic nations of the world—no matter how victorious in the end on the battlefield—if these nations would tolerate being again fettered by the bonds of the gold money too short for the distribution of capacity production at the existing price levels.

Old Marshall Petain's trial in Paris brought into the news the name of Georges Mandel, former head of the House of Rothschild, whose real name was Jeroboam Rothschild, close adviser to Clemenceau when the Versailles alleged peace-treaty was written. The charge against the old Marshall was "he caused the death of Georges Mandel." If that charge was true then Petain was guilty of an unpardonable sin against International Finance, for he killed the worst enemy France ever had.

When the impregnable Maginot Line against the Germans on the east border of France was completed, part of the Government

and all the people of France wanted further protection by continuing the wall from its north end to the sea. Such a wall would have saved France but would have led, no doubt, to an invasion of England and the end of the British Empire. The Bankers refused a loan for further construction, and so France later fell to the Germans who flanked the wall in the defenseless discontinued sector.

At the time Jeroboam Rothschild (Georges Mandel) was in the French cabinet, along with his puppet Premier, Paul Reynaud. They defeated the project which could have saved France militarily and they are the guilty ones. Petain may have been guilty too; the point is not the defense of any dictator, only the prosecution of the real criminals. The fall of France and of every nation, including the planned fall of the American Republic, is the work of the same gang of criminals, the International Financiers.

Like World War I, the late war was not national, it was not even racial. It was economic. And economic systems are dominated, controlled and operated by the chief agents of finance, the international bankers.

There was no quarrel between the peoples of the United States and the people of Germany. The only exchange of arguments was one diplomatic tilt between Roosevelt and Hitler with the American President getting the soundest beating any national leader ever received at the hands of the leader of another nation in the whole history of diplomacy. Because Roosevelt’s message was an ultimatum in disguise, because the exchange was the nearest thing to a disagreement between the two countries and because the newspapers and other media of propaganda covered the matter up for history, it is well to review the facts here. The argument could not for obvious reasons be played up as a cause for hostilities nor to hide the real reasons. Other causes than the guilt of international finance had to be found. Unjust aggression was finally hit upon although England and Russia, beloved allies, stood even more

guilty than did Germany.

Mr. Roosevelt began his message by expressing the concern of the Western Hemisphere for the fear of a new war or series of wars. Hitler observed what even a schoolboy diplomat should have known; that since the treaty of Versailles fourteen wars were waged, “in none of which Germany was concerned, but in which the States of the Western hemisphere, in whose name President Roosevelt also speaks, were indeed concerned.”

In addition, he pointed out there were in the same period (1919-38) twenty-six violent interventions and sanctions in which Germany had no part while the United States carried out military interventions in six cases since 1918.

To Mr. Roosevelt’s opinion that every major war must have serious consequences for generations to come, Hitler remarked that the German people were made to learn this better than any other peoples because the treaty of Versailles imposed burdens on the German people which could not have been paid off in a hundred years, although it had been proved precisely by American teachers of Constitutional law, historians, and professors of history that Germany was no more to blame for the outbreak of the war than any other nation.

Mr. Roosevelt declared that three nations in Europe and one in Africa have had their independence terminated. As regards the three nations of Europe, the answer was that the Allies themselves did that when in 1918 in the treaty of Versailles, contrary to solemn promises, the nations were separated from their communities and forced into a dependence upon an international foreign world which they hated. As regards the one nation in Africa, practically all the peoples of Africa, such as the Moroccans, Berbers, Arabs, and Negroes, for example, have fallen to foreign might, the swords of which were not inscribed “Made in Germany,” but “Made by Democracies.”

Mr. Roosevelt said that no peoples should go to war except in the cause of self-evident home defense. Hitler pointed out that in World War I American soldiers invading the shores of Europe hardly did so in defense of their homes. He also observed that a research committee set up by President Roosevelt himself (the Nye Investigation) had examined the cause of American entry into the Great War and reached the conclusion that the entry ensued chiefly for exclusively capitalistic reasons, and that nevertheless, no practical conclusions have been drawn from this fact.

Mr. Roosevelt also declared that it was clear to him that all problems could be solved at the conference table. Hitler pointed out that "America herself gave the sharpest expression of her mistrust in the effectiveness of conferences." The conference table was not even used in the war between the States when every condition favored its use. The United States was the first nation to refuse to join the greatest conference of all times, the League of Nations.

As for this conference settling anything, not one instance can be cited of a decisive solution of a single international problem If every problem can be solved at the conference table, then every nation, including the United States, has been led for the past 800 years by blind or criminal men.

Mr. Roosevelt's chief object in the message was to get assurance that "the German armed forces will not attack, and above all, not invade, the territory or possessions of the following independent nations: Finland, Latvia, Estonia, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, Great Britain, Ireland, France, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, Leichtenstein, Luxemburg, Poland, Hungary, Turkey, Iraq, the Arabias, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and Iran."

Whoever wrote that part of the President's speech which included Ireland and Palestine, should have been attending night school. It was easy for Hitler to point to the speech of

the Prime Minister of Ireland (de-Valera) who charged England, not Germany, with oppressing Ireland and subjecting her to continuous aggression, and then add, “With all due respect to Mr. Roosevelt’s insight into the needs and cares of other countries, he may nevertheless be assured that the Irish Prime Minister will be more familiar with the dangers which threaten his country than the President of the United States.”

Hitler then noted that it was English, not German, troops which occupied Palestine; and that in this case England was not defending herself against evident Arab attack on the British homeland which Roosevelt wanted as the only excuse for war. without being called upon to do so, was endeavoring to establish her power in a foreign territory which did not belong to her.

The German leader answered the reference to all the nations listed by President Roosevelt by first ascertaining from the States mentioned that not even one felt itself menaced by Germany and that the inquiry addressed by the American was not sent with even their consent, much less its suggestion. Hitler then made the following offer:

> *“The German Government is nevertheless prepared to give each of the States named an assurance of the kind desired by Mr. Roosevelt on the condition of absolute reciprocity, provided that the State wishes it and itself addresses to Germany a request for such an assurance together with appropriate proposals.”*

The peace pact was intended to be effective for ten years. Several years ago Hitler appealed to the League of Nations for a 25-year peace and was turned down. A 10-year peace was desirable by its erstwhile supporters in 1939.

When Roosevelt asked Hitler to make to the nations of the world a statement “on the present policy of the German Government,” Hitler noted that many important statements of

German policy made by him are either withheld from the democratic peoples or distorted by their press, then said: “If President Roosevelt thinks he is qualified to address such a request to Germany . . . we on our side might, with the same right, address to the President of the American Republic the question as to what aim American foreign policy has in view in its turn.”

When Mr. Roosevelt called for disarmament, Hitler called attention to his previous proposal for a maximum strength for all armies of 200,000, to his proposal for the abolition of all offensive weapons, of bombing planes, poison gas, etc. When these were refused, Hitler offered to raise the maximum to 300,000 and no one even deigned to discuss the matter.

Instead of throwing a mad fit, raging at the democracies, shouting German defiance, immediately rushing to war or grabbing a few more territories as he was evidently supposed to do, Hitler treated the Roosevelt message with the sincerity and respect it did not deserve. The world-famous message was not the plea for peace it was advertised as being; it was an ultimatum of war, a last warning issued to the dictatorships that the democracies would resist aggression with aggression.

Acting upon the suggestion of former British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden, the America State Department stigmatized Italy, Japan and Germany as aggressor” nations, but it was noticed that at the same time Britain entered into secret agreements with Italy and Japan and Germany—the now famous Chamberlain-Halifax treaties. Even an amateur in international diplomacy would have recognized that America had committed an act of war and had been double-crossed by Britain.

At the time of the Munich Conference following the Czech crisis it was known that Chamberlain, Daladier, Mussolini and Hitler had entered into certain agreements regarding the annexation and acquisition of new territories. Britain and France agreed that the Reich should re-acquire territories

taken from Germany in the iniquitous Versailles treaty—provided the Reich did not move for the annexation of former colonial territories now held by Great Britain. The democracies agreed with Italy that Mussolini might annex lands that were promised to Italy in 1914 as the price for the betrayal of the Triple Entente-promises that were never fulfilled. Hence, Chamberlain and Daladier determined upon the so-called appeasement policy in order to disguise the concessions which their democracies had granted to the so-called dictatorships.

Following the Munich Conference the State Department embarked upon a program of taunting belligerence. It framed trade policies which were concessions to favored nations and sanctions against the dictatorships—secret trade agreements which were for practical purposes treaties; pacts with certain nations, and economic and political sanctions against other nations. It is dreadfully apparent that the State Department acted beyond its limits in making unconstitutional commitments with foreign nations—unconstitutional because the framing and ratifying of treaties belongs only to the United States Congress.

Concerning the ostensible cause of the war, the Polish case let it be recorded that Germany had every just reason for the annexation of Danzig. Either the treaty of Versailles was in effect or it was not in effect; there is no other alternative. If it was in effect Danzig belonged to Germany because according to the terms of the treaty minorities were self-determinant, that is, they could by a free choice join whichever power they cared to! Danzig was estimated to be 96 percent pro-German, wanted to return to the German government and the people were refused a chance to express their free choice. If the Versailles treaty were not in effect, then that portion which created the free city of Danzig was not effective and the situation reverted to the status it was previous to the treaty's enactment. At that time Danzig was a

part of Germany.

Concerning the United States-Japanese peace negotiations of 1941, it will be noted that the same method of approach was used as Roosevelt applied against Hitler. And the answers, self evident, are equally as humiliating as those supplied by Hitler.

The United States wanted Japan to quit the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis. Japan could by the same logic have demanded hat the United States quit the United States-London axis. The United States wanted the Jap[anese] to get out of China. Japan could by the same logic have demanded that the United States get out of Iceland, New Guina and the bases leased from England. The United States demanded Japan withdraw her troops from Indo-China as evidence of good intentions Japan could by the same logic have demanded that the United States withdraw supplies from Libya as evidence of good intentions. The United States wanted Japan to stop aiding Germany. Japan could by the same logic have demanded the United States stop aiding England.

Roosevelt, as tool of the internationalists, and one time member of their clique, timed his ultimatums to Germany and Japan perfectly. The "steps short of war" were, as he knew, steps to war. These steps as listed by Senator Books of Illinois were as follows:

> *"(1) We passed a law called the neutrality law. That was to prevent our getting into their next war. And, in the short span of a few months, all the promise that we would stay out of the war and the pretext of building our own national defense, we have quickened our step….*
>
> *"(2) We changed our neutrality law to sell goods to those people fighting for liberty. But to obtain that change in the law both the Executive branch and Members of the Congress pledged that all sales would be for cash-and-carry, and that it would keep war away from our shore.*

“(3) Then came the original conscription bill. They said it was only for our own defense. The administration and Members of Congress pledged that these men would be taken only for 1 year, and that they would not be taken beyond the limits of the Western Hemisphere. Who could be so unpatriotic as not to be willing to serve 1 year to prepare himself to protect our home and our shore? “It was a pledge and it was a promise. It was another step.

“(4) Then we were told that Britain needed our airplanes and tanks, and that we must sell them to them even though we didn’t have enough to train the men we were calling into service. But that was done.

“(5) The law forbade our selling these war implements, but we got around the law by calling them obsolete even though they were of our latest design and the best we had. Still they found a way to sell them. They said it was to keep war away from our shore.

“(6) Then Britain said she needed our destroyers. The law forbade it. But we called them obsolete. too. And we were told that we were trading them for bases. Britain got our ships. We got the right to negotiate for and to purchase bases, and to pay for them with cash.

“(7) Then came the lease-lend bill. They said it was needed to prevent our becoming involved in the war. Some of us who opposed it said that if one man, namely the President, was given all the power to distribute our military and naval equipment throughout the world, that it was bound to involve us because he would naturally ask them what they needed it for, and sit in and advise them in the conduct of the war, which naturally would involve us. We were assured that this would not happen.

“(8) Then came the problem of production, and a priority system was established. Certain strategic materials were

curtailed, and our factories throughout the country began even then to feel that they would soon be faced with shortages that might result in losses or even closing down of their plants completely. But they were told it was to keep us out of the war.

"(9) Then the Chief Executive ordered ships of the countries of the world who were fighting those we chose to aid seized in our harbors. Then Congress was again asked to pass a law to give authority for that which had already been done.

"Another step. But, of course, they said, to keep us out of the war.

"(10) The United States Army moved in on men who were striking for a living wage in a factory that produced airplanes, 90 percent of which were being sent across the sea. There was no authority to move the Army with fixed bayonets into an industrial plant, but after the deed was done Congress was asked to pass a 'seizure bill,' and in the Senate it was intimated that we were not backing up our President when we wrote in an amendment which merely required that the management and labor be given ample time to conduct negotiations before the Army was used to seize the plant. But it was to keep us out of war.

"(11) Then we find suddenly that our troops are in Iceland—outside of the Western Hemisphere. Although we were told we were to take over Iceland and protect its people, we find that our soldiers are participating with the British troops there—outside the Western Hemisphere. They say again it is for national defense and to keep us out of war.

"Then we find that boys who were drafted from their homes, from their work, under the promise in the law for only 1 year's service have been sent, some of them, to the bases where those in authority knew at the time they were sending them that they could not keep faith with these boys and

return them within the year.

"(12) Then they came to Congress again and asked for authority for things that had already been done. What authority did they ask for? To remove the restrictions of the law so that men could be sent anywhere the Commander in Chief wished to send them beyond the Western Hemisphere. And, more—they asked to have every restriction removed as to the number that could be drafted, and they asked to have the restriction also removed as to the limit of time of their service."

Then came an ultimatum first to Germany, and afterwards to Japan. After the ultimatums came the "shoot on sight" order, followed by the news that "the shooting has started." That was the end Roosevelt had in view all the while he was guaranteeing his leadership as a course calculated to keep us out of war. The criticism he deserves is not that he misled his country but that he deliberately and deceitfully misled it. As one of his political critics said, "He lied us into war because he did not have the courage to lead us into war."

To find out how much Roosevelt was but the tool of the international bankers in these steps, "short of war," one had but to consider the forces behind a few of them. Take the Conscription Act first. It is hoped that a more detailed account of this step, as well as the others, will soon get a specific treatment and thus furnish still more light on the intrigues and power of the international bankers.

The conscription drive was started at the Harvard Club in New York City. Present was Mr. Grenville Clark of the law firm of Root, Clark, Buckner and Ballantine. It was he, according to Senator Holt, who actually wrote the original conscription bill. According to an Associated Press dispatch of July 1, 1937, Mrs. Grenville Clark saved $90,000 in taxes in one year through the use of 16 trusts. The Clark's trusts were established by Mr. and Mrs. Clark and were operated so that

during the 1936 tax year each of their three children was the beneficiary of five separate trusts.

That was the man who wrote the Conscription Bill—a man who refused to have his dollars conscripted but was anxious to have the sons of America conscripted to save his dollars. As Senator Holt remarked, it is "Communism" when one tries to conscript dollars, but it is "holy democracy" when one conscripts cannon fodder to save dollars.

Robert P. Patterson who was then the assistant Secretary of War was there, as was Elihu Root, Jr.—a member of the Clark law firm. Then there was Julius Ochs Adler, general manager of the New York Times, the pro-British … bible of journalism. Mr. Adler, according to Senator Holt, is a man who holds stock in corporations in countries then at war. Did he want to protect his investments?

Then there was Mr. K. P. Budd—a director of the North British and Mercantile Insurance Co., with headquarters in London. Add the name of Mr. J. B. Taylor, Jr., which the Congressional Record links up with those who have money invested in aircraft and aviation corporations. Also present was Mr. F. M. Weld, a director of the Baldwin Locomotive Works which will make millions out of this impending war. Brig. Gen. Benedict Crowell was there. He was the Assistant Secretary of War and Director of Munitions during the World War.

These men met on the 22nd day of May and set in motion this drive for conscripting the youth of the nation. There were no farmers present. There were no laborers present. There were no mothers present. There were no peace-loving Americans present. Present only were the scions of wealth, the directors of propaganda and the hard-boiled minions of Mars all except one of whom, according to Senator Holt, represented international banking firms.

On the 23rd day of May they went back to the same club and

passed a resolution for “aid to the Allies short of war.” On the 3rd day of June they met again. They met to raise money. They met to raise a quarter of a million dollars, according to Senator Holt (who puts his assertion in the form of a question) to drive a conscription bill through the Congress of the United States. One quarter of a million dollars to pay for propaganda. One quarter of a million dollars to conscript the boys of America. And that is patriotism!

About the time Senator Holt made this story known, the facts on the “Destroyer Dealt’ leaked out.

The Senate Committee on Naval Affairs asked Lewis Compton, the Acting Secretary of the Navy, to appear before the Committee and submit to questioning. Mr. Compton was asked by what authority this fleet of American warships was handed over to Great Britain. He was asked by what logic this fleet could be called a “surplus” fleet, or an obsolete fleet even when it was in the process of being built. Knowing that the cat was out of the bag, he admitted that the fleet was not obsolete but that the Navy Department “could change its mind.”

The chairman of the Committee then asked if Mr. Compton made this transfer by his own authority. The Under-Secretary of the Navy said it had been done entirely on his own responsibility. Immediately news of this admission got into the President’s cars. To save the situation from further embarrassing disclosures, Mr. Roosevelt contradicted Mr. Compton, saying that he, the President of the United States. had been fully and directly responsible for the transfer.

The law covering this point was read in the House of Representatives by Mr. Case of South Dakota. It is found in Chapter 30, Title V, 3, 40 Stat. 222. It is a law which has been in effect since 1917. It reads thus: It is unlawful “during a war in which the United States is a neutral nation to send out of the jurisdiction of the United States any vessel built, armed or equipped as a vessel of war … with any

intent or under any agreement or contract, written or oral, that such vessel shall be delivered to a belligerent nation." And the law goes on to say that if it is broken, the breaker shall suffer a fine or imprisonment or both. There stood Mr. Roosevelt once more displaying his disregard for law in the spotlight which he himself had created.

And if these vessels were obsolete as Lewis Compton tried to say they were, let us remember that they were built and constructed under President Roosevelt. Perhaps that admission is even more significant when one arrives at the conclusion that the ships which he built were not efficient when constructed to compete with better grade ships. That is the man into whose hands the United States entrusted the building of a two-sea navy. One wondered by the force of logic that if after the two-sea navy would have been built, the Secretary of the Navy would be forced to admit it was an obsolete, inefficient hunk of junk.

A pro-New Deal source reported soon after American troops invaded Germany east of the Rhine in World War II, that one H. J. Caesar, alien property custodian in France during the German occupation, had been captured by American forces and that proof was found among his captured papers, that United States and British Branch banks in Paris aided the enemy by loaning money to the Germans after the fall of France and while the United States was at war with Germany. If these charges are true as to American banks (Morgan and Chase National branch banks were specifically mentioned) then these bankers it would seem, are clearly guilty of treason by aiding the enemy with loans during the war.

The intrigue of international finance usually follows a pretty familiar pattern; if not the treasonable fashion pursued in the accusation just referred to, then often in the manner used by the Rothschilds as far back as 1815.

A group of international money lenders desired to make a World

War financial cleanup similar to that of old Nathan Rothschild at the battle of Waterloo Brother Nathan, historians say, spread false news; depressed the market on bonds and bought in at low, distress prices, only to have his holdings increase a hundredfold when the delayed real news came in.

The World War I group knew that, owing to the speed of communications (even though they controlled them), an important and battle would not serve their purposes, so they bought heavily and waited.

When the naval battle of Skaggerrack had been fought, the news came first to Winston Churchill as First Lord of the Admiralty. The news was carefully suppressed while a report which did not agree with the facts was sent to the British Prime Minister David Balfour to be read in Parliament. For five days the facts were suppressed through the co-operation of Churchill at the Admiralty.

The plan worked. Those five days were marked by the wildest rumors about mounting casualty lists and the defeat of the British fleet was painted far worse than the facts warranted. The inner circle of financiers made millions; but their deliberately engineered crash in English securities brought ruin to scores of old English titled families. These English aristocrats did not know why—but the bottom simply fell out of their security investments and "the war" was blamed.

It must be remembered that this group of manipulators did not represent English interests, although they hid, and are still operating, behind the protection of the Union Jack. The … Deutsche Bank in Germany, and several American banking houses, were part and parcel of the syndicate that reaped the windfall from the battle of Skaggerrack.

Of course, Mr. Winston Churchill—that hypersensitive character who collected a huge sum from an American publisher for publishing a single erroneous statement about him after he

called America that dastardly, more slanderous name, “Uncle Shylock.” with complete immunity—being the key man in springing this deal, did not, we may be sure, perform without compensation. All in all. it was a sordid piece of business, this profiteering handsomely while several thousand courageous German and English sailors died in a steel hail of exploding shells and went to their end in watery graves.

It is not difficult to understand why Winston Churchill, Goat of Gallipoli and Duke of Dunkirk, received such a magnificent press.

The international money lenders control many channels of publicity. Other unsavory characters of unsavory plots had to be built up. Take the case of Maxim Litvinov deposed as Foreign Commissar of Soviet Russia. In how many newspapers was it read that he was responsible for killing more than 30 persons at Tiflis and injuring more than 200 in a bank robbery, or that he was a “notorious smuggler” or that he was a spy, or that he was twice ordered out of England for seditious and traitorous activities? Why should all this be unprintable and why should such a character be built up in the world press with nations, prime ministers—yes, even presidents—hanging on his words, and doing his bidding? Who builds up such characters if not the war mongers’ press?

Secretary of State Byrnes was supposed to be the outstanding American on the true causes of the war. Yet he displayed the most startling ignorance regarding this fundamental aspect and showed himself steeped in war propaganda when he said in Paris while attending the “Peace” Conference that the two World Wars in this century were due to German military might. And to think Byrnes was chosen as the “man of 1946!” British Foreign Secretary Bevin reiterated the same thought when he said that the chief aim of the deputy foreign ministers was to throttle the Reich for hundreds of years by crushing the German lust for power.

When the history of the late war propaganda is written it will be found that when conscription was first passed in England it was really for the purpose of internal control rather than aimed at the German Reich where the English had tremendous investments It will reveal that in the war that followed the Battle of Singapore, for example, was in effect a battle for Kuhn, Loeb and Company of America, with their rubber monopoly, and the Sasoons of Britain, with their opium monopoly. Americans were fed propaganda for so long that it was a shock for them to learn that roughly four out of every five American G. I's preferred their enemy Germany to any of the Allied countries they saw. When the history of World War II propaganda is written other information still more shocking will be told. It will also be found that the financiers were propagating it.

The mass of evidence concerning the people and principles responsible for World War II is so vast that the author of "Citadels of Chaos" hopes it will be put into a volume of its own. Such a manuscript should be prepared now while the evidence is still fresh in order that it might be of untold service in molding true American patriotism as well as profitable to future true historians in their battle with propaganda.

When the startling information concerning International Bankers' stake in the war is known people will not find it difficult to believe that if Hitler had agreed to take a loan of one billion dollars from the Bank of England on any day from the invasion of Poland to the German capitulation, the war would have been over by evening of the next day.

The tense Berlin situation of the present has put World War III in a more or less cold stage. The basic difference between Russia and American internationalists is over whose money, Russia's or America's, shall be used in the Berlin area. The blood and fortunes of Americans are definitely in danger of being used once again to enforce the un-Constitutional and

anti-American practice of our unlawfully legalized counterfeiters.

When people learn the facts they will say with the brilliant Indian lecturer, C. Jinarajadana:

> *“I do not believe we shall finally disarm War till we have a reform of the banking system of the world. International Finance is the one element which contributed to War.”*